



Tithe an
Oireachtais
Houses of the
Oireachtas

Joint Committee of Inquiry into the Banking Crisis

Clarification statement of

David Doyle

Strictly Private & Confidential

As indicated on its cover page, the document(s) contained within are confidential unless and until the Joint Committee decides otherwise including where the Joint Committee publishes such document(s). For the avoidance of doubt, "documents" include witness statements in this context. Further to section 37 of the Houses of the Oireachtas (Inquiries, Privileges and Procedures) Act 2013 ("the Act"), while the documents remain confidential, you must not disclose the document(s) or divulge in any way that you have been given the document(s), other than:

- "(a) with the prior consent in writing of the committee,
- (b) to the extent necessary for the purposes of an application to the Court, or in any proceedings of the Part 2 inquiry, or
- (c) to his or her legal practitioner."¹

Serious sanctions apply for breach of this section. In particular, your attention is drawn to section 41(4) of the Act, which makes breach of section 37(1) a criminal offence.

¹ See s.37 of the Houses of the Oireachtas (Inquiries, Privileges and Procedures) Act 2013

Material Clarification –David Doyle

12th September 2015

I refer further to the Chairman's letter of 28 August.

Regarding my meetings with Paddy Mullarkey and Alan Gray while Secretary General you asked me to outline discussions relating to official matters during these meetings. I have now been supplied with a copy of my digital diary by the Department.

I note that the only reference you can give me to these meetings were to entries in my digital diary and that you had no other papers in this regard.

In the first instance I would note, as I have on other occasions when asked about that digital diary, the inclusion of an entry in the diary is no guarantee that a meeting actually took place as changed last minute circumstances could from time to time dictate that an appointment would not be kept. Secondly many meetings took place on an ad-hoc or urgent basis which would not have been listed in the diary.

Regarding the nature of the question posed, - outline discussions relating to official matters, it is not possible for me to recall, purely on the basis of the listing of a date, what transpired, between six and nine years ago.

Dealing with Paddy Mullarkey first. As I have already indicated, Mr Mullarkey was, and is, a close personal friend. My digital diary records twelve contacts- two in 2006, three in 2007, three in 2008, and four in 2009. In all cases these were social occasions over lunch. I have no recollection of explicitly discussing official matters but I am sure that the general environment of the day would have been discussed. I had no discussions with Mr Mullarkey concerning any measures being considered by Government across the spectrum of Government interventions on any front, or on any issues regarding private sector involvements he may have had.

Turning to my meetings with Mr Gray. Mr Gray was known to me prior to his appointment as I had come across him from time to time in his advisory work. He was thus a work acquaintance, not a personal one.

I would have met Mr Gray regularly at the Board meetings of the Central Bank - usually on a monthly basis. The Board minutes would record the general tenor of matters discussed at that forum.

Apart from those board meetings, my digital diary records six probable meetings - one in 2007, one in 2008, three in 2009 and one in 2010. I can recall two of those. In January 2007, Mr Gray was appointed to the Board of the Central Bank and the Regulator and I met him that month. We had a discussion about the appointment. I was very pleased that Mr Gray had been appointed as he was very well regarded generally, and in the Department. The only point that I

recall is that I explained to Mr Gray that being on the two Boards, even without any involvement in any sub-committees, would be very intensive in terms of his time commitments.

The next meeting was listed as a lunch at one pm on 29 August 2008 in a public restaurant. I have no recollection of this. As a lunch in a very public location, there would have been no discussions about individual Central Bank or regulatory authority matters or about specific Department of Finance policy considerations. Assuming the lunch did occur, I am sure that the rapidly deteriorating economic and fiscal position would have been discussed in general terms.

Three meetings were listed in the diary in January 2009 - for 4 pm on the fifth for half an hour, for 10 am on the sixth for half an hour, and for 230 on the 26th for a half an hour. I am sure that given the events that had transpired on the Banking front and the myriad of issues that this gave rise to such as in relation to a reform of the Structure of the Central Bank / Regulatory board, the ongoing issues in relation to the need to consider the future of the banking sector, capital requirements and the terms for this etc etc would have been touched on. Given the ongoing fiscal deterioration at that point I am also sure that position would have been touched on too.

The final meeting was over lunch on the 22 January 2010. I do recall that - it was a social occasion to mark my impending retirement the following week.

If there any specific questions you want to put to me regarding my contacts with both individuals I will do my best to be of assistance.

The Chairman's letter also posed a series of questions relating to a scoping paper produced in the Department in 2008. I have been advised that this paper was produced in the context of the work of the Domestic Standing Group. I was not involved in the work of the group or with the paper referred to.

Yours sincerely,

David Doyle