

52. The Report also identifies several crucial barriers to the effective implementation of the Nolan Report, the chief of which was the absence of leadership at the top. In general, my experience was that Bishops and Congregational Leaders did not take full responsibility for using their legitimate authority to lead the changes that were needed. Unfortunately, they were too often paying lip service to the work, viewing it as a regrettable and temporary necessity to deal with the unwelcome and damaging publicity at the time. Many were resistant to change, fearful that their authority and autonomy would be undermined, and unwilling or unable to recognise the anguish and harmful, lasting impact of abuse. If culture is defined as "*the way the leaders do things around here*", it was evidently a harder task to affect the change of culture that was needed further down the organisation in light of these attitudes.
53. It proved impossible to call them together for training and development, and I therefore visited every Bishop in England and Wales individually to attempt to engage them in the change process and assist with any specific issues they were dealing with. Resources did not allow for this approach in relation to Religious Congregations; see para 22 above for my work in connecting with them.
54. Other barriers included:
- 54.1 The clash between the requirement for accountable hierarchical leadership and organisation to deliver a safe environment for children, and the collegiate, and varied organisational structures, cultures priorities and resources within and between Dioceses and Religious Congregations;
  - 54.2 The wide diversity of Religious Congregations, which was a huge challenge to the One Church approach, with uptake of national policies hugely variable, according to attitudes and/or resources, and the initial collaboration of CBCEW and CoR faltering;
  - 54.3 A lack of familiarity with partnership working both internally and externally;
  - 54.4 The use of people from various backgrounds in key roles, some with little or no experience of this complex and demanding work;
  - 54.5 a (misguided) perception that the paramountcy principle and Canon Law were diametrically opposed;
  - 54.6 a persistent issue regarding assessment and management of risk where the alleged abuser was a priest or religious, whereby unsuitable internal Church assessors were often preferred to assess risk instead of professionally qualified independent experts;