



DUTY OF CARE

a ransomware attack and data theft through Carevault, the third party supplier that holds rostering and electronic care records for all 41 homes

CLIENT

MERIDIAN CARE GROUP

DATE

12 AUGUST 2026

FACILITATOR

ELLIS WARNER

DURATION

92 MINUTES

SUMMARY

DURATION	INJECTS	DECISIONS	POLLS	CALLS	ESCALATIONS
92m	14	11	2	2	4

Meridian Care Group ran Duty of Care on 12 August 2026, a ninety-two minute crisis simulation built around a ransomware attack and data theft through Carevault, the third party that holds rostering and electronic care records for all 41 homes. Fourteen injects were delivered to nine seats. Two AI phone calls were placed to participants, one from a home manager who could not administer a morning medication round and one from a journalist who already had the ransom note. The exercise scored 65 out of 100 for crisis response under pressure.

The technical and legal response was genuinely good. Escalation scored 80 and was the strongest thing in the room: four escalations, every one of them to the right person, with the Head of IT reaching the CEO within nine minutes of the supplier confirming unauthorised access. Legal and regulatory handling scored 74, and it was earned rather than lucky. The Data Protection Officer notified the ICO on the earlier of the two defensible awareness times rather than the one that bought more runway, and the CEO refused to open a channel with the threat actor within forty seconds of direct contact landing in her inbox. The Operations Manager's call with Ashfield Lodge is the best three minutes of the session: paper charts authorised, the GP surgery brought in for the three residents whose medication had changed, and a clear instruction on what home staff were and were not to say to families.

The systemic gap is everything facing outwards. Media handling scored 39 and reporting 40. A family member asked a reasonable question in public at T+31 and was never answered by anyone. The CQC's request for assurance on resident safety arrived at T+60 addressed to a Head of Care Quality who sat in the room for ninety-two minutes without a single captured action, and it was still unanswered when the exercise closed. Under pressure from a journalist who already had the ransom note, the Head of Comms confirmed contact with "the relevant authorities", which was read straight back as confirmation of a notifiable breach. Engagement was 78: 7 of 9 seats produced a decision or took a call, and the two seats that did not were the two closest to the people this incident actually happened to.

KEY DECISIONS

Supplier notification: security incident at Carevault (T+14:10)

Dan Whitlock, Head of IT, isolated the Carevault integration and put every home on paper MAR charts, seven and a half minutes after the supplier's email arrived. His reasoning was that a compromised supplier environment does not get a live connection into Meridian's. The call cost care continuity in the short term and protected the regulatory position, which is the right way round. He escalated to the CEO a minute later.

Ransom note found on the shared drive (T+16:00)

Whitlock again, and again quickly: preserve the note, pull the affected servers, touch nothing else. He named the insurer as well as forensics as a reason, which is more than most rooms do at this point.

Ashfield Lodge: no medication records for the morning round (T+22:10)

Tom Ashworth, Operations Manager, authorised paper charts, sent the regional lead and told the home manager to ring the GP surgery for the three residents whose medication had changed since the March printout. He also gave her a clean line for families and drew the boundary at head office for anything about a cyber attack. This is the decision the rest of the exercise should have been measured against and largely was not.

Poll: do we pay to stop resident data being published? (T+27:30, committed T+30:20)

The room's first instinct was clear. Five of eight voted not to engage at all, two for a negotiator without payment authority, one to pay. The Finance Director was the one, and wrote that nine hundred thousand against the cost of this going public "is not an obviously stupid trade". The facilitator committed the majority position. Worth noting the poll ran before the sample of 300 records arrived, so this is genuine first instinct rather than a reaction to names on a page.

ICO opens an enquiry (T+33:40)

Nadia Farrow, Data Protection Officer, notified with what she had and stated 03:20 as the point of awareness, which is the supplier's discovery rather than Meridian's. Her reasoning was that arguing the point later looks worse than notifying early with gaps. She escalated to the General Counsel for sign off on the wording rather than sending it alone.

Health Service Journal (T+40:10)

Sophie Brennan, Head of Comms, held the line: technical issue, care unaffected, statement within the hour. The decision was right and the execution on the call was not. Asked directly whether resident data had been taken, she said Meridian had "contacted the relevant authorities", and Okeke read it back as an ICO notification and therefore a confirmed personal data breach. The transcript is in section 05 and is worth reading out in the room.

Backups are eleven days old (T+49:30)

Whitlock chose to rebuild from the eleven day restore point and reconstruct the gap from paper and GP records, in under five minutes. The decision is defensible. What nobody asked, in the room or afterwards, is where else an alert is going to a mailbox nobody owns.

Threat actor sends a sample of 300 resident records (T+58:00)

Priya Raval, CEO, did not engage, routed it to legal and the police and opened nothing further, forty seconds after it landed. She then told the General Counsel so in writing, and the General Counsel's reply is the sharpest line in the session: put the fact that we did not engage in front of the board today, in writing, because that sentence is the one that protects us later.

Poll: do we tell families today that resident records were taken? (T+63:00, committed T+66:10)

The most diagnostic moment in the exercise. First instinct was to wait: four of eight for waiting until the ICO and police confirmed scope, three to write to every family today, one to tell only the 300. The General Counsel was in the wait camp and said she did not want anything in writing to 1,900 families before scope was confirmed. Three minutes of argument later the room committed the opposite, and the argument that moved it came from the Data Protection Officer: Article 34 is a when, not an if, and waiting only shortens the runway. The room can be moved by a good argument, which is the best thing you can learn about a crisis team. It also means the default, unargued, was to wait.

Insurer sets out notification requirements (T+79:20)

Elena Marquez, General Counsel, notified inside the 48 hour condition and instructed the panel firm rather than her own. Unglamorous and exactly right.

Board convening in twenty minutes (T+86:00)

Raval took the board the containment position, the ICO clock and a cost envelope, and kept anything about payment inside legal privilege. Correct, and six minutes before the exercise ended.

ROLE OBSERVATIONS

Priya Raval, CEO. The two decisions that mattered most at her level were both taken fast and both right: no engagement with the threat actor, and a board brief that answered the three questions asked rather than everything she knew. Her message to the General Counsel at T+59:20 shows she understood the difference between having contact and engaging with it. She let the board brief become the last item of the day rather than a running thread.

Dan Whitlock, Head of IT. Three decisions, all inside eight minutes of the inject, all defensible. He was also the only seat to name a downstream consequence unprompted, on the ransom note, where he cited the insurer as well as forensics. His escalation to the CEO was the fastest in the session. The backup decision was fast in the way that worries rather than reassures.

Sophie Brennan, Head of Comms. Made two decisions and took the journalist call, so she was one of the most active seats. The holding statement and the home manager briefing after the Mercury Live story were the right move. The problem is what she was doing before that: the family post at T+31 was in front of her and went unanswered, and on the call she gave away the ICO contact. Her message to the facilitator at T+41 shows she knew it: "Probably that I already said it."

Elena Marquez, General Counsel. Two escalations received, one decision of her own, and the two best written contributions in the exercise. On the pay poll she wrote that payment "discharges exactly none of our obligations and creates several new ones". On the board question she insisted the non-engagement go in writing. She was also in the wait camp on the family notification, which is worth putting to her directly.

Nadia Farrow, Data Protection Officer. One decision, one escalation, and the argument that turned the room on the family notification poll. She chose the harder awareness time, sought sign off rather than sending alone, and then changed four colleagues' minds. Strong session.

Tom Ashworth, Operations Manager. One call, one decision, and the clearest three minutes in the exercise. He was the only participant to give somebody a line to use with families, and the only one to draw the boundary at head office for anything about a cyber attack.

Rachel Kim, Service Desk Lead. Raised the P1 on volume alone rather than waiting for the supplier's status page, escalated with a note that framed the scale correctly, and pushed back on closing tickets before the audit trail was secure. She voted to tell only the 300 families in the sample, which is the position nobody else held and is worth exploring rather than dismissing.

James Okonkwo, Head of Care Quality. Joined the session and produced no captured decision, call, escalation or message across ninety-two minutes. The CQC request for assurance was addressed to him. This is the single most actionable finding in the report, and the debrief conversation should start from why rather than from blame: nobody in the room, including the facilitator, noticed the seat had gone quiet.

Marcus Boateng, Finance Director. Voted in both polls and nothing else was captured. His pay vote was the only dissent in the room and he argued it in writing, so this is not disengagement. He simply never had a decision in front of him, in an exercise that moved £620,000 off the cash position and sent a cost envelope to the board.

ESCALATION ANALYSIS

Four escalations, and every one of them earns its place.

Rachel Kim to Dan Whitlock at T+08:30 on the service desk inject, with the note "twelve homes now, not two. This is bigger than a supplier wobble." That is a service desk correctly identifying that volume has changed the category of the problem, and framing it so the recipient does not have to work it out.

Dan Whitlock to Priya Raval at T+15:10, a minute after his own containment decision, on the supplier's confirmation of unauthorised access. He did not wait to have a fuller picture, which is right, and his note tells the CEO why she is being told now: "you need this before the board does."

Nadia Farrow to Elena Marquez at T+34:30, seeking sign off on the awareness wording rather than handing over the decision. This is the good kind: the DPO owned the notification and escalated the one element that carried legal exposure.

Priya Raval to Elena Marquez at T+58:40, forty seconds after the threat actor's email landed. "I have not replied and I am not going to. It is yours." A CEO recognising that continued possession of that channel is itself a risk.

No hop was wasted, nothing bounced between seats, and nothing was escalated to avoid making a decision within remit. Every escalation went upward or to the correct specialist and all four resolved into action.

The gap is under-escalation, not over-escalation. Three things in this exercise should have been escalated and were not. The CQC request at T+60 was never picked up at all, by the seat it was addressed to or by anyone who noticed it sitting there. The family member's post at T+31 was in front of the Head of Comms and never reached the Head of Care Quality or the Operations Manager, who were the two people with something useful to say to families. And the discovery that a backup alert had been failing to an unowned mailbox for weeks was treated as a fact about Carevault rather than escalated as a question about the estate.

Verdict: escalation is a clear strength of this team, and the thing to fix is not how they escalate but what they notice is escalatable. Everything they routed, they routed well. Everything they missed, they missed silently.

BEHAVIOURS TESTED

Response time - 81/100

The room was quick where speed was cheap. Rachel Kim raised a P1 four and a half minutes after the service desk inject landed, on the strength of volume alone, and Dan Whitlock had the supplier email actioned inside eight minutes of reading it. Tom Ashworth took the Ashfield Lodge call and had paper charts authorised before it ended. Nothing in this exercise sat unread.

Escalation path - 80/100

Four escalations, all of them upward and all of them correct. Service desk to Head of IT on volume, Head of IT to CEO on the supplier's confirmation, DPO to General Counsel for sign off on the awareness wording, CEO to General Counsel the moment the threat actor made direct contact. No hop was wasted and nothing was routed sideways to avoid a decision. This is the strongest thing in the session.

Board engagement - 75/100

Priya took the board three answers to three questions and kept the ransom conversation inside privilege, which is the right instinct. What holds the score down is timing and reach: the board brief was the last thing to happen in a ninety minute exercise where the board had been on the horizon since T+15, and the Finance Director sat through the whole session without a decision in front of him.

Legal & compliance - 74/100

Nadia Farrow notified on the earlier of the two defensible awareness times rather than the one that bought the most runway, and said so. Priya Raval did not reply to the threat actor and handed the channel to legal within forty seconds. Elena Marquez notified the insurer inside the policy condition and accepted the panel firm. Three regulated decisions, three that hold up in writing.

Containment - 63/100

Isolating the Carevault integration and preserving the ransom note were both correct and both taken fast. Where this drops is the backup call: eleven days of care plan changes, an alert going to a mailbox nobody owned, and a rebuild decision taken in under five minutes without anyone asking what else in the estate had the same unowned alert.

Reporting - 40/100

Two regulators, two very different outcomes. The ICO enquiry was picked up, argued about properly and answered. The CQC request for assurance on resident safety was delivered at T+60 and nobody touched it for the remaining thirty-two minutes. It was addressed to the Head of Care Quality, who joined the session and made no captured contribution to it.

Media handling - 39/100

The weakest dimension by a distance, and the one that would have done the most damage. The family member's post at T+31 was never answered. The journalist call was taken, and under pressure the line "we have contacted the relevant authorities" was traded for a direct question about the ICO, which Okeke immediately read back as confirmation of a notifiable breach. The holding statement after the Mercury Live story was the right move, forty minutes after it would have been useful.

This exercise did not test comms quality. That is a limit on what was put in front of the team, not a judgement on them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Give the CQC an owner and a deputy, in writing, this month. The request for assurance on resident safety went unanswered for the last thirty-two minutes of the exercise and would have gone unanswered in reality. Everyone in the room knew who owned the ICO. Nobody owned the regulator that can stop you admitting residents.
2. Write the family holding line before you need it, and put it in the home managers' hands. The family post at T+31 cost nothing to answer and was ignored, and the eventual statement came forty minutes after a local paper had already told families what was happening. Home managers are who families actually ring. They should never be the last to know.
3. Rehearse the press line as a script, not as a position. The decision to hold the line was correct and the execution gave away the ICO notification inside four exchanges. Take the transcript in section 05 into the next comms session and run it again with the General Counsel in the room. "The relevant authorities" is not a safe phrase when the journalist already has the note.
4. Audit where else an alert goes to a mailbox nobody owns. The eleven day backup gap was not a backup failure, it was an ownership failure that had been running for weeks in silence. Treat the Carevault finding as a sample, not a conclusion, and come back with a list.
5. Put a decision in front of finance. The Finance Director sat through an exercise that took £620,000 off the cash position and produced a board cost envelope, and never had anything to decide. Either the scenario is under-written for that seat or the real crisis plan is, and both are worth checking.
6. Watch for the silent seat during the exercise, not after it. One of nine seats made no captured contribution for ninety-two minutes and nobody noticed in the room. A facilitator prompt at the halfway mark costs nothing and would have surfaced it while it could still be fixed.

7. Re-run Duty of Care in the spring with an inject that requires something written. This exercise never asked anyone to draft a statement, a family letter or a regulator response, so the quality of Meridian's written communication under pressure remains untested. That is a gap in the rehearsal, not in the team.

DECISIONS AUDIT

RACHEL KIM · SERVICE DESK LEAD

T+07:40

Inject: Service desk: Carevault errors spreading

Raise it as a P1 and page the Head of IT now

“ Twelve homes with the same error is not twelve faults. I am not sitting on this waiting for a status page.

DAN WHITLOCK · HEAD OF IT

T+14:10

Inject: Supplier notification: security incident at Carevault

Isolate the Carevault integration and put every home on paper MAR charts

“ If their environment is compromised I am not leaving a live connection into ours. Paper is slower but it is ours.

↑ FAMILY CONFIDENCE 78 → 82 +4 ↑ ICO STANDING 88 → 98 +10

↓ CARE CONTINUITY 95% → 89% -6%

DAN WHITLOCK · HEAD OF IT

T+16:00

Inject: Ransom note found on the shared drive

Preserve it, pull the affected servers off the network, touch nothing else

“ That note is evidence. Forensics will want it exactly as it is and so will the insurer.

↓ STAFF MORALE 65 → 63 -2 ↑ ICO STANDING 98 → 100 +2

Inject: Ashfield Lodge: no medication records for the morning round

Paper MAR charts now, GP surgery to confirm recent changes, regional lead on site within the hour

🗨️ Twenty-two people need their medication at half eight. Everything else can wait, that cannot.

↑ STAFF MORALE 63 → 66 +3 ↑ CARE CONTINUITY 89% → 99% +10%

Inject: ICO opens an enquiry

Notify now with what we know, state 03:20 as awareness, commit to a follow-up

🗨️ The clock started when the supplier knew. Arguing about it later looks worse than notifying early with gaps.

↓ BRAND REPUTATION 82 → 80 -2 ↑ ICO STANDING 86 → 98 +12

Inject: Health Service Journal: Lara Okeke

Hold the line: technical issue, care unaffected, statement within the hour

🗨️ I am not confirming ransomware to a journalist before I have confirmed it to families.

↓ BRAND REPUTATION 80 → 76 -4 ↓ FAMILY CONFIDENCE 76 → 73 -3

Inject: Backups are eleven days old

Rebuild from the eleven day backup and reconstruct the gap from paper and GP records

“ Eleven days of changes is recoverable from the homes. Paying is not recoverable from anything.

↓ CASH POSITION £8,265,000 → £8,085,000 -£180,000 ↓ FAMILY CONFIDENCE 73 → 68 -5

↑ CARE CONTINUITY 99% → 100% +1%

Inject: Threat actor sends a sample of 300 resident records

Do not engage. Route it to legal and the police, open nothing further

“ The moment I reply I am negotiating. Elena and the NCA can own the channel, not me.

↑ BRAND REPUTATION 76 → 78 +2 ↑ ICO STANDING 76 → 82 +6

Inject: Regional news runs the story

Publish a holding statement and brief every home manager on what to say to families

“ Home managers are the ones families actually ring. They should not be finding out from Mercury Live.

↑ BRAND REPUTATION 73 → 77 +4 ↑ FAMILY CONFIDENCE 66 → 72 +6

Inject: Insurer sets out notification requirements

Notify the insurer today and instruct the panel firm

“ Cover is worth more than my preference for counsel. Notify inside 48 hours and use their panel.

↓ CASH POSITION £7,825,000 → £7,780,000 -£45,000 ↑ ICO STANDING 82 → 86 +4

Inject: Board convening in twenty minutes

Containment position, ICO clock and cost envelope, with no ransom discussion outside legal privilege

“ Three answers to three questions. Anything about payment goes through Elena so it stays privileged.

↑ STAFF MORALE 63 → 65 +2

POLLS

For each poll, the room's individual first-instinct votes are visualised alongside the choice the facilitator finally committed. Divergence between the room's majority and the committed choice is the most diagnostic signal.

Do we pay to stop resident data being published?

FIRED T+27:30 · RESOLVED T+30:20



- No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all (5) COMMITTED
- Engage through a negotiator to buy time, no payment authorised (2)
- Pay, if it keeps resident records off the internet (1)

Room voted 5/8 for "No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all"; facilitator committed the same.

VOTERS

Priya Raval · CEO	No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all - "We cannot be an organisation that pays for silence about the people in our care."
Dan Whitlock · Head of IT	Engage through a negotiator to buy time, no payment authorised
Sophie Brennan · Head of Comms	No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all
Elena Marquez · General Counsel	No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all - "Payment discharges exactly none of our obligations and creates several new ones."
Marcus Boateng · Finance Director	Pay, if it keeps resident records off the internet - "Nine hundred thousand against the cost of this going public is not an obviously stupid trade."
Tom Ashworth · Operations Manager	Engage through a negotiator to buy time, no payment authorised
Rachel Kim · Service Desk Lead	No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all
Nadia Farrow · Data Protection Officer	No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all

Do we tell families today that resident records were taken?

FIREED T+63:00 · RESOLVED T+66:10



- Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope (4)
- Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there (3) COMMITTED
- Tell only the families of the 300 residents in the sample (1)

Room voted 4/8 for "Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope"; facilitator committed "Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there".

VOTERS

Priya Raval · CEO	Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope
Dan Whitlock · Head of IT	Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope
Sophie Brennan · Head of Comms	Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there
Elena Marquez · General Counsel	Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope - "I want confirmed scope before we put anything in writing to 1,900 families."
Marcus Boateng · Finance Director	Wait until the ICO and the police have confirmed the scope
Tom Ashworth · Operations Manager	Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there
Rachel Kim · Service Desk Lead	Tell only the families of the 300 residents in the sample
Nadia Farrow · Data Protection Officer	Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there - "Article 34 is a when, not an if. Waiting does not improve our position, it just shortens the runway."

TIMELINE

T+00:00	INJECT	Opening brief: rostering and care records unavailable
T+03:10	INJECT	Service desk: Carevault errors spreading
T+06:40	INJECT	URGENT: Security incident affecting Carevault services
T+07:40	DECISION	Rachel Kim (Service Desk Lead) - "Raise it as a P1 and page the Head of IT now" on Service desk: Carevault errors spreading
T+08:30	ESCALATION	Rachel Kim (Service Desk Lead) → Dan Whitlock (Head of IT) · Service desk: Carevault errors spreading - "Twelve homes now, not two. This is bigger than a supplier wobble."
T+12:05	INJECT	Ransom note found on the shared drive
T+14:10	DECISION	Dan Whitlock (Head of IT) - "Isolate the Carevault integration and put every home on paper MAR charts" on Supplier notification: security incident at Carevault
T+15:10	ESCALATION	Dan Whitlock (Head of IT) → Priya Raval (CEO) · Supplier notification: security incident at Carevault - "Supplier has confirmed unauthorised access. You need this before the board does."
T+16:00	DECISION	Dan Whitlock (Head of IT) - "Preserve it, pull the affected servers off the network, touch nothing else" on Ransom note found on the shared drive
T+18:30	INJECT	Ashfield Lodge: no medication records for the morning round
T+18:32	CALL	Tom Ashworth (Operations Manager) - Ashfield Lodge: no medication records for the morning round, 154s
T+22:10	DECISION	Tom Ashworth (Operations Manager) - "Paper MAR charts now, GP surgery to confirm recent changes, regional lead on site within the hour" on Ashfield Lodge: no medication records for the morning round
T+24:15	INJECT	Information Commissioner's Office: initial enquiry
T+27:30	POLL FIRED	Do we pay to stop resident data being published?
T+30:20	POLL RESOLVED	Committed "No. Do not engage with the threat actor at all" for: Do we pay to stop resident data being published?
T+31:00	INJECT	Family member posts about missing care plans
T+33:40	DECISION	Nadia Farrow (Data Protection Officer) - "Notify now with what we know, state 03:20 as awareness, commit to a follow-up" on ICO opens an enquiry

T+34:30	ESCALATION	Nadia Farrow (Data Protection Officer) → Elena Marquez (General Counsel) · ICO opens an enquiry - "72 hour clock started at 03:20. I want your sign off on the awareness wording."
T+37:20	INJECT	Health Service Journal: Lara Okeke
T+37:22	CALL	Sophie Brennan (Head of Comms) - Health Service Journal: Lara Okeke, 208s
T+40:10	DECISION	Sophie Brennan (Head of Comms) - "Hold the line: technical issue, care unaffected, statement within the hour" on Health Service Journal: Lara Okeke
T+44:50	INJECT	Backups are eleven days old
T+49:30	DECISION	Dan Whitlock (Head of IT) - "Rebuild from the eleven day backup and reconstruct the gap from paper and GP records" on Backups are eleven days old
T+52:30	INJECT	proof of life
T+58:00	DECISION	Priya Raval (CEO) - "Do not engage. Route it to legal and the police, open nothing further" on Threat actor sends a sample of 300 resident records
T+58:40	ESCALATION	Priya Raval (CEO) → Elena Marquez (General Counsel) · Threat actor sends a sample of 300 resident records - "They have resident records. I have not replied and I am not going to. It is yours."
T+60:10	INJECT	Request for assurance: resident safety during system outage
T+63:00	POLL FIRED	Do we tell families today that resident records were taken?
T+66:10	POLL RESOLVED	Committed "Yes. Write to every family today, before the press get there" for: Do we tell families today that resident records were taken?
T+67:40	INJECT	Regional news runs the story
T+70:00	DECISION	Sophie Brennan (Head of Comms) - "Publish a holding statement and brief every home manager on what to say to families" on Regional news runs the story
T+75:00	INJECT	Cyber policy MC-4471182: notification and panel appointment
T+79:20	DECISION	Elena Marquez (General Counsel) - "Notify the insurer today and instruct the panel firm" on Insurer sets out notification requirements
T+82:20	INJECT	Board convening in twenty minutes
T+86:00	DECISION	Priya Raval (CEO) - "Containment position, ICO clock and cost envelope, with no ransom discussion outside legal privilege" on Board convening in twenty minutes

CALL TRANSCRIPTS

TOM ASHWORTH · OPERATIONS MANAGER

T+18:32 · 154S · ASHFIELD LODGE: NO MEDICATION
RECORDS FOR THE MORNING ROUND

AGENT

Tom, it's Marie at Ashfield. I've got twenty-two residents due meds at half eight and Carevault won't load. I can't see a single MAR chart.

PLAYER

Marie, don't wait on the system. Go to the paper fallback pack, it's in the treatment room safe.

AGENT

The pack was last printed in March. Three of mine have had changes since then, one of them a controlled drug.

PLAYER

Then ring the GP surgery for those three and write it down as they give it to you. Do not guess and do not skip. I'll get the regional lead over to you within the hour.

AGENT

And what do I say if families ring? Two have already asked why the portal is down.

PLAYER

Say we have a system issue, care is unaffected, and someone will come back to them today. Nothing about a cyber attack. That's coming from head office, not from you.

AGENT

Right. And the lunchtime round?

PLAYER

Same. Paper until I tell you otherwise. I'll call you at eleven either way.

SOPHIE BRENNAN · HEAD OF COMMS

T+37:22 · 208S · HEALTH SERVICE JOURNAL: LARA OKEKE

AGENT

Sophie Brennan? Lara Okeke, Health Service Journal. I'm told Meridian's rostering and care records systems have been down since early this morning. Is this ransomware?

PLAYER

We're aware of a technical issue affecting one of our systems. I'm not able to characterise it beyond that at the moment.

AGENT

I have a screenshot of what looks like a ransom note on your shared drive. It names your company and a figure. Do you want to comment?

PLAYER

I'd want to see what you're describing before I comment on it.

AGENT

Has resident data been taken?

PLAYER

I'm not going to speculate. What I can tell you is that resident care is continuing and we've contacted the relevant authorities.

AGENT

So you've notified the ICO. That's a confirmation there's been a personal data breach, isn't it.

PLAYER

I said we've contacted the relevant authorities. I'll come back to you with a statement.

AGENT

My deadline is two o'clock.

PLAYER

Understood. You'll have something before then.

MESSAGE THREADS

GENERAL COUNSEL · CEO

4 MSGS · T+59:20 → T+62:00

Elena Marquez → Priya Raval

PRIYA RAVAL · CEO

T+59:20

They've sent 300 records to my inbox. I have not replied and I'm not going to.

ELENA MARQUEZ · GENERAL COUNSEL

T+60:05

Correct. Forward it to me and don't open anything else from that address. I'll get the NCA reference open this morning.

PRIYA RAVAL · CEO

T+61:15

Do we tell the board we've had direct contact?

ELENA MARQUEZ · GENERAL COUNSEL

T+62:00

Yes, today, in writing, including the fact that we did not engage. That sentence is the one that protects us later.

HEAD OF COMMS · FACILITATOR

3 MSGS · T+41:00 → T+43:10

Sophie Brennan → Facilitator

SOPHIE BRENNAN · HEAD OF COMMS

T+41:00

HSJ deadline is 2pm. Am I allowed to confirm we've been in touch with the ICO?

ELLIS WARNER · FACILITATOR

T+42:30

That's a call for the room, not for me. What would your General Counsel say?

SOPHIE BRENNAN · HEAD OF COMMS

T+43:10

Probably that I already said it.

SERVICE DESK LEAD · HEAD OF IT

3 MSGS · T+09:10 → T+10:40

Rachel Kim → Dan Whitlock

RACHEL KIM · SERVICE DESK LEAD

T+09:10

Ticket queue is at 41 and they're all Carevault. Do you want me closing the duplicates or keeping them for the audit trail?

DAN WHITLOCK · HEAD OF IT

T+10:05

Keep everything. Do not close a single ticket today.

RACHEL KIM · SERVICE DESK LEAD

T+10:40

Understood. Putting a banner on the intranet telling people to stop raising new ones.