



Rt Hon Kier Starmer KCB KC MP
Prime Minister
10 Downing Street
London SW1A 2AA

Dear Prime Minister,

Thank you for confirming that you are willing to meet with survivors reporting trafficking and exploitation linked to Mohamed Al Fayed and Harrods.

For such a meeting to be meaningful, it should involve substantive engagement with the structural issues raised by survivors and advocates. It should not function merely as symbolic engagement in the absence of clarity regarding investigative scope, public accountability and institutional integrity.

The purpose of this letter is therefore to outline a small number of matters that we ask you to consider in advance of the meeting and to which we hope you will be prepared to respond substantively. We are setting out these issues clearly in advance so that the discussion can be focused, constructive and properly informed by the public commitments already made by Government.

It would be helpful to receive a brief written response addressing these matters in advance of the meeting so that survivors can engage in that discussion as constructively as possible.

Public Standard Articulated by Government

In your remarks in Hastings on 5 February 2026, you stated: *“In this country, we will not look away. We will not shrug our shoulders. And we will not allow the powerful to treat justice as optional. We will pursue the truth. We will uphold the integrity of public life. And we will do everything in our power — and in the interests of justice — to ensure accountability is delivered. That is what the public expects. It is what the victims deserve. And it is what I will do.”*

Separately, the Minister for Safeguarding, Jess Phillips, wrote in February 2026 that: *“Deeds not words are what matter... change is all that will suffice.”*

Taken together, these statements establish a clear public standard. The issues set out below are framed consistently with those principles.

Constitutional Boundaries

We recognise the limits of executive authority. Nothing proposed in this letter involves directing investigative tactics or influencing evidential decisions. Rather, the issues raised concern whether appropriate assurance mechanisms exist to ensure that investigations of this scale are capable of testing the full range of allegations where evidence supports doing so.

We recognise that matters relating to policing oversight and potential assurance mechanisms would fall primarily within the responsibilities of the Home Secretary and relevant ministers. We write to you as Prime Minister because the scale and public significance of these allegations raises issues of national leadership and cross-government responsibility.



The Core Public Interest Question

The central issue is whether the investigation being conducted by the Metropolitan Police Service is structured to test the full breadth of allegations reflected in survivor accounts and public reporting. Specifically, whether investigative scope is capable of examining potential trafficking or organised exploitation, the involvement of all named perpetrators, institutional or individual facilitation, systemic enablement, institutional failure and cross-border elements, where supported by evidence, to a standard capable of withstanding court scrutiny and independent inspection. This question seeks assurance regarding the scope and structure of the investigation, not outcomes.

Public reporting indicates that more than 400 women have come forward with allegations linked to Mohamed Al Fayed and the Harrods enterprise. Allegations of this scale reasonably require appropriate resourcing, structured victim engagement and investigative scope capable of testing the full range of potential offences where evidence supports doing so.

Matters We Ask You to Address

In advance of meeting survivors, we ask that you consider the following issues and be prepared to address them substantively.

Recognition of Investigative Breadth

Confirmation that, as asked by Wendy Chamberlain MP during PMQs on 11 March 2026, you recognise the characterisation of trafficking and that, where allegations raise potential issues of facilitation, systemic enablement, organised exploitation, or trafficking, investigative scope must be capable of testing those possibilities where evidence supports them.

Application of Your Public Commitments

Whether the commitments you articulated in Hastings, including that the powerful should not be permitted to treat justice as optional and that government will do *“everything in our power”* to ensure accountability, apply fully in this case.

Independent Investigative Scope Assurance

The need for a proportionate, independent assurance mechanism to review investigative scope. This could include, for example, inspection by HMICFRS or an independently chaired review commissioned by the relevant minister, with appropriate safeguards to avoid interference with live evidence or operational tactics.

Such a mechanism could assess whether investigative frameworks are structured to test:

- patterns or networked offending hypotheses where suggested by evidence;
- facilitator or enabler roles;
- international liaison pathways where cross-border elements have been reported;
- financial or asset strands where appropriate;
- victim engagement processes proportionate to the reported scale of survivors.

Evidence Preservation Assurance

Whether you are satisfied that appropriate systems are in place to preserve relevant records and material in investigations of this scale and public significance.



Escalation Pathway

We recognise that public inquiries established under the Inquiries Act 2005 can operate alongside criminal investigations. An important function of establishing an inquiry framework at an early stage is that the chair may issue directions requiring the preservation of relevant documents and material. Given the scale and nature of the allegations reported in this case, the safeguarding of evidence is a matter of obvious public importance. An independent assurance mechanism could therefore help determine whether escalation to a statutory inquiry may be warranted, including in circumstances where systemic institutional failures, multi-agency breakdowns, evidence suppression, or other serious concerns were identified.

Leadership and Public Confidence

Where allegations of this scale raise profound questions about institutional accountability and investigative scope, national leadership has a responsibility to ensure that public confidence in the justice system is protected.

We therefore hope that when we meet, you will be able to address these issues directly and demonstrate how the commitments you have articulated publicly will translate into meaningful institutional action.

Survivors have waited many years for institutional engagement. For this meeting to carry real significance, it should provide an opportunity for substantive discussion of the structural issues outlined above.

As the Minister for Safeguarding has written, deeds - not words - are what matter. Survivors deserve institutional integrity, not symbolic engagement.

Yours sincerely,

No One Above

isabella@nooneabove.org

www.nooneabove.org