

<p>1 Thursday, 22 November 2012 2 (10.00 am) 3 MS LIZ GIBBONS (called) 4 Housekeeping 5 MR POLLARD: Good morning, Liz, and Susan. I think we will 6 probably be here for a couple of hours. I have some 7 questions to ask you, as you know. Most of the 8 questions will be by Mr Maclean, QC. I will dive in 9 with an occasional question as we go along. As you know 10 we are taking a transcript and you will be able to see 11 that on a screen in front of you. 12 Before we start, just a few procedural comments from 13 Mr Spafford. 14 MR SPAFFORD: Thank you. Obviously you know who is here. 15 In addition to the people mentioned, Dame Janet Smith is 16 sitting in as well. As Nick says, there will be 17 a transcript. At the end of the process that will be 18 made available. That will go to Susan to correct any 19 typographical errors. 20 That apart, obviously the whole process is 21 confidential as you know and you have kindly provided 22 a confidentiality agreement. It is very important that 23 that be stressed, that nothing that is said here by you 24 or any document that you've seen be revealed by you, 25 subject to that agreement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 Q. That is right. An email to Nicola Cain? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Then we also have this from you as well, which is more 4 in note form, a timeline. 5 A. Involving -- yes. 6 Q. This one? Covering the same ground, the nature of the 7 original commission, MPRL and the Impact team. 8 A. That was written before I had managed to retrieve some 9 sent items. 10 Q. Which one is the most reliable? 11 A. The most reliable is the later one I sent directly to 12 the enquiry. 13 Q. To us? 14 A. Yes. And there is a second document as well, outlining 15 what I knew about the editing process, which I believe 16 I sent you as well. 17 MR SPAFFORD: If we have had it, it is probably in the 18 bundle. 19 MR POLLARD: I think that is at tab -- 20 MR MACLEAN: We will probably come across it. 21 MR POLLARD: That is at tab 2. 22 MR MACLEAN: I have tab 2. 23 Can I ask you to take bundle 1, please, A1, and turn 24 to page 267. 25 A. 267?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 Is that understood and confirmed? 2 A. Yes, absolutely. 3 MR SPAFFORD: Thank you, great. 4 MR POLLARD: Alan, over to you. 5 Questions by MR MACLEAN 6 MR MACLEAN: Can I ask whether you have any of your own 7 timelines or statement of account? 8 A. I have a timeline, yes. 9 Q. We have three. Can we check which one you have? 10 A. I have one I prepared myself, rather than a -- 11 Q. Do you have a spare statements of account bundle, 12 Richard? 13 I will show you which one we have, and show you if 14 it is the same as the one you have. 15 A. This is our own. 16 MR MACLEAN: Well, we have seen three things from you -- 17 A. Sorry, my timeline, as in my statement? Yes, I have -- 18 yes. 19 Q. Yes. We have seen three. I think the one for us is 20 a two page one dealing with the original investigation 21 and then the blog. 22 A. Right. 23 Q. Is that right? 24 A. Yes, that's the one I sent to you. There was a previous 25 one I sent to litigation at an earlier stage.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 Q. 267. Jimmy Savile died on 29 October. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. You are on holiday -- 4 A. Yes, I was on holiday then, yes. 5 Q. So what is your first date back? 6 A. It says the third here, but I don't think that's right. 7 It was the Monday of that week. 8 MR POLLARD: The 7th, I think. 9 A. So the 7th, yes. 10 MR MACLEAN: Right. Just keep a finger in 267. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. On 31 October there had been discussions between 13 Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean and Peter Rippon. If you 14 just keep a finger in 267, which is where I'm coming 15 to -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- but go to 107. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. This is an email from Meirion Jones to Peter Rippon and 20 Liz MacKean on the 31st at lunchtime. In it -- most of 21 this email is a chunk of the web memoir of the woman we 22 now know to be [REDACTED] 23 A. Um-hm. 24 Q. Did you ever see that -- 25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 Q. -- web memoir? 2 A. No. 3 Q. At any stage? 4 A. No, not until I got it as part of the stuff for the 5 enquiry. 6 Q. We will come to this. What you did get at some stage 7 was the evolving script, such as it was? 8 A. Yes, I got two copies, as it turned out, of the draft 9 script. 10 Q. ROUGHSAVILE? 11 A. ROUGHSAVILE, yes. 12 Q. Right. So let's go then to the 9th, at 267, which is 13 a Wednesday. There is reference here in Liz MacKean's 14 email to a meeting which she had just had, or had with 15 you and Peter Rippon? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Was that your first substantive involvement? 18 A. No. When I -- on the 7th, when I came back from 19 holiday, Peter Rippon told me -- we were catching up in 20 a planning meeting with a few other people there and he 21 told that he had commissioned a piece looking at 22 Jimmy Savile and allegations of sexual abuse. 23 Q. What does that mean? You say in your statement he had 24 commissioned it. What does that mean? 25 A. That means he's got a team to start working on it. It</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 certainly reflects one element of concern I had about 2 the commission which I flagged up to Peter on the 7th 3 when I got back from holiday. I think my key concerns 4 about it was the timing; the fact that Jimmy Savile had 5 just died and I felt to embark on a story of this nature 6 the minute he died did raise some issues of taste, and 7 raise some issues of how his relatives, for example, 8 might feel if we were to broadcast a story so soon after 9 his death. 10 The other issue I had was the view that we shouldn't 11 just be doing a story which, you know -- because there 12 were no longer libel implications to do with somebody, 13 and that we shouldn't start thinking that journalistic 14 standards should necessarily be dropped just because 15 somebody had died. So they were my key concerns which 16 I relayed to Peter on the 7th. 17 Q. So what was your understanding of what the story was 18 about? 19 A. On the 7th he told me that Meirion had had some evidence 20 from girls at a school, an approved school, that 21 suggested that there had been sexual abuse taking place 22 on the premises -- sorry, I don't know whether he said 23 on the premises -- with the girls from that approved 24 school that Jimmy Savile regularly visited. 25 Q. You knew this was something that had taken place years</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 doesn't necessarily mean that it will end up on air, but 2 it means that he's -- he's got a team involved in 3 working on it. 4 Q. Right. So when you come into work on the morning of the 5 9th, what you knew about Jimmy Savile was that 6 Peter Rippon had commissioned a piece about it while you 7 were on holiday? 8 A. Yes, when we had had a conversation about it on the 7th, 9 actually, when I came back from holiday. 10 Q. So at this meeting on the 9th -- do you remember that? 11 A. I don't actually recollect having a meeting with Liz and 12 Peter, no. I recollect a separate conversation that 13 I had with Liz about various stories she was working on, 14 in which she mentioned the Jimmy Savile investigation 15 which obviously I already knew a bit about from Peter. 16 I don't recollect that I was in a meeting with the 17 two of them together, but I certainly recollect an early 18 conversation with Liz about the investigation. 19 Q. This email records you as saying: 20 "We shouldn't do JS story on grounds of taste." 21 We will see the word "taste" appearing a bit later 22 as well. First of all is that what you said, what you 23 articulated as you view, and secondly, if it is, what 24 does it mean? 25 A. I don't know whether I used the word "taste", but it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 and years ago -- 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. -- as opposed to something more recent? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. What about any question of the police or CPS 6 investigations into Savile? 7 A. I don't recollect that being discussed at the time. 8 I know that they were looking initially at the idea 9 that -- you know, what they could establish about this; 10 what may or may not have gone on at this school. 11 Q. What about the fact that Meirion Jones had been on the 12 trail of this story for some time? 13 A. I didn't know that, no. 14 Q. And that he had a family connection? 15 A. I didn't know about the family connection until much 16 more recently. 17 Q. Did you know about that at any time in 2011? 18 A. No. 19 Q. Now, Liz MacKean's email says that she persuaded her -- 20 is that you -- otherwise, especially given police line? 21 A. It may well be true that in the course of that 22 conversation -- which I don't recollect, but as I say 23 I do believe it was just a one to one conversation -- 24 she told me that there was some evidence that the police 25 had looked into the allegations of abuse at this school.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

1 And it sounds likely to me that I would have thought
 2 that that was a slightly more reassuring line to pursue.
 3 If there was a suggestion that the police had, at some
 4 point, been looking into these allegations.
 5 Q. Why would that be more "reassuring", as you put it?
 6 A. Because it suggests that there was a genuine issue there
 7 that the police felt was sufficiently credible to
 8 investigate in some form.
 9 Q. So that would help to assuage your concerns about --
 10 A. It didn't entirely assuage them, but it certainly --
 11 I can imagine that that was something I thought was --
 12 made me less concerned about the fact that we were
 13 investigating it at all in that timeframe.
 14 Q. Next sentence is:
 15 "PR agrees that it is worth it but [of course] they
 16 are concerned about women's credibility."
 17 This would suggest that you were more sceptical than
 18 Peter Rippon was about this story, but both of you had
 19 real concerns about it?
 20 A. I think that is fair to say.
 21 Q. Is that a fair way of putting it?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. How did your attitude change, if it did, in the next few
 24 weeks?
 25 A. Well, to be honest I did try and I think I made this

Page 9

1 clear to Peter, I mean, I, um -- he had a separate
 2 conversation with the other deputy editor when she came
 3 back from leave. She was also on leave at the same
 4 time, she returned about a week later. I think her view
 5 on whether we should be pursuing the story was slightly
 6 different to mine, so I felt at that point, um, that it
 7 was -- it was something I felt that Peter needed to
 8 pursue as the editor and I didn't particularly get
 9 involved from then on in the gathering of material or
 10 the -- or the discussions with Meirion and Liz about
 11 where the investigation was going.
 12 Q. So did you form the view that this story was an
 13 inappropriate one for Newsnight, or that it was going to
 14 be -- cause a problem or simply it was somebody else's
 15 responsibility?
 16 A. I thought -- I felt that I had raised the concerns that
 17 I had with Peter about the story which I have already
 18 expressed.
 19 Q. As I understand it, normally you are the executive
 20 producer of this sort of piece for Newsnight?
 21 A. For a majority of pieces, but not all, I would say 80 to
 22 90 per cent of pieces, but some pieces, you know,
 23 particularly investigations, Peter would -- would exec
 24 produce.
 25 Q. So this story had been commissioned, as you put it -- or

Page 10

1 at least commenced the research for it -- while you were
 2 away?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. Then you come back before it has really got very far.
 5 Why didn't you become the executive producer of it when
 6 you came back?
 7 A. Because he had commissioned it and it's not unusual for
 8 him to continue to work on a story if he has
 9 commissioned it. He often did actually exec Meirion's
 10 projects, probably more of Meirion's projects than
 11 I did, I would say.
 12 Q. So what did you have then to do with the story in the
 13 next -- between 9 November and, say, 9 December, which
 14 is, as it happens, the day that the CPS confirmation
 15 comes in that the investigation hadn't been pursued, not
 16 because Savile was old and infirm, but because of lack
 17 of evidence?
 18 A. I recollect a conversation with Peter around the issue
 19 of, um, when the fact that the BBC1 tribute was coming
 20 up, how that left things, in terms of what higher
 21 management do about those sorts of situations if there
 22 are two things going on at the same time. And
 23 I recollect a conversation with him in late November
 24 where he told me that he was feeling that this element
 25 of trying to ensure whether the CPS didn't prosecute

Page 11

1 because Savile was too old became, for him, the key
 2 thing to establish as to whether the piece would go
 3 ahead or not.
 4 Q. Right. So two things there. We will come to late
 5 November, but this first conversation, can you pin that
 6 down at all, when that was?
 7 A. I can't pin down the timing exactly, but I think
 8 a colleague in the office told me that a Jimmy Savile
 9 tribute had gone into that -- had gone into the schedule
 10 and I don't know if it was the next day or a few days
 11 later or whatever in a conversation with Peter that may
 12 well have been about something else. I asked him, just
 13 out of interest, what the issue -- what would happen in
 14 those circumstances in terms of: would News management
 15 talk to Vision or not? And I believe he said he would
 16 talk to Steve about it and --
 17 Q. He had talked or he would talk?
 18 A. I think -- well, I don't know whether in this
 19 conversation or whether he then went away to talk to
 20 Steve, I can't recall. But I remember the words, um
 21 "Chinese walls" being used.
 22 Q. Who is the colleague in the office who told you about
 23 the tribute?
 24 A. It was no one working on the Savile investigation.
 25 Q. Who was it, though? Do you remember?

Page 12

1 A. I do.
 2 Q. Who was it?
 3 A. Do I have to -- it was a colleague called
 4 Adam Livingstone.
 5 Q. What did he -- what did he do?
 6 A. He was just a producer on the -- on the programme. He
 7 just happened to see it, I think, when he was working
 8 late one night and I was on duty late at night.
 9 Q. Saw it on some BBC --
 10 A. I think so, yes.
 11 Q. -- notice board. Some document goes round, does it?
 12 A. Or just saw it in the schedules, I don't actually know.
 13 But he had obviously seen it on some sort of schedule,
 14 yes.
 15 Q. We have heard that Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean, on the
 16 way back from interviewing [REDACTED] -- which you may
 17 or may not know was on 14 November -- heard on the BBC
 18 radio, as it happens, coming back from that interview
 19 about the tributes; some sort of trail. And that's when
 20 they first appreciated that the BBC was running these
 21 tributes.
 22 A. Okay.
 23 Q. Does that help?
 24 A. I hadn't heard that. But it could well be. That feels
 25 like it could be about right in terms of dates.

Page 13

1 Q. Now the discussion between Mr Mitchell and Mr Rippon was
 2 probably on or about 21 or 22 -- well it was on about 21
 3 or 22 November.
 4 A. Right.
 5 Q. Can I just show you the document -- I will show you the
 6 document shortly, but there is an email that says that,
 7 "Peter and Steve talked about the Vision issues", with
 8 a capital V and a small i -- Vision issues surrounding
 9 Savile. Do you understand what that means?
 10 A. I wrote that, didn't I?
 11 Q. You did.
 12 A. That was in response -- because I'm in charge of
 13 updating the Managed Programmes Risk List, which I send
 14 to Sara Beck who is Steve Mitchell's assistant. So when
 15 it came round to update the Managed Programmes Risk
 16 List, I guess it would have been that day, I put the
 17 Savile investigation -- I didn't say very much but I put
 18 it on the list which then -- she decides -- well, she
 19 then collates and sends to wherever the MPRL goes. And
 20 she replied to me to say she was taking it off.
 21 Q. I'm coming to the MPRL. That is obviously an important
 22 part of the story, I'm coming to that.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. I'm just asking you about what the Vision issues were.
 25 A. What I meant by that was that I -- that Peter had

Page 14

1 already suggested to me that the idea would be that
 2 there would be "Chinese walls" between what we were
 3 doing and what Vision were doing. So when she came back
 4 to me and said, "This is being taken off the MPRL
 5 because it goes quite high in Vision", I said, "Okay,
 6 that makes sense", because it corroborates what Peter
 7 had told me about his conversation with Steve.
 8 Q. So the "Chinese walls", that was an expression you think
 9 was used to you by Peter Rippon?
 10 A. I believe so. It could be that it was -- it was
 11 something that I have -- it was certainly -- I certainly
 12 had a sense that this would proceed as, certainly in
 13 terms of, you know, straightforward dealings that it
 14 would not be mentioned to --
 15 Q. It wouldn't be mentioned?
 16 Had you ever encountered before an instance where
 17 a News programme you were working on was doing a piece
 18 which was in some sense about the BBC?
 19 A. No. Not to that degree, which is why I was interested
 20 to ask Peter what -- what the form was in these
 21 circumstances.
 22 Q. Was he also unfamiliar, did you think, with this
 23 situation?
 24 A. I wouldn't be able to say for sure.
 25 Q. We'll come to the list, obviously I want to ask you some

Page 15

1 questions about the list.
 2 Can I just ask you to put bundle 1 away and take
 3 bundle 2. Please go to page 57. Now, this is four days
 4 later than the email we looked at earlier, from
 5 Meirion Jones to Roger Law. Roger Law is a lawyer at
 6 the BBC?
 7 A. That is right, yes.
 8 Q. Just dealing with him for a moment, was it your
 9 understanding that there was ever any difficulty in
 10 running the Savile story, that had been identified by
 11 BBC lawyers?
 12 A. No. Not as far as I was aware.
 13 Q. So there wasn't any legal impediment to running the
 14 story?
 15 A. Not as far as I was aware.
 16 Q. And the most obvious legal impediment didn't exist
 17 because the man was dead?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. This was sent to you. And it is dealing with three
 20 different things. "Newsnight Vultures." That was
 21 a story that Meirion Jones was working on that
 22 eventually did go out, I think?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. "Savile" and then something called "Anna". It may be
 25 that that is entirely irrelevant?

Page 16

1 A. It is entirely irrelevant. It was a story that never
 2 ran.
 3 Q. Another story?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. You see what he says. It starts off talking about his
 6 vulture film. Why was this sent to you?
 7 A. I was looking after the vulture film.
 8 Q. You see he says:
 9 "I'm filming one of the Savile victims in [REDACTED]
 10 tomorrow. I will be in the office on Tuesday. Then
 11 there is a reference to "Meirion's gambit", at the
 12 bottom. Did you recognise that description?
 13 A. Not specifically, no.
 14 Q. So the reason you got this was that you were concerned
 15 with the first three of the stories?
 16 A. Yes, I would imagine what Meirion was doing -- which
 17 with would not be unusual for him -- would be to be
 18 writing a sort of catch-all email to keep us up to date
 19 on the various projects he was working on and where he
 20 was at with them.
 21 Q. Right. Did you know -- were you aware on 14 November --
 22 that Jones and MacKean had gone off to interview
 23 a Duncroft girl?
 24 A. No.
 25 Q. There is an email from Liz MacKean the following day,
 Page 17

1 15 November, page 85 of the same bundle.
 2 MR POLLARD: Sorry, could I just ask about your answer to
 3 that question. You say you didn't know that they had
 4 gone off to interview a Duncroft girl?
 5 A. Well, it does say -- it says in that email, but it's not
 6 necessarily something I would have taken in. I mean --
 7 MR POLLARD: Yes. You weren't involved?
 8 A. No.
 9 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 10 MR MACLEAN: Page 85 there is an email from Liz MacKean to
 11 Hannah Livingston. Was she --
 12 A. No, I never even met her, actually.
 13 Q. She did quite a lot of the research?
 14 A. So I gather, yes.
 15 Q. But you don't know her?
 16 A. No, I never met her.
 17 Q. You see she says, Liz MacKean says:
 18 "There is more enthusiasm for the story in the
 19 office which is good. Any letter progress yourself?"
 20 Were you aware of ebbing and flowing of the degree
 21 of enthusiasm?
 22 A. Not especially, no. She could have meant other
 23 colleagues.
 24 Q. What about the letter progress?
 25 A. I now know what it would mean.
 Page 18

1 Q. They were chasing a letter?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. One of the important staging posts in the story is that
 4 on 25 November, if you take bundle 3, page 11, this is
 5 only concerned with the Jimmy Savile story, this email?
 6 A. Um-hm.
 7 Q. It is sent to Peter Rippon and to you. And he says:
 8 "Confidential. Off the record Surrey Police have
 9 now confirmed that they did investigate Jimmy Savile
 10 about sexual abuse of minors and that they interviewed
 11 the girls from Duncroft as part of that enquiry. The
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED] and hopefully tell us more on Monday."
 14 Did you know what the off the record source was?
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. Did you know who Mark Williams-Thomas was?
 17 A. No, I didn't know he was working on the investigation.
 18 Q. I asked did you know who he was?
 19 A. At that point, um, yes, he had already done -- he had
 20 done a piece for us about six months previously.
 21 Q. But you didn't know he was working on this?
 22 A. No.
 23 Q. So why was this sent to you, do you think, by
 24 Meirion Jones?
 25 A. Again, it wouldn't be unusual for him to copy me in on
 Page 19

1 the progress of an investigation, even if it was being
 2 excec and overseen by Peter.
 3 Q. He doesn't copy in Shaminder Nahal.
 4 A. She didn't have any responsibility for working on
 5 commissioning films or -- she had an entirely
 6 separate --
 7 Q. But you say, I think, you didn't have any responsibility
 8 for this film, so why is he bothering to copy you?
 9 A. As I say, it wouldn't be unusual for him to do that.
 10 Because we both worked on film stuff together. I mean
 11 he would have -- that doesn't necessarily mean that
 12 I had responsibility and was taking account of every
 13 single move in the -- in what they were working on.
 14 Q. You saw Mr Rippon's response over the page, page 12.
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. "Excellent. We can then pull together the transmission
 17 plan."
 18 That is something that you would be involved in,
 19 isn't it?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. How would you be involved if pulling together the
 22 transmission plan?
 23 A. I would establish a potential TX date, which would
 24 obviously be subject to change or cancellation at any
 25 point, and I would establish how many days of editing
 Page 20

1 were required and any other requirements, graphics and
 2 so on, and in conjunction with our assignments desk
 3 I would pencil in editing for a project of this nature
 4 or any other nature.
 5 Q. What was your understanding now about what this
 6 developing story was about?
 7 A. I cannot -- to be honest, I can't recollect from the
 8 time. I knew that Peter was pursuing the story. And
 9 I felt it was -- he was making the decisions, so I guess
 10 I would have thought okay, and as I --
 11 Q. He hasn't made any decision yet, has he?
 12 A. No, but making decisions as to how the story was going
 13 to progress, and, you know ...
 14 Q. By this time, we think, he'd had his discussion with
 15 Steve Mitchell.
 16 A. Right.
 17 Q. And we're coming to your email about the Vision issues
 18 on the 22nd. Did you ever speak to Steve Mitchell about
 19 this story, or to Helen Boaden?
 20 A. No.
 21 Q. You see, when you first heard about this story you were
 22 dead against, weren't you?
 23 A. I wasn't dead against it, but I was sceptical.
 24 Q. You weren't dead against it?
 25 A. I wasn't absolutely dead against it, but I -- well

Page 21

1 I have explained the reasons why I had concerns and
 2 I explained them to my boss.
 3 Q. Didn't you think this was a story that basically you
 4 wouldn't have touched with a bargepole?
 5 A. I wouldn't necessarily go that far. But I had concerns
 6 about it, which I expressed to Peter.
 7 Q. Would it be fair to say you wouldn't have gone near this
 8 story in the first place?
 9 A. I think, had I been in Peter's chair that day,
 10 I probably would have said, "I don't want to look into
 11 it yet." But that said, Meirion is a very persuasive
 12 character and a good journalist so I cannot say for
 13 certain what I would have done.
 14 Q. Well, just take bundle 8 for a moment, please. If you
 15 go to page 101, now, there is an email from
 16 Meirion Jones to Sanchia Berg, do you see? Do you see
 17 that? (Pause).
 18 A. It's not -- there appears to an email I have sent.
 19 Q. No, no. 101. Then if you go over the page to 101.001.
 20 A. Sorry, got you.
 21 Q. There is an insert. It is headed, "This house", at the
 22 top.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Just before I ask you some questions about that, let me
 25 just find out what the process has been. How did you go

Page 22

1 about producing documents to the BBC to furnish to this
 2 review?
 3 A. I went through all my sent items that I still had and
 4 asked for any new ones to be -- and looked under
 5 "Savile".
 6 Q. Right.
 7 A. And asked the, um, IT department to try to dig out any
 8 deleted items.
 9 Q. So you went through some of it yourself, the ones that
 10 weren't deleted, is that right?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. Inbox and outbox?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. And then got IT to dig out the deleted ones?
 15 A. Yes, but they didn't manage -- as I think I say in my
 16 statement -- they didn't maybe to establish everything.
 17 Q. This one didn't get pulled out, maybe because it is not
 18 headed "Savile". Mr Prendergast is, presumably a friend
 19 of yours that works at the National Theatre?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. Some of this is quite chatty, between friends which I'm
 22 not interested in. But I am interested in your email of
 23 3 October at page 101.001. Do you see?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. You have you have been asked to go to the email below.

Page 23

1 Mr Prendergast is asking after your welfare, and there
 2 is obviously a lot going on. Are you okay? What's your
 3 involvement in it? And then you say:
 4 "My involvement is basically I was on holiday when
 5 it was commissioned and I issued lots of expletives when
 6 I got back and found out we were doing it. Personally
 7 I wouldn't have gone near it in the first place and
 8 I was very supportive of the decision to drop it, for
 9 a host of reasons. Not because of any BBC establishment
 10 fears -- and there was no attempt to get us to drop it
 11 on those grounds whatsoever -- but because I didn't
 12 think there was a public interest defence in allegations
 13 involving a dead celebrity."
 14 Then you say:
 15 "It is just terribly sad. There are people here who
 16 are happy to damage the programme and the wider BBC to
 17 serve their own dubious ends."
 18 What was the, "Host of reasons"?
 19 A. I guess they were the reasons I expressed right at the
 20 beginning.
 21 Q. About the fact that Jimmy Savile was only recently dead?
 22 A. Um-hm.
 23 Q. Anything else?
 24 A. Yes, the issue of, as I say, of journalistic credibility
 25 and rigour not having to still stand.

Page 24

1 Q. Was it ever suggested that lower editorial standards
 2 were being applied to this story?
 3 A. There was -- well my fear was that I didn't want us to
 4 end up making a programme which would not have stood
 5 were he alive.
 6 Q. The reference to public interest defence:
 7 "I didn't think there was a public interest defence
 8 in allegations involving a dead celebrity."
 9 Why would there need to be a public interest defence
 10 against a dead celebrity who couldn't sue?
 11 A. I suppose for the reasons I go back to on taste grounds.
 12 If I didn't feel that there was a, um, a reason to
 13 expose this, which obviously now in retrospect there was
 14 because there was a lot of institutional failure
 15 involved. I didn't feel that it was something that
 16 I would have pursued myself.
 17 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask, you are drawing
 18 a distinction -- or perhaps you should draw
 19 a distinction -- between your view at the start and your
 20 view when the story came to be dropped.
 21 A. Um-hm.
 22 MR POLLARD: Am I right in thinking that you were against it
 23 at the start. When you heard it, you just had a sort of
 24 gut feeling; this is not the right story for us, for all
 25 sorts of reasons?

1 A. Yes.
 2 MR POLLARD: And then later, if you like, the start of the
 3 process was when you didn't know whether there was any
 4 real evidence or not?
 5 A. Um-hm.
 6 MR POLLARD: When it got to be dropped you were able to
 7 have -- although you weren't closely involved -- have
 8 a sense of: actually I think Peter Rippon's view is
 9 right, because the evidence doesn't support it.
 10 I just want to take you back to the start of the
 11 process, and I think you came close to saying just now,
 12 effectively, that, actually it was a worthwhile story,
 13 as it turned out. The story of Jimmy Savile as an
 14 historic and long term molester of young people was
 15 right. So do you think your initial reaction was wrong?
 16 A. In hindsight, absolutely. Yes. After what transpired.
 17 After the ITV documentary. Yes.
 18 MR POLLARD: Do you think, with hindsight, actually it was
 19 a valid Newsnight story?
 20 A. I did not feel like it was an obvious thing for us to
 21 pursue in the terms that we had it at that point.
 22 MR POLLARD: But that was the starting point, really, in the
 23 early days of November?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 MR POLLARD: Do you think your strong resistance to the

1 story right at the start coloured your view of it
 2 through November, or would it be fair to say you had an
 3 open mind about it, because you clearly were viscerally
 4 against it, a string of expletives at the start and
 5 so on --
 6 A. That may have been exaggerating for a friend. But, no,
 7 I think it is fair to say I didn't have an especially
 8 open mind and when the other deputy came back from leave
 9 and took a different view, I remember thinking, right,
 10 this is kind of one for Peter, really.
 11 MR POLLARD: You didn't want to get involved. Okay.
 12 MR MACLEAN: Why did Shaminder Nahal take a different view?
 13 Was it that she thought that a story which -- you know,
 14 "Dead man was paedophile", that might have been the
 15 story. "Dead man was paedophile involving abuse at
 16 approved school-type places", might be the story. "Dead
 17 man who was BBC star was paedophile", or "Dead man who
 18 was BBC star involving allegations of abuse at the BBC",
 19 might be the story?
 20 A. You would have to ask her what she thought and why she
 21 felt it was a story. I wasn't in the room when Peter
 22 and her had the discussion.
 23 Q. Your initial thought was that a story that was, as it
 24 were, simply, "Recently dead man was a paedophile", was
 25 not a story you wanted to touch?

1 A. Yes I was very is dubious about it, which I think I have
 2 explained, yes.
 3 Q. About that story?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. Now, your reluctance to get involved, was that partly
 6 conditioned by the attitude of people in other parts of
 7 the BBC? For example in BBC1?
 8 A. No, not remotely. I don't know anyone in BBC1.
 9 Q. You know who the important people are in BBC1?
 10 A. I know their names.
 11 Q. So your reluctance to get involved in this story was --
 12 A. It was --
 13 Q. -- born of what?
 14 A. Born of the fact that I had concerns about the fact --
 15 that I have expressed -- that we had embarked upon it.
 16 I knew that there was a difference of view in the senior
 17 team about whether that was -- whether that was the
 18 right view, so I took a view, "This is Peter's project,
 19 he can oversee it and take the ultimate decision".
 20 And also in previous stories and investigations
 21 where -- we have had issues where there hasn't been
 22 a clear line of command in terms of who is taking
 23 a story on, and that occasionally -- not necessarily
 24 with this team but with other teams that are involved in
 25 investigations -- you can get into a situation where,

1 you know, the team might be playing me off against Peter
 2 or vice versa. So I didn't feel it was an unusual --
 3 I mean, it -- it's not an unprecedented situation for me
 4 to feel this is something that he is overseeing.
 5 Q. The team playing a deputy editor off against the editor.
 6 You mean the investigation team?
 7 A. Yes, that had happened in the past on Newsnight. You
 8 know you put -- a reporter might come to me and say X
 9 and then go to Peter and say, "Well, Liz says X", and
 10 try to influence the process by sort of, you know,
 11 telling us different things.
 12 Q. It doesn't sound like an office that is replete with
 13 trust?
 14 A. I think that is probably how a lot of offices work.
 15 Q. It is an accurate characterisation of mine?
 16 A. I don't think it is, actually.
 17 Q. Do you still have bundle 3? We were looking at page 12
 18 and the transmission plan.
 19 So from 25 November it looks like, notwithstanding
 20 your hostility to this story, it is all systems go,
 21 isn't it?
 22 A. At this stage.
 23 Q. We looked at page 12, 25 November, Peter Rippon to
 24 Meirion Jones, "We can pull together the transmission
 25 plan."

Page 29

1 So it is all systems go on the face of it. Doesn't
 2 mean it is necessarily going to broadcast but the wheels
 3 are in motion?
 4 A. Wheels in motion I would say is a fair characterisation.
 5 Q. You then got sent a rough script at page 143. Four days
 6 later, on the 29th.
 7 Now, had anything -- had you had any substantive
 8 involvement -- I don't mean the nuts and bolts of
 9 transmission planning, which is presumably going on, I'm
 10 not interested in that. Did you have any substantive
 11 involvement that you can recall between 25 and 29th?
 12 A. No.
 13 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask one question about that? If
 14 you just flick back in that bundle to 121, do you have
 15 that? An email from Liz MacKean to you, copied to
 16 Meirion --
 17 A. Yes.
 18 MR POLLARD: -- on the 28th. I just wondered how that
 19 date -- I was just sort of struck that it was slightly
 20 odd that it was Liz MacKean telling you, rather than the
 21 other way round. How would that have come about? You
 22 were the production planner.
 23 A. Yes. I don't know. It does seem unusual.
 24 MR POLLARD: Does --
 25 A. Perhaps -- perhaps she talked to Peter about that as

Page 30

1 a potential date.
 2 MR POLLARD: I wondered about that. But as far as you
 3 recollect --
 4 A. No.
 5 MR POLLARD: You haven't put in --
 6 A. Not -- not at that stage, no. No.
 7 MR POLLARD: So you were being told about that, rather
 8 than --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: That's how it struck me.
 11 A. No, I think that's probably accurate, yes.
 12 MR POLLARD: Okay, thank you.
 13 MR MACLEAN: You are looking at this timeline, which I don't
 14 have. Is there anything on that between 25th and
 15 29th --
 16 A. Um --
 17 Q. -- apart from the point Nick has just raised?
 18 A. No.
 19 Q. So at 9.51 on the 29th, Meirion Jones sent to several
 20 people, including you, a copy of ROUGHSAVILE. If you
 21 keep a finger there, and then go further on in the
 22 bundle, I think at 11.30, page 159, he sends another
 23 email. On the subject strapline he says:
 24 "If you haven't looked at ROUGHSAVILE, this
 25 ROUGHSAVILE 2 is better."

Page 31

1 In other words the second one overtakes the first
 2 one?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. Why has this been sent to you?
 5 A. Again, because that was very much Meirion's way to
 6 keep -- to be maximalist about who he sent stuff to.
 7 Q. But he didn't send it to Shaminder Nahal.
 8 A. Again, as I say, she didn't have any involvement in
 9 commissioning or execing or planning of films.
 10 Q. Neither did you, according to you, in this instance?
 11 A. But that wouldn't be unusual for him to -- on a project
 12 that I was execing that Meirion was doing, he would
 13 probably copy Peter into a script.
 14 Q. He's the editor of the programme. So what was your
 15 understanding of what you were expected to do with,
 16 let's take -- I don't know did you read the first one or
 17 the second one or neither of them?
 18 A. I recollect skimming a version.
 19 Q. Maybe it doesn't matter which version. If we take the
 20 second version then at 159, what did you understand
 21 Mr Jones's purpose was in sending this to you? What did
 22 he want you to do?
 23 A. You would have to ask him.
 24 Q. Well, you must have had -- when you got this email, did
 25 you think: I'm being sent this so that I can keep it in

Page 32

1 my inbox, or so that I can read the script, or read the
 2 script and then do something else, or what?
 3 **A. I probably thought -- I get a lot of emails and this is**
 4 **not something I'm overseeing.**
 5 Q. So did you -- if you look at 160 and following, do you
 6 think you read that? You say you skimmed it, what did
 7 you take in when you skimmed it?
 8 **A. The fact that they had one victim on camera.**
 9 Q. So what, as it were? What conclusion does one draw from
 10 that?
 11 **A. Well, it seems still quite rough and there was quite**
 12 **a lot still to get.**
 13 Q. Now, in fact -- well, did you clock for example the fact
 14 that the script has words, for example, at page 160,
 15 from Mark Williams-Thomas which he hadn't yet said?
 16 **A. Um, I was -- not that specifically, but I noted the:**
 17 **"Rough. Still to come. Not legal, nowhere near**
 18 **final."**
 19 Q. This sort of document which is rough, nowhere near
 20 final, you see at 160:
 21 "Mark Williams-Thomas, approximately what I expect
 22 him to say."
 23 Is that a normal sort of document that a producer
 24 would send to the executive producer? Somebody in
 25 Jones's position would send to you or to Peter Rippon?

Page 33

1 **A. The kind of thing Meirion would send, yes.**
 2 Q. The kind of thing Meirion would send?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. And that is the kind of thing you would then expect the
 5 executive producer to take a decision on the basis of?
 6 **A. Go through in detail and discuss and establish whether**
 7 **there was enough and what more was needed.**
 8 Q. If it was established that this was enough, then would
 9 that be subject, of course, to scheduling and something
 10 else happening which means it cannot run on the night,
 11 because of some other news event? That would be it,
 12 would it? It would be green light?
 13 **A. Not necessarily. You can watch something in a suite and**
 14 **think actually it doesn't feel right. You can see**
 15 **something on a script and it can feel enough and then**
 16 **you can see it in an edit and think actually it doesn't**
 17 **feel like it's enough to go with. There is no**
 18 **hard-and-fast rule about these things.**
 19 Q. So the executive producer would look at the piece once
 20 it was put together?
 21 **A. Yes, or a rough -- I mean an early version. It depends**
 22 **per project, per project really and how tight the timing**
 23 **on the editing is. But, yes, they would watch**
 24 **a version.**
 25 Q. You see the words from Mr Williams-Thomas, which of

Page 34

1 course he hadn't said, are ending with the words, "Why
 2 was it all hushed up?"
 3 Do you see that at 160?
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. Then if you go over a few pages to the end at 163 --
 6 sorry, 165, what is anticipated is that the piece is
 7 going to end with "PTC", piece to camera:
 8 "Duncroft or TVC [TV Centre], not sure yet, with any
 9 statement from police or CPS."
 10 So it happens that what is contemplated is quite
 11 early on in this story we are going to have the supposed
 12 expert saying something has been hushed up?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. And then at the end we're going to have the police and
 15 the CPS giving some statement. So it looks, does it
 16 not, as if this is a piece which, sure, is about Jimmy
 17 Savile being a paedophile, but the sting of it is that
 18 the police and the CPS have dropped the ball?
 19 **A. Yes, or, as we now know, the suggestion was the CPS had**
 20 **decided not to prosecute because Savile was too old.**
 21 Q. That's what it says at 160. Those are the words which
 22 Mr Williams-Thomas is going to say --
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. -- specifically, do you see?
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 35

1 Q. "Savile was too old and infirm."
 2 **A. Yes. Which he hadn't yet said.**
 3 Q. Which he hadn't yet said.
 4 If you look in this script, there is reference to
 5 [REDACTED] if you look at page 164, towards the
 6 bottom, this is taken from the -- I think it is called
 7 the sync pull, isn't it, that Meirion Jones had done.
 8 He pulled this from the interview with [REDACTED] who we now
 9 know is [REDACTED] You see what he says about
 10 [REDACTED] being particularly horrible and so on, and
 11 the reference to Jimmy Savile's dressing room.
 12 Was that aspect, that there was an allegation of
 13 something particularly nasty having taken place at the
 14 BBC, was that something on your radar screen?
 15 **A. Not especially no. I had had an early -- in that early**
 16 **conversation with Liz she had suggested that there was**
 17 **a Savile-related suggestion that something may have gone**
 18 **on at Television Centre, but ...**
 19 Q. It doesn't appear that that aspect was really picked
 20 up --
 21 **A. No.**
 22 Q. -- not only by you, who on any view wasn't directly
 23 involved in this story -- but by Ms MacKean or
 24 Meirion Jones or Peter Rippon, is that right?
 25 **A. I agree with that.**

Page 36

1 Q. Is that right? So although this is one of the aspects
 2 which has been given a lot of publicity recently, it
 3 wasn't the focus?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. Did Meirion Jones or Liz MacKean ever suggest, so far as
 6 you were aware, that that should be the focus --
 7 A. No.
 8 Q. -- that was something they had in mind?
 9 A. No.
 10 Q. What about the, [REDACTED] the
 11 non-Jimmy Savile aspects of this?
 12 A. Yes, I wasn't aware of the non-Jimmy Savile. I mean
 13 obviously it is in the script but I -- again I'm not
 14 sure it's something that they were pursuing.
 15 Q. Was it your understanding -- maybe you didn't have an
 16 understanding -- that all of the Duncroft girls had
 17 already been spoken to by the police or investigated by
 18 the police to some extent?
 19 A. I didn't know about that. I wasn't aware of what the
 20 police situation was at all, in relation to the girls
 21 we'd spoken to.
 22 Q. But you understood later that --
 23 A. I...
 24 Q. -- a reason for the story not running was that this CPS,
 25 police/CPS aspect couldn't be stood up?

Page 37

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. That only makes sense, or at least makes more sense, if
 3 all of the girls have been spoken to by the police.
 4 A. Certainly if some -- if -- my assumption was that we'd
 5 found out about the police investigation through
 6 a victim.
 7 Q. So you would agree then that this script looks as if
 8 it's got two thrusts, if I can put it like that. Is one
 9 that Savile was a nasty paedophile and the second one
 10 was that the police and the CPS had not pursued him for,
 11 as it were, perhaps a bad reason. Not that there wasn't
 12 enough evidence to go against him, but because he was
 13 too old and infirm?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. And that was going to be --
 16 A. As I say, I don't remember -- I don't recollect looking
 17 at it in detail, but I certainly knew that there was
 18 a police element to the story that we now had.
 19 Q. Now on the 29th it was clear by this stage, wasn't it,
 20 that word had got out to a part of the BBC called
 21 Impact, is that right?
 22 A. Um-hm.
 23 Q. Is that something that should have happened by this
 24 stage of the story?
 25 A. Um, what normally happens with Impact is I would have

Page 38

1 conversations with them on a sort of formal, weekly
 2 level and occasionally on an informal level about what
 3 was coming up.
 4 Q. When would you do that? Was this story ready for that
 5 conversation?
 6 A. I would say not. But it's not unprecedented for, you
 7 know, people to have conversations with -- directly with
 8 a team on something that they are looking into.
 9 Particularly if they have a relationship with them
 10 through past projects.
 11 Q. Had you told Impact about Jimmy Savile?
 12 A. No.
 13 Q. But somebody clearly had.
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Who do you think was that? Who do you think --
 16 A. I assume it was the production team.
 17 Q. So either Meirion Jones or Liz MacKean?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. It is fair to say that the Impact team was anticipating
 20 a huge amount of interest in story, if it ran, wasn't
 21 it?
 22 A. One of the members of the Impact team was. Yes, that
 23 was her view.
 24 Q. Did anybody on the Impact team take a different view?
 25 A. She was the only person that I was aware of that knew

Page 39

1 anything about it.
 2 Q. Were you surprised that the Impact team thought that
 3 there would be a huge amount of interest in the story?
 4 A. Not in the sense that they often think that it there
 5 will be a huge amount of interest in stories that
 6 I frankly think that there won't be. But it is their
 7 job to be enthusiastic about things running all over the
 8 BBC which I feel won't necessarily run all over the BBC.
 9 Q. That is their job?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Go to 179 please. Jo Mathys is a senior producer in the
 12 Impact team.
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Is Helen Weaver -- is she in the same team?
 15 A. She's in the same team.
 16 Q. She's in the same team.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. You were copied this at the time. You have probably
 19 seen this in the last couple of days, have you?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. "Hi Peter, I have just had a very interesting chat with
 22 Meirion about Jimmy Savile. I won't mention anything to
 23 Programmes until you and he are ready for me to do so."
 24 Just help me with what part of the BBC that is.
 25 A. Programmes means News programmes. It just means -- it's

Page 40

<p>1 an overarching term for, I mean in some -- in some 2 context it can mean the non-bulletins, but I would 3 imagine in these terms she'd mean bulletins and 4 structured programmes. 5 Q. So it doesn't mean programmes in the sense that 6 Helen Boaden has explained to us that Steve Mitchell is 7 head of programmes -- 8 A. Sorry, yes, head of programmes -- so there is 9 essentially the head of programmes which is, um, 10 non-bulletin types things: Newsnight, Today, World at 11 One, PM and so on. Then the newsroom is basically 12 online and bulletins. 13 Q. You think that means programmes in a more ordinary 14 sense? 15 A. I think it means -- 16 MR POLLARD: Other news outlets? 17 A. I think it means all news outlets, yes. 18 MR MACLEAN: We can read the emails where she explains that 19 she thinks it is safe to assume there is going to be 20 a huge amount of interest and they want Liz MacKean to 21 do pieces to put on the radio and television and online 22 and so on. 23 If you go to page 230, for some reason the reply to 24 this is in bundle -- can I just tell you what it says. 25 On the 29th, at 14.45, Peter Rippon replies to this Page 41</p>	<p>1 this story was going to run? 2 A. Well, he certainly had a conversation with me in which 3 he -- I'm now speculating that it would have been around 4 this time, having seen how things developed, where he 5 said he was only content to run with the story as it 6 stood if he could get the CPS line stood up. 7 Q. Did you form a view as to how or why -- how and why he'd 8 come to that conclusion? 9 A. Well, because I think it then obviously established that 10 a police investigation had decided to cover up the idea 11 that Jimmy Savile was a paedophile, because they felt he 12 was too old, rather than that there wasn't sufficient 13 evidence. 14 Q. Did he discuss with you the desire or need to take 15 Mr Mitchell's view again? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Do you know whether he spoke to Steve Mitchell around 18 this time? 19 A. No. 20 Q. Steve Mitchell was in Belfast, I think, on 29 November? 21 A. Right. 22 Q. Do you recall that? 23 A. No. 24 Q. So what would -- how would you characterise 25 Peter Rippon's attitude to this story? We saw the Page 43</p>
<p>1 email we were just looking at -- 2 A. I have the wrong -- 3 Q. I'm just reading it to you. 14.45, not copied to you: 4 "I'll let you know what we can do when we know we 5 have the story scheduled. I'm guessing rolling out 6 won't be too bad as have time, we can control when we do 7 it." 8 A. Okay. I see what you mean. 9 Q. In other words there is not great compression of time? 10 A. Right. 11 Q. So if you want to look at it now or later, it is 12 bundle 16, page 238, but I don't think it is necessary. 13 A. Okay. 14 Q. So, it looks as if on the 29th that it is still, as it 15 were, all systems go for this piece, doesn't it? 16 A. Um, certainly the wheels were in motion. 17 Q. The script comes in? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Impact is gearing up? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Peter Rippon essentially saying what I just read to you: 22 "Rolling out won't be too bad as have time, can 23 control when we do it." 24 Were you aware of any particular deliberation on 25 Peter Rippon's part, at about this time, about whether Page 42</p>	<p>1 Liz MacKean email at the beginning which suggested that 2 you were, as it were, at the sceptical end. He was 3 perhaps a little less sceptical but still sceptical. We 4 know Shaminder Nahal, I think a bit later, was less 5 sceptical than either of you. 6 Peter Rippon described his attitude to us at the 7 beginning as being lukewarm. What was your view of 8 Peter Rippon's attitude to the story? 9 A. I -- I wouldn't feel comfortable characterising it. 10 Q. Did it -- whatever it was, did you perceive it changing 11 in any way, either warming up or cooling down? 12 A. Not -- not from a warmth to a cold. I think he was 13 weighing things up, one way or the other, all the way 14 through to be honest. 15 MR POLLARD: Can I just push you on the reluctance to 16 categorise it. If you like you are a witness to this 17 all the way through November, from the day you get back 18 from holiday. I appreciate you were not talking about 19 this story all the time because there were lots of other 20 things going on. But it would be helpful to get a sense 21 of, you know, at that key level of editor, deputy 22 editor, when the story came up or, you know, when there 23 was a development in it, I think all we're asking is how 24 did he seem? I mean on a scale of 1 to 10 of very cold 25 and red hot, was it -- Page 44</p>

1 A. I don't think he veered from hugely enthusiastic to
 2 hugely sceptical. I think he was -- he was some days
 3 more convinced, other days less convinced. I won't say
 4 that there was any point at which he changed his mind
 5 and I guess it might have been hard for him, the fact
 6 that I had a particular view and the other deputy had
 7 the opposite view.
 8 MR POLLARD: It wasn't an unreasonable position. He was --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: Without putting words in his mouth, do you
 11 think he was waiting to be convinced by the evidence?
 12 A. I think that would be perfectly legitimate if he were.
 13 MR MACLEAN: Steve Mitchell detected Peter Rippon being --
 14 at least appearing to Steve Mitchell to be, as he put
 15 it, keener on the story by 29 November, than he had
 16 been --
 17 A. That would probably be because there was a suggestion
 18 that the police had looked into it. It also appears
 19 that there was a perception that that -- that it hadn't
 20 been pursued because he was too old, which would have
 21 been a stronger story.
 22 Q. Yes. Can I show you in bundle 3, page 197.001, you see
 23 there is an email at the bottom of page from
 24 Peter Rippon to Steve Mitchell at 1.18 in the afternoon.
 25 We only have the first word on that page. Then you go
 Page 45

1 over the page:
 2 "We have made progress on the Savile story and now
 3 propose to transmit on Wednesday, 7 December. We have
 4 spoken to seven victims, two on tape, who say he
 5 molested and sexually assaulted them."
 6 A. I don't seem to have that.
 7 Q. 197.002.
 8 A. I'm sorry, I beg your pardon.
 9 Q. Do you have 001?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. The word "Steve".
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Over the page is the email, "We have made progress ..."
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Have you seen that before? This email?
 16 A. No, not that I know -- no.
 17 Q. Just cast your eye over the email then first.
 18 A. No, I haven't seen that before.
 19 Q. Now do the terms of that email really strike you as --
 20 do they come as a surprise to you, given what you
 21 understood to be Peter Rippon's attitude to the story,
 22 or not?
 23 A. I think he was probably setting out what we had.
 24 Q. But in fact you didn't have, for example, confirmation
 25 that Surrey Police had carried out --
 Page 46

1 A. That's true.
 2 Q. -- an extensive investigation?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. The investigation knew that the police had investigated,
 5 but it didn't know why it hadn't gone any further. So
 6 that sentence -- I appreciate it's not your email --
 7 isn't accurate.
 8 A. Um-hm.
 9 Q. Right?
 10 A. Um-hm.
 11 Q. It also refers to two victims -- two victims on tape --
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. -- when in fact there was only ever one victim on tape.
 14 A. Yes, that is right, yes.
 15 Q. And it says that the women are, "Credible... "
 16 A. Where does it say that?
 17 Q. The pre-penultimate paragraph.
 18 A. Yeah, okay.
 19 Q. "... And have no motive for speaking to us, other than
 20 they want the truth to be known."
 21 Were you ever aware of, or party to, any discussion
 22 about the fact that some of the women may have had some
 23 other motive for speaking to the BBC?
 24 A. Only subsequently. Since.
 25 Q. And that was what?
 Page 47

1 A. As in -- in recent months.
 2 Q. No --
 3 A. One of them had a [REDACTED]
 4 Q. It was the [REDACTED] point, was it?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. You don't remember that being a factor discussed at the
 7 time?
 8 A. No.
 9 Q. We see the reference to "credible". Liz MacKean's email
 10 at the beginning of the story has both you and
 11 Peter Rippon being concerned about the credibility of
 12 the women.
 13 A. Um-hm.
 14 Q. Do you know how Peter Rippon would have come to the
 15 conclusion, if he did, by 29th, that the women were
 16 credible? Did he have a discussion with you about it
 17 saying, "I'm now cheered up by the credibility"?
 18 A. No.
 19 Q. Did you know that he had or hadn't looked at the film of
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 A. I didn't know whether he had or not.
 22 Q. If you had been in his position, would you have done
 23 that?
 24 A. Not necessarily.
 25 Q. Not necessarily at all or not necessarily at this stage?
 Page 48

1 A. Not necessarily at this stage.
 2 Q. So he said, I think -- I will be corrected if I'm
 3 wrong -- that he had the script. In fact he had a later
 4 iteration of it, ROUGHSAVILE 5 -- I can't remember if
 5 you saw that, but it is to much the same effect. And he
 6 hadn't looked at the film then but he said he would have
 7 done, once they got the edit and pulled it all together,
 8 he would have looked at the piece before it was
 9 broadcast.
 10 A. Yes, a rough cut and then made changes and approved it
 11 for broadcast.
 12 Q. If you had been in his position you might have done the
 13 same?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. But it might be said that before you form a view about
 16 the credibility of a witness that you have on tape, one
 17 of the best ways of doing that is to look at the tape?
 18 A. Yes, that's true.
 19 Q. So you didn't see this email and you didn't see,
 20 I assume -- no reason why you should have done --
 21 Steve Mitchell you see over the page says he's in
 22 Belfast, "Can call you later". And then there is
 23 another email from Peter Rippon in which he's copied
 24 bits from the ROUGHSAVILE script and he's --
 25 A. Yes.

Page 49

1 fact of the tribute became an issue.
 2 Q. So you got it from Peter?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. Not from Steve Mitchell?
 5 A. No.
 6 Q. Did you ever have any discussions with Steve Mitchell?
 7 A. No.
 8 Q. What would you understand Peter Rippon's, as it were,
 9 responsibility to be, vis-a-vis those Vision issues once
 10 he became aware of them?
 11 A. To tell Steve.
 12 Q. Having done so, that's it, from his perspective? He can
 13 then get on with doing his job, is that right?
 14 A. I think -- I think informing Steve would be the key
 15 thing to do in that situation, yes.
 16 Q. And then it is for Steve to do whatever Steve does?
 17 A. I would -- yes, I would guess.
 18 Q. Now, I'm going to come to those, that list, in just
 19 a minute. Just keep that one open, if you would.
 20 Do you still have bundle 3? Go to page 181. This
 21 is the early afternoon of the 29th of November. This is
 22 the day -- we've had Jo Mathys with her Impact email --
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. -- we have had ROUGHSAVILE being circulated twice at
 25 9.50 and 11.30.

Page 51

1 Q. -- put them down and sent them to Steve Mitchell.
 2 Let me just ask you then to turn to the last but one
 3 page of that bundle. There are two emails on this page.
 4 I want you at the moment only to look at the bottom one,
 5 Peter Rippon to Steve Mitchell at 19.30 on the 29th:
 6 "I will get a script to you this time tomorrow.
 7 I just need to iron out a few bits with Meirion first.
 8 He's interviewing a second victim on camera tomorrow..."
 9 And reference to others chasing it and the
 10 difficulty The Sun was in.
 11 Would it be normal for Steve Mitchell to be sent
 12 the script of a piece like this?
 13 A. I don't know I don't think it would be unprecedented,
 14 no; a piece of this nature.
 15 Q. Did Peter Rippon ever -- we saw your -- you haven't seen
 16 the email yet, but the Vision issues email which is in
 17 bundle -- I will show you that now in fact. It is in
 18 bundle 2, page 276, I think.
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. I'm going to come to the list. I'm still coming to
 21 that. In your email you say:
 22 "I know Peter and Steve talked about the Vision
 23 issues surrounding Savile, so that sounds sensible."
 24 How did you know that?
 25 A. As I previously explained, I had asked Peter when the

Page 50

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. And then you see what you are doing here is you are
 3 sending on the 11.30 email to Peter Rippon.
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. And you say:
 6 "Are you going to exec this? I'm not sure Joe M is
 7 right about other outlets clamouring to run it, but
 8 I may be wrong, especially pre-watershed. Anyway I have
 9 no problem with the 5pm embargo if you don't."
 10 The reference to pre-watershed is to do with the
 11 subject matter of the piece?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. It looks as if it hasn't been decided who is going to
 14 exec the piece at this stage.
 15 A. No I wouldn't say that is right, I just wanted to be
 16 absolutely clear that I could not get involved in
 17 re-versioning of various versions and that he would take
 18 control of it, because there was occasionally situations
 19 where he would be overseeing a project and then it would
 20 come to me at the last minute, and I wanted to be
 21 absolutely clear that he had the line of control in this
 22 case.
 23 Q. So you didn't want the hospital pass further down the
 24 line; is that your concern?
 25 A. For all the reasons I have explained before, I felt

Page 52

<p>1 there had to be a clear line of command on a story of 2 this nature. 3 Q. Was one of the reasons that you didn't want to get 4 involved in this that you didn't want to trample on the 5 toes of BBC1? 6 A. Not remotely. I had 101 other projects to be execing at 7 that time, including a very controversial one with 8 The Guardian. 9 Q. And you didn't want Newsnight to be running a story that 10 would be seen to piss off BBC1? 11 A. No. That had absolutely no impact on my view. It 12 wasn't even an issue when I came back from holiday, when 13 I expressed my concerns. 14 Q. You probably know why I'm asking you that question? 15 A. Yes, I do. 16 Q. You have seen the email from Liz MacKean to one of her 17 friends, a Mr Hughes, a little bit down the track on 6 18 December where she says: 19 "Having commissioned this story Peter Rippon keeps 20 saying he's lukewarm about it. He's trying to kill it 21 by making impossible editorial demands. When we rebut 22 his points he resorts to saying it was 40 years ago ... 23 he hasn't warned BBC1 about the story so they are 24 beavering away on the special oblivious. Liz G has said 25 to Meirion, 'I'm having nothing to do with this.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 MR POLLARD: That would not necessarily stop you being aware 2 of BBC1 interest. 3 A. Well, I knew about the tribute. And I knew that -- at 4 this point that Meirion was suggesting that it would 5 look like it had been covered up because of the tribute. 6 MR POLLARD: Yes. 7 MR MACLEAN: Did you form the impression that Meirion Jones 8 was saying that in order to cajole, or one might say 9 bully Newsnight into running the story? In other words 10 saying it as a threat? 11 A. I wouldn't want to characterise it like that. But I -- 12 certainly a lot of people in the office knew that that 13 was his view. 14 Q. What was his view; that if it didn't run there would 15 be an accusation of a cover up? 16 A. Yes, yes. 17 Q. And do you know that as it transpired subsequently he 18 made precisely that allegation to others? 19 A. I didn't know that. But -- 20 Q. Did we give you the email from Meirion Jones, for 21 example, to Mary Wilkinson? 22 A. Yes, I have subsequently seen that. 23 Q. And the one to David Lomax? 24 A. Yes, I have seen that. 25 Q. No point in showing you them now. You didn't see them</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 I don't want to piss off Danny Cohen, it is down to 2 Peter." 3 So she's recording in her email to her friend what 4 Meirion Jones appears to have reported to her about what 5 you said to him. So what do you -- 6 A. That's not remotely true. 7 Q. What did you say so Meirion Jones? 8 A. I don't remember any conversations with him in the 9 course of the investigation. I remember him coming up 10 to me around the time it looked like the CPS line was 11 not going to stand up, expressing concerns that it would 12 look like a cover up and I said I didn't think it would, 13 because it wasn't. 14 Q. Can you account for why Meirion Jones might have said 15 this to Liz MacKean? 16 A. No. 17 MR POLLARD: It just seems a bizarre thing, doesn't it, to 18 pluck out of the atmosphere? I can understand all the 19 reported conversations about he doesn't want to run it, 20 he won't listen to the evidence or he has things up his 21 sleeve. But to suddenly suggest that you had made 22 a reference to Danny Cohen, clearly something involving 23 BBC1 -- you had no conversation, no mention about 24 Danny Cohen or BBC1? 25 A. No, I have never even met Danny Cohen.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 at the time? 2 A. No. 3 Q. But you have seen them? 4 A. I've seen them since, yes. 5 Q. So, having seen those emails that he sent to those 6 people, did that reinforce or did that harden -- or does 7 that harden any view that he was, in effect, bullying or 8 trying to bully Newsnight into running this story? 9 A. I wouldn't want to characterise it like that. But it is 10 clear that he either felt there was a cover-up or that 11 it would be perceived that way if the piece didn't run. 12 Q. Now in Liz MacKean's email to her friend Mr Hughes, she 13 says: 14 "He hasn't even [that is Peter Rippon] warned BBC1 15 about the story." 16 But he had gone to Steve Mitchell, and your Vision 17 issues email makes that clear. Your evidence, which is 18 I think the same as Peter Rippon's evidence, which is 19 that: where there is an issue like this, I go to 20 Steve Mitchell, and then Steve Mitchell will do what 21 Steve Mitchell does. You think that's entirely correct? 22 A. I do, yes. 23 Q. It's not for Peter Rippon to go to -- 24 A. No. 25 Q. -- BBC1? So then, what's the purpose of the Managed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

1 Programmes Risk List?
 2 A. Um, that is to alert -- I don't actually know, to this
 3 day, who gets it, but it's to alert people within the
 4 organisation to potentially controversial stories.
 5 Q. Why?
 6 A. So that those that may have a view on elements of --
 7 aspects of them that the programme team may need to know
 8 are in a -- are in a position to seek that advice or
 9 knowledge.
 10 Q. So --
 11 A. For example, if there were -- if we were working on
 12 a story about the phone hacking for example and it
 13 turned out Panorama was too, if you see what I mean?
 14 Q. Yes.
 15 MR POLLARD: Do you want a short break?
 16 MR MACLEAN: We're about to come to some of the detail of
 17 this. We need to have a break every so often for the
 18 transcribers. So can we just have ten minutes?
 19 A. Yes, sure.
 20 (11.40 am)
 21 (A short break)
 22 (11.50 am)
 23 MR MACLEAN: Can we look at this list in a little bit more
 24 detail? There are a various things. Can I just show
 25 you, first of all, in bundle A4, page 29.004 --
 Page 57

1 MR POLLARD: Which page?
 2 MR MACLEAN: 29.004. You should be looking at the covering
 3 email of a bunch of papers for something called the
 4 Editorial Standards Board.
 5 A. Right.
 6 Q. As it happens, this is for a meeting that took place on
 7 8 December last year?
 8 A. Right.
 9 Q. You see there is a whole bunch of attachments?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. From Christina Roski to the Editorial Standards Board.
 12 Then over the page there is something called the
 13 Editorial Standards Board Managed Risk Programme List,
 14 form noting on 8 December.
 15 A. Um-hm.
 16 Q. And:
 17 "The purpose of the Managed Risk Programmes List is
 18 that it identifies programmes to be transmitted in the
 19 coming three months which have potential risks and also
 20 those who production may be sensitive during the whole
 21 of the production process up to transmission."
 22 You then go over the page again, and there is a long
 23 document which runs to 20 pages or more. It starts with
 24 Vision, which is BBC speak for television. BBC1 and
 25 then BBC2 programmes start at .009. Then BBC2, news and
 Page 58

1 current affairs, and you see the Newsnight stories at
 2 page 10; academics, phone hacking and so on.
 3 Then by the time you get to page 12 you are on to
 4 BBC3.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. Then it is radio and so on.
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. As we understand it, this is the -- the Editorial
 9 Standards Board is the ultimate highest level consumer
 10 of the Managed Programmes Risk List?
 11 A. Right, that makes sense, yes.
 12 Q. And that is presumably not something that you would see?
 13 A. No.
 14 Q. That's well above your level on the programme?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. In between, in order to get to this stage as we
 17 understand it -- but tell me if your understanding is
 18 different -- a programme has to put a piece that it is
 19 going to do on to this list at base camp, if you like.
 20 In Newsnight's case that's done by you, usually by you,
 21 and you send it to somebody called Sara Beck who works
 22 in Steve Mitchell's office?
 23 A. That's right.
 24 Q. And then the Newsnight feed into this list is then
 25 collated with the feed in from people in a similar role
 Page 59

1 to you in other programmes, and then that gets sent by
 2 Steve Mitchell's office to the News list, which goes to
 3 a News board chaired by Helen Boaden. Then from there
 4 fed up to this at the top of the tree.
 5 A. You know more about it than me, but that sounds right.
 6 Q. So your role is what I unfairly characterised as "base
 7 camp" here; feeding the information to Sara Beck. Once
 8 you have done that, that's it, is it, so far as you your
 9 involvement?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. So --
 12 MR POLLARD: I just ask: can you add things -- from your
 13 purpose in this, your role, can you add things at any
 14 time?
 15 A. I wouldn't normally. I would normally wait for, um, her
 16 to send me round a list to say, "Is this updated, is
 17 this up to date?" And then I would -- I would check it
 18 and update it. So I won't necessarily go to her and
 19 say, "By the way, there is a new one for the MPRL".
 20 MR POLLARD: Okay. But because obviously Newsnight has
 21 quick turn around items --
 22 A. Yes.
 23 MR POLLARD: -- I'm just wondering whether, if you had
 24 a particularly controversial item and you thought you
 25 were going to transmit it in, say, a fortnight, and you
 Page 60

<p>1 had just done the MPRL --</p> <p>2 A. That would have been -- that would be referred to Steve</p> <p>3 anyway. So it would -- you know.</p> <p>4 MR POLLARD: But would you send Sara Beck a quick email and</p> <p>5 say, "I know we did the MPRL two days ago".</p> <p>6 A. I might do.</p> <p>7 MR POLLARD: But I have another one to --</p> <p>8 A. I might do, but I wouldn't necessarily as a matter of</p> <p>9 course, but, yes, sometimes I would, yes.</p> <p>10 MR MACLEAN: I am afraid I have forgotten. How long you</p> <p>11 have been at the BBC?</p> <p>12 A. Since 1997.</p> <p>13 Q. So do you know when this Managed Programmes Risk List</p> <p>14 came in?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Or why it came in?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. So if I was to suggest to you that it might have been an</p> <p>19 innovation of Mr Byford, does that ring any bell?</p> <p>20 A. It could well be.</p> <p>21 Q. What kind of risk, as it were, qualifies to be on this</p> <p>22 list?</p> <p>23 A. Um, I think it's loosely characterised as potentially</p> <p>24 controversial stories. So anything with a legal</p> <p>25 perspective or an editorial policy perspective, or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. You know, and we know, that the Jimmy Savile story was</p> <p>3 on what I characterised as the base camp list.</p> <p>4 Can I just show you what we have about this? I don't</p> <p>5 think we have the full picture. It's not a criticism of</p> <p>6 you in any way.</p> <p>7 If we go to bundle 2, page 188, you got back from</p> <p>8 holiday on I think we decided Monday 7th.</p> <p>9 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>10 Q. This is the following week. Now, can you just help us</p> <p>11 to unpick this? At the bottom of the page there is an</p> <p>12 email from you to Sara Beck on 17 November at 25 past 6</p> <p>13 in the evening.</p> <p>14 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>15 Q. And Fiona Connory. She works for Peter Rippon, is that</p> <p>16 right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Can you help us with what is going on here?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. There is all sorts of different fonts. It may be people</p> <p>21 are replying by writing into somebody else's email.</p> <p>22 What is --</p> <p>23 A. What that is, is every week Steve Mitchell would put out</p> <p>24 a note to the entire programmes team in which the</p> <p>25 highlights of that week, of the week's show would be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 controversial in any other way. Which would normally,</p> <p>2 to be honest, involve some sort of legal or ed pol</p> <p>3 issue.</p> <p>4 Q. So running a story that a live person, someone who is</p> <p>5 still alive, was a paedophile, whether they had ever</p> <p>6 been to the BBC in their lives, that would be</p> <p>7 a controversial story in itself?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Because if you get it wrong there is a reputational risk</p> <p>10 to the BBC and if you get it right there is</p> <p>11 a reputational risk to the living person?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. So whichever way it goes it is controversial. If you</p> <p>14 add to the mix that the person worked at the BBC, was</p> <p>15 a BBC celebrity, then that's all the more clearly --</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. -- a controversial story?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. So the fact that a story might have a reputational risk</p> <p>20 for the BBC might qualify a story to be on the Programme</p> <p>21 Risk List?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, but it would -- I think whether Jimmy Savile had</p> <p>23 worked for the BBC or not, I think it would have ended</p> <p>24 up on the MPRL, a story of that nature.</p> <p>25 Q. For the reasons I have just been exploring?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 celebrated in this list.</p> <p>2 Q. So the David Milliband business is celebrating what</p> <p>3 happened the week before?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, exactly.</p> <p>5 Q. Right.</p> <p>6 A. So this is something that -- well it would normally be</p> <p>7 whoever was least busy, but Peter and I and sometimes</p> <p>8 Shaminder would do. We would get a prompt from Fiona,</p> <p>9 or whoever was Peter's PA, to say, "Could you do your</p> <p>10 pick of the week?" And we would do it and send it on to</p> <p>11 her.</p> <p>12 Q. Right. So, "Our biggest coup of the week", that is</p> <p>13 Newsnight's biggest coup of the week?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And Vulture Funds is Newsnight?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 MR POLLARD: Just so I'm clear, there would have been</p> <p>18 a previous email from Sara Beck to you saying --</p> <p>19 A. Sara might have emailed Fiona and said --</p> <p>20 MR POLLARD: "Can you give us your highlights?" Got it,</p> <p>21 right.</p> <p>22 MR MACLEAN: In your email with the pick of the week</p> <p>23 starting with the youth unemployment case. These are</p> <p>24 your words, are they, "Here you are Sara"?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

<p>1 Q. Is that you? Is this also you, "Can you send me the 2 latest MPRL, by the way. Ta.?" 3 A. I assume that is me. It is hard to know, actually. 4 Q. It is hard to know. Then it appears, but this might not 5 be right, that the following day at 9.56 she sends you 6 an email saying: 7 "Welcome back, here you are, although it has been 8 rather mad these last two weeks and all a bit 9 neglected." 10 So it looks as if she then sends you the list with 11 the Newsnight stories, on which you can see is 12 Jimmy Savile. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. In the last column, that last column is identifying the 15 exec producer, I think, or the commissioner? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Maybe that is the same thing, is it? 18 A. Yes, normally. 19 Q. So it might be, it looks as if the Newsnight story has 20 been put on the list and sent to Sara Beck by somebody 21 else while you are away, is that right? 22 A. Yes, it does seem that way. 23 MR POLLARD: You have not added it in the 11 days since you 24 got back from holiday? 25 A. It doesn't look like it from this, does it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 This is the list now from the whole of News 2 programmes? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. So this is Newsnight and lots of others? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Being sent up the tube, if you like. So we have the 7 programme synopsis, the identified risk, the 8 transmission date or slot, who is doing it and the 9 executive producer. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. If you go to page 70, that's the start of BBC2 news and 12 current affairs. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Which finishes by page 72. Starts with the Newsnight 15 stories and there is no sign of Jimmy Savile? 16 A. Um-hm. 17 Q. So something has happened between the 17th and the 28th. 18 One of the things that has happened between the 17th and 19 28th is the -- A2/276 -- Vision issues email. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. So don't look at that one for the moment. Look at the 22 one at the bottom of page 276, at 13.21 on the 21st. 23 If you remember back on page 188 in this same 24 bundle, do you remember it was left on the 18th -- 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 MR MACLEAN: Not from, "Welcome back". 2 A. It is possible that Peter added it while I was away. 3 Q. The risk that is identified is, "Legal/taste". So those 4 would have been the words used by whoever put it on the 5 list at what I call base camp? 6 A. Um-hm. 7 Q. I had rather assumed, at least for some time, that that 8 might have been you, given the word "taste" in the 9 MacKean email, but it may be that it wasn't? 10 A. I actually assumed it was me. But I'm beginning to 11 think maybe it wasn't. 12 Q. Then you say: 13 "I've been back for two weeks believe it or not... " 14 So it does look as if this is the first contact you 15 have had with Sara Beck: 16 "... But been slow to get nose to grindstone 17 properly. Will have a look at this later and update." 18 Now if you then go to bundle 3, at page 66, who is 19 Emma Wilson? 20 A. Um, I don't know. 21 Q. And Stephanie Harris? 22 A. She works, I think, in Helen Boaden's office. 23 Q. So this is, "Subject: Programmes MPRL. MPRL News 24 programmes Nov.doc. Here's our list, hope it makes 25 sense, Sara."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 Q. -- that you were, "Slow to get your nose to 2 grindstone... " 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. "... Will have a look at this later and update"? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Now 18 November was -- it was a Friday. So 21st would 7 be the Monday. 8 A. Right. 9 Q. So having said at lunch time, 12.13 on the Friday: 10 "Will have look at this later and update". 11 I infer that you got down to it -- 12 A. I got round to it on the Monday, yes. 13 Q. At 13.21. So you then say to Sara Beck: 14 "Here you are, I feel that there is something I have 15 forgotten. It will come back to me." 16 If we compare the list that she sent you with the 17 one that you sent her -- 18 A. Um-hm. 19 Q. -- some of the same things are on. 20 A. Some additional things. 21 Q. Some have dropped off, for example Egypt. 22 A. No, that is still there. 23 Q. Sorry, you are right. You are right that has come on. 24 Some of the ones are still the same. But anyway 25 Jimmy Savile is still there and you say, "Something</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1 I have forgotten, it will come back to me". And then
 2 the one that comes back to you, you remember, which is
 3 Tottenham.
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. And then, on 22nd Sara Beck tells you that:
 6 "Just so you know, have taken Jimmy Savile off for
 7 now and will put back on when its imminent. The
 8 document goes quite far in Vision, et cetera, and we
 9 thought it might be best to keep off just for now."
 10 What did you understand was happening and why?
 11 Obviously it has come off the list, but --
 12 A. I took that to mean, as I explained earlier, because
 13 Vision were working on an obit.
 14 Q. An obituary, some sort of tribute?
 15 A. Um-hm.
 16 MR POLLARD: What is the logic of that, then?
 17 A. As I explained before, the conversation that I'd had
 18 with Peter where he'd suggested that Steve and he had
 19 talked and that the view was that there should be
 20 Chinese walls between the two projects.
 21 MR MACLEAN: Chinese walls between the two projects. So who
 22 did you understand "we" to be, who thought it might be
 23 best to keep it off just for now, in the second line?
 24 A. Um, I would understand Steve and Sara, but I don't know
 25 for certain.

Page 69

1 Q. And it would be Steve's decision to take these things
 2 off the list. I mean Sara Beck, she tells us in her
 3 statement, she wouldn't take anything off the list
 4 without Steve Mitchell telling her to; he was her boss.
 5 Had you come across this situation before, of
 6 a programme being put on to the MPRL and taken off
 7 again, not because the story didn't run or had been
 8 canned or whatever, but for this type of reason?
 9 A. Not that I can recollect. But that's not to say it
 10 didn't happen.
 11 Q. Did this strike you as odd?
 12 A. Not in the context of the conversation I'd already had
 13 with Peter.
 14 Q. Did it not strike you as slightly curious that to impose
 15 Chinese walls in this sense was in fact preventing
 16 Vision from having visibility of the Newsnight story on
 17 the MPRL? That's a --
 18 A. That's not a question for me, really.
 19 MR POLLARD: Just explain to us what you understood by --
 20 this may be blindingly obvious, but explain anyway the
 21 purpose of this Chinese wall, as you understood it, at
 22 that point.
 23 A. As I understood it, the idea was not to -- my
 24 understanding of it, which may be wrong, would be that
 25 there would not be a desire to influence what was

Page 70

1 happening in Vision and equally that Vision would not
 2 want to be in a position where they knew something which
 3 would mean that they would be trying to influence what
 4 was happening in News.
 5 MR MACLEAN: Did that not strike you as just bizarre, as
 6 a matter of logic?
 7 A. Well, I asked Peter the question when it came up as
 8 an issue, because I genuinely didn't know how the BBC
 9 dealt with situations of this nature.
 10 MR POLLARD: But even not knowing how the BBC dealt with it,
 11 the implication would seem to be that the way was being
 12 cleared for Vision to make programmes saying what the
 13 great bloke he was and telling everybody at Christmas,
 14 while Newsnight, with a carefully built wall between the
 15 two, was doing a programme about what a horrible
 16 disgusting person he was. And the mechanism by which
 17 that might be prevented had been kept -- had been
 18 stripped away, if you like.
 19 A. I agree. But I can see that the alternative would be
 20 potentially problematic as well.
 21 MR POLLARD: Why would it be problematic?
 22 A. Because there would be a perception of influence one way
 23 or the other.
 24 MR MACLEAN: But look at it from Vision's point of view.
 25 I am the director of Vision. I am planning tribute

Page 71

1 programmes to this national icon which I'm going to have
 2 on BBC1 on Boxing Day. And in another part of the BBC
 3 journalists are uncovering evidence that the fellow was
 4 a particularly nasty paedophile. If I know that, that's
 5 got obvious implications, hasn't it, for my scheduling.
 6 I'm not going to run tributes to somebody who has been,
 7 or is about to be, exposed as a paedophile, am I?
 8 A. If it was felt that there was sufficient evidence to
 9 broadcast, then, no.
 10 Q. So there is every reason why the BBC's journalism in the
 11 News side should influence the Vision scheduling of the
 12 tribute programme. It is a different matter whether
 13 Vision should be influencing Meirion Jones and
 14 Liz MacKean and Peter Rippon, doing their journalism,
 15 exerting some pressure on them to can the story or
 16 something, but so far as Vision is concerned, the people
 17 in Vision would be less than pleased, wouldn't they, if
 18 they weren't given the heads up that News was planning
 19 this story. Can you see that?
 20 A. I can, but I can see it's a difficult situation.
 21 Q. But to take the Jimmy Savile story off the Risk List
 22 might be thought to be subverting its whole purpose.
 23 A. I mean, I feel I did my job by ensuring it was on the
 24 MPRL, and what happened to it afterwards --
 25 Q. I'm not suggesting you took it off. I'm just asking you

Page 72

1 for your views, as an intelligent observer of these
 2 facts as they now transpire; that it does seem, whether
 3 intentionally or otherwise, to have subverted the whole
 4 purpose of this list, by keeping Vision in the dark.
 5 **A. Well, for whatever reason that decision -- the decision**
 6 **was taken that that was the right thing to do.**
 7 Q. We've asked a number of people this question. We know
 8 that, for whatever reason the Newsnight story doesn't
 9 run and by about 9 December when the CPS information
 10 comes through, that is the, as it were, the tin hat
 11 on it from Peter Rippon's point of view. The story has
 12 been, perhaps, you might think, dying a death for a few
 13 days, but that's the end of it.
 14 But nonetheless Newsnight had gathered information,
 15 evidence, which at the very least suggested that
 16 Jimmy Savile was a nasty paedophile, right? Whether it
 17 was enough to run with is another matter. It doesn't
 18 appear that there was any discussion or thought at the
 19 Newsnight end of going to Vision at that stage and
 20 saying, "We're not running this story because we don't
 21 think editorially it's strong enough, but we ought to
 22 tell you that actually we've got some evidence that this
 23 fellow probably was a nasty paedophile and you ought to
 24 know about it, because you are still planning these
 25 tribute programmes."
 Page 73

1 **A. Well, if it was felt in News management that there was**
 2 **sufficient evidence for that, for Vision to be warned,**
 3 **that would have been a matter for them to decide.**
 4 Q. But the next person up the line was Steve Mitchell, who
 5 was never even sent the script. He doesn't get the
 6 script. So News management was never going to be in
 7 that position to do that, were they? The only people
 8 who knew what Newsnight had were in Newsnight and to
 9 some extent Steve Mitchell?
 10 **A. Steve had a -- had an overview, as we now know, of what**
 11 **was in the script and he may well have been briefed in**
 12 **other forums, I don't know.**
 13 Q. You now know, as we all do, that there was a discussion
 14 of some sort between Helen Boaden and George Entwistle
 15 at the awards lunch on 2 December. If I was to say to
 16 you that some people have suggested to us -- some people
 17 who work in Vision in the BBC -- that:
 18 "Each month all sensitive subjects are put by
 19 programme editors and executive producers on the BBC's
 20 Managed Risk Programmes List. It is not necessary to
 21 have ten second conversations between directors. We
 22 have very rigid protocols to make sure that the left
 23 hand and right hand knows what they are doing."
 24 In other words, here is the mechanism for ensuring
 25 that Vision knows what News is doing and vice versa, and
 Page 74

1 there is no need for Helen Boaden to go and whisper in
 2 George Entwistle's ear. What would you say?
 3 **A. I don't really --**
 4 Q. Do you have any observations about that?
 5 **A. I don't really want to speculate on why that**
 6 **conversation happened and what she knew or didn't know**
 7 **about the MPRL.**
 8 Q. She says that there was never any MPRL that she saw that
 9 had Jimmy Savile on it, because it gets taken off at
 10 this stage.
 11 So the story having been taken off the MPRL, just
 12 going back to 276, Sara Beck's email says, "Will put
 13 back on when its imminent".
 14 What did you understand the purpose of that to be?
 15 **A. That if it was going to run, once we had certainty about**
 16 **that, that she would put it back on and the relevant**
 17 **people would be alerted.**
 18 Q. That's what the words say. But why put it back on when
 19 its imminent?
 20 **A. Because then the people in Vision would need to know.**
 21 Q. So that they could do what?
 22 **A. It would have an impact on their --**
 23 Q. On their schedule?
 24 **A. On their schedule, yes.**
 25 Q. But all the time Vision is getting ready for these
 Page 75

1 tributes. It is hiring Shane Ritchie and making
 2 arrangements to do the programme and so on. The later
 3 it gets, the bigger the problem, surely?
 4 **A. Potentially.**
 5 Q. What did you understand by the reference to, "Goes quite
 6 far in Vision et cetera"? It goes quite high, is that
 7 the same as far?
 8 **A. I took far to mean that a lot of people in Vision would**
 9 **get it, rather than a small number.**
 10 Q. Why should that be a problem, that a lot of people knew
 11 or were given the information:
 12 "Newsnight Jimmy Savile. Investigation by
 13 Liz MacKean. Legal/taste"?
 14 That is all they would see on this form. No
 15 reference to paedophilia, young girls, BBC premises,
 16 none of that:
 17 "Jimmy Savile. Investigation by Liz MacKean.
 18 Legal/taste."
 19 **A. Well, for whatever reason the decision was taken that it**
 20 **should not go far in vision, that -- even in that form**
 21 **of words.**
 22 Q. Is that because as soon as anybody in the BBC in Vision
 23 saw that, they would know what the investigation was
 24 likely to be about, without having to be told anything
 25 more?
 Page 76

<p>1 A. Not necessarily.</p> <p>2 Q. But isn't that what this was about? Since everybody, as</p> <p>3 it were, knew that Jimmy Savile was a paedophile, as</p> <p>4 soon as people in Vision saw these words at 277, they</p> <p>5 would immediately know that there was going to be</p> <p>6 a Jimmy Savile sexual abuse story?</p> <p>7 A. Potentially, yes. But I took it as a -- as a decision</p> <p>8 to ensure that there was no undue influence exerted one</p> <p>9 way or the other.</p> <p>10 Q. I understand that, but it is important this: was that</p> <p>11 your understanding of what underlay this; this concern</p> <p>12 about going quite far in Vision?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, that was my -- yes, that was my understanding.</p> <p>14 Q. So it would go quite far in Vision and Vision would</p> <p>15 understand, just from this entry on the MPRL, that this</p> <p>16 was -- they would understand what the investigation was</p> <p>17 about?</p> <p>18 A. I don't think they necessarily would, no.</p> <p>19 Q. Because otherwise, if they -- it might be into</p> <p>20 somebody's, I don't know, an investigation into</p> <p>21 somebody's tax affairs or whatever. If they would have</p> <p>22 no idea what the investigation was, it's hard to see why</p> <p>23 the fact that it goes quite far in Vision matters a jot,</p> <p>24 isn't it?</p> <p>25 A. Except if they were working on a tribute programme and Page 77</p>	<p>1 Newsnight -- nobody has got the information which kills</p> <p>2 the story eventually. So the position, so far as that's</p> <p>3 concerned, is that Newsnight is still pursuing the CPS</p> <p>4 angle.</p> <p>5 You are familiar with -- I haven't actually showed</p> <p>6 you Peter Rippon's email of the 30th --</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I know about it, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. "Pondered overnight... "</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. "... The key being the CPS."</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. So that key, one way or the other, has not been produced</p> <p>13 yet?</p> <p>14 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>15 Q. 8 December, from Sara Beck to you. Does this need</p> <p>16 changing? So she then sends you the extract which is --</p> <p>17 presumably the story is then on this list from</p> <p>18 Newsnight. Sorry, page 55.</p> <p>19 A. Yes, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So academies is the first one, boxing is the last one.</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. You say:</p> <p>23 "I think that just about covers it, aside from</p> <p>24 Savile-gate."</p> <p>25 Why use that expression? Page 79</p>
<p>1 the idea that we were investigating Jimmy Savile would</p> <p>2 suggest that we weren't looking into anything</p> <p>3 particularly nice.</p> <p>4 Q. So the concern, as you understood it, about it going</p> <p>5 quite far in Vision is that people in Vision would see</p> <p>6 there was an investigation, they may or may not be able</p> <p>7 to work out what it was about, but as you say they would</p> <p>8 know the investigation wasn't going to be -- the piece</p> <p>9 wasn't going to be saying what a marvellous fellow he</p> <p>10 was?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Because that's not a story at all. What was the concern</p> <p>13 about what Vision would then do that involved -- that</p> <p>14 necessitated the Chinese wall being built?</p> <p>15 A. I took it, as I say, as an issue of protocol. If it</p> <p>16 were not on there then there could be no suggestion of</p> <p>17 undue influence being exerted either way.</p> <p>18 Q. Had there been undue influence exercised before that</p> <p>19 would give rise to this concern?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. This wasn't quite the end of the story. Do you have</p> <p>22 bundle 4? Take bundle 4, please. Go to page 55. This</p> <p>23 is 8 December. As it happens, this is the day before</p> <p>24 the CPS note comes through which is the tin hat from</p> <p>25 Peter Rippon's point of view. So he hasn't got -- Page 78</p>	<p>1 A. Because at that point it was well known in the office --</p> <p>2 and I assumed that Sarah also knew because Steve had</p> <p>3 been copied into emails relating to it -- that Peter had</p> <p>4 imposed -- not imposed, had made clear that this</p> <p>5 particular issue of the CPS was key to whether or not</p> <p>6 the investigation would run or not. And that had</p> <p>7 created a clear division between Peter and the team</p> <p>8 working on the project.</p> <p>9 Q. And there had been some rather heated exchanges, hadn't</p> <p>10 there?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. On 30 November between --</p> <p>13 A. It was the 30th?</p> <p>14 Q. -- Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean, on the one hand, and</p> <p>15 Peter Rippon on the other. And Liz MacKean sends some</p> <p>16 emails to her friend Jackie Long on the 30th.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Is that right?</p> <p>19 A. That sounds about right, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you have some more detail there that I haven't got?</p> <p>21 A. No, I'm just looking -- yes, that looks about right.</p> <p>22 Q. Then Sara Beck replies to you, over the page, page 56:</p> <p>23 "Thank you very much. Will keep Savile off until we</p> <p>24 know for sure."</p> <p>25 By this time, the original transmission date has Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

1 passed.
 2 A. That's right, yes.
 3 Q. So what's the state of play now then?
 4 A. Well, I think Peter had previously sent an email saying,
 5 "Let's stop working on other elements until we know
 6 about the CPS."
 7 Q. Did anything else happen? I infer that, given what
 8 happened on 9 December, there was no need for any
 9 further communication with Sara Beck about the MPRL, so
 10 far as Savile was concerned?
 11 A. Probably not. Not that I can recall.
 12 Q. Just going back to 30 November for a moment. Put
 13 bundle 4 to one side and take up bundle 3, page 214
 14 first of all. This is what we refer to as the,
 15 "Pondered overnight", email. At least I do.
 16 A. Yes, yes.
 17 Q. It is not copied to you, but presumably you became aware
 18 on 30 November, did you, that Peter Rippon had come to
 19 this view?
 20 A. It must have been around that time, yes.
 21 Q. "The key is whether we can establish the CPS did drop
 22 the case for the reasons the women say. That makes
 23 a much better story."
 24 Pausing there, we may have touched on this earlier,
 25 but just let me be absolutely clear. Did you have any

Page 81

1 understanding about how, or in what circumstances,
 2 Mitchell come to the view that this was the key?
 3 A. Um, no. But I can see why he would think it was the
 4 key.
 5 Q. Because it would make it a better story?
 6 A. Because it would establish that there was sufficient
 7 evidence to prosecute, but the decision was taken not to
 8 prosecute on the grounds of his age, rather than that
 9 there was insufficient evidence to prosecute.
 10 Q. And we see that he says:
 11 "Our sources are just the women and a secondhand
 12 briefing."
 13 As we touched on earlier, this led immediately to
 14 some heated exchanges in the office.
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. Were you a spectator or a party to any of those?
 17 A. I wasn't a party to them. I would say most of the
 18 office was a spectator to them in some form.
 19 Q. If you look at 215, Liz MacKean's email to Jackie Long
 20 that morning at 10.30:
 21 "PR in an absolute spin. He has already done
 22 the surrender gesture and told me and Mei, 'If the
 23 bosses aren't happy (they won't be) I can't go to the
 24 wall to this one."
 25 Did you witness that --

Page 82

1 A. No.
 2 Q. -- discussion? Peter Rippon doing the surrender
 3 gesture?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. Whether it was this or that (indicates).
 6 A. No.
 7 Q. At page 220, the reference to, "A very long political
 8 chain"?
 9 A. Yes, again I have only seen or heard that allegation
 10 since.
 11 Q. Did you -- you say most of the office witnessed these
 12 exchanges. What do you remember witnessing?
 13 A. I don't -- I wasn't party to any conversations that were
 14 had between Liz and Meirion and Peter. There was
 15 just --
 16 MR POLLARD: When you said a spectator, most of the office
 17 was a spectator, do you mean raised voices --
 18 A. I do not remember raised voices, but I think -- it's
 19 a small office, people knew that Meirion and Liz were
 20 working on this story and that Peter was keen for the
 21 CPS line to be established before going for it to be
 22 broadcast. That was well known in the office and the
 23 fact that it had caused tensions was also very
 24 well known. Whether people knew the specifics of what
 25 had been asked to be proven or not, I don't know. But

Page 83

1 people certainly knew that it had reached a peak.
 2 Q. Who is Hannah MacInnes?
 3 A. She's a researcher on Newsnight.
 4 Q. Jo Mathys we know is on the Impact team.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. If we go to 222 in that same bundle, this, I think, is
 7 the only email we have from you that day.
 8 A. Right.
 9 Q. You are obviously in the office, or at least you are
 10 working.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. Who is Jennifer?
 13 A. Jennifer? She's -- she was working -- she was at that
 14 point compiling the list that goes to -- that is
 15 compiled by Impact and goes to all programmes about what
 16 is coming up on the following week's programme.
 17 Q. She's working with or for Jo Mathys?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. They are in the same part of the empire?
 20 A. Exactly at that point, yes.
 21 Q. Then you say:
 22 "I'm not going to mention Jimmy Savile investigation
 23 in next week's prospects for Jennifer because is still
 24 v sensitive and legally complicated and may not run, so
 25 can we not mention it at the meeting please."

Page 84

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

1 So what was the meeting, first of all?
 2 A. So basically this -- on a Wednesday I would alert the
 3 Impact team to the prospects that we were planning for
 4 the next -- so any kind of big items that we were
 5 planning to run that week I would send to Jo Mathys and
 6 I would copy in Hannah MacInnes because she would be the
 7 representative from Newsnight at that Thursday morning
 8 10am meeting, where the programmes' planning teams meet
 9 to discuss what is coming up.
 10 And I don't know whether I pre-empted what I was
 11 about to send or whether this was an additional email
 12 that I sent after I sent the planning grid to Jo; to
 13 make it clear that I wasn't going to add it to the list.
 14 Q. You obviously have an understanding in this email that
 15 it was legally complicated?
 16 A. Yes, I mean, it wasn't legally complicated. I probably
 17 just wrote that as a -- it wasn't legally complicated.
 18 Q. Nobody had ever suggested to you it was legally
 19 complicated, had they?
 20 A. No.
 21 Q. And you don't understand that it was legally
 22 complicated?
 23 A. No.
 24 Q. Did you know that Meirion Jones had run it past Mr Law?
 25 A. I knew that Roger had seen it, had been copied in on it.

Page 85

1 Q. He hadn't raised any objections?
 2 A. He may have done to Meirion and not copied me in on the
 3 response. I don't know whether it had gone to the point
 4 of being lawyered.
 5 Q. We were told that there was a potential problem of
 6 somebody who was still alive but they weren't going to
 7 mention them in the script. Jimmy Savile was dead and
 8 the view was taken that there wasn't much to fear from
 9 [REDACTED] bringing a libel action so it was okay to
 10 mention him, for perhaps obvious reasons.
 11 That was not a reference to sensitive in the
 12 Newsnight office, that was a reference to sensitive
 13 across the BBC.
 14 A. No. That was a reference to -- this is the kind of
 15 story that we can't -- a lot of people get that email
 16 and we don't necessarily alert everyone on that list to
 17 things that are coming up. I mean, I would do that
 18 actually quite frequently with stories that I felt that,
 19 you know, we wouldn't necessarily want people at that
 20 level in News to know until the day. This is pretty
 21 common.
 22 Q. This is back to the Chinese walls?
 23 A. No. Well, it is different. So any kind of
 24 controversial investigation really that was -- that
 25 I felt that it would not be good if our colleagues in

Page 86

1 News knew about before we were going with them.
 2 Q. Was there an element, from the journalistic point of
 3 view, of actually relishing the prospect of running this
 4 story at the same time as BBC1 was running tributes to
 5 Jimmy Savile?
 6 A. Who would -- I mean I wasn't relishing it, who were you
 7 suggesting would be relishing it?
 8 Q. I'm not suggesting you were relishing it, but it might
 9 be thought that an even bigger impact of this story
 10 would be if it did run alongside the tributes. Was that
 11 an element you detected?
 12 A. No.
 13 Q. Not from anybody?
 14 A. No.
 15 Q. Right. Was there any response from Jo Mathys or from
 16 Impact about this? They just -- they just moved on?
 17 A. Not that I can recall, no.
 18 Q. Can I just ask you about how the IT system works? What
 19 happens if you are working at home on Newsnight on
 20 a story or doing some work; are you able to access your
 21 BBC email address?
 22 A. Yes, yes.
 23 Q. So is there a need, in order to do your job, to transfer
 24 emails to a private email address?
 25 A. Very rarely.

Page 87

1 Q. In what circumstances might you, in your experience,
 2 want to do so? A reason for doing so?
 3 A. Um --
 4 Q. I am not suggesting you ever have.
 5 A. No, I can't think of a reason until recently why I would
 6 want to.
 7 Q. I won't ask you about that.
 8 There's a regular meeting on, I think, a Monday
 9 morning which is called an "investigations meeting" at
 10 Newsnight. At least it is diarised.
 11 A. Yes. It didn't really happen very much. I think it was
 12 a -- it was a certainly an aspiration from Peter that
 13 Meirion and he and I, if I were around, would have
 14 a catch up on investigations --
 15 Q. And Shaminder, I think, as well?
 16 A. If she were around.
 17 Q. If we look at Peter Rippon's diary for a Monday,
 18 habitually at 11.30, there is an investigations routine,
 19 Peter, Meirion, Liz and Shaminder. In his diary.
 20 A. It could be in his diary.
 21 Q. You are not the first person to tell us it didn't happen
 22 very regularly.
 23 A. No.
 24 Q. So what happened in the aftermath of 30 November, these
 25 discussions that we have seen, and then in the next few

Page 88

1 days, leading up to the CPS information and thereafter?
 2 The decision was made to drop the story. Was that,
 3 as far as you could tell, accepted by everybody else and
 4 everybody got on with doing other things, or did it
 5 leave a bad taste?
 6 **A. I don't think Meirion was particularly happy, but nor**
 7 **did I get the impression he was -- I saw no fights or**
 8 **arguments or anything that's been reported of that**
 9 **nature.**
 10 Q. In bundle 4, at page 32, despite an email we have just
 11 seen from you on 30 November, the Jo Mathys and
 12 Hannah MacInnes and Jennifer one -- I think this might
 13 be a different part of the BBC, just help me with how
 14 she fits in.
 15 Do you see the email from Helen Deller on 7 December
 16 at 17.02?
 17 **A. I know the one you mean, because I have seen it since.**
 18 **Hold on.**
 19 Q. 32.
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. 17.02 to Peter Rippon, Meirion Jones, copied to you and
 22 others.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Now, she's described as a publicist at BBC News. So she
 25 is still, it seems, under the misapprehension that -- or

Page 89

1 apprehension perhaps at the time -- that the piece was
 2 in the pipeline. And she has been still getting ready
 3 for this story potentially to run, hasn't she?
 4 **A. She appears to be, yes.**
 5 Q. How does that chime with the email from you we have just
 6 seen about not putting it on the list for the meeting
 7 the previous Thursday?
 8 **A. Well, Helen wouldn't be at that. That is a entirely**
 9 **separate process, the alerting of the press office to**
 10 **things. The Impact team is about impact across BBC**
 11 **programmes, BBC News programmes.**
 12 Q. This is looking outside, is it?
 13 **A. Yes, the publicist for BBC News would be thinking about**
 14 **external press relations.**
 15 Q. To the rest of the world?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. She's looking at external press relations and then you
 18 see Mr Rippon's response at the top of the page, "Cart
 19 before the horse".
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. Then Meirion Jones disagreed with that. He sent
 22 Peter Rippon a reply at page 42. He says:
 23 "Still waiting for CPS. Files are not electronic so
 24 they had to physically send out for them. Hope to have
 25 them tomorrow. As you know I already think story is

Page 90

1 strong enough and danger of not running it is
 2 substantial damage to BBC reputation, but no point
 3 having that discussion until I have final word from
 4 CPS."
 5 That email is not copied to you. We know that two
 6 days later, in fact, the CPS letter came in. Were you
 7 aware of any discussion involving Meirion Jones and
 8 Peter Rippon, or anybody else for that matter, about the
 9 substantial damage to the BBC reputation that he
 10 identifies here?
 11 **A. No. Aside from the conversation which I have already**
 12 **related that he came up to me at my desk and said --**
 13 **this was after the CPS thing had come back as a no, when**
 14 **he came up and said this will look bad for the BBC or**
 15 **whatever the words were. But at this point, no.**
 16 Q. If you look at page 77 have you seen the this email in
 17 the last few days, one of the ones we sent you?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. Liz MacKean to Stuart Denman:
 20 "PR said to me and Mei I'm not going to the wall on
 21 this one. LG said I'm having nothing to do with this
 22 story, it's up to Peter."
 23 If one were to read that email as being a criticism
 24 of your, as it were, moral courage in all of this, what
 25 would you say?

Page 91

1 **A. I don't know what she meant by it. But it does chime**
 2 **with things -- with what I have said before in the sense**
 3 **that I was trying to be very clear that I -- that there**
 4 **had to be a clearly editorial lead on the story to**
 5 **prevent different things being said to different people**
 6 **at different times.**
 7 Q. Just let me ask you a little bit more about this
 8 executive producer role. In this particular case
 9 Peter Rippon was the executive producer of the piece and
 10 he was also, obviously, the editor of the whole
 11 programme. What would you understand his additional
 12 involvement to be with this story because he was the
 13 executive producer?
 14 In other words, compare this story with one where
 15 you were the executive producer and he was the editor of
 16 the programme.
 17 **A. Sure. Compare it to one I would do. So, um, there's no**
 18 **hard-and-fast rule, but the normal position would be**
 19 **I would commission something, establish that he was**
 20 **happy with it to go ahead. I would then oversee the**
 21 **gathering of the material, the way things were put**
 22 **together, what was shot, why it was shot, how it was**
 23 **shot, the kind of the legal and EdPol aspects and**
 24 **I would watch a rough cut, make suggestions and sign it**
 25 **off. Unless I felt that there was -- that it was**

Page 92

1 a story in which an additional level of sign off would
 2 be required from Peter as well. In which case I would
 3 bring him in to watch a final version. In the course of
 4 anything I was overlooking if I felt I needed an
 5 additional bit of advice or sign off from him, I would
 6 seek it out, but essentially I would be the key point of
 7 contact for everything.
 8 But as I say, there's no hard-and-fast rule because
 9 occasionally there could be pieces that he would
 10 commission and then ask me to oversee, and then
 11 occasionally there would be a piece where he felt it was
 12 possibly a more visual piece than his direct skills were
 13 and he would ask me to oversee it because that's more my
 14 background. So I would come in at a later stage and
 15 make something.
 16 Q. So that email we looked at earlier in bundle 3,
 17 page 181, on the 29th when you asked Peter Rippon if he
 18 was execing it.
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. I know he didn't, but if he had said, "Actually, I would
 21 rather you did. Why don't you exec it?" It wasn't
 22 then, as it were, too late to exec the piece?
 23 A. Well, I sort of felt it was, really, because he had been
 24 across every aspect of the gathering of the evidence.
 25 I didn't really feel that it was something I could then

Page 93

1 pick up at the last minute, you know, aside from the
 2 fact I had a lot of other projects running at the same
 3 time and I didn't want to be in a position where I was
 4 having to pick something up that I hadn't been across
 5 the whole way through.
 6 Q. Were you clear in your mind, when you wrote that email
 7 on the 29th, "Are you going to exec this?"
 8 Did you think he already was, or did you think
 9 nobody was?
 10 A. Of course I thought he was, but I just wanted to be
 11 absolutely clear he was going to oversee the final
 12 version and all the versions that were going to be done
 13 for other outlets, if indeed other outlets wanted them.
 14 Q. I'm not sure we actually have a reply to your email.
 15 Did he reply?
 16 A. I can't remember that he would -- that he did, but he
 17 may well have done.
 18 MR POLLARD: Was fact that you were fundamentally against
 19 the story a factor in you being keen not to get landed
 20 with it? And also to some extent -- and I'm just trying
 21 to get a sort of sense of the atmosphere and the colour
 22 in the newsroom, if you like. You had witnessed at the
 23 very least robust exchanges and Meirion in particular
 24 pushing very hard -- you might say using every trick in
 25 the book to get Peter on board with this story. I get

Page 94

1 the sense -- correct me if I'm wrong -- that you weren't
 2 very impressed by the way that had happened. Were these
 3 all factors in your decision really not to get involved
 4 with it?
 5 A. There was the initial factor about the initial concerns
 6 I had when I came back and the fact that there were
 7 other people on the senior team who had a different
 8 view, which made me think perhaps my view is wrong. You
 9 know, there was the issue of -- I felt there had to be
 10 a clear line of command on the story and there was the
 11 issue of I didn't want to end up in a situation with it
 12 close to TX where I was having to take on responsibility
 13 for overseeing the key story and versions of the story
 14 that I had not had involvement in up to that point. And
 15 I don't think that's an unreasonable position. So
 16 I think the answer is it was probably a combination of
 17 all those things.
 18 Q. So?
 19 MR MACLEAN: So you were concerned that a firm enough grip
 20 might not have been -- got a hold of the story.
 21 A. No, I wouldn't say that. But sometimes the way things
 22 work in the office is I take over a project if Peter is
 23 too busy or something and I just wanted to make clear
 24 that in this case it was not something I wanted to take
 25 over. I felt it was, you know, too significant a story

Page 95

1 for the editor not to be involved in a key fashion all
 2 the way through.
 3 Q. Right. We're nearly finished. Can I ask you just to
 4 look at page 219 in bundle 4? On New Year's Day,
 5 11 minutes past 4, you sent an email to Helen Deller and
 6 Karen Rosine copied to Peter Rippon:
 7 "Just a heads up from a Newsnight colleague who has
 8 heard The Times are looking at running a story alleging
 9 that the BBC put Newsnight under pressure to drop the
 10 investigation into Jimmy Savile. Apparently they got
 11 this story from [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED] Pretty sure I know who that is."
 13 The person you had in mind there was
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 A. I don't actually know who I meant. I must --
 16 Q. Well I think I do. I do because if you go to page 223,
 17 Peter Rippon says, [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 That is [REDACTED] right?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. "Still I'm very comfortable with the decision-making
 22 process."
 23 You say, "I was assuming [REDACTED]
 24 So that's who you had in mind?"
 25 A. Um-hm.

Page 96

1 Q. Who was the Newsnight colleague who gave you the heads
 2 up?
 3 A. **Do I have to say?**
 4 Q. I'm asking you the question.
 5 A. **It was nobody involved in the -- in the Savile story.**
 6 Q. So they had heard from The Times, that was your
 7 understanding?
 8 A. **A friend at The Times, yes.**
 9 Q. Did he tell you who the friend was at The Times?
 10 A. **No.**
 11 Q. Mr Williams-Thomas denied that it was him, didn't he?
 12 A. **Did he?**
 13 Q. Look at page 261. This is a different piece, this is
 14 The Sunday Mirror piece, but actually
 15 The Sunday Mirror eventually did run a story on
 16 8 January. The Times didn't. 261:
 17 "Good morning Peter, you are no doubt aware of the
 18 article in The Sunday Mirror. The reason for this email
 19 is to say that categorically I have not spoken to any
 20 newspaper about what I know and therefore the story has
 21 not come from me at all."
 22 A. **Okay.**
 23 Q. And then you know that there was a piece in The Oldie in
 24 February?
 25 A. **Yes.**

Page 97

1 Q. You passed an email, I think it was you, making a remark
 2 about The Oldie.
 3 A. **Possibly.**
 4 Q. And that had been trailed by the Guido Fawkes blog prior
 5 to that. [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 A. [REDACTED]
 10 Q. [REDACTED]
 11 A. [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 Q. What did you understand to be the relationship between
 14 Meirion Jones and Mark Williams-Thomas about that story?
 15 A. **On that story?**
 16 Q. Yes, in 2012.
 17 A. **I wasn't aware there was one. But Meirion did -- was**
 18 **working with Mark Williams-Thomas on another potential**
 19 **project for Newsnight which -- some of which was filmed**
 20 **and didn't happen, around, sort of April/May time.**
 21 Q. Right. Then moving ahead to October 2012, the ITV stuff
 22 was heavily trailed in the press, wasn't it, in the days
 23 after the Exposure documentary?
 24 A. **Yes.**
 25 Q. On, I think, Monday 1 October, there was some discussion

Page 98

1 about whether Newsnight should itself run something --
 2 A. **Yes.**
 3 Q. -- on this story?
 4 A. **Yes.**
 5 Q. Some people, for example Jeremy Paxman were very keen
 6 that.
 7 A. **I don't think -- on that day he wasn't.**
 8 Q. The next day certainly he was keen.
 9 A. **Yes.**
 10 Q. And others were not keen and Peter Rippon was in the
 11 latter camp, wasn't he?
 12 A. **Yes.**
 13 Q. So, for example, bundle 7, page 3, Neil Breakwell had
 14 said -- was essentially asking whether Newsnight should
 15 cover the story, and he said:
 16 "I think it would be a bit bizarre for us to jump on
 17 ITV's wagon at this point."
 18 If you go to page 8, Peter Rippon sent you an email:
 19 "Will go to W1 for pilot kick off."
 20 Because you were running pilot programmes at this
 21 time.
 22 A. **Yes, we were, yes.**
 23 Q. Because of the move to New Broadcasting House.
 24 A. **Yes.**
 25 Q. You replied at 9.30:

Page 99

1 "Still think we were absolutely right not to run it
 2 and would have got way more stick than ITV if we had."
 3 What was that a reference to?
 4 A. **The fact of when we were doing it.**
 5 Q. Because of the --
 6 A. **Two to three weeks after his death.**
 7 Q. Because he wasn't long dead. So that is back to the
 8 taste-type issue. You say, "More stick than ITV",
 9 suggesting that ITV had got some stick?
 10 A. **Well, they did initially from the relatives, yes. It**
 11 **was only, I think, when it became clear it was a much**
 12 **broader story than just Duncroft that everything**
 13 **transpired in the way it did.**
 14 Q. I just want to show you one more document, I think, at
 15 bundle 11 on 10 October. Newsnight eventually covered
 16 the story on the 11th.
 17 A. **That sounds right, if it was a Thursday.**
 18 Q. The announcement about this review and Dame Janet's
 19 review, I think, was made on the 12th.
 20 A. **Um-hm.**
 21 Q. I just want to show you an email exchange with
 22 Peter Rippon on the 10th. If you go to page 71 --
 23 A. **Yes.**
 24 Q. -- the second email down, 11.13 on the 10th,
 25 Peter Rippon:

Page 100

1 "Okay. At W1 initially then will come over.
 2 Chatted to Shaminder about big Savile take out tomorrow.
 3 We should then do some good sex abuse investigations
 4 like MWT. Bored of being exhausted and on the back
 5 foot."
 6 What is, "The big Savile takeout tomorrow"?
 7 **A. The thought was that we could finally do the story that**
 8 **was growing in size and magnitude and significance day**
 9 **by day, and take it on and take on the idea of**
 10 **institutional failures across a broad range of areas.**
 11 Q. Right.
 12 Nick do you have any questions?
 13 MR POLLARD: No, I don't think so.
 14 MR MACLEAN: I think that is all we want to ask you.
 15 **A. Okay.**
 16 Q. Is there anything else that you want to say?
 17 **A. I don't think so.**
 18 Q. Anything we haven't covered?
 19 **A. No. No, I don't think so.**
 20 **Questions by MR POLLARD**
 21 MR POLLARD: You didn't, I think, have a major role in the
 22 correcting of the blog, did you? You mention a couple
 23 of little bits about that in your --
 24 **A. Yes, I realised one aspect of the blog was wrong.**
 25 MR POLLARD: Which was the --
 Page 101

1 **A. The Duncroft element. And I -- I did flag that up with**
 2 **the person that was my boss at the time when I became**
 3 **aware of that. I think I sent a note about how that all**
 4 **came about.**
 5 MR POLLARD: Yes. And that was roughly when?
 6 **A. Um, that would have been -- I think it should be on**
 7 **there.**
 8 MR MACLEAN: "Very late on Thursday 11 October I became
 9 aware that one aspect of the BBC's public statement
 10 about the Savile investigation was incorrect."
 11 **A. There was an issue of whether there was a second**
 12 **interview, which wasn't on the blog, but had been said**
 13 **by various people and was said by George Entwistle the**
 14 **following day. And then over that weekend -- sorry, on**
 15 **the Monday I then became aware that the Duncroft issue**
 16 **was also incorrect on the blog.**
 17 MR MACLEAN: You say:
 18 "On the following Monday I saw the transcript of the
 19 second interview and realised there was material in the
 20 second witness interview which meant that aspects of
 21 Peter's blog were incorrect."
 22 That was because [REDACTED] had suggested
 23 that Meirion Jones's aunt was aware of what was going
 24 on. And you went to Fran Unsworth?
 25 **A. Yes.**
 Page 102

1 Q. We have that. We have read that.
 2 MR POLLARD: I just really wanted to ask you about in that
 3 period running up to November/December last year, just
 4 if you give us a sense of the, shall we say the dynamics
 5 of the office because various people have described it
 6 to us, we have not been there ourselves and it is the
 7 history anyway. But it does seem to be, from the
 8 pictures that were given to us, quite a factional place
 9 to some extent. That there was an element of cliques
 10 being in existence, quite a lot of tension. Not
 11 necessarily the happiest place to work.
 12 How did you see it?
 13 **A. Without wanting to be Pollyanna-ish, I didn't see it**
 14 **like that. I, um -- I mean --**
 15 MR POLLARD: How long had you been working at Newsnight?
 16 **A. Since 2002.**
 17 MR POLLARD: So you had seen it through different editors --
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 MR POLLARD: -- different phases and so on?
 20 **A. Yes. I don't, I mean I think -- I'm not sure that any**
 21 **newsroom is a perfect place where everybody gets on and**
 22 **sometimes creative tension is a good thing. I think**
 23 **different editors have different styles. Um, you know,**
 24 **some -- some strong personalities will get on with some**
 25 **editors and not with others.**
 Page 103

1 **I think it was the kind of place that bred lots of**
 2 **creative ideas and wasn't always, you know, a entirely**
 3 **happy ship but every party we had was a happy party and**
 4 **I don't think it was any more tense or difficult a place**
 5 **to work than anywhere else in BBC News. In fact in many**
 6 **ways I think it was a place full of camaraderie and**
 7 **mutual support.**
 8 MR POLLARD: It has been suggested to us -- and I appreciate
 9 these things are difficult because you are talking about
 10 colleagues and passing opinion on people you work with
 11 everyday -- that if Peter Rippon had a weakness, it was
 12 that he was perhaps a touch too steeped in his radio
 13 background and hadn't necessarily fully embraced every
 14 element of a television programme.
 15 Was that fair or unfair?
 16 **A. I think he -- he would be the first to admit that he**
 17 **didn't have a TV background and that he would -- that**
 18 **he, um would appreciate when people with more of a TV**
 19 **background were able to sort of help with that side of**
 20 **the story -- sorry, that side of the programme making.**
 21 **He would -- I think he would be honest about the fact**
 22 **that there were some projects that required a visual**
 23 **sort of flair and expertise that he wasn't so versed in.**
 24 **But he had years of experience of being a journalist.**
 25 MR POLLARD: Did you regard his relationship with Meirion as
 Page 104

1 beyond what you would call the normal give and take of
 2 sort of producer/reporter, producer/investigator and
 3 editor? You will have seen a lot of this close up: did
 4 you think Meirion pushed Peter too hard or tried to?
 5 A. No, I think Meirion's style -- I mean, you know, up
 6 until this point it had always been, yeah, enthusiastic
 7 and bullish, but also able to draw back. You know, if
 8 he -- and able to accept if a story didn't -- you know,
 9 a lot of Meirion's stories, I think he would accept, did
 10 not stand up at whatever stage in the process that would
 11 be.
 12 I actually thought they had a very good relationship
 13 actually and that Peter was very supportive of his
 14 journalism for the most part. Really appreciated him as
 15 a key member of the team.
 16 MR POLLARD: Was it commonly accepted in the Newsnight
 17 office, as some people have suggested to us, that
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 A. [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 MR POLLARD: [REDACTED]

Page 105

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 A. [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 MR POLLARD: Did you have strong views when the Panorama
 8 programme was being commissioned about whether Meirion's
 9 role in that was a fair or, if you like, editorially
 10 scrupulous way to use him?
 11 A. Once I became aware that the Panorama was not going to
 12 focus on the historical aspects of the BBC, which was my
 13 initial understanding, but have a large focus on what
 14 did or didn't happen at Newsnight, I felt it was very
 15 inappropriate for Meirion to be a producer on the
 16 project. I gather he was taken off and given more of
 17 a consultative role, but, yes, I didn't think that was
 18 the right way to proceed.
 19 MR MACLEAN: Was that a real distinction, giving him
 20 a different hat?
 21 A. I don't know. I assume it meant something tangible in
 22 terms of how he was involved in the Panorama programme
 23 after that point. But I wouldn't be able to comment on
 24 what that was.
 25 MR MACLEAN: Can I just show you one document that arises

Page 106

1 out of that? Bundle 10, page 127. There was a piece in
 2 The Sunday Times in October, wasn't there?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 MR MACLEAN: Do you remember?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 A. [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 MR MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 A. [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 MR MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 A. [REDACTED]
 22 MR MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 A. [REDACTED]

Page 107

1 MR MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 A. [REDACTED]
 4 MR MACLEAN: If you look at page 128, on 8 October you were
 5 reading The Sunday Times and you emailed Peter Rippon:
 6 "Should we ask for a retraction? Edit suites were
 7 never booked."
 8 And then you express a rather pithy view about this
 9 story. And Peter Rippon replies he booked them and they
 10 were cancelled:
 11 "Shows how it was entirely from him ..."
 12 Is the story was from him, all right?
 13 A. Um-hm.
 14 MR MACLEAN: Then you use an expression which you actually
 15 share with Liz MacKean. And you say:
 16 "It is up to me to book the suites not him."
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 A. [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 I was concerned that editing had been absolutely fully
 25 booked.

Page 108

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

1 MR MACLEAN: What I really wanted to ask you about was not
 2 just to tease you about your coyness about
 3 Meirion Jones, but to look at the email at 13.31 from
 4 Peter Rippon --
 5 A. Yes.
 6 MR MACLEAN: -- which goes back to more historic events.
 7 A. Yes.
 8 MR MACLEAN: It might be suggested it doesn't quite stack up
 9 with the picture you have just painted of relationships
 10 in the office.
 11 Mr Rippon says:
 12 "He was so personally involved I became concerned
 13 about some of his behaviour -- booking suites when it is
 14 not his job, refusing to cancel filming, booking cars
 15 when told not, writing alleged scripts with interviews
 16 that had not even done -- meant his judgement was
 17 cloudy. Since [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED] made me ..."
 20 MR POLLARD: "Very nervous".
 21 MR MACLEAN: "... about his story."
 22 That last sentence is a reference back to prior
 23 events which Mr Rippon, it seems, is suggesting had
 24 eroded his trust, really, in Meirion Jones' ability?
 25 A. Yes. I mean that last bit, I must admit he hadn't ever

Page 109

1 suggested to me that what happened -- I think I know
 2 what he's referring to in that.
 3 MR MACLEAN: It is [REDACTED]
 4 A. Yes. And I think --
 5 MR MACLEAN: We know quite a lot of this, so don't be coy.
 6 A. Sure. I never got -- I wasn't actually on the programme
 7 when [REDACTED] happened. But I actually didn't get the
 8 impression particularly that Peter felt that that was
 9 something that could be blamed on Meirion. I think it
 10 was an unfortunate incident that happened and actually
 11 Peter was incredibly supportive of that story all the
 12 way through from what I understand.
 13 But, yeah, I did say in my previous answer "Up until
 14 this point" I thought they had a good relationship.
 15 I think the Savile story poisoned that relationship.
 16 MR MACLEAN: Clearly it poisoned it.
 17 But what I'm asking you about is this is some
 18 evidence that in fact there had been something of
 19 a fracture in their relationship some time ago.
 20 A. Yes.
 21 MR MACLEAN: I think you are saying that was news to you?
 22 A. Yes, I must admit it was, yes.
 23 MR MACLEAN: Then we can see the point Nick just asked you
 24 about, about Panorama. We can see your view expressed
 25 in your reply:

Page 110

1 "There is no way Meirion should be working on it."
 2 That is if the focus of Panorama was Newsnight?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 MR MACLEAN: That was your concern?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 MR MACLEAN: And then we can see what you say:
 7 "I do think it's weird [at the top] for Meirion to
 8 be part of a story about what Newsnight did with the
 9 story especially if it does end up in an official
 10 inquiry and you want to deploy the line you had lost
 11 trust in him."
 12 I understand why you say it is weird, but what are
 13 you getting at in the last bit there?
 14 A. What I mean is, if -- if a boss is allowing one of his
 15 staff to go and work on a programme about what happened
 16 on -- on Newsnight with this story, and the boss's view
 17 is that the person that is about to go and make that
 18 story was not trustworthy in the process of that
 19 happening, how could he then be going and allowed to
 20 make a programme about what did or did not happen on
 21 that story? It didn't seem to make sense to me.
 22 MR MACLEAN: Who is the boss in that? Who is doing the
 23 allowing?
 24 A. Well, Peter allowed Meirion to go off to Panorama,
 25 I believed, on the understanding that they were doing

Page 111

1 a story looking more broadly at what happened with
 2 Jimmy Savile and the BBC in the 70s.
 3 MR MACLEAN: But you didn't understand that Peter Rippon
 4 had, as it were, welcomed the fact that Meirion Jones
 5 had gone off to Panorama?
 6 A. I think on the basis on which he was originally going,
 7 I think he was happy with it happening. That was my
 8 understanding.
 9 MR MACLEAN: Your understanding was that that was
 10 Peter Rippon's, as it were, own decision?
 11 A. That he okayed it, yes. Because I suppose he had to as
 12 his boss. That was my understanding, yes. I don't --
 13 MR MACLEAN: Right.
 14 A. It may be wrong, but that was the impression I had.
 15 MR MACLEAN: Okay. Thank you very much.
 16 MR POLLARD: Sorry, just one --
 17 A. Go on.
 18 MR POLLARD: -- very specific rather than general point.
 19 Just remind me, the issue of booking edit suites --
 20 A. Yes.
 21 MR POLLARD: -- we have seen, I think, a document that has
 22 edit suites booked out for Savile.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: I think from memory on 5 and 6 December.
 25 A. Yes.

Page 112

1 MR POLLARD: Just to clear up for us, did he book those or
2 did you?
3 A. I haven't ever been able to establish how that -- where
4 that booking came from or at what point.
5 MR POLLARD: Which implies you didn't, you mean?
6 A. It implies I didn't, but it doesn't mean that I didn't.
7 I may well have put it in at some point, but that is
8 a constantly changing file that at some point changed
9 and on those days something else was put in the edit
10 instead.
11 MR POLLARD: Because somewhere in that previous email it
12 says Meirion claims he booked them and they were
13 cancelled. In the end that might be true, possibly?
14 A. Yeah, I mean Peter sent an email saying "I'll pull
15 editing", which I was copied in on. So I would assume
16 that at that point I thought okay, I've got loads of
17 other projects that need to start getting edited, I'll
18 stick them in."
19 MR POLLARD: We saw some that, yes. Thank you very much,
20 sorry for just throwing that in at the end. Thank you
21 for coming in and talking to us.
22 A. It was a pleasure, kind of.
23 MR POLLARD: Much appreciated.
24 (1.09 pm)
25 (The Inquiry adjourned until 1.00 pm,
Page 113

1 Friday, 23 November 2012)
2
3 MS LIZ GIBBONS (called)1
4 Housekeeping1
5 Questions by MR MACLEAN2
6 Questions by MR POLLARD101
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Page 114