

1 Tuesday, 13 November 2012
 2 (10.00 am)
 3 MS LIZ MACKEAN (called)
 4 Opening remarks
 5 MR POLLARD: Liz, thank you for coming along. I hope today
 6 goes well. It shouldn't be too difficult, I hope.
 7 Just to say that Alan Maclean will be doing most of
 8 the questioning, with occasional interjections from
 9 myself, and Richard is there to help you find documents
 10 and any sort of procedural questions that you might
 11 have. So in fact over to Alan.
 12 MR SPAFFORD: Can I make a couple of points if that is okay?
 13 Thank you, Liz, for coming in. Obviously we have to
 14 your left over there Richard Blakeley, a barrister,
 15 Alan Maclean whom you have met, Nick Pollard and me,
 16 here, Richard Spafford.
 17 Just so you know, the process is being transcribed
 18 and you can see on the screen in front of you that you
 19 have a real-time screen of that. At the end of the
 20 process the transcript will be made available to you and
 21 your lawyers on a confidential basis to enable you to
 22 correct any typographical errors. Thank you very much
 23 for the copies of the two agreements. Obviously we have
 24 those, which is great. Obviously confidentiality is
 25 very important part of our process.

Page 1

1 I know that you spoke to Meirion Jones yesterday.
 2 We talked to Meirion about that. We had concerns about
 3 that because obviously it is incredibly important that
 4 we get just your view of what went on and your account
 5 and not a sort of combined account. We wanted to make
 6 sure that you hadn't spoken to Meirion again since
 7 yesterday lunch time?
 8 A. No, yesterday lunch time it was more a sort of "how are
 9 you?" Obviously he was here on his own. It was that
 10 sort of chat rather than detail about the session.
 11 MR SPAFFORD: Good. But you are aware of your obligation of
 12 confidence and you understand it?
 13 A. Yes, very much.
 14 MR SPAFFORD: We will have various breaks.
 15 (10.05 am)
 16 (Pause due to technical fault)
 17 (10.13 am)
 18 Questions by MR MACLEAN
 19 MR MACLEAN: Can you look at bundle A1, page 170, please.
 20 It's an email from Meirion Jones to Peter Rippon and to
 21 you at 12.33, on the 31st.
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. He's sending you an extract from the web memoir from
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 A. Yes.

Page 2

1 Q. So what contact did you have before you got this email
 2 about this?
 3 A. I think only one previous to October was during the
 4 summer. Meirion talked to me about this story that he'd
 5 always wanted to do. That's my only recollection of the
 6 time we'd spoken about it. And I was sort of vaguely
 7 interested. We didn't go into much detail but it was
 8 obviously he had the bit between his teeth and it was
 9 something he'd kept an eye on over a long period of
 10 time.
 11 So once Savile died, on 29 October, he spoke to me
 12 again. At that point I said, yes, I would be interested
 13 to work with you. Then after that he sent this
 14 document.
 15 Q. And you had worked with Meirion Jones before, had you?
 16 A. Yes, many times, many times over the years.
 17 Q. So what did you -- what did you do when you got this
 18 email, apart from presumably reading it? How did it
 19 strike you?
 20 A. Um, how did it strike me? Well I would say overall that
 21 I approached it all in quite an open-minded way. I was
 22 inclined to think that Savile, who had always growing up
 23 struck me as an odd ball, and I saw him perhaps given
 24 all the rumours that had attended him, I had seen him as
 25 someone who attracted rumours because he just seemed

Page 3

1 odd.
 2 Q. When did you -- I don't know when you joined the BBC.
 3 I should do, but I have forgotten. When did you first
 4 encounter the rumours about Jimmy Savile?
 5 A. I would even say before I joined the BBC. I mean, there
 6 was a rumour about necrophilia. That's the one
 7 I remember from being very young, just finding it all
 8 quite surprising and odd. So I did have the impression
 9 that Savile might well just be someone about whom people
 10 said things and hence my slightly open approach to
 11 everything Meirion told me about it in the early stages.
 12 Q. But he, Meirion Jones, was obviously quite close to this
 13 story?
 14 A. Um-hm.
 15 Q. It had been, as it were, nagging away at him for years?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. All right?
 18 A. Absolutely, yes.
 19 Q. How did Hannah Livingston come on the scene of this
 20 story?
 21 A. Hannah was BBC trainee and had been seconded to work on
 22 Newsnight for a couple of weeks, specifically under
 23 Meirion's wing.
 24 Q. Where was she based really? Was she based in Scotland?
 25 A. She was based up in Glasgow.

Page 4

1 Q. For report Scotland?
 2 A. Among other things, like all trainees she did a series
 3 of attachments around the BBC.
 4 Q. How long did this trainee ship last. This two weeks
 5 with Meirion Jones was two weeks in a period of what?
 6 A. I think it's a year but I don't know for certain.
 7 Q. As we can see from these bundles, she did quite a lot of
 8 the leg work and the research?
 9 A. Yes, in the opening bit, she did a lot of the work in
 10 terms of finding numbers. You know, like a lot of
 11 people who have grown up in the internet age, was very
 12 good at it. Was very good at going through different
 13 databases and helping to come up with numbers.
 14 Q. So what was the first actual, as it were, work you did
 15 on this story?
 16 A. I mean, it was more or less straight away, in terms of
 17 looking -- you know, looking particularly at the Friends
 18 Reunited website where there had been a certain amount
 19 of chatter and references to Savile. That was my first
 20 concrete starting point, I suppose. From there to
 21 contact some of the people who had been talking and
 22 other people who had been there at the relevant time.
 23 Q. So if you take bundle A3, and go to 255. I think this
 24 is your handwritten note, isn't it?
 25 A. Yes.

1 A. That's right. He had been aware of her for well over
 2 a year.
 3 Q. And he had been following the Friends Reunited chatter
 4 so he knew the names that people gave for themselves on
 5 Friends Reunited, not of course the real names or full
 6 names. So we see that you have written down there in
 7 the middle of the page:
 8 "A few have letters saying not to pursue because he
 9 was too old, 2009, Surrey Police".
 10 Where are you getting that information from, that
 11 you are writing down?
 12 A. This is coming from the people we have started to speak
 13 to, including [redacted] who had had contact with
 14 the police. I mean I write Surrey Police in big bold
 15 letters. Some of them said Surrey, some of them of said
 16 Sussex, and least one doesn't know. So we didn't know
 17 exactly where this investigation had come from.
 18 Q. So how many of these people that you had spoken to at
 19 this stage were saying, "I got a letter". Not
 20 necessarily I have a letter, but I got a letter at some
 21 point?
 22 A. Three or four. I could think of three, but there might
 23 have been four.
 24 Q. And they all told the same story, did they?
 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. It comes from meeting LNI, that's you at the top of the
 2 page. So can you put a date on this, or not?
 3 A. Not a precise date, no. It would have been early
 4 November.
 5 Q. So, I think it says at the top:
 6 "Hannah, three girls, one willing to be filmed."
 7 A. Yes. I think the one willing to be filmed initially was
 8 [redacted]
 9 Q. And there's quite a long note that gets produced,
 10 I think by Hannah Livingston.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. She had a discussion with [redacted] and then you had
 13 a discussion with [redacted] and there's a note of that as
 14 well?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. So at this very early stage [redacted] is the candidate to be
 17 filmed?
 18 A. Yes. It was always in the offing that there would be an
 19 on-camera interview with [redacted] I don't know that
 20 it was confirmed, but that was always Meirion's
 21 intention to get her to do an on-camera interview. He
 22 thought she'd be willing.
 23 Q. So who first as it were discovered [redacted]
 24 A. That was Meirion.
 25 Q. From the blog?

1 Q. Old and infirm?
 2 A. Yes, they were told in the letter that that was the
 3 reason the prosecution didn't go ahead.
 4 Q. And you realised, presumably, that the importance of
 5 that potentially was that if that was the reason that
 6 the investigation was dropped, then it wasn't dropped on
 7 the basis there was no evidence, or he didn't do it, but
 8 rather for some other reason, namely too old and infirm?
 9 A. Potentially, I certainly wanted to find out who had done
 10 the investigation and why it was stopped.
 11 Q. So potentially that fact, that the investigation had
 12 taken place and then stopped for that reason would help
 13 to give credibility to the story that the women were
 14 telling?
 15 A. Not necessarily. It was a separate thing but an
 16 important thing in my mind. The story was about the
 17 fact that Savile abused these people. That was our
 18 story. In the course of looking at that, these
 19 tantalising things came up about a police investigation,
 20 so of course I wanted to find out about it. But
 21 I didn't look at it as that then made these accounts
 22 more credible, but it would add another layer of
 23 interest to the story.
 24 Q. Right. Back in the first email that Meirion Jones sent
 25 you in A1/107, at 108, near the end, it includes

1 a reference to [redacted] You see the penultimate paragraph?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. "Another celebrity, whom I can only refer to as [redacted]
 4 showered those he sexually abused (on the day we met
 5 him) with expensive perfume [and so on]. He didn't
 6 touch me, although I watched in a detached fashion as he
 7 had full sex with one of the other girls in the dressing
 8 room into which we were all crammed."
 9 Obviously now a huge part of this story has been
 10 allegations of misconduct, not necessarily by
 11 Jimmy Savile directly but by others in the dressing room
 12 at the BBC?
 13 A. Um-hm.
 14 Q. Did that bit of the story strike you at this stage or
 15 was that something that really came to the fore later?
 16 A. I think it came to the fore-- I registered it, but we
 17 were so strongly focused on Savile the time that
 18 I really registered it as something potentially
 19 important was after the on-camera interview with
 20 [redacted]
 21 Q. On the 14th?
 22 A. Yes, when she obviously spoke in more detail about it.
 23 Q. We will come to that obviously. Do you still have the
 24 handwritten note, page 257? If you turn that round on
 25 the right-hand side this looks like your note of
 Page 9

1 a conversation with [redacted] Presumably that is
 2 a telephone number you have called?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. So at this stage [redacted] had -- she had already spoken to
 5 Hannah Livingston had she, and you were following it up?
 6 A. That's right.
 7 Q. So we can see she was at a story meeting that you have
 8 noted down and she was one of the ones who said that
 9 she, herself, had been abused by Savile.
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Then at 259. You see the numbers we have put on?
 12 I think this is still -- I think you have numbered
 13 page 1 at 257 where we have just been then the pages
 14 I think are numbered. So 3, 4, 5 and then 6. So
 15 I think this is still the interview with [redacted] is it?
 16 A. Yes. Yes, I recognise the quote.
 17 Q. So in the right-hand side then, 259, "he started going
 18 in the late 60s Surrey Police ..." what does that say?
 19 A. Not -- hang on, "Not Child Protection Unit."
 20 Q. CPU?
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. Then "station at Kingston Road, Staines". That's
 23 a police station?
 24 A. That is right. That's where she's thinking the
 25 investigation came from.
 Page 10

1 Q. Can you decode the next bit for us?
 2 A. DC Angela. She didn't have a surname, but she was
 3 pretty sure the Christian name was Angela. She didn't
 4 mention Savile by name but obviously was trying to find
 5 out from her about people who had gone to the school.
 6 Q. In other words the police person, DC Angela perhaps, who
 7 had spoken to [redacted] she didn't say Jimmy Savile, she as
 8 it were, gave an open interview inviting [redacted] to then
 9 identify somebody?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Then you say, [redacted] mentioned JS. DC wrote: saying
 12 interview gentlemen", is that gentleman or gentlemen?
 13 A. Gentleman.
 14 Q. "But no action because of his age"?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. Then if you go over the page I appreciate this is a --
 17 you didn't expect this to be crawled over by lawyers?
 18 A. I have bloody awful handwriting, I know.
 19 Q. Where does the interview with [redacted] finish? For example
 20 when we get to 260, in the middle of page, there is
 21 a word that looks -- it could be Reggie or it could be
 22 Maggie and it is scored through, do you see?
 23 A. It can't be Reggie because it says, "She said."
 24 Q. Angie?
 25 A. "She said Sussex Police".
 Page 11

1 Q. Angie was another girl, was it?
 2 A. No. Was it not Angela? Possibly Angela the
 3 investigating officer? Possibly.
 4 Q. And the note above that, [redacted]
 5 [redacted] That is [redacted] again, is it?
 6 A. That was definitely [redacted] She didn't like Maggie Jones
 7 all [redacted]
 8 [redacted]
 9 Q. It is cut off in the left-hand side. We may need to
 10 look at the original of this, but can you see here --
 11 I can't read that, but something "had a"?
 12 A. [redacted] couple of friends. I think that's JS, that
 13 would be.
 14 Q. JS?
 15 A. That makes sense, yes.
 16 Q. And then B, perhaps is broadcasting. TVC is presumably
 17 Television Centre?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. Plus [redacted]
 20 [redacted]
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. So what was said about [redacted]
 23 A. What she said was that the girls didn't like him. That
 24 he offered to sort of give them a safe house. If they
 25 were in trouble with the police and they had run away,
 Page 12

1 he offered to put them up and said he wouldn't say
 2 anything, but they entirely mistrusted his motives.
 3 I mean something that did come out from talking to
 4 some of them, [redacted] they felt very upset by, and they
 5 just thought that there was something dangerous about
 6 him. Savile they thought was an utter creep but there
 7 was a difference in their attitude to both men. They
 8 just felt there was something dangerous about one.
 9 Q. In a sense less sinister, or how do we capture this
 10 difference? Savile less sinister.
 11 A. Yes. I think they saw Savile as a creep and a dirty old
 12 man who would give them things in return for sexual
 13 favours and occasionally it was a bit sort of unpleasant
 14 and he would sort of force himself on them, but I got
 15 the feeling that some of the women I spoke to felt they
 16 could handle him and they sort of knew where they were,
 17 unlike [redacted] where they wouldn't have been in
 18 a room with him on their own?
 19 Q. He was a level or two up the scale as it were?
 20 A. That was what they were -- they indicated, yes.
 21 Q. Right. Now at some point in the story you or
 22 Hannah Livingston managed to identify at least one of
 23 the people that [redacted] assaulted at television
 24 centre, didn't you?
 25 A. On Klunk Click. That was Hannah who did the picture
 Page 13

1 research.
 2 Q. And that was [redacted]?
 3 A. [redacted] who we never contacted. We tried but we
 4 couldn't find her.
 5 Q. But she had been identified by a combination of Hannah
 6 and your research and what [redacted] had told us as to
 7 a likely candidate?
 8 A. A likely candidate, not a definite candidate. What he
 9 photo which had [redacted] on it and her and it was from
 10 that photo that Hannah identified her as being in the
 11 footage of Klunk Click.
 12 Q. The photo was at [redacted] was it, [redacted]
 13 [redacted] -
 14 A. Was it [redacted]?
 15 Q. [redacted] yes. So [redacted] gave you a photograph?
 16 A. I think so.
 17 Q. Then later, Hannah Livingston who spent some time
 18 looking at all these old Klunk Clicks, then found
 19 a Klunk Click with Savile, [redacted] [redacted] and
 20 Gary Glitter as a guest on the show; is that it?
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. And that helps to put the --
 23 A. Yes, I mean there were two sections of footage that we
 24 got, and I don't know that they were the same programme.
 25 One of them had Freddie Starr, and [redacted] was in
 Page 14

1 that, definitely. And I can't -- I can't now remember
 2 if she was in the one with Gary Glitter.
 3 Q. Right. So there are two different Klunk Clicks that are
 4 involved?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. Is there one with Savile and Starr and one with Savile
 7 and Glitter?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. Just to finish off on these notes you have made, if you
 10 go to 261, this looks like -- this is now later in fact.
 11 If you look at 260 just -- sorry to muck you around, if
 12 you go back to 260, do you see we have (indistinct), the
 13 names don't matter. Then it says redacted.
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Is that your writing "redacted"?
 16 A. No.
 17 Q. So just let me understand what happened to these
 18 documents. You provided these documents to the BBC?
 19 A. Litigation would have redacted them. Possibly there was
 20 a number or a name --
 21 MR POLLARD: You have not seen that before, have you, the
 22 redaction?
 23 A. No.
 24 MR MACLEAN: Because we can see, for example if you go to
 25 262, there are more names than you can shake a stick at
 Page 15

1 there.
 2 A. Yes, these were all the Friends Reunited people
 3 I contacted.
 4 Q. Just so we understand, because we have been provided
 5 with a lot of documents which say redacted or have
 6 things blanked out. Since this whole review process
 7 started, have you redacted any documents?
 8 A. Nothing, no.
 9 Q. You provided documents to the BBC litigation and, as it
 10 were, didn't see them again?
 11 A. That is right.
 12 Q. So whenever we see anything involving you that has
 13 something blanked out or redacted, the --
 14 A. It hasn't come from me.
 15 Q. You are sure about that?
 16 A. Yes, positive.
 17 MR POLLARD: They have not asked you about -- should we take
 18 out, should we cover up anything?
 19 A. I had one conversation with Nicola Cain in litigation.
 20 I don't remember asking her to redact anything or her
 21 asking me, but it was a conversation about -- in terms
 22 of handing stuff over to the police, would I be
 23 comfortable if a couple of names were handed over and
 24 I said yes. I am sure we didn't talk about redacting
 25 anything.
 Page 16

1 MR MACLEAN: That question arose in the context of whether
 2 you had given some promise, as it were, to somebody you
 3 had spoken to of confidentiality or --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. -- just ordinary journalist source confidentiality?
 6 A. More the people we had spoken to.
 7 Q. So the upshot of the conversation with Nicola Cain was
 8 that you weren't providing any obstacle to the police?
 9 A. That's right.
 10 Q. So far as this review are process is concerned, you
 11 haven't had any discussion with the BBC about covering
 12 up parts of documents.
 13 A. No, if I have, I have entirely forgotten it.
 14 Q. Just below the word "redacted"?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. We have a date on this now, you see 21/11?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. So we have jumped quite far down the story. Liza Dowd,
 19 Sky. We heard, I think from Meirion Jones -- it is in
 20 the documents -- that you and he thought, or had grounds
 21 to believe that Sky were sniffing around this story as
 22 well; is that right?
 23 A. Yes. The Sun newspaper had been. [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

Page 17

1 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] And [REDACTED] told me that Liza Dowd from Sky
 4 had spoken to her.
 5 Q. Does Liza Dowd perform a similar role to you?
 6 A. To me, yes, she's a reporter.
 7 Q. Then you see over the page, this looks like the embryo
 8 for the script. We will come to this, "Rough Savile 2",
 9 and so on?
 10 A. This is the start of putting things down.
 11 Q. So you have written opening -- this is the opening of
 12 the piece, "Royal funeral, Fix It."
 13 Then, is that PTC, piece to camera?
 14 A. Yes, PTC.
 15 Q. Can we read that?
 16 A. "But who was Jimmy Savile? Not the only celebrity to be
 17 surrounded by rumour but we have spoken to a group of
 18 girls...(Reading to the words)... who say they saw
 19 a side of him shielded to the public revealed when he
 20 swept up the drive here on one of his regular visits."
 21 So that would have obviously been recorded outside
 22 Duncroft School.
 23 Q. Then there a mark down the side, your mark, is it,
 24 "sideline"?
 25 A. Yes.

Page 18

1 Q. Not -- what's the next word?
 2 A. Made credible witnesses in court.
 3 Q. So how did that follow on from the previous paragraph,
 4 or is that a separate thought?
 5 A. I think it's a separate thought. It was a thought
 6 having -- something I was thinking at an early stage we
 7 would have to address in the script. When you are
 8 looking at any sexual abuse claims, particularly ones
 9 that are historical, the credibility of the witnesses is
 10 always the biggest problem, which is why we were
 11 determined to speak to as many as we could.
 12 Another feature of the story that really struck me
 13 was the extent to which these particular women, as
 14 girls, had been so compromised. You know, the way now
 15 we call it grooming, but at the time I don't think there
 16 was a word for it. He gave them stuff, they got
 17 something out of him. So to some extent they felt sort
 18 of in control out of what was happening to them, even if
 19 they had to give him a blow job. They thought in some
 20 ways perhaps they had sort of invited it, but at least
 21 they were getting something back. And that note is just
 22 the start of me addressing in my mind how that gets put
 23 across, when it comes to a script.
 24 Q. Now on the opposite page -- and I don't quite
 25 understand, maybe we should look at this, the original

Page 19

1 of this notebook, if it still exists, to work this out,
 2 but it seems to be jumping around time-wise. Monday --
 3 A. 14 November.
 4 Q. The day you interviewed [REDACTED]?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. That then says "numbers"?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And then --
 9 A. MO. These are little notes of the sort of areas I want
 10 to talk to her about. So the MO would have been
 11 Savile's MO, the sort of grooming style approach --
 12 Q. Right?
 13 A. -- she herself, and what was her involvement with
 14 Savile.
 15 Q. So this is your note for your interview?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. "Her view of him, why not an obvious question. Why wait
 18 until now. Why should you be believed...(Reading to
 19 the words)... Gulf between public image and your
 20 reality."
 21 And then TVC guide --
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. So the basis of those notes for [REDACTED] was the
 24 document that Meirion Jones had sent you that came from
 25 the document [REDACTED] had published on the web?

Page 20

1 A. Well, certainly the TVC [redacted] references. But I
 2 think the others were the sort of open questions to get
 3 her to tell the story that weren't based on the original
 4 note from Meirion. They were then just me about to
 5 interview this person and this is how I want to draw out
 6 her story.
 7 Q. In the end, there was a filmed interview with
 8 [redacted] --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. -- as we know. And there was a filmed interview for
 11 [redacted]
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. We have seen the rushes. We have seen all of it. So we
 14 know what was done there. There was you and Meirion
 15 Jones and Hannah Livingston and the cameraman?
 16 A. Um-hm.
 17 Q. The interview with [redacted] was done by Meirion
 18 Jones and not by you?
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. Why was that?
 21 A. It was a practicality thing. I think I wasn't in the
 22 office. That day I was originally going to do the
 23 interview -- [redacted] changed the date and I think I was
 24 filming another story and not available.
 25 Q. Right.

Page 21

1 A. But I had had the original conversation with [redacted] so
 2 obviously I had briefed Meirion ahead of the interview.
 3 Q. So if we go to 263 in the same bundle --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. -- it looks like 17/11, 20/11, do you see that?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Still your notes. This looks -- tell me if I'm wrong --
 8 whereas the one we just looked at for the 14th was
 9 a note that looked as if you had written it in advance
 10 of the interview, a sort of aide-memoire, points to
 11 cover, sort of thing I have here. This looks like the
 12 notes you have made because of the quote.
 13 These are your notes made of a discussion with
 14 [redacted]
 15 A. That's right.
 16 Q. Is that right?
 17 A. Yes. I spoke to her, I think it was at a weekend. As
 18 I was speaking to her I wrote down these direct quotes
 19 which I would have then used to brief Meirion for the
 20 interview.
 21 Q. Right. So you have provided to the BBC -- not directly
 22 to us -- all of the notes that you made in 2011 for this
 23 story?
 24 A. Um, as much as I have able to get my hands on them.
 25 I think I have made more notes that I just don't have

Page 22

1 now.
 2 Q. Where would they be?
 3 A. Well, originally in the office in Television Centre.
 4 There have been various clearouts of things over the
 5 months as the office was prepared for the move to W1.
 6 And I had more notes, I am sure, which I wasn't able to
 7 then locate.
 8 Q. Right. So is this -- this is a single -- these were all
 9 done in a single notebook?
 10 A. Yes. These came from -- no, two notebooks.
 11 Q. Did you provide the whole notebook to the BBC or copied
 12 the relevant pages?
 13 A. No, I just photocopied the relevant pages.
 14 Q. Okay. We have jumped around -- jumped ahead a bit in
 15 the story. Can I take you back to the beginning, to
 16 Meirion Jones' email? He sent the email to you and to
 17 Peter Rippon, the programme editor?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. And also to Hannah Livingston. If you go to page 267 of
 20 bundle 1 -- A1/267, Meirion Jones told us yesterday that
 21 shortly after sparking the story on 31 October he was
 22 actually in America --
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. So he was away for a few days and told us he didn't
 25 really get his hands on this story again properly until

Page 23

1 shortly before the interview with [redacted] is that
 2 right?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. So in the intervening couple of weeks it was you and
 5 Hannah Livingston who were doing the research?
 6 A. Yes. Doing the digging.
 7 Q. And he told us that at this stage the programme, or the
 8 piece, hadn't been commissioned. Is that right?
 9 People talk about commission --
 10 A. I feel vague about that. To be honest I thought it had
 11 been subject to it standing up to our satisfaction.
 12 I thought I was working on it with a view to doing it.
 13 The reason that was -- there is an email, I think it
 14 might be 3 November from memory -- in fact I have it in
 15 my statement -- where Peter tells me -- 2 November, he
 16 replied on 3 November, top of page 2 of my statement.
 17 I was sort of showering Peter with possible stories and
 18 his reply was quite straightforward, "Let's do the JS
 19 story with my first". So I think in my mind, that's --
 20 subject to the thing working -- that's the commission.
 21 Q. When people talk about commissions it's not a formal
 22 thing? You tell me, how does something get
 23 commissioned? Some importance is attached to the notion
 24 of it being commissioned?
 25 A. Yes. I mean, it obviously can vary but this was

Page 24

1 a fairly typical thing where you have a word with the
 2 editor and say, "I'm working on this story." And they
 3 say, "Great", and then the broad expectation is that it
 4 is going to get on the air.
 5 I mean there were formal aspects to the Jimmy Savile
 6 story that kicked in down the line when the editing was
 7 booked and the budget was approved. That's what you
 8 might call a copper bottom commission and we were given
 9 a date for transmission. This is an informal
 10 commission, but he's telling me let's do it first. So
 11 his expectation, I took from that, to be this is a story
 12 that's going to be done.
 13 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask a detail on that. I get the
 14 point about there to be booking in the editing and you
 15 know it is up on the board and so on. Does a camera
 16 crew day affect that? Would you say if you are shooting
 17 an interview, that's a commissioned story?
 18 A. Yes. I mean, again you can quibble about the word
 19 "commission", but pretty much -- and as you well know we
 20 don't often just go round speculatively booking camera
 21 crews, that is 500 quid a day off including expenses to
 22 film interviews. It is quite a commitment in this day
 23 and age, so we definitely thought we were working
 24 towards a story that would get on air.
 25 MR POLLARD: I just, effectively for the sort of information
 Page 25

1 of everybody, if you are Channel 4, or the part of the
 2 BBC, and there is a story, a documentary or a film or
 3 a light entertainment programme, that will be officially
 4 commissioned and you will get a contract saying, "Please
 5 make this contract, this programme for us". That's not
 6 quite what you mean by "commissioned" is it?
 7 Commissioned can be, in Newsnight terms, correct me if
 8 I'm wrong, "Yes, let's do that".
 9 A. Exactly, it's a nod from the editor; let's do it.
 10 Q. Yes.
 11 A. So "let's do the JS story with Mei first". That makes
 12 me think I'm going to prioritise that above other
 13 stories I was working on with a view to doing it.
 14 MR POLLARD: Would that make you think you could book
 15 a camera crew to do an interview for that story?
 16 A. Yes, absolutely. Because we're in control of that story
 17 development and that includes booking a crew.
 18 MR MACLEAN: What is the executive producer of a piece like
 19 this?
 20 A. You have the producer, which in this case would be
 21 Meirion who is responsible for all the practical details
 22 although our roles would overlap a lot. Then you have
 23 the exec producer who has the ultimate editorial
 24 responsibility for the film.
 25 Q. If I'm the executive producer for a piece and you are
 Page 26

1 the editor of a programme --
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. -- who has, would you say, ultimate editorial
 4 responsibility for the film? Me or you?
 5 A. Well, in this case Peter was the executive.
 6 Q. In this case he had both hats?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. But I'm just exploring to you what had happened -- for
 9 example if Liz Gibbons had been the executive producer
 10 and Peter Rippon was the producer of Newsnight, who had
 11 ultimate responsibility for the film?
 12 A. He would. We have seen in recent days the director
 13 general taking editorial responsible for a Newsnight
 14 report. So Peter technically would have more
 15 responsibility than Liz Gibbons. But she would have the
 16 working responsibility for getting it on air and he
 17 wouldn't have had any involvement.
 18 Q. We will come to this. So when we come to questions
 19 about whether Mr Rippon should have looked at more
 20 things than he did --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. -- before the story was killed, I just want to explore
 23 with you which hat might have required him to do that;
 24 it was because he was the commissioning executive
 25 producer rather than the fact he was editor of the whole
 Page 27

1 programme?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. Because the editor of the whole programme obviously has
 4 the whole programme to run, is that right?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. So the fact that he was executive producer on this is
 7 rather important to understanding what his, as it were,
 8 obligations were in relation to it?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. In their opinion stronger and deeper than the
 11 obligations he had to a Newsnight story executively
 12 produced by someone else, is that right?
 13 A. Yes, he would have more involvement with the story.
 14 What it means in practice often is that he would be the
 15 person viewing the film, viewing the edited film, and
 16 either saying, "Not sure about that, change that round",
 17 or, "Fine".
 18 Q. Was there ever any doubt about the fact that
 19 Peter Rippon rather than say Shaminder Nahal or
 20 Liz Gibbons were the executive producer of this piece?
 21 A. No doubt at all. Because Liz -- she almost recoiled at
 22 the story. She just didn't want to have anything to do
 23 with it.
 24 Q. Let us look at precisely that point. A1/267. You
 25 recognise this mail. It is your email --
 Page 28

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. -- to Meirion Jones on 9 November?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. That time of year When I'm A Celebrity was on. "Had
 5 a meeting with Liz and Peter, she thinks we shouldn't do
 6 JS story on grounds of taste."
 7 I just pause there. This was a meeting in
 8 Peter Rippon's office or something?
 9 A. Um-hm.
 10 Q. How did she -- what did she do? Did she use the word,
 11 "taste"?
 12 A. Yes, literally that. You know, she said it's taste. I
 13 don't think it's tasteful. I --
 14 Q. What was distasteful? The fact that he had died or
 15 what?
 16 A. The fact he had just died. And obviously within the
 17 context of the BBC already, you know, we knew there were
 18 going to be tributes at some point.
 19 Q. You didn't know that -- quite know that now, did you?
 20 A. No, they hadn't been commissioned, or at least they
 21 hadn't been announced but remember we have not long
 22 since had this sort of major coverage is given to his
 23 funeral so there is a sort of wider atmosphere that was
 24 one of celebrating Savile. So this "taste" was sort of:
 25 why are we making these claims about him when he has

Page 29

1 just died?
 2 Q. But was it the fact that a man had just died or was it
 3 the fact that a big BBC personality had just died? Or
 4 what?
 5 A. I'm not sure I know the answer to that. But of course
 6 Savile was a big personality. He had been, you know,
 7 celebrated immediately after his death and I think it
 8 was that that therefore seemed in bad taste.
 9 Q. So Liz Gibbons didn't fancy this story from the start?
 10 A. No. I think her reasons for not liking it changed,
 11 that's my impression, last year. But she certainly
 12 didn't like it at any point.
 13 Q. So they changed?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. But they start off as being taste?
 16 A. The taste issue, yes.
 17 Q. Which you interpreted as being it was distasteful --
 18 A. Don't speak ill of the dead.
 19 Q. Don't speak ill of the dead. We will come to this in
 20 more detail. Just give us the overview of what the
 21 change was that you perceived?
 22 A. In Liz?
 23 Q. Yes?
 24 A. At some point a little bit further down the tracks, and
 25 again the emails show it, her concerns seemed more that

Page 30

1 this was going to cause a big fuss, the story that we
 2 were trying to do. Because I approached her -- I can't
 3 remember exactly what day, but to literally -- because
 4 normally it's Liz that we talk to about films, not
 5 Peter.
 6 Q. Because?
 7 A. Because she's the commissioning editor. The deputy, and
 8 Peter is sort of beyond that. I think this is the only
 9 film I have ever done where Peter was the exec producer.
 10 Maybe there was one other, but it would normally be Liz
 11 that I would talk to.
 12 So I approached her desk to say, you know, I will be
 13 filming this day and then I'm going to go and do another
 14 story that day. But as soon as I mentioned the Savile,
 15 she just turned away and just said, "No, I want nothing
 16 to do with it. That's Peter's story, it's nothing to do
 17 with me. Talk to Peter about it". And that was the end
 18 of the conversation.
 19 So I -- well, I didn't think that was down to the
 20 feeling that the story was in bad taste. But I do think
 21 it might have been more to do with the fact that, you
 22 know, Meirion and I could see for some time that there
 23 was going to be a looming difficulty with the fact that
 24 part of the BBC was running the tributes and officially
 25 celebrating Savile, while the other little bit of the

Page 31

1 BBC was planning to run this incredibly damaging to his
 2 reputation story. If you follow me.
 3 Q. So you were going to, if I can put it like this, you
 4 could see that Newsnight was going to rain on the BBC's
 5 parade?
 6 A. Yes, totally. And Liz said at one point to Meirion --
 7 again a bit later, about this time, which is why I think
 8 I had taken from that exchange with her that she didn't
 9 want to go near it. She had said to Meirion, I don't
 10 want to piss off Danny Cohen, the controller of BBC1.
 11 So that clearly indicated that she was, you know, seeing
 12 which way the wind was blowing and realising there was
 13 going to be a big fuss.
 14 Q. What I don't understand is if Liz Gibbons is the
 15 commissioning editor, and if a decision is taken which
 16 Liz Gibbons doesn't approve of, but we can see from this
 17 email that in the end it's decided that it's a runner,
 18 at least at this stage, why didn't Liz Gibbons
 19 nonetheless have the responsibility as commissioning
 20 editor? Since that's what she did and it's what
 21 Peter Rippon didn't do?
 22 A. Because --
 23 Q. Isn't a bit odd?
 24 A. Because Peter occasionally does exec films. It's
 25 unusual in my experience, but that's not to say he

Page 32

1 doesn't do it reasonably often. But day to day issues
 2 of where I am, when I'm available, when I am not, tend
 3 to go through Liz.
 4 Q. So did you get the sense by this later time of not
 5 pissing off Danny Cohen --
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. -- that Liz Gibbons realised that Peter Rippon was
 8 holding a bit of a hospital pass here?
 9 A. Yes. That's how it seemed, yes. I felt by the time
 10 we're talking about, which was obviously later than this
 11 email, I could see Peter seemed to me to be between
 12 a rock and a hard place.
 13 Q. If Liz Gibbons could see that he had a hospital pass,
 14 did Peter Rippon give the impression of appreciating the
 15 pickle that was looming?
 16 A. He gave the impression of being extremely uncomfortable
 17 and, you know, verging towards desperate not to run the
 18 story and looking for a lot of excuses not to run the
 19 story.
 20 Q. We will come to the detail of that. Just let me ask you
 21 about the next sentence in your email:
 22 "I persuaded them [is that you?] her otherwise ...
 23 especially given police line".
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. Can you fill that out for us?

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. She(?) had been told, as indeed you had been told?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And it was that fact, was it, about the police
 5 investigation not going anywhere in the end because of
 6 age and infirmity, that appeared to you to persuade
 7 Liz Gibbons to go along with it?
 8 A. I can't remember if it was because it didn't get
 9 anywhere, because of age and infirmity, or just the fact
 10 of the police investigation. I mean, the fact that
 11 there seemed to have been a police investigation seemed
 12 the most material point. Because it showed that
 13 a complaint had been made -- at least one complaint had
 14 been made -- and it was taken sufficiently seriously for
 15 there to have been an investigation.
 16 Q. So at this stage, is this right, at this early stage
 17 there wasn't really any focus on the fact -- tell me if
 18 I'm wrong -- that ██████████ had never been to the
 19 police and they had never spoken to her, and whatever
 20 investigation might have been done didn't appear to
 21 include her? But it becomes important later on?
 22 A. It became important later on. I'm not sure I was even
 23 registering that detail at this point; that, you know,
 24 we were in the course of the research talking to people
 25 who hadn't spoken to the police.

1 A. Never mind that Jimmy Savile had just died, I thought
 2 there was very strong public interest for the story to
 3 run. You know, if someone is being seen and held up,
 4 especially by the BBC as one thing but actually we're
 5 getting by now, by this stage, quite a few conversations
 6 which suggest that we have got good grounds for
 7 suggesting he was something very different, I just saw
 8 a clear public interest, particularly in the BBC making
 9 that clear. You know, far better it came from within.
 10 So --
 11 Q. But what's the police line?
 12 A. The police line now is the fact that we were hearing
 13 that there had been a police investigation, we didn't
 14 yet have confirmation. I can't remember if at this
 15 point we knew that it was definitely Surrey, but that to
 16 me added to the public interest. And it was an added
 17 thing, if you like, to help persuade her that the story
 18 was in the public interest.
 19 Q. You discussed with her the fact that you had some
 20 information to suggest, did you, that there had been
 21 a police investigation which hadn't gone anywhere
 22 because of his age and infirmity?
 23 A. Yes. I had said that's what we were being told.
 24 Obviously we didn't have any confirmation of that.
 25 Q. That's what you told Liz Gibbons?

1 Q. Obviously if the people who were speaking to you --
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. -- if they had all been part of some police
 4 investigation and that police investigation had gone
 5 nowhere because of a lack of evidence for example, then
 6 your story start -- the balloon starts to collapse,
 7 doesn't?
 8 A. I think it would have substantially weakened the story.
 9 Q. Now Mr Rippon, his view, he was a bit -- he was a bit
 10 more enthusiastic, was he, than Liz Gibbons?
 11 A. Yes, when I left the office there, I have indicated to
 12 Meirion, it's a goer, with Peter's say so.
 13 Q. Right. So having got the apparent green light back on
 14 the 3rd?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. You have now had a sticky meeting with Liz Gibbons, but
 17 it's still on track?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. Go to 276, please --
 20 MR POLLARD: You may be coming back to this, apologies if
 21 you are. You say in the 267 email:
 22 "But of course they are concerned about the women's
 23 credibility".
 24 Was that Peter and Liz? And if so, how strongly
 25 were they concerned?

1 A. From memory it was both of them. And it was a sort of,
 2 "Yes, but are they believable? Will they be
 3 believable". You know obviously we were looking now at
 4 allegations of things that would have happened 40 years
 5 previously. I mean, it didn't phase me in the least
 6 that they raised that concern. It is always, as
 7 everyone knows, a real issue with these old cases. You
 8 know, claims are generally made by people who don't
 9 expect to be believed and tend not to be. Certainly in
 10 the case of -- these women, you know, had a chequered
 11 history, some of them very much so. But despite what
 12 Peter said in a more recent email, they didn't all have
 13 criminal records.
 14 But that's why in my mind, from the get-go it was
 15 very important to talk to a lot of people. I would not
 16 have tried to push this story based on even the -- you
 17 know, the first ever on camera interview, very credible
 18 as I found [REDACTED] That wouldn't have been enough
 19 to make me think we should push as hard as we did push.
 20 It was the collective -- it was the weight of all the
 21 different accounts that we heard that were describing
 22 a very similar thing. And just very quickly to say we
 23 had Mark Williams-Thomas onboard who later did the story
 24 for Exposure who is steeped in this type of work. And
 25 his feedback to Meirion, because he was kept in the loop

Page 37

1 about what we were uncovering, his feedback to Meirion
 2 was "it is stacking up", which gave us added
 3 reassurance, if you like.
 4 MR POLLARD: Did Mark Williams-Thomas talk to any of the
 5 women himself?
 6 A. Um, certainly when our story was dropped, yes. Not at
 7 this stage, no.
 8 MR POLLARD: Not before the story was dropped?
 9 A. No.
 10 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 11 MR MACLEAN: He in fact wanted your job on this story. Did
 12 you know that?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Did you know that at the time?
 15 A. Yes, Meirion told me.
 16 Q. At the time?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. We will come to Mark Williams-Thomas a bit later, but he
 19 had multiple roles in this story, didn't he? He was
 20 helping with the research and ultimately he was going to
 21 appear on the piece as some sort of expert witness
 22 opining on the quality of the work the police had done.
 23 A. Um, opining on the credibility of the witnesses we had
 24 spoken to. Not, from memory, particularly on the work
 25 the police had done, on the police investigation. His

Page 38

1 role in research was only to try to help us track down
 2 where was this investigation, where was it based and
 3 what had happened to it.
 4 Q. But the particular -- one particular reason why he was
 5 suited to this was because he had previously worked
 6 himself at Surrey Police?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. So he was well placed, he had good contacts --
 9 A. That is right.
 10 Q. -- for doing a bit of digging there?
 11 A. Yes. You see that won't have been in the original brief
 12 for him when Meirion first signed him up. But obviously
 13 as we were going along and we needed to find out about
 14 this investigation, he was an obviously good help.
 15 Q. That neatly I think takes us to 276. Now at this stage
 16 we can see from the bottom there is some discussion
 17 about people entering the building. What was going on
 18 was they were being interviewed for the Newsnight
 19 political editor's role, weren't they?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. We know that Allegra Stratton got that job?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. And her predecessor was Michael Crick?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. He had recently left Newsnight had he?

Page 39

1 A. Um, yes. I can't remember exactly when he left. But he
 2 left some time before Allegra was appointed. He had --
 3 there had been a gap, he left in the summer.
 4 Q. [REDACTED]
 5 A. [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 Q. [REDACTED]
 8 A. [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 Q. [REDACTED]
 14 A. [REDACTED]
 15 Q. [REDACTED]
 16 A. [REDACTED]
 17 Q. He had not been political editor for all that long, had
 18 he?
 19 A. He had been appointed by the previous editor,
 20 Peter Barron, and his predecessor had been
 21 Martha Kearney.
 22 Q. Who had gone off to --
 23 A. World at One.
 24 Q. You send this email to Meirion Jones. You say at 276:
 25 "Just spoken to Hannah, she will send me down

Page 40

1 briefing notes."
 2 If you just go over to 278, keeping a finger in 276,
 3 those are the briefing notes, right:
 4 "Here are the notes from the conversations I have
 5 had".
 6 Do you see?
 7 "The best is probably [REDACTED]', do you see that? 278?
 8 MR SPAFFORD: We have some redactions in the top of this.
 9 A. Yes, they are, with the different phone calls.
 10 MR MACLEAN: Different people's names. Can you read the
 11 words, "Best is probably [REDACTED]"?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. "Don't get in touch without ..."
 14 A. Talking to me please.
 15 Q. "I said ...(Reading to the words)... phone numbers
 16 et cetera."
 17 If you go to 280, we can see what you were being
 18 given at this stage. There is a note, do you see --
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. -- that Hannah has made with one of the girls, as she
 21 was. Then 282, that's Hannah's note?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. It's a long one about [REDACTED]
 24 So back to 276, you are anticipating with Meirion
 25 Jones being sent those from Hannah Livingston. Then you

Page 41

1 say, "Shall I contact Surrey Police or wait"? And he
 2 says:
 3 "Wait on Surrey Police. [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]".
 5 What did that mean?
 6 A. Well, I was asking him, you know: shall I approach
 7 Surrey Police to see if perhaps the investigation had
 8 come from them? Because at this stage we still didn't
 9 know. [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 I think Meirion's caution, from memory, was that,
 13 you know, he didn't want it getting back to The Sun that
 14 we were looking at the story in case they escalated
 15 their efforts and got there before us.
 16 Q. Did you know about Sky at this stage sniffing around, or
 17 not?
 18 A. I can't remember. I knew about that from when I had
 19 spoken to [REDACTED] that first time, which I think was after
 20 this.
 21 Q. Then can we go to 289, please? Still the same day, the
 22 9th.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. From Hannah Livingston to you and Meirion Jones:
 25 "Here's all the notes I have on JS and Duncroft. So

Page 42

1 far the only woman willing to go on the record is
 2 [REDACTED].
 3 A. Um-hm.
 4 Q. Is that the first time you knew about [REDACTED] as
 5 such, so named; using her proper name?
 6 A. No I had known [REDACTED] obviously since Meirion's
 7 original email.
 8 Q. I'm not sure that identified [REDACTED] as such?
 9 A. It did. She went under another name, [REDACTED]
 10 Q. That was my question.
 11 A. I knew it was the same person.
 12 Q. You knew that?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Because one of your handwritten notes is, [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED].
 16 A. That was her alternative name. I think that was her
 17 name at Duncroft and [REDACTED] is her more recent one.
 18 Q. Hannah says what we know for certain. We see what she
 19 says:
 20 "What definitely needs confirming was the presence
 21 of a police investigation and Meirion was in touch with
 22 the reporter ..."
 23 We know that was --
 24 A. Mark Williams-Thomas.
 25 Q. One thing he wasn't was a reporter, "Who used to be in

Page 43

1 Surrey Police."
 2 She says:
 3 "A few of the girls have referenced a letter they
 4 received from the police saying that there would be no
 5 further action taken against Mr Savile because of his
 6 age. And a police officer named Becky."
 7 It is quite a long story this. We have read all the
 8 emails and I'm not going to take you through them all
 9 because we have read them, but it is fair to say, isn't
 10 it, that there was a lot of time and effort spent by you
 11 and by Hannah Livingston chasing this letter?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Which I think [REDACTED] said she still had, is that right?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. And others said they had received?
 16 A. Um-hm.
 17 Q. But as we all know, there was no letter and the only
 18 letter that eventually did get produced, a long time
 19 later, to The Daily Mail turned out to be a fabrication?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. Yes. But what we can see is that from the 9 November,
 22 the Surrey Police investigation, which is her first
 23 bullet point about what definitely needs confirming was
 24 whether there had been investigation and, secondly, the
 25 question of no further action because of his age, were

Page 44

1 both identified as important elements in the developing
 2 story, weren't they?
 3 **A. Yes. It was partly because it was tantalising. We had**
 4 **been told about it, therefore I wanted to know about it.**
 5 **As I'd said before, the fact of a police investigation**
 6 **gave added legs to the story. And I just wanted to**
 7 **know.**
 8 **Q. So you --**
 9 **A. By this point I was now of the view -- having gone into**
 10 **it, as I told you, open-mindedly -- that abuse had taken**
 11 **place, that we were onto a story of Savile the abuser,**
 12 **and that was going along nicely, that part of it. But**
 13 **there was this other bit that had come up about the**
 14 **police and we weren't getting anywhere with it for**
 15 **a while. So that, you know, hence my, you know, real**
 16 **efforts to want to get to the bottom of it.**
 17 **Q. So if you close A1 now, please, and put that away and**
 18 **take the next one, page 8, this is an email exchange**
 19 **between you and Hannah Livingston the following day, the**
 20 **10th. Do you see?**
 21 **A. Hang on, I'm looking at October --**
 22 **Q. Forget about the top of that. That is when it was**
 23 **forwarded to the BBC by you, I think?**
 24 **A. Um-hm.**
 25 **Q. Forget about that. Just below that, you see 10 November**
 Page 45

1 at 14.41?
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 **Q. So you have been in touch. If we look at the bottom of**
 4 **the page, Hannah Livingston called you or emailed you**
 5 **the day before for a chat. Then the next day you say:**
 6 **"One detail you really need is the police force that**
 7 **handled the investigation. My source suggests it was in**
 8 **Surrey."**
 9 **A. And that was Mark Williams-Thomas.**
 10 **Q. That was my question.**
 11 **So I infer from that, that that was not one of the**
 12 **girls who said that. What had happened, I infer, is**
 13 **that Williams-Thomas had been to Surrey, and said "Did**
 14 **you investigate Jimmy Savile" and is drawing a blank?**
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 **Q. So he wasn't getting any positive information as to**
 17 **which police force it might have been; he was simply**
 18 **saying it doesn't look like Surrey, is that right?**
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 **Q. But it turns out it was Surrey?**
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 **Q. Then if we look at page 26 in the same bundle -- we**
 23 **numbered all these pages chronologically, so you can**
 24 **forget about the references in the top right-hand**
 25 **corner, they are impossible to follow. But the numbers**
 Page 46

1 at the bottom right do follow --
 2 **A. It is beginning to make my handwriting notes look good.**
 3 **Q. So November, so the same day, the 10th,**
 4 **Hannah Livingston said she had spoken to -- that has**
 5 **been blanked out, not by you presumably?**
 6 **A. No.**
 7 **Q. "Both happy to be contacted by Liz."**
 8 **Do you know who that blank space is, then? Can you**
 9 **work that out?**
 10 **A. Um --**
 11 **Q. It may not matter.**
 12 **A. I wonder if it is [redacted] Such is the inconsistency**
 13 **of the redactions that the word '[redacted]' occurs on the**
 14 **last paragraph.**
 15 **MR SPAFFORD: There were further redactions --**
 16 **MR MACLEAN: Let's not take time on it.**
 17 **One of the points here is that [redacted] still thinks**
 18 **that it is the Surrey Police. Hannah has been back to**
 19 **[redacted] and she is adamant that it is Surrey:**
 20 **"She hasn't managed to track down the letter yet**
 21 **...(Reading to the words)... and it was taped under**
 22 **caution."**
 23 **Did that strike you as odd?**
 24 **A. Yes, very. Because why would [redacted] be being cautioned?**
 25 **Possibly later for hoaxing a letter, but I mean at this**
 Page 47

1 **point it seemed an odd --**
 2 **Q. It didn't make any sense, does it?**
 3 **A. -- approach, yes.**
 4 **Q. We can see what she said. We don't need to read out the**
 5 **whole email, but at the bottom Hannah offers the view,**
 6 **gives you some advice '[redacted] talks a lot'. And then**
 7 **there was some, as it were, dissent in the ranks, wasn't**
 8 **there, amongst --**
 9 **A. Amongst the women.**
 10 **Q. Amongst the women themselves?**
 11 **A. Yes. Now it has more recently been suggested that they**
 12 **were possibly cooking up their collective story via**
 13 **social media, and that's how I have interpreted the**
 14 **briefing. But they weren't all like one clump at all.**
 15 **There were, you know, enmities possibly going back**
 16 **decades and [redacted] wasn't in touch with very many of**
 17 **them. [redacted] had a little group of two or three that she**
 18 **was in touch with but others we spoke to had not been in**
 19 **touch directly with any of them.**
 20 **Q. Was your impression -- to the extent that X was in touch**
 21 **with Y and Z -- that it was just the way you keep in**
 22 **touch with some school friends and not others, or that**
 23 **they got in touch as a result of the Friends Reunited**
 24 **chat about Savile before he died? Because there was**
 25 **quite a lot of it on Friends Reunited.**
 Page 48

1 A. I'm not sure I know. I mean, I certainly remember
 2 I spoke to some people who had not been in touch, had
 3 not had any direct contact with any of the people for
 4 years.
 5 Q. These girls, as they were at the time, had presumably by
 6 this stage in time scattered all over the place?
 7 A. And married, so names changed and so on. I do remember
 8 that [redacted] -- not [redacted] [redacted] online book that
 9 Meirion originally sent the extract from it was resented
 10 by [redacted] as I recall.
 11 Q. Right.
 12 A. So she thought that maybe [redacted] was trying to --
 13 Q. Big herself up?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. And that would be reflected in that [redacted] isn't overly
 16 keen on [redacted] being their spokesperson.
 17 Then she's adamant that it was somebody's sister who
 18 sparked the police investigation?
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. Now that sister had also been at Duncroft, is that
 21 right?
 22 A. Right, the sister is [redacted] who was at Duncroft.
 23 Q. Hang on. She isn't overly keen on [redacted] either. She's
 24 adamant that it was [redacted] sister who sparked the
 25 investigation.

1 Duncroft girls --
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. -- not the other way around?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. But not [redacted]?
 6 A. That's right.
 7 Q. Who neither contacted nor was contacted by the police,
 8 is that right?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Hannah offers the opinion, for what it's worth, at the
 11 end of this email that [redacted] seems the most sorted?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Did you form a view in your discussions with [redacted] as to
 14 whether she was at all sorted in fact?
 15 A. No, I formed the view she wasn't. She was incredibly
 16 articulate, she was clearly a very bright woman, but the
 17 way she spoke, which you can see from both references
 18 from Hannah but also from the length of the notes of our
 19 conversations with her, she loved to talk. And I felt
 20 unlike every single other person I spoke to in relation
 21 to this, I felt she enjoyed it very much.
 22 Now did that make her less believable? I'm not
 23 really sure. But, um, [redacted] would not have made the
 24 main witness for a story.
 25 Q. So you were concerned that there might have been

1 A. The sister was not at Duncroft. The sister had been in
 2 [redacted]
 3 Q. You say the sister: you mean [redacted] sister?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. The sister had not been at Duncroft, she had been [redacted]
 6 [redacted]
 7 A. Yes, visiting Stoke Mandeville.
 8 Q. Right. So the police investigation had derived from, is
 9 this right, a complaint made by somebody against
 10 Jimmy Savile not at Duncroft at all but at Stoke
 11 Mandeville Hospital?
 12 A. Yes. We suspected that it was that way round. And that
 13 then in the course of that the police had then heard
 14 further complaints from Duncroft.
 15 Q. Did that, in the end, stack up? Did you ever
 16 understand -- did you ever find out what the spark for
 17 the Surrey Police investigation actually was?
 18 A. I think it was -- we now know from a statement the CPS
 19 gave ahead of the Panorama that there had also been
 20 a separate complaint in Sussex.
 21 Q. At times we can see in these documents there is
 22 reference to the girls contacting the police. But in
 23 fact the position is, isn't it, that obviously somebody
 24 contacted the police at some point, but what happened
 25 then was that the police contacted a number of the

1 elements of, for example, grandiosity and so on?
 2 A. Very possibly. I mean I couldn't -- talking to her,
 3 there wasn't a point where I thought, "Well, that sounds
 4 crap", but she just seemed to really enjoy it. I don't
 5 know if it was just she enjoyed being phoned up and
 6 having a conversation but, you know, I didn't think she
 7 was sorted. I just thought "she sounds articulate and
 8 clever".
 9 Q. Although she didn't sound sorted, did she sound the most
 10 sorted?
 11 A. No.
 12 Q. There were others more sorted?
 13 A. To be honest [redacted] was the most sorted.
 14 Q. Leave her to one side. In the end she does a film
 15 interview and you can judge for yourself --
 16 A. You can judge for yourself.
 17 Q. But none of the other, except for [redacted]
 18 fall into that category?
 19 A. [redacted] certainly was sorted. I had phone
 20 conversations -- I didn't have one conversation where
 21 I thought somebody sounded shambolic. Some of them were
 22 a -- some of them were a little vague in their
 23 recollections, not surprising really. You know, I felt
 24 I was speaking to perfectly reasonable people, albeit
 25 people who had had a hard life.

1 I'm thinking of ones like [redacted] and
 2 [redacted] I remember they were sorted. I mean they
 3 were constrained, a lot of the people talking to me,
 4 because they were really afraid of having their
 5 identities made public. They were adamant they wanted
 6 to tell me things and they definitely wanted things to
 7 emerge, they wanted the record on Savile to be
 8 corrected, but they were really concerned about being
 9 identified.
 10 MR POLLARD: May I just ask a question?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 MR POLLARD: Of the roughly 10, give or take one or two,
 13 people who you regarded as important witnesses for your
 14 programme, how many did you speak to personally and how
 15 many were spoken to by Hannah?
 16 A. By Hannah? I think there is only one I didn't speak to
 17 personally. And I can't remember why not.
 18 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 19 A. It was [redacted] From memory she had been very
 20 hard to get hold of, and Hannah had conducted a sort of
 21 conversation by text because again she was so concerned
 22 about being named. So I tried to get hold of her
 23 personally and didn't, but all the others I did speak
 24 to.
 25 Q. The point you made about [redacted] we can see -- I don't

Page 53

1 need to take you to it unless you want to -- from your
 2 emails your lack of enthusiasm for speaking to her.
 3 A. Yes. Because you knew you weren't going to get out in
 4 under two hours.
 5 Q. So we see you saying at one point, I think you say words
 6 to the effect of "I'm about to", as it were, "endure
 7 another conversation with [redacted]"
 8 A. By the way, one other impression of [redacted] which again
 9 added to my sort of, you know, sense that she wasn't as
 10 sorted as perhaps Hannah had thought, was that I felt
 11 she was teasing me about this letter.
 12 Obviously she -- I came to think she was my only
 13 hope of ever seeing it, because she said she had it. At
 14 one point she said "I have emailed it to you" and, you
 15 know, I had to ring her back so often to say I haven't
 16 got it. At one point I offered to drive down to Dorset
 17 to get my hands on it and she started making excuses
 18 about how her husband wouldn't want me in the house.
 19 The fact that she never did provide it, I began to
 20 think "she's playing along, she's enjoying this, it's
 21 some kind of power trip for her".
 22 Q. But it had become a very important element of you making
 23 the story to get that letter?
 24 A. And I didn't try to conceal from her the fact that
 25 I needed the letter. And then ultimately, even though

Page 54

1 it was after the story was thoroughly dropped, I still
 2 couldn't resist having one more go and telling her, "We
 3 have reached the end of the line if I don't have this
 4 letter". I just thought why not, but I had no
 5 expectation that it would produce the letter.
 6 Q. So you formed the view that [redacted] was manipulative?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Is that fair?
 9 A. About the letter.
 10 Q. Really very manipulative? Manipulating you?
 11 A. She was playing a game, yes, on the letter.
 12 Q. Playing you like a cat with a string?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Would you say that was true of most of the women that
 15 you spoke to, that they were manipulative?
 16 A. No. I didn't form that impression about any of the
 17 others.
 18 Q. If you go to page 310, please, in that same bundle --
 19 I don't know whether you have seen this. 309 is the
 20 start of it. I don't know whether you have seen this
 21 before, it is an email from Meirion Jones to
 22 Mark Williams-Thomas on 23 November. You have seen that
 23 before?
 24 A. I don't know. It looks like the original one.
 25 Q. It is like the original one. What he does is he's

Page 55

1 sending Duncroft photos and then do you see the
 2 quotation beginning:
 3 "The first time the celebrity visited ..."
 4 That's a quote from the original [redacted]
 5 self-published piece?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. If you go over the page, we get to Meirion Jones' own
 8 words as it were, "I knew about it because ...". You
 9 see that paragraph in the middle?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. "... kept an eye you on for Duncroft and
 12 Friends Reunited" and so on. Then he says at the end:
 13 "It goes without saying that most of these girls are
 14 intelligent and emotionally damaged, but with a criminal
 15 background and suspicious and extremely manipulative,
 16 which makes them particularly difficult to deal with or
 17 get them to trust us".
 18 Now Meirion Jones himself had had telephone or
 19 face-to-face contact with how many of these girls or
 20 women as they are?
 21 A. Only [redacted]
 22 Q. So he must have formed this view from something that you
 23 and/or Hannah Livingston had told him, must he not?
 24 A. No, because I wouldn't have given him that view. I mean
 25 his comment, "most of the girls are intelligent but

Page 56

1 emotionally damaged with a criminal background", he is,
 2 I think, drawing from his experiences as a young person
 3 going there and knowing about the school. It was for
 4 emotionally disturbed people, some of whom had been in
 5 trouble with the police but some of whom were just a bit
 6 too hard for their parents to handle.
 7 Q. But --
 8 A. Suspicious? Yes. Certainly that they were, as I say,
 9 very concerned, most of them, about having their
 10 identities kept out of it.
 11 Q. Suspicious of you, of the BBC --
 12 A. Yes --
 13 Q. -- or journalists?
 14 A. There was a degree of being suspicious about
 15 journalists: what's the point of talking to you, it will
 16 never come out. And obviously suspicious that their
 17 identities would be protected if that's what they
 18 wanted.
 19 The extremely manipulative, I genuinely don't know.
 20 I -- apart from [redacted] and the letter, I did not find
 21 anyone I spoke to manipulative in the least.
 22 Q. It's not your email, it's his email, but you see how
 23 that last sentence follows on from the sentence before,
 24 which is not talking about Duncroft girls in general,
 25 still less Duncroft girls in the 1970s or any particular
 Page 57

1 time in general, or Duncroft girls when I was a boy, it
 2 follows on from a sentence about "five we have talked
 3 to". I think "we've talked to five", and then it says
 4 "it goes without saying that most of these girls ..."
 5 A. Yes. I think Meirion is generalising using some of his,
 6 you know, impressions of Duncroft growing up.
 7 My account to him at the time would not have led him
 8 to suggest they were extremely manipulative. He would
 9 have known that they were suspicious. And trust and
 10 gaining their confidence was obviously a big hurdle in
 11 our conversations with them.
 12 Q. You know that the interview --
 13 A. Can I add one thing there? The other striking thing,
 14 they didn't want anything. Even [redacted] herself
 15 didn't ask for money or even a fee for doing the
 16 interview. They seemed, all of them, just very driven
 17 to put the record straight about Jimmy Savile.
 18 Q. Just on that, we might come to this letter, but one of
 19 the points that has been mentioned is that [redacted]
 20 [redacted]
 21 [redacted] That's true, she was,
 22 wasn't she?
 23 A. [redacted]
 24 [redacted]
 25 [redacted]
 Page 58

1 [redacted]
 2 [redacted]
 3 Q. Was that something discussed back at the ranch in
 4 Newsnight? You and Peter Rippon for example, did that
 5 ever come up in conversation?
 6 A. Not with me, no.
 7 Q. Do you know -- did you hear tell of it coming up in
 8 conversation? Is that a reason why one should be wary
 9 of running a story with [redacted] for example?
 10 A. No, absolutely not.
 11 Q. The 14th was the interview with [redacted]?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. We have seen that. I don't want to go into what she
 14 said, because we've seen it.
 15 If you go to page 85, please, bundle 2, it's an
 16 email from you to Hannah Livingston on the 15th.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. This is the one I had in mind. You see the word
 19 "endured"?
 20 A. The redaction is '[redacted]', by the way.
 21 Q. I have that here. It is the last sentence I'm
 22 interested in, about the women. Tell me about that.
 23 Why?
 24 A. Because we would have come back from filming the
 25 interview with [redacted] We would have marched into
 Page 59

1 the office and very positively said "We've done a great
 2 interview".
 3 Q. So the office: who were the human beings that you were
 4 referring to?
 5 A. Liz Gibbons. I would have definitely told her,
 6 especially knowing how generally hostile she was to the
 7 story, but obviously Peter.
 8 Q. So Peter's enthusiasm has been bucked up?
 9 A. Yes. You know, just it felt great, this is more of
 10 a goer now.
 11 Q. But the very next thought is about the letter?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. So that's still an important part of the jigsaw?
 14 A. Yes, as I said for me it was. It was, you know, what
 15 the hell -- what's going on with that part of the story,
 16 I wanted to know.
 17 Q. If you go to 112 then, do you have mostly a blank
 18 page --
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. -- with a couple of paragraphs at the bottom?
 21 A. Um-hm.
 22 Q. I take it -- we had this discussion earlier, I'm not
 23 going to do this every time -- you didn't blank that
 24 out?
 25 A. No.
 Page 60

1 Q. Do you remember what might have been there, when you say
 2 "see this"?
 3 A. Is it a photo? Yes, I had sent something -- it was
 4 a link for something online involving Jimmy Savile.
 5 I can't remember much more than that, but I had sent it
 6 to Meirion and Hannah.
 7 Q. The bit at the bottom of the page is something that you
 8 put on Friends Reunited?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Yes. So the "sorry to have made you grimace", that is
 11 obviously a reference to the paragraph above, no doubt
 12 some unpleasant photograph of Jimmy Savile?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. So that's a different topic. Then from "we have been
 15 approached", that's the text you put on
 16 Friends Reunited?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. And the purpose of it was to ask the people on
 19 Friends Reunited to fill in any gaps, and in particular
 20 chasing up the point about the letter?
 21 A. Um-hm.
 22 Q. Yes. And what was the response to that?
 23 A. From [redacted] --
 24 Q. No, no, I mean -- yes, from [redacted] She was a former
 25 Duncroft girl?

Page 61

1 A. Yes, I am sure she responded but I don't remember.
 2 Q. If you go to page 117, that's your email to [redacted] yes?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And then at 116, that's an email to you from [redacted] --
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. -- in response. Then at the top of 116 you to [redacted]
 7 "grim picture" et cetera, but is that as far as this
 8 went, this little trail?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. It didn't get you any further forward? Is that right?
 11 A. Um-hm.
 12 MR SPAFFORD: We need to take a break for the shorthand
 13 writer.
 14 (11.30 am)
 15 (A short break)
 16 (11.45 am)
 17 MR POLLARD: Liz, could I just resume, just with a couple of
 18 questions. We had reached the point where we were
 19 talking about the [redacted] interview and coming back
 20 to the office, and that went well and so on.
 21 Having seen all the rushes of that, there were just
 22 a couple of questions about it. She's obviously -- she
 23 makes quite a big impact when you see it all. How did
 24 you judge her overall credibility when you saw that?
 25 A. Very high. She just seemed believable. She didn't

Page 62

1 pretend to remember things she couldn't remember. [redacted]
 2 [redacted]
 3 [redacted] and I think that was why she was doing it.
 4 You know, she wanted to set the record straight and, you
 5 know, she had clearly had a hard life. [redacted]
 6 [redacted] -- you
 7 know, her home made quite an impression, it wasn't
 8 a place that was looked after, if you like. And she
 9 just radiated a woman who had had a hard life who was
 10 kind of cynical and didn't expect to be believed
 11 necessarily but was telling her story. And I found her
 12 story compelling and I believed her.
 13 MR POLLARD: Did you have any qualms about a couple of
 14 things she mentioned, one that she was clearly on
 15 medication at the time, she talked about Lithium,
 16 whether that was Librium or somebody else said it was
 17 Largactil and a different thing. She and probably
 18 several of the other girls were on some sort of
 19 medication and she also talked about being in a sort of
 20 dream-like state for part of that period, and as you say
 21 there were several things where she said, "I just don't
 22 remember the incident". Did that give you any sort of
 23 pause for thought?
 24 A. Well, no. I mean, yes, in that I registered her saying
 25 it, and of course I wondered what effect would that have

Page 63

1 on her recollection. The question is would she have
 2 been hallucinating, did she imagine things that had
 3 happened to her and in fact didn't happen and Savile was
 4 blameless. But that again is where we were relying on
 5 wider accounts and having spoken to more people.
 6 MR MACLEAN: But Savile was dead. Some people have
 7 suggested to us that it shouldn't -- not, I hasten to
 8 add BBC management -- that it shouldn't make any
 9 difference to the substance of the story, the bar that
 10 you set, whether somebody that you are accusing of being
 11 a paedophile is alive or dead. Do you agree with that?
 12 A. Well, yes, I agree with the spirit of it. But maybe not
 13 the practice. The key difference is that this story
 14 would not have run, I'm pretty sure, had he been alive.
 15 I don't think any of those people we talked to would
 16 have talked to us, for fear of being sued. You know, it
 17 is a practical fact.
 18 Q. There are two different elements there, aren't there?
 19 One element is whether the women would have talked to
 20 you in the first place for fear of being sued. That's
 21 one thing, I can see that. But then there's another
 22 question, isn't there, which is: if they did talk to you
 23 and said all the things that they said, whether any
 24 sentient broadcaster would have broadcast that piece.
 25 So there are two different stages at which things

Page 64

1 might well have been different had Savile still been
 2 alive, is that right?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 **Q.** So let's go back to this interesting and perhaps
 5 important question about the spirit and the practice.
 6 I cut you off, you were in the middle of your answer.
 7 I said:
 8 "It shouldn't make any difference if you are
 9 accusing somebody of being a paedophile whether they are
 10 alive or dead, do you agree?
 11 You said: yes, I agree with the spirit and not
 12 necessarily the practice. Then you said the key
 13 difference --
 14 **A.** I'm there again. The practice is the women were willing
 15 to talk to us and they would not have been. But I think
 16 there is something in the spirit. I mean I wasn't sort
 17 of champing at the bit to rubbish Jimmy Savile now that
 18 he was dead. I didn't come into the story, as I said to
 19 you at the beginning, with any baggage in relation to
 20 Savile, beyond the thought that he seemed a bit of
 21 a weirdo.
 22 That is why for me it was always very important that
 23 we had what I would consider a credible number of
 24 complementary accounts to justify, because I could see
 25 the clear public interest in this story if it were

Page 65

1 justifiable, and to make it justifiable I felt we needed
 2 to speak to more people. Because you had to take
 3 account of the fact that, you know they were, as I said
 4 before, women who had been compromised. They had
 5 difficult backgrounds, obviously a lot of mental health
 6 issues along the way. They were clearly disturbed --
 7 some of them very disturbed teenagers.
 8 **MR POLLARD:** Were you reconciled and happy with the idea of
 9 putting a case to air that couldn't have been put while
 10 he was alive?
 11 **A.** Well, I didn't try -- I didn't come to it when he was
 12 alive. So I was only looking at it in that context.
 13 I haven't really asked myself that question. I mean, if
 14 he had been alive, with what I had, if those women had
 15 spoken to me -- and as I say I don't think they would
 16 have done -- I think I would have still reached the
 17 conclusion that it was worth -- you know, it was
 18 important and worth running. We might have wanted even
 19 more, I don't know.
 20 **MR POLLARD:** Because there is a point, we may be coming
 21 to it later, where you are talking to a friend about the
 22 bar being put impossibly high. This, I think, has been
 23 construed as a reference to the idea that just because
 24 Jimmy Savile is dead you shouldn't drop the level of
 25 proof required to put a story out.

Page 66

1 **A.** No, that doesn't relate to that. That relates to Peter
 2 wanting us to establish from the CPS that the reason
 3 they didn't prosecute Savile was because of his age and
 4 infirmity.
 5 **MR POLLARD:** We will come to that. But one final question
 6 about this and the [redacted] interview: in the rushes
 7 we can see you going back after the main interview --
 8 **A.** Yes.
 9 **MR POLLARD:** -- and doing some sequences over again.
 10 Obviously some things just for different camera shots
 11 but some things you are getting her to say the same
 12 account over again. Why was that?
 13 **A.** That's really common practice, because obviously I was
 14 there with a producer and, you know when you are doing
 15 the interview you are in this sort of complete
 16 here-and-now state. So I would always turn to the
 17 producer at the end of an interview and say, "Have
 18 I missed anything? Or do we need to go over anything
 19 again?" To perhaps get a shorter reply for instance.
 20 **MR POLLARD:** Why might you want to go over something again
 21 that you have already gone over?
 22 **A.** To get a shorter reply might be a reason. Or, you know,
 23 to put two separate things together in one answer could
 24 be another reason. It is just -- obviously the producer
 25 has been listening to the thing cold and will very often

Page 67

1 have a view about an answer they want to hear again.
 2 **MR POLLARD:** If, if you like an outsider or
 3 a non-journalistic person was looking at that, they
 4 could construe that as going again to get the account
 5 right, rather than it being a spontaneous offering.
 6 **A.** Did you form that impression when you looked at it?
 7 **MR MACLEAN:** We will ruminate about that.
 8 **A.** Yes. I mean, I know why we go over things again. It's
 9 for, you know, reasons of practicality, that the chance
 10 may be I haven't asked something that Meirion thinks
 11 I should have asked. You know, it's almost like
 12 a safety net. It gives you more than just one chance to
 13 get at particular things in the interview.
 14 **MR POLLARD:** Okay.
 15 **MR MACLEAN:** There was one element in the rushes where, for
 16 example, [redacted] she simply lost her train of
 17 thought and at one point she confused two words,
 18 I think. I forget what they were, but I don't know if
 19 you remember that. She used the wrong word and then it
 20 stopped and there was a kind of a chuckle and you said,
 21 "You confused one word with another word", and you went
 22 back over it again.
 23 **A.** Yes.
 24 **Q.** It has been suggested to us that Peter Rippon took the
 25 view that it simply wasn't a good idea to have

Page 68

1 interviews done on film at the stage that you got them,
 2 because it was necessary to establish the full strength
 3 of the story before doing any interviews that you might
 4 not be able to use. All right?
 5 First of all, do you recognise that as a part of --
 6 topic of discussion that you had at the time?
 7 **A. Absolutely not. No discussion about that at all.**
 8 Q. Then secondly, let's assume for example that the
 9 broadcast had been made in respect of somebody who was
 10 still alive, who then the brought a legal action --
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. -- which would be an entirely foreseeable consequence.
 13 Whether it succeeded or not is another matter. There
 14 would be no question of anonymised sources with
 15 [redacted] no question of confidentiality. There she
 16 was, doing a piece. If those rushes had got into the
 17 hands of a lawyer of the defamation claimant, it is
 18 obvious, isn't it, that they would be able to punch big
 19 holes in her credibility?
 20 **A. Yes, you know, it is a fact that people like her have**
 21 **a very hard time getting their accounts believed.**
 22 Q. So, once you accept, as you have and others have said to
 23 us, that it's entirely appropriate to apply the same
 24 standards to accusing a dead person of being
 25 a paedophile as it would be of accusing a live person of

Page 69

1 being a paedophile --
 2 **A. I don't think I said that.**
 3 Q. Well --
 4 **A. I didn't quite mean that.**
 5 Q. Well, that was what I was trying to get at earlier.
 6 **A. Right. Self-evidently it's not the same standard.**
 7 **Because the standard of accusing someone who's alive, is**
 8 **that, yes, you have to stand up there in the libel court**
 9 **with the people you have used as witnesses to be tested.**
 10 **As we know, it's very easy to knock holes in what people**
 11 **are saying, particularly people with these sorts of**
 12 **backgrounds.**
 13 Q. Let's assume that a hypothetical BBC manager had come to
 14 you at some point --
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. -- and said, "Liz, you are applying the same standards
 17 of whether you call it rigour or whatever that you would
 18 apply if you were accusing a live person of being
 19 a paedophile, aren't you?"
 20 Your response would have been --
 21 **A. No, I think I would have --**
 22 Q. -- no, I'm not.
 23 **A. -- thought that unwarranted.**
 24 Q. Leave aside the question of whether it would be
 25 unwarranted interference by somebody. Somebody you are

Page 70

1 telling -- a colleague of the same rank for example,
 2 leave aside whether it is an inappropriate thing to be
 3 saying to you, as a matter of principle?
 4 **A. I think I would say, as a matter of principle, no.**
 5 **Because if you are trying to make these -- bring these**
 6 **allegations against someone who is alive, obviously you**
 7 **are thinking about the libel court and the credibility**
 8 **of your witness in those extremely difficult situations.**
 9 **But where I meant before about the spirit being the**
 10 **reasonable consideration, you've got to bring, if the**
 11 **person is dead, you've got to bring claims that, you are**
 12 **as sure as you can be, are true. That's where the**
 13 **rigour comes in. That you, you know, make -- you are as**
 14 **certain as you can, you talk to as many people as**
 15 **possible, you subject what they tell you to scrutiny, to**
 16 **cross reference.**
 17 **What I absolutely think is just because the guy is**
 18 **dead it's not a great free for all, he can't sue us,**
 19 **let's dig up a salacious story. That is absolutely the**
 20 **last approach I would ever take.**
 21 Q. In the end you had two filmed interviews, one with
 22 [redacted] and one with [redacted]?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. [redacted] didn't claim to be a victim of
 25 Jimmy Savile?

Page 71

1 **A. No.**
 2 Q. So you, as it were, only had one victim on camera?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. So that made it important, didn't it, to have the other
 5 aspect of the story, which was the police
 6 investigation -- the fact there had been this police
 7 investigation, and this business of the letter, which is
 8 why you spent so much time chasing it down?
 9 **A. More important than that were the anonymous testimonies**
 10 **to shore up [redacted] account of things. We were not**
 11 **relying on her account as a victim. It was obviously**
 12 **the main -- it would have been a big part of the film**
 13 **but I attached, you know, great importance to all the**
 14 **other people we had spoken to.**
 15 Q. You told Nick earlier you had spoken to all of them, bar
 16 one --
 17 **A. Bar [redacted]**
 18 Q. -- who, for some logistical reason, you didn't manage to
 19 talk to yourself?
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. Can we look at bundle A2-page 121? This is 16 November,
 22 an email exchange between you and Hannah Livingston.
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. You had emailed a whole bunch of people. A photograph
 25 had been tracked down which featured [redacted] and

Page 72

1 [redacted] and somebody else, yes?
 2 A. Um-hm.
 3 Q. We can see that Hannah Livingston thinks it would be
 4 ideal to track her down because [redacted] thought that she
 5 was the girl she had seen [redacted] having sex with?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Obviously that would have been a big help if you had
 8 been able to do that. You say in your reply:
 9 "Brilliant you registered that about [redacted] I was
 10 thinking we could do with corroborating about that
 11 incident".
 12 But it never got any further, that particular
 13 aspect?
 14 A. No, we couldn't find her.
 15 Q. So the position that you got to was that [redacted]
 16 thought that [redacted] was the girl she had seen
 17 [redacted] having sex with. You had a photograph of
 18 [redacted] and [redacted] which is how she had identified
 19 her, and then Hannah finds the Klunk Click which puts
 20 those two girls, as they were, at the TV centre with the
 21 perpetrator, which obviously gives legs to the
 22 suggestion that she was the victim.
 23 A. Yes. I mean it certainly takes you further to that
 24 conclusion than without the footage.
 25 Q. It doesn't in itself prove anything --
 Page 73

1 A. No, it doesn't.
 2 Q. -- but you had reached the position where you were
 3 satisfied in your own mind -- and I think Hannah was as
 4 well -- I suggest, but tell me if this is wrong, that
 5 you probably had identified the likely victim of
 6 [redacted]
 7 A. The possible victim rather than the likely victim.
 8 I mean, [redacted] thought she was the victim. But she
 9 wasn't certain about it. So I thought we'd tracked --
 10 we'd identified someone who, if we could find her, would
 11 help shed light on that.
 12 Q. How many times had [redacted] been to Television Centre for
 13 a Jimmy Savile programme?
 14 A. Certainly more than once, but I don't remember.
 15 Q. And how many times had she been to TV centre to
 16 a programme that [redacted] was on?
 17 A. I think once.
 18 Q. And how many girls had gone to that programme --
 19 A. A number.
 20 Q. -- from Duncroft?
 21 A. A number, she was not specific.
 22 Q. And they went in, was it Theo's minibus or something?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Theo being a woman?
 25 A. Being a teacher.
 Page 74

1 Q. Can we go to 194, please? It's an email from somebody
 2 called Helen Weaver to Meirion Jones.
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. You know who Helen Weaver is?
 5 A. She's from the Impact team.
 6 Q. There are a number of emails from her, which I am sure
 7 you have seen. But at the time did you have any email
 8 contact, first of all, with Helen Weaver?
 9 A. No. No.
 10 Q. Did you have any telephone or face-to-face contact with
 11 Helen Weaver?
 12 A. I may have seen her in the office and had a word, but,
 13 no, Meirion was looking after that side of it. But
 14 obviously he was keeping me in the loop because it was
 15 going to greatly affect what -- you know, the amount of
 16 extra work I would need to do on different versions.
 17 Q. Yes, because the idea was you would be all over the
 18 place --
 19 A. Yes, they anticipated that would be the case.
 20 Q. So, unless you want to say anything to us about Helen
 21 Weaver and Impact, it doesn't sound like a very fruitful
 22 way of spending our time to go through those emails,
 23 does it?
 24 A. No, not particularly. The significance of it in terms
 25 of the timeline is that this was showing that the word
 Page 75

1 was getting out that we were looking at a story about
 2 Jimmy Savile being a sexual abuser, and the response
 3 was, you know, immediate and very enthusiastic as in:
 4 this is going to be a huge story and everyone will want
 5 to run it.
 6 So in terms of the other background that I was
 7 talking about earlier, you know, gearing up to tributes
 8 in this general atmosphere of celebration of
 9 Jimmy Savile, this was, if you like, another sign that
 10 there was going to be -- you know, a collision was
 11 looming.
 12 Q. Is that quite fair? A general atmosphere of
 13 celebration? Is that really what was going on at the
 14 time or is that --
 15 A. I think so. You know, you had had the elaborate
 16 funeral, the huge coverage on the BBC and the body lying
 17 in state.
 18 Q. The elaborate funeral and the body lying in state, they
 19 were not the BBC's doing.
 20 A. But the BBC gave it massive coverage at the time.
 21 Q. There were a lot of people there. It was a big public
 22 event in that sense.
 23 A. It was an atmosphere of celebration.
 24 Q. Well, among the people lining the streets of Leeds.
 25 A. Sure, but the amount of attention it got, particularly
 Page 76

1 on the 24-hour news channels, reflected this atmosphere.
 2 Remember by this time, 18 November, the BBC's tributes
 3 had been announced. I hadn't realised it, and I don't
 4 know if it was relevant, but I heard since that on
 5 11 November there was a tribute which had gone out on
 6 BBC1 to a big audience --
 7 Q. -- there was one in November.
 8 A. -- which I had not been aware of at the time, I hadn't
 9 registered it.
 10 So in other words there was this sort of alternative
 11 reality.
 12 Q. But the one that you were focused on, the one that you
 13 heard about on the 14th, that was the Jim'll Fix It,
 14 wasn't it?
 15 A. Yes. The one on BBC1 and one on BBC2 on the 28th.
 16 Q. Did you know that there was thought given at some point
 17 to making a series; in effect reviving Jim'll Fix It?
 18 A. No. I have heard it since, but I didn't know it.
 19 Q. So when we see references in here to Vision and alerting
 20 Vision and there's one -- you are obviously familiar,
 21 presumably, with Meirion Jones' red flag email which
 22 talks about Vision and he explained to us yesterday that
 23 he could see the looming problem. The focus of that was
 24 the Christmas Jim'll Fix It --
 25 A. Yes.

1 one hand, with an open mind and a blank piece of paper,
 2 and Mr Jones' position. He did have baggage. I think
 3 it probably follows, doesn't it, that therefore, for
 4 you, that Jimmy Savile was a paedophile was only part of
 5 it, and we can see that you are trying very hard to
 6 build up the police aspect as well, because that's going
 7 to make a really good story?
 8 A. When you say, "It was only a part of it", it was the all
 9 of it. You know, we were looking at whether
 10 Jimmy Savile was a paedophile. And on that matter
 11 I went into the story, as you say, with an open mind.
 12 The police letter I could see would be another brilliant
 13 dimension to the story, plus I just wanted to know,
 14 because it was this thing that had opened up that took
 15 us ages to get an answer for.
 16 But, yes, I thought it would reinforce -- the fact
 17 that there had been a police investigation without doubt
 18 gave the story more of the sort of depth, extra layer;
 19 it was something I wanted to establish.
 20 Q. It's also a fact, isn't it, that if you had been able to
 21 establish that the investigation had run into the sand
 22 because he was old and infirm, that that was the reason
 23 that had been given, that that would really help to
 24 catapult this story about Jimmy Savile being
 25 a paedophile from a kind of tabloid story to a Newsnight

1 Q. -- with Shane Ritchie.
 2 Let's look at 324, please. I asked you about
 3 impact. Jo Mathys, she is in Impact, is she --
 4 A. She is.
 5 Q. And she's emailing Liz Gibbons on 23 November.
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Why is she -- that's part of some regular process,
 8 is it?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Why Liz Gibbons, why not Shaminder Nahal or
 11 Peter Rippon?
 12 A. Because Liz Gibbons is the commissioning editor.
 13 Q. That goes back to the point we discussed earlier?
 14 A. Yes, exactly.
 15 Q. But this wasn't Liz Gibbons' baby, this particular one?
 16 A. It was not her --
 17 Q. This was not Liz Gibbons' piece?
 18 A. No, very much not.
 19 Q. Just jumping around a bit, we see if we go to 266 you
 20 mentioned earlier, you made the point just after we
 21 resumed, that you didn't come to this with any baggage.
 22 A. Um-hm.
 23 Q. There is a distinction, isn't there, between your
 24 position which is coming to this, if I may say so, as an
 25 intelligent but, in a sense ignorant, journalist on the

1 story?
 2 A. I think it would have done in the mind of Peter Rippon
 3 from things that he's said. But I really question
 4 what's behind what you are asking me, in that a tabloid
 5 story is to sort of dismiss it and make it sound, in the
 6 way I that Peter characterised it this year, as
 7 celebrity exposé.
 8 I mean, these were such serious claims about
 9 a public figure involving the BBC -- I mean that was
 10 clearly a huge thing, not just that he had been a BBC
 11 employee but he had actually operated on BBC premises.
 12 But you know a school with vulnerable teenage girls --
 13 vulnerable but tricky teenage girls who were being
 14 looked after variously by the Home Office or the local
 15 authority, and we had had this suggestion or account
 16 from Stoke Mandeville, the hospital, and it was very
 17 vague but I think we were going to try to shoehorn it
 18 in. We had seen that he had been at Haute de la Garenne
 19 and there had been some hint of a complaint which we
 20 didn't get anywhere with.
 21 All I'm trying to say is without doubt we had
 22 a story that took in -- it was more than just some sort
 23 of tabloid silly tittle-tattle, it took in important
 24 institutions, but it suggested a pattern of behaviour of
 25 wilful targeting of the sort of people who probably

1 wouldn't be believed if they complained and who were
 2 very vulnerable.
 3 Q. I understand that. My function is -- this is
 4 a inquisitorial process, I am sure you understand
 5 this --
 6 A. Sure.
 7 Q. One of my functions is to test what you are saying and
 8 whoever comes tomorrow we will test what they say.
 9 A. If I seem fired up it is because I believe very strongly
 10 that this story, and what we were trying to do has been
 11 totally denigrated for quite suspect reasons.
 12 Q. Let's just unpick some of this. I think you accepted
 13 that in principle the police inquiry running into the
 14 sand because he was old and infirm would help to convert
 15 this into more of a Newsnight story?
 16 A. Certainly the police investigation, the police inquiry.
 17 Q. Your next answer focused on Jimmy Savile and Stoke
 18 Mandeville and the various places that he worked, and
 19 I understand that. But if you can leave out of account
 20 the fact for the moment that Jimmy Savile had been a BBC
 21 personality -- let's assume he had been a pop singer or
 22 a footballer or whatever -- pop singer is probably
 23 a good enough example for the moment, who had done all
 24 these things, some aged rock star. Without the police
 25 element this would have been a story about aged pop star

Page 81

1 is a paedophile; a predatory, nasty paedophile in
 2 a range of places a long time ago. That is not the
 3 bread and butter of Newsnight is it?
 4 A. No, but don't forget the charity aspect. Savile --
 5 setting aside, as you have asked, that he was a BBC
 6 person --
 7 Q. Yes.
 8 A. -- he was also a huge charitable figure who was, you
 9 know, knighted twice for his services to charity. So
 10 I think that elevated him as a target of public interest
 11 over and above the fact -- you know, he wasn't just in
 12 your rock star category that you are making. I think
 13 the charitable side of it, the fact that he was held in
 14 such great esteem all around the country, that he had
 15 raised so much money for good causes and was therefore
 16 identified with them added to the public interest in
 17 testing whether there was more to know about him. I
 18 don't think he was -- I don't think your example is the
 19 best one.
 20 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask, while we're on this subject
 21 of, if you like, the strength of the story, just to be
 22 a bit more specific about the issue of the supposed
 23 letter and the CPS dropping the case for the reason that
 24 was given; old and infirm and so on. It may be the case
 25 that -- and we will see this obviously when we talk to

Page 82

1 Peter Rippon -- that was, if you like, the final
 2 barrier. If that had been proven to be the case, if the
 3 letter had arrived, it may well be that he would have
 4 been happy to have run the story.
 5 So can you just explain what in your mind the story
 6 was without that element, and what the story would have
 7 been with that element, in the sense that logically if
 8 we got the extra element that would have meant that the
 9 case against Jimmy Savile had been investigated and
 10 proven to have substance and dropped for a reason that
 11 wasn't to do with the facts, as it were?
 12 A. I mean, in my mind at the time I never expected to be
 13 told that the reason the prosecution was dropped was
 14 because of his age and infirmity. It just seemed
 15 a totally unlikely thing that the CPS would have
 16 admitted.
 17 MR POLLARD: So did you think that the letter didn't exist?
 18 A. No, I think enough people had said they had seen it and
 19 had remembered that being a part of it, which is why
 20 I really wanted to see it. Because I thought that might
 21 be our only way to see if his age and infirmity had been
 22 a consideration in the decision.
 23 But, you know, the fact of the police investigation
 24 definitely added weight to the story in my mind.
 25 MR POLLARD: Does the fact that several of the women

Page 83

1 remembered seeing this letter and the terms of the
 2 letter which, it would appear, in the end wasn't written
 3 in those terms, or didn't exist in those terms, did that
 4 give you some concern about a sort of collective false
 5 memory, to use a slightly quasi-scientific term?
 6 A. No. I mean it is possible, if I'm honest -- you know,
 7 it is entirely possible. But -- and I can't say this
 8 with utter certainty, actually, so I don't know if my
 9 answer is going to be helpful. But I don't think they
 10 necessarily all got together on the letter. I'm not
 11 certain that people we'd spoken to about the letter were
 12 all in touch. Certainly both [redacted] and [redacted] were
 13 in touch and both talked about the letter. So therefore
 14 I would have to say yes, it's possible it was some
 15 collective memory.
 16 But we do know now of course that there was an
 17 investigation that was dropped for lack of evidence.
 18 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 19 A. So, you know, they knew about -- I think they were right
 20 in their memory of a letter.
 21 MR POLLARD: Yes, okay.
 22 MR MACLEAN: We can put bundle 2 away, I think, and take
 23 bundle 3 and go to page 11. Now we go to 25 November.
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. You are not actually sent this email, but you presumably

Page 84

1 discovered this pretty much instantaneously; that off
 2 the record Surrey Police has confirmed that they did
 3 investigate Savile about sexual abuse and they
 4 interviewed girls from Duncroft.
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 Q. Mr Rippon is pleased by this, if you go over the page.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. He sends an email to Meirion Jones copied to
 19 Liz Gibbons. Why is Liz Gibbons in this? It is
 20 slightly odd that having sort of got her bargepole out
 21 at the beginning of this, why is she still in the
 22 picture here?
 23 A. Because now she would come into play whether she liked
 24 it or not, because she needed to book editing, which she
 25 did. You know, it's something which at this point she

Page 85

1 needs to know what is happening directly because she's
 2 the person for organising editing, making sure that
 3 there are -- you know, all the ducks are in a row so
 4 that the piece can proceed to go on air.
 5 Q. Then if you go over the page again, Meirion replies
 6 telling Peter Rippon that:
 7 "We are hoping to interview a second victim on
 8 Monday afternoon, but we won't be sure until midday".
 9 There was a bit of shuffling around with dates.
 10 I can't remember the details, I am afraid, and it
 11 doesn't matter, I think, but the second victim that's
 12 a reference -- an inaccurate reference, actually -- to
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Now it was obviously of some importance, isn't it,
 16 whether that second person is herself a victim or
 17 merely -- well, you could be a victim, you could be
 18 a spectator in the [REDACTED] in the dressing room
 19 sense, or you could simply be a girl at the school who
 20 had heard other girls talking. But if you are in the
 21 first of those category, that obviously gives the most
 22 corroborative weight.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. You know that there is some suggestion that Peter Rippon
 25 either didn't know or hadn't registered about there

Page 86

1 being a second interview --
 2 A. On camera.
 3 Q. -- on camera at all. What interaction did you have
 4 with Peter Rippon in 2011 about the second victim, or
 5 the second interviewee?
 6 A. Yes, I mean I would never have called her a victim,
 7 because obviously I had --
 8 Q. You knew she wasn't?
 9 A. And I wasn't included in this email so I don't recall
 10 correcting Meirion. I mean, it was significant to have
 11 a second on camera interview. I'm sure I have said
 12 something to Peter, but certainly it was then, as you
 13 know, put on to the script that became ROUGHSAVILE 2
 14 that this second interview was on its way.
 15 Q. Yes, that's right.
 16 Then if you look at page 30, in the same bundle, do
 17 you see at the very bottom that single line from Meirion
 18 Jones, and then over the page it's an email to
 19 Hannah Livingston copied to you on the 27th, so two days
 20 later. Meirion has written a draft cue. That's the
 21 intro to the piece?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. We can see, can't we, that after a bit of intro about
 24 Prince Charles leading the tributes, we get straight
 25 down to the police investigation and the CPS having

Page 87

1 decided in query 2009 that he was too old and infirm to
 2 face a trial. So that was going to be the immediate
 3 fronting up of the story?
 4 A. Um-hm.
 5 Q. Then there is reference to some of the abuse having
 6 taken place after BBC recordings. Hannah Livingston
 7 makes a rather interesting correction, doesn't she, if
 8 we go back a page? She quite rightly suggests that it
 9 would be more accurate to say that they even claim that
 10 some of the abuse took place at the BBC, not merely
 11 after. After was correct, as a matter of time, but at
 12 was more precise?
 13 A. Um-hm.
 14 Q. Did that draft Q ever find its way into Peter Rippon's
 15 hands, other than as part of the ROUGHSAVILE --
 16 A. Not that I'm aware of.
 17 Q. So what was Peter Rippon furnished with?
 18 A. Um, well, I don't know if he'd have seen this Q.
 19 I mean, you know as you say it's a draft Q, as Meirion
 20 says, it's a first attempt.
 21 Q. Yes.
 22 A. What he had was the knowledge of the [REDACTED]
 23 interview is. I think two days later we sent him the
 24 ROUGHSAVILE 2 script which had clips transcribed from
 25 [REDACTED] interview and quotes transcribed from the

Page 88

1 anonymous interviews, along with what we were pretty
 2 sure Mark Williams-Thomas would say given that Meirion
 3 had been in close touch with him and knew what he
 4 thought about what we were -- how the thing was shaping
 5 up and the detail that we were getting a second
 6 interview on camera with a Duncroft pupil.
 7 Q. So where were the rushes? Where did they reside?
 8 A. With Meirion. With Meirion.
 9 Q. In his office in the BBC?
 10 A. Yes, in his open office. He has an area in the office
 11 and his normal practice is to put stuff in his files, in
 12 a drawer.
 13 Q. Would you expect not the editor of the programme, going
 14 back to our earlier discussion --
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. -- but the executive producer of a piece to view the
 17 rushes from start to finish?
 18 A. No.
 19 Q. So the information that you would expect to furnish to
 20 the executive producer of a piece in a typical story
 21 would comprise what?
 22 A. Well, the verbal account and then a script of how the
 23 story was looking. I would expect the exec producer to
 24 say, "Hang on, let's go back to the source material", if
 25 they had a problem or they wanted to make sure of

Page 89

1 Liz Gibbons on the 28th --
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. -- copied to Meirion Jones, subject JS. Was this talked
 4 about in some sort of code, was this deliberate code?
 5 A. No.
 6 Q. Why not just write Savile?
 7 A. Shorthand.
 8 Q. So we should not read anything into that?
 9 A. No, no.
 10 Q. TX, that is transmission, is Wed 7th. So that is just
 11 over a week, nine days later?
 12 A. Um-hm.
 13 Q. "We will do a day's filming this Weds", and that was
 14 with -- what was that, what is that?
 15 A. That would have been with [REDACTED] but she put
 16 it back to the following day.
 17 Q. Finishing off on Monday 5th. That was your pieces to
 18 camera?
 19 A. And the Mark Williams-Thomas interview.
 20 Q. The location of your pieces to camera had not yet been
 21 decided?
 22 A. No, no, we knew it would be at Duncroft.
 23 Q. Not at Television Centre?
 24 A. Maybe one of them would have been done at Television
 25 Centre.

Page 91

1 things.
 2 Q. And the source material here would be --
 3 A. The rushes and the notes.
 4 Q. Would be the rushes, your handwritten notes, the
 5 typed-up notes from Hannah Livingston --
 6 A. The typed-up notes, yes, I wouldn't have treated Peter
 7 to my handwriting. But, yes, everything had been typed
 8 up.
 9 Q. Is this right then -- forget about stories that don't
 10 run -- stories that do run are okayed, given the green
 11 light, whatever expression you want to use, on the basis
 12 of the reporter or the producer or in collaboration,
 13 providing the executive producer with a draft script
 14 saying: this is what we are proposing to say, as they
 15 say in Private Eye, "Will this do Ed?"
 16 Is that how it works?
 17 So there must be occasions when the executive
 18 producer comes back and says, "This won't do. I don't
 19 think this is good enough", for whatever reason. Strong
 20 enough. So what would typically happen then?
 21 A. Well in this case I would then expect a conversation
 22 where a lot more is asked of us in terms of the way
 23 we're presenting the material in that draft script.
 24 Q. Just before we get to the draft script, if you go to
 25 page 121, bundle 3, there is an email from you to

Page 90

1 Q. That's why I asked.
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. You were doing something else, a day's filming with
 4 Poppy. Who is Poppy?
 5 A. She's another producer who I was working on a story
 6 about academies with.
 7 Q. Is she Poppy Sebag Montefiore?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. You have some email traffic with her about the Jimmy
 10 Saville story as well.
 11 A. Do I?
 12 Q. Yes.
 13 A. That's how you know her name. Maybe I do, I can't
 14 remember, it was all going on at the time.
 15 Q. Did she work for the BBC?
 16 A. She is a freelance, yes.
 17 Q. So this was something about the education policy?
 18 A. Yes, yes.
 19 Q. So why does this go to Liz Gibbons and not Peter Rippon?
 20 Why is this her department?
 21 A. Because that's logistics, you know. That is saying this
 22 is going out that day, when we are going to be filming,
 23 when we are going to be finished. I'm just keeping her
 24 in the loop because now it is much more of a matter for
 25 her.

Page 92

1 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask one factual thing, where did the
 2 definite date of Wednesday 7th, TX come from?
 3 A. Well it's in the budget, in the budget called Jimmy that
 4 was identified as the date.
 5 Q. But who would have set that? Is that --
 6 A. Meirion and Peter set it in conversation.
 7 MR POLLARD: Between them.
 8 A. So when there was basically space to run it, giving us
 9 enough time to turn it round.
 10 MR POLLARD: So it would have been set some time in the
 11 previous couple of days, do you think?
 12 A. Exactly, it would have been set after 25 November.
 13 MR POLLARD: Okay, thanks.
 14 MR MACLEAN: Did you know that by this stage -- in fact I
 15 think the day before but it doesn't matter precisely,
 16 I am sure it is the day before -- that Meirion Jones had
 17 been in contact with Roger Law?
 18 A. I think he'd had a telephone call with him. I mean we
 19 didn't think that the story would be legally that
 20 difficult, but Meirion had had a phone call with him.
 21 I don't know how much detail he had given him and I know
 22 he copied him into the script ROUGHSAVILE 2.
 23 Q. So far as you are aware, did the BBC's lawyers -- Mr Law
 24 or any of his colleagues -- ever suggest that there was
 25 any difficulty with the script that you were developing?

Page 93

1 A. Not that I'm aware of.
 2 Q. So whatever sensitivity there might be for the BBC, it
 3 wasn't driven by those considerations? Legal defamation
 4 type considerations?
 5 A. No.
 6 Q. We can also see at 118, just a little bit before where
 7 we were, that by this time Meirion Jones had done what
 8 he calls a sync pull. Then if you just keep a finger
 9 there, please, and go to 125. If I have this right, you
 10 then take the sync pull he sent you at a 14.53 and you
 11 are working, we can see this from your handwritten notes
 12 on the script -- if we go to 126 there is a early draft
 13 of the script which is dropping in these gobbets, to use
 14 a legal term, of pieces from the [redacted] interview?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. I don't think -- we went through this with Meirion Jones
 17 in some detail, I don't think it is particularly
 18 fruitful to go through these, this draft script, unless
 19 you want to. Because we can see what it says.
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. Now both you and Meirion then worked on the script a bit
 22 further, didn't you, in that couple of days, the 27th,
 23 28th --
 24 A. Yes, the 29th and 30th, there were two further drafts.
 25 Q. I want to come to and pause at the 29th. If we go to

Page 94

1 page 143, this is the 29th, in the morning. What has
 2 happened is, as we have just seen, he, Meirion, gets the
 3 sync pull, you do a draft. You and he work it up a bit.
 4 It doesn't -- the details of that doesn't matter for
 5 present purposes. He then sent an email to you, Hannah,
 6 Roger Law, Peter Rippon and Liz Gibbons:
 7 "And that is a very rough script to give you an idea
 8 of what we're saying. Could put a defence in there or
 9 leave it as a prosecution case and have a defender off
 10 the back in the disco, very '70s."
 11 I find that slightly opaque. What's that
 12 a reference to?
 13 A. That we would either -- we would obviously need to give
 14 right of replies particularly in relation to Duncroft
 15 school and the BBC. Then we would either put them into
 16 the body of the film or leave it as a prosecution case,
 17 have the film setting out the allegations with a chance
 18 for the people, you know, in the dock if you like to
 19 appear in the studio as a right of reply.
 20 Q. So the people in the dock, as you put it, would be the
 21 Duncroft School? It had been closed down, hadn't it?
 22 A. Well, it was Home Office, but it's a -- it's sort of
 23 changed. I think it was local authority control. It
 24 was sort of -- both had been in charge during the time
 25 period that we were dealing with.

Page 95

1 Q. But the draft scripts rather suggest, don't they, that
 2 the person or the institution in the dock at the end of
 3 this piece -- of course there is Jimmy Savile the
 4 paedophile, we take that as read, but the institution
 5 that is in the dock is either the police or the CPS,
 6 isn't it? That is how you are anticipating finishing
 7 the piece?
 8 A. I would put the CPS ahead of Surrey Police in terms of
 9 being in the dock.
 10 Q. Let's just, as it were, register that at 143 that is
 11 a draft of the script going to, amongst others,
 12 Peter Rippon?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. And if you go on to 159, within just over an hour and
 15 a half Meirion has done a bit of further work which we
 16 went through with him yesterday, the details don't
 17 matter for present purposes, and he says:
 18 "If you haven't looked at ROUGHSAVILE ..."
 19 In other words, if you have been too busy to look at
 20 my previous email, forget about that and look at this
 21 one. And what follows then is at 160, and that is
 22 ROUGHSAVILE 2.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. And ROUGHSAVILE 2 anticipates you saying something about
 25 Jimmy Savile's funeral, a synopsis of his career Jim'll

Page 96

1 Fix It, charity work, Stoke Mandeville, Prince Charles
 2 and so on. Then you do a piece to camera, then we have
 3 Mark Williams-Thomas. Then you and Meirion are
 4 anticipating that Mark Williams-Thomas will then deal
 5 with the Surrey Police investigation and with the fact
 6 that the CPS had decided that he was too old and infirm
 7 and that that was unacceptable and was an unacceptable
 8 hushing up of Jimmy Savile's criminal activity. That's
 9 the direction of travel for the script?
 10 **A. Yes.**
 11 **Q.** If you jump to the end at 165 the piece is going to end
 12 you with saying to the camera -- piece to camera --
 13 that's why I asked you a moment ago if it wasn't certain
 14 where, Duncroft or Television Centre:
 15 "Not sure yet, with any statement from police or CPS
 16 and line about girls not believing it just happened at
 17 Duncroft. Others will now come to tell what happened to
 18 them."
 19 So in the dock, to use your word, are the police or
 20 the CPS, with the addition of the suggestion from you at
 21 the end of the piece that what might well happen as
 22 a result of this is that other people will, as it were,
 23 appear from other aspects of Jimmy Savile's life and say
 24 something nasty happened to me at X or Y or Z.
 25 Is that a fair summary?
 Page 97

1 **A. Yes, in a way where we felt we were going with this**
 2 **whole story was towards a picture where Savile had**
 3 **insinuated himself into all sorts of institutions, with**
 4 **his sort of charitable hat on, around the country. And**
 5 **it seemed to us if we'd had this account at**
 6 **Stoke Mandeville, Duncroft obviously, and Television**
 7 **Centre, it just seemed very likely that what we might be**
 8 **looking at -- and we had a whisper about Haute de la**
 9 **Garenne -- is the idea that he, you know, deliberately**
 10 **worked his way into places where he could access**
 11 **vulnerable people.**
 12 **Q.** But there is no mention in the script -- it is true it
 13 mentions the [redacted] episode at Television Centre,
 14 but by no stretch of the imagination does this script
 15 focus on what has in recent weeks been focused on, which
 16 is that the BBC has got a, so it is said, a real problem
 17 because it, as it were, allowed these things to happen
 18 on its premises.
 19 That wasn't -- that wasn't the focus of this. The
 20 focus of this was the police investigation and the CPS
 21 and the fact that Savile may have done this in other
 22 places.
 23 **A. Yes, but not the BBC.**
 24 **Q.** Is that fair?
 25 **A. I think that's completely fair based on the script.**
 Page 98

1 **But, you see, we had been a bit, um, hesitant**
 2 **I suppose -- well, we had been weighing up when do we**
 3 **approach the BBC because also in our minds we were**
 4 **afraid the BBC might somehow stop us running the story,**
 5 **given that we were implicating -- by the testimony about**
 6 **[redacted] and the dressing room and the recordings,**
 7 **the Klunk Clicks, we were implicating the BBC.**
 8 **Q.** Right.
 9 **A.** And we were alive to the possibility that it might make
 10 it harder for the piece to get on air.
 11 **Q.** Right.
 12 **A.** So we needed to contact the BBC and get some comment,
 13 but at this point that was still quite undeveloped.
 14 **Q.** So what was the embryonic thought? Who was going to be
 15 the recipient of the right to reply letter at the BBC?
 16 **A.** We would have gone through the press office.
 17 **Q.** The press office?
 18 **A.** Yes, which is the way that -- you know, like in the
 19 recent fuss since the beginning of October, BBC
 20 journalists had to direct all their inquiries through
 21 the press office.
 22 **Q.** That is common, isn't it?
 23 **A.** That is standard.
 24 **Q.** One of the BBC's rules is you are not allowed to short
 25 circuit things. If you are doing a piece about my
 Page 99

1 programme you have to go through the same channels as if
 2 you were working for ITV, The Times or The Telegraph --
 3 **A.** An outside journalist.
 4 **Q.** -- or The Guardian, whatever.
 5 **A.** Exactly. So people were expressly told not to contact
 6 me and Meirion directly.
 7 **Q.** So you said that you thought the BBC might stop you
 8 doing it. Let me see exactly what you said.
 9 **A.** We were alive to the possibility.
 10 **Q.** Can I just ask you to look, while Richard is finding
 11 that, at page 171? We have heard a bit about something
 12 called editorial policy.
 13 **A.** Yes.
 14 **Q.** Meirion told us yesterday that he spoke to the person
 15 you see named in the middle of the page called Phil
 16 Abrahams and he also spoke to somebody called
 17 Roger Mahony. What contact did you have in 2011 with
 18 editorial policy, if any, about this story?
 19 **A.** None.
 20 **Q.** So when you said a moment ago, "In our minds we were
 21 afraid the BBC might somehow stop us running this
 22 story." Which entity, which part of the BBC or which
 23 individual did you have in mind?
 24 **A.** I think just it was a corporate thing. I just imagined
 25 that, you know possibly because of the tribute
 Page 100

1 programmes going ahead it would just be seen as
 2 inconvenient and something they wouldn't want.
 3 I thought there might be resistance.
 4 Q. But no one in Vision ever communicated to you, did they,
 5 any concern about the tribute programmes?
 6 A. No.
 7 Q. And they didn't communicate with you at all about
 8 Jimmy --
 9 A. No.
 10 Q. So when you say "corporate", what does that mean? Where
 11 was the dam going to be placed in the river?
 12 A. I wasn't really sure. And that's -- you know, it's just
 13 my vague sense that there's a lot of the BBC that's
 14 right above my head, so I'd imagined it would come down
 15 through the route directly down to Peter.
 16 Q. We're on 29 November.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. You know about the email on the 30th which we're coming
 19 to?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. But up until that email, did you have any reason to
 22 think -- you may have had some background fear -- that
 23 this story was going to be stopped?
 24 A. No. No, I did have a background fear. You know, I knew
 25 it was a hot potato. It felt like it was.

Page 101

1 Q. Is this right: the first evidence or the first kind
 2 of -- where it first appeared to you that there was
 3 a real problem as opposed to an apprehended problem, was
 4 Peter Rippon's email on the 30th?
 5 A. Is that the CPS?
 6 Q. Is that right?
 7 A. Is that the one?
 8 Q. It's the one on 214. It's actually not sent to you, but
 9 I'm pretty sure it came to your attention pretty
 10 quickly.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. That one, yes?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. I just want to be completely clear about this, what
 15 you're telling us. Is it right that so far as you are
 16 concerned it was only on 30 November that it became
 17 apparent that Peter Rippon was having pretty cold feet?
 18 A. Um-hm.
 19 Q. And until then, we've seen the earlier emails and in
 20 particular the one of the 25th where he says, you know,
 21 next step is transmission date. Had anything happened
 22 between then, the 25th and the end of the 29th, to lead
 23 you to think that he was changing his mind?
 24 A. I honestly don't remember if there had been
 25 conversations, I don't recall. But I do remember this

Page 102

1 email of course and I think it was the first time it was
 2 clear in black and white that the CPS line, which I'd
 3 never thought it likely we would get verbatim, had
 4 become the test for the story going ahead.
 5 Q. What contact had you had with Helen Boaden by the end of
 6 the 29th September about this story?
 7 A. None.
 8 Q. What contact had you had with Stephen Mitchell about
 9 this story?
 10 A. None.
 11 Q. Had you discussed with Peter Rippon whether he'd had any
 12 contact about this story with either of those two?
 13 A. I remember a conversation that would have been about
 14 this time, yes, when I asked him directly if he'd spoken
 15 to Helen.
 16 Q. After this email? After you -- I can see why you would
 17 have reasoned, once you saw this, to go to Peter Rippon
 18 and say, "Well, what does X say, what does Y say, have
 19 you spoken to Z"? But before this email can you
 20 remember if there was any such discussion?
 21 A. No. I can't -- I just can't remember the precise
 22 timing.
 23 Q. The same day, we're on the 29th still, if you just jump
 24 back to 174, this is not to you but it is about you.
 25 This is about all the places that Jo Mathys had you

Page 103

1 covering these bases when the story goes out?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. So it is an indication of about how widespread an impact
 4 Jo Mathys was expecting the story to have. I assume
 5 that none of this, of course, happened because the plug
 6 gets pulled?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Before any of this comes to fruition. Because in order
 9 to do this, you would have to have finalised your own
 10 piece. When you nod --
 11 A. I beg your pardon, yes.
 12 Q. How would you characterise 214 then? Would that come as
 13 a surprise, or not a surprise; something you had feared
 14 and half expected?
 15 A. I think from memory I had known that Peter was -- the
 16 tone had changed from the excellent email of the 25th,
 17 but I remember seeing this email as a kind of a new
 18 thing, a new test that seemed to be changing the
 19 requirement from the story.
 20 Q. What happened when you learned about this at 9.37 or
 21 presumably shortly thereafter?
 22 A. As I recall on that day we were having a lot of
 23 conversations with Peter to try to keep the thing on
 24 track.
 25 Q. As a result of the email?

Page 104

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. How would you characterise those conversations?
 3 A. Well, um, I mean firm. They were firm, but they weren't
 4 sort of argumentative or antagonistic. But we felt
 5 strongly what we felt and we communicated that.
 6 Q. Just on the email, on the language. You are aware
 7 obviously there has been some talk in the press about
 8 the expression that Peter Rippon uses here, "Just the
 9 women". But you didn't understand him to be, as it
 10 were, belittling the women in that sense, did you? He
 11 was simply making the factual point that your sources
 12 were in fact the Duncroft women and the secondhand
 13 briefing which is a reference to Mark Williams-Thomas
 14 and what he's got from the Surrey Police?
 15 A. Well --
 16 Q. As a matter of fact that was correct. You might form
 17 a different view as to whether it was enough for
 18 a story --
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. -- but as a matter of fact your sources were -- leave
 21 out the word "just" -- the women and the secondhand
 22 briefing. That was true, wasn't it?
 23 A. Yes. But that's great. I mean, the secondhand briefing
 24 obviously we were due to have that formally confirmed.
 25 So we had stood up that there was a police

Page 105

1 investigation.
 2 Q. Yes.
 3 A. The numbers of witnesses we'd had were really strong.
 4 You know, we thought we had the basis for a very strong
 5 story. And I don't see what added strength that CPS
 6 line would give, because already in our minds was the
 7 fact that we had more than Surrey Police would have
 8 presented to the CPS.
 9 Q. Yes. One of the important factors that underlies this
 10 is that if the CPS was investigating something that
 11 never took account of [redacted] story at all --
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. -- then why that investigation got dropped so far as her
 14 story is concerned is neither here nor there, in
 15 a sense.
 16 A. Well, yes.
 17 Q. Right?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. So there's a -- if one had properly understood what
 20 [redacted] had been saying, and that she hadn't been to
 21 the police, it's a bit harder to make the suggestion
 22 that the CPS, "Dropping the case for the reasons the
 23 women say", it's a bit harder for that because
 24 [redacted] wasn't, for these purposes, one of those
 25 women with that case at all, right?

Page 106

1 A. Um-hm.
 2 Q. And that becomes -- and we can see from the blog -- an
 3 important element of all of this going ahead, doesn't
 4 it?
 5 A. Well, it does become very significant and I can't
 6 account for it, because I just know at the time that
 7 I came to see the fact that we'd spoken to women who the
 8 police hadn't spoken to -- as far as I was concerned
 9 that torpedoed this editorial requirement to have the
 10 CPS saying that they dropped it because of age and
 11 infirmity.
 12 Q. I think there is an email -- I think it is from mobile
 13 phones, but as it were don't quote me on that, if I can
 14 say that -- later on which says that the blog is
 15 undermined by the fact that [redacted] hadn't been to
 16 the police and the CPS and the police had never
 17 investigated her story at all.
 18 If that is right, and let's assume for the purposes
 19 of the discussion that that is a good point, surely
 20 that's a point that you and Meirion Jones would have
 21 emphasised to Peter Rippon on 30 November?
 22 A. We did. I mean, all along we would have said we have
 23 more than the police, she hasn't gone to the police,
 24 because it was such a material fact adding to the
 25 strength of what we had.

Page 107

1 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask a question on the specific
 2 subject of Peter Rippon's view of the CPS line. I think
 3 you are suggesting that his suddenly throwing in of this
 4 as a factor to decide whether the story could run or
 5 not, was very unexpected. But is clear that through the
 6 previously sort of two or three weeks he had been asking
 7 about that letter and whether you or Meirion had been
 8 saying effectively, "Yes, we're on the case. We know
 9 that the letter says the case was dropped because he was
 10 old and infirm".
 11 So it is not merely on the 30th, something that he
 12 just produces out of a hat; it had been a constant
 13 subject between the two of you and he had let it be
 14 known he was pretty keen to get this element and he
 15 considered it important.
 16 A. Sure. I considered it important, but not -- not the
 17 thing that would stop the story going ahead.
 18 Particularly given the fact that on the other hand we
 19 had more evidence than the CPS had to consider.
 20 Q. And you and Meirion made it clear to him, "Okay, we get
 21 this about the CPS, but [redacted] is new, fresh
 22 evidence which effectively, shall we say, negates the
 23 overriding value of that CPS"?
 24 A. Yes, it reduces its importance. But you see, I have
 25 obviously now, after the weekend, I have seen emails

Page 108

1 where it's -- Peter doesn't appear to have hoisted that
 2 in and I can only say I am astonished.
 3 MR MACLEAN: After this weekend?
 4 A. Yes, I got them on Friday night.
 5 MR MACLEAN: As a result of seeing the stuff from us?
 6 A. Yes. I really can't account for that because it was
 7 such a consideration in my mind, and it gave us so much
 8 more weight that I don't know how he couldn't have
 9 hoisted that in.
 10 Q. When I asked you the last question, I said let's assume,
 11 for the purposes of discussion, that it was a good point
 12 that the CPS angle was undermined by the fact that
 13 [REDACTED] hadn't been to the police.
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. And I said surely that's a point you and Meirion would
 16 have emphasised to Peter Rippon on 30th November; all
 17 along we would have said we had more than the police.
 18 Did you say it? Is it conditional or --
 19 A. No, I'm --
 20 Q. -- you did in fact say it?
 21 A. I'm positive. Definitely.
 22 Q. If you go to page 215, please, Jackie Long is a friend
 23 of yours who used to work for the BBC and now works for
 24 ITN?
 25 A. Yes, Channel 4.

Page 109

1 Q. You email here that morning about this story, and you
 2 say that Mr Rippon was, "In an absolute spin". I don't
 3 know how we are going to get this on the transcript, but
 4 what was the surrender gesture?
 5 A. He just raised both hands up in an open palmed way
 6 (raises hands palms facing out).
 7 Q. "And he told me and Mi, if the bosses aren't happy (and
 8 they won't be) I can't go to the wall on this one."
 9 The words in parenthesis, "They won't be", are those
 10 your words or his words?
 11 A. My words.
 12 Q. So what he said was, "If the bosses aren't happy,
 13 I can't go to the wall on this one"?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Is that what he said?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. He used the words bosses and wall, did he?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. Who did you understand him to be mean by the word
 20 "bosses".
 21 A. I appear assumed his bosses, Stephen and Helen.
 22 Q. You assumed it to be a news thing rather than anything
 23 bigger than that?
 24 A. Yes, possibly. They would have been who I would have
 25 thought of. I didn't take from that that they had been

Page 110

1 breathing down his neck, necessarily, but just that he
 2 wasn't going to be challenging them if they had
 3 concerns.
 4 Q. When he said, "If the bosses aren't happy", that might
 5 be thought to suggest that he hadn't yet approached
 6 them?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. So what was your understanding of the extent to which if
 9 at all Peter Rippon had, by this stage, approached the
 10 bosses?
 11 A. Um, I -- I suppose I thought -- I assumed he would have
 12 done because that would be standard practice. I didn't
 13 take from this that he had spoken to them and they were
 14 breathing down his neck. I took from it that he wasn't
 15 willing to really push it. That he didn't want to cross
 16 them full stop.
 17 Q. Just let me explore with you your reference to standard
 18 practice, because is quite important this. To
 19 understand on a run of the mill Newsnight story -- not
 20 one that is going to lead to particular great press
 21 coverage, still less what has happened with this
 22 story -- what would be the norm in terms of
 23 relationship, discussion, interaction between the editor
 24 of the programme on the one hand and his immediate
 25 superior, who in this case happens to be Stephen

Page 111

1 Mitchell?
 2 A. I'm the wrong person to ask and I can't give you chapter
 3 and verse. But there is a lot of contact. I think
 4 there is a sort of weekly arranged contact, but then
 5 they all get together twice a day to have a sort of --
 6 deputy editors, output editors, to have a conference
 7 meeting, an editorial one, about the stories of the day
 8 and the different approaches.
 9 Q. And there is nothing sinister about that, because their
 10 job, the manager's job, is to manage?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. So that would not lead the journalists and the troops on
 13 the front line to, as it were, revolt. It would be
 14 perfectly normal for the editor of the programme to be
 15 speaking to Steve Mitchell?
 16 A. Um-hm.
 17 Q. So from a journalist's point of view work on this
 18 programme, where would the line be, if you like, in
 19 terms of that interaction? There is a discussion: this
 20 is what we're doing, I have decided not to run this
 21 story, that's presumably perfectly normal?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. So you, by 30 November, simply didn't know whether there
 24 had been any contact between Mr Rippon and Mr Mitchell,
 25 or what the content of it might have been?

Page 112

1 A. No. I absolutely didn't know. But I also assumed there
 2 would have been contact.
 3 Q. When we get Peter Rippon essentially going cold on this
 4 story, you and Meirion Jones could have gone to
 5 Steve Mitchell or Helen Boaden and said, "Peter's about
 6 to make, or has made, the most ghastly error", couldn't
 7 you?
 8 A. We could have done. But it's not surprising we didn't.
 9 Q. You could have done, but you didn't. So why? Why not.
 10 A. Because that would have been highly unusual. I mean I,
 11 in my day to day world, have almost no contact with
 12 either of those people. I think I have only ever had
 13 one conversation with Helen, and three or four with
 14 Steve.
 15 Q. Over a period of?
 16 A. Years and years.
 17 Q. That doesn't sound like particularly interventionist
 18 management then?
 19 A. No, they are detached. They are -- you know, they sit
 20 in a completely different bit of the building and at my
 21 level I never encounter them, because obviously I'm not
 22 an editorial figure, I don't go to these meetings where
 23 you would interact with them.
 24 To sort of go over Peter's head, which is what you
 25 are suggesting, at this point it wasn't something

Page 113

1 I seriously considered doing because I assumed that they
 2 were of one mind because I did assume that Peter would
 3 have been involving them and discussing with them,
 4 privately or wrongly, and --
 5 Q. That's what I'm trying to get at. What if they were not
 6 of one mind? What if they disagreed?
 7 A. Obviously then.
 8 Q. What happens then?
 9 A. I would have missed a trick. But I assume they would
 10 be. To go over Peter's head would have undermined and
 11 risked antagonising him at a time when I was trying to
 12 keep him on side because I was still trying to persuade
 13 him of the merits of this story.
 14 Q. What would have happened if they had disagreed, Mitchell
 15 and Rippon -- you don't know anything about it. I'm not
 16 suggesting that they did or didn't disagree. Let's take
 17 a hypothetical theory.
 18 A. Sure.
 19 Q. What would happen if there is disagreement between
 20 editors of the programme and someone in Steve Mitchell's
 21 position, Helen Boaden's position, about whether to run
 22 a story? How would that clash, as it were, get
 23 resolved? It must be somebody's decision in the end.
 24 A. Yes. I don't know. I mean I know during the course of
 25 the last year -- for a while I have been trying to get

Page 114

1 a story, a very delicate interview in Northern Ireland
 2 and Peter was completely like: if my boss is saying no,
 3 I can't say yes, is what he said. And we did end up
 4 both of us going up to have a meeting with Stephen
 5 Mitchell who said, "Yes, go for it if you can do it."
 6 So my experience on that occasion was that Steve
 7 Mitchell is the ranking person who can say yea or nay.
 8 Q. Is that something to do with Mr Rippon and his
 9 relationship with Steve Mitchell or is that something
 10 laid down in the rules?
 11 A. I don't know about the rules but in that example Peter
 12 was immediately concerned because it would have been
 13 a risky project for a lot of reasons and he needed the
 14 say-so of his superior to even consider going ahead
 15 with it.
 16 MR POLLARD: Could I just check that, because I misheard.
 17 It wasn't that you went over Peter's head to Steve
 18 Mitchell?
 19 A. No.
 20 MR POLLARD: You know that Peter, with you --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 MR POLLARD: You both went up to see Steve Mitchell?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: That in a way seems a model of how it might
 25 work, but that for some reason wasn't possible on the

Page 115

1 Savile story?
 2 A. No. And the Savile story predated the example I'm
 3 giving you, I think.
 4 MR MACLEAN: But it also predated the current fuss, as you
 5 put it earlier.
 6 A. Yes, definitely.
 7 Q. Fuss being an interesting word in the context.
 8 A. Yes.
 9 MR POLLARD: To put it bluntly, it does seem that both you
 10 and Meirion consistently -- to be fair, consistently say
 11 that you were keen not to go over Peter's head, that you
 12 thought that would be counter-productive and that he had
 13 already perhaps taken the views of his superiors into
 14 account. But at no stage did you say, "Look, could we
 15 just have a chat with Steve or Helen about this? We
 16 think it's incredibly important and there is the
 17 possibility of the BBC making the most colossal mistake
 18 by dropping this story and running tributes, it will be
 19 a disaster", as we know Meirion was writing in his
 20 notes.
 21 You didn't push Peter to do that?
 22 A. No. I did ask him if he had spoken to Helen and he said
 23 firmly, "Yes, I have".
 24 Q. Okay.
 25 A. I just thought they were all consulted and all of one

Page 116

1 mind.
 2 MR POLLARD: When was that that he said he had spoken to
 3 Helen?
 4 A. I asked him -- I think it was on the 30th. It was
 5 a conversation in his office, just him and me and I was
 6 trying to establish the point, basically was it worth
 7 going around him so I had asked about Helen.
 8 Q. You mention that specifically in your statement, I can
 9 see that, paragraph 24:
 10 "I remember asking if he had spoken to the head of
 11 news Helen Boaden about the story, and he said he had."
 12 Okay, thank you.
 13 MR MACLEAN: Another of your emails I think we read about in
 14 the press in recent weeks. I think it is at page 220.
 15 Another email from you to Jackie Long. We are still on
 16 the 30th:
 17 "PR's latest panic attack. Liz, internally this is
 18 a very long political chain".
 19 A. Um-hm.
 20 Q. Just picking up on the next point earlier: why was the
 21 chain any longer -- leave aside the word "political" for
 22 a moment, he obviously means BBC. We could substitute
 23 BBC could we? Or even managerial? Would that be
 24 another synonym?
 25 A. Not as neutral as that. To me that suggested that there

Page 117

1 were politics involved.
 2 Q. What kind of politics?
 3 A. I took it to mean that this is going a long way up and
 4 we're not running the story.
 5 Q. So why was this chain any longer than, for example the
 6 Northern Ireland story you just mentioned?
 7 A. I think by very long, I wondered then if that was above
 8 Helen Boaden.
 9 Q. That's the inference you drew at the time?
 10 A. Yes, it is pure inference and that is what I drew.
 11 Q. Above Helen Boaden -- obviously there was the director
 12 general ultimately.
 13 A. I was thinking channel controllers. I wasn't even
 14 thinking about George as head of Vision.
 15 Q. Channel controllers, you meant -- did you infer that was
 16 a reference to the channel controller of BBC1, because
 17 of the tribute?
 18 A. Yes, and BBC2.
 19 Q. In a sense it has nothing to do with BBC2. It is just
 20 a story on a BBC2 programme.
 21 A. As far as I know, yes, they were doing another tribute
 22 as well on the 28th.
 23 Q. I see, so I'm with you. So you didn't take it as being
 24 a reference to Mark Thompson?
 25 A. No.

Page 118

1 Q. And you -- tell me if I'm wrong -- at no stage had any
 2 indication or evidence that Mark Thompson, had been
 3 involved -- or was involved at all, either on
 4 30 November or thereafter, presumably until very
 5 recently?
 6 A. No I was aware that before Christmas a foreign
 7 correspondent had brought it to his attention.
 8 Q. That is Caroline Hawley?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Had you spoken to Caroline Hawley before she went to
 11 that drinks party?
 12 A. Yes, definitely. She had been around in the office
 13 because she does work for Newsnight periodically.
 14 Q. You teed her up saying if you catch a hold of the DG
 15 tonight~..?
 16 A. I don't know that I even know that she was going to
 17 drinks party. But we were chatting and she would have
 18 asked what are you working on and we would probably have
 19 given her a sort of précis of what was happening, which
 20 was it looked like the story was not going to run.
 21 Q. The story by that time was completely dead wasn't it, so
 22 far as Newsnight was concerned?
 23 A. Yes, I cannot remember when I spoke to her, but it was
 24 before her conversation with Thompson, but I didn't know
 25 that she was going to drinks or to see him.

Page 119

1 Q. Those drinks were, I think, the 20th December. It was
 2 very close to Christmas, and by that stage your story
 3 was dead as a Dodo.
 4 A. Yes, it was.
 5 Q. Can I just show you one more and then we should break
 6 for lunch.
 7 222, please. I don't know whether you seen this one
 8 before. I don't know -- we're not entirely sure what
 9 you have seen from us already. Liz Gibbons on the 30th.
 10 Jo Mathys, we know who she is. Hannah MacInnes, Meirion
 11 explained yesterday who she was and I am afraid I have
 12 forgotten.
 13 A. She sits on the planning desk in Newsnight.
 14 Q. And Jennifer we see in the first line?
 15 A. Yes, yes, sorry. I'm not sure I know who Jennifer is.
 16 Q. Do you understand the reference to, "Next week's
 17 prospects"? What would Liz Gibbons be --
 18 A. I mean I'm --
 19 Q. What's this about, basically?
 20 A. I'm the wrong person to ask. A guess would be that it's
 21 a sort of regular channel to make sure other bits of the
 22 BBC know what Newsnight is up to.
 23 Q. Did you understand that your story was legally
 24 complicated?
 25 A. No, as I said to you before, I don't think it was

Page 120

1 legally complicated.
 2 Q. What about the reference to it being, "V. sensitive"?
 3 A. Well it was certainly sensitive.
 4 Q. For?
 5 A. Well, definitely for Liz --
 6 Q. For Jimmy Savile's family for a start.
 7 A. -- and for the public. You know, who genuinely -- you
 8 know, who had been celebrating Savile. I mean overall
 9 it was a sensitive subject.
 10 Q. So you can't help us -- it's not a criticism, it's just
 11 an observation -- with what the meeting is that's
 12 referred to in the second line?
 13 A. No, it reads like a regular thing, though, doesn't it?
 14 Q. You can't help us with whether it is noteworthy or how
 15 noteworthy that she should be saying, "Can we not
 16 mention it at the meeting?"
 17 A. No, I mean that jumps out at me of course because it --
 18 you know, it was clear that the story became
 19 inconvenient in the extreme. It wasn't -- you know,
 20 from the time it was dropped it wasn't treated like
 21 a normal dropped story. It came to be treated in an
 22 entirely different way, so I'm just mentioning it
 23 because seeing that sentence -- bearing in mind this is
 24 out of the context in which it was written, but it jumps
 25 out at me as: here we go, this could be the start of the

Page 121

1 special treatment given to this story.
 2 Q. Leave aside the question of the running or the not
 3 running of the story --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. -- let's assume for the moment that the non-running of
 6 the Newsnight story has happened. But the information
 7 that would have been in it is still there, so, as it
 8 were, the risk, from the BBC's point of view, of running
 9 tributes to someone who might very soon be discovered to
 10 be a paedophile, is still there, isn't it, even though
 11 the Newsnight story has not run? Not at least because
 12 Sky and everyone else were sniffing around.
 13 So did you impress upon Peter Rippon, Helen Boaden,
 14 Steve Mitchell or anyone else -- go to them and say, "My
 15 story is not running, but you really do need to
 16 understand that there's a problem for the BBC?"
 17 A. Not Steven, not Helen Boaden. Certainly in conversation
 18 with Peter Rippon. It -- you know, I mentioned at some
 19 point and I know Meirion did it more forcefully than me
 20 but I also did it, to say, you know it's going to look
 21 terrible.
 22 MR MACLEAN: That's 30th November, probably a place to
 23 pause, I think.
 24 A. All right. I mean I'm guessing we will come back to
 25 that, won't we? You see when I talk about special

Page 122

1 treatment for this story, unlike other dropped stories,
 2 I felt that this story came to be presented publicly as
 3 a different story.
 4 Q. We will come to that.
 5 A. Okay.
 6 Q. You mean in 2012?
 7 A. Exactly, from the beginning of 2012.
 8 Q. Also, at the end if there is something that we have not
 9 said that you want to say, you can say it, and if
 10 something occurs to you on the bus home as it were, you
 11 can send us something in writing subsequently.
 12 A. All right.
 13 MR POLLARD: Thanks Liz.
 14 (1.10 pm)
 15 (The short adjournment)
 16 (1.45 pm)
 17 MR MACLEAN: We looked at the email at 222 from Liz Gibbons
 18 about, "Very sensitive and legally complicated." So the
 19 next thing I want you to look at, please, is at 225.
 20 This is an email from Meirion Jones to himself. He
 21 explained to us yesterday that he was essentially -- it
 22 was like a memo, note to self, because, he said it had
 23 become obvious from the discussions that day that, you
 24 know there was some controversy about whether the story
 25 should run and he wanted to get the facts down in

Page 123

1 something he could record.
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. Did you do anything similar?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. He says at the bottom of the page -- I just want you to
 6 look at that last paragraph beginning, "We contacted
 7 60~..."
 8 A. Um-hm.
 9 Q. "We contacted 60 ex-Duncroft girls". That was done by
 10 Hannah and by you?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. You did it by all sorts of different research methods
 13 and then essentially phoning them up mostly?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. "Ten came back and were prepared to talk about Savile
 16 allegations. Seven said they had, themselves, been
 17 molested or assaulted, and three said they had talked to
 18 friends".
 19 Meirion made some very slight amendments to these
 20 numbers, but essentially, if you go over the page, this
 21 is where we get end of that first line:
 22 "Seven confirmed that they had been contacted by the
 23 police..."
 24 So it is not them contacting the police but the
 25 police contacting them:

Page 124

1 "... and interviewed, and a year or so later had
 2 received another letter saying that the case was not
 3 going ahead three specifically remembered that the
 4 letter said he was too old and infirm to prosecute."
 5 And then the reference to Sky.
 6 I think he made one slight correction in the
 7 numbers, but is that paragraph essentially right?
 8 **A. Yes, in terms of the numbers, I don't remember seven**
 9 **saying they had been contacted by the police. That's**
 10 **the only thing I would have a question mark about.**
 11 **Certainly a number, a good few.**
 12 Q. I think he explained there were 10 plus one, in a sense.
 13 There was ten Duncroft girls, and then the sister of one
 14 of them, who we discussed earlier had herself been
 15 a Duncroft girl, but was, as we said, the source of the
 16 Stoke Mandeville allegation.
 17 **A. Yes.**
 18 Q. Now if you go to page 231, on 2 December there was
 19 something called the Women in Film and Television
 20 Awards. I think it was at lunch time, no, it was in the
 21 evening. Did you attend that function?
 22 **A. No.**
 23 Q. We see from seating plan that Mr Entwistle, Mr Mitchell,
 24 Ms Boaden and Mr Rippon all did. I think they all did
 25 in fact attend. This is the seating plan but they did

Page 125

1 all in fact attend.
 2 Did you hear at the time about the discussion, that
 3 we now see reported, that it took place then between
 4 Helen Boaden and George Entwistle?
 5 **A. Not at the time.**
 6 Q. And not at any time until in the last few weeks?
 7 **A. Sadly.**
 8 Q. So far as George Entwistle is concerned, he just didn't
 9 feature in this story at all?
 10 **A. No.**
 11 Q. Is that right?
 12 **A. No.**
 13 Q. And so far as you were concerned, nobody from Vision
 14 featured in any active way in the story at all?
 15 **A. Exactly, not as far as I was aware.**
 16 Q. When I say, "Actively", by which I mean you had at the
 17 back of your mind that there might have been issues with
 18 the controller of BBC1 and BBC2, as we discussed
 19 earlier, but they didn't feature on your radar, if I can
 20 put it like that?
 21 **A. That's right.**
 22 Q. And the same goes for, as we discussed earlier,
 23 Mark Thompson?
 24 **A. Um-hm.**
 25 Q. And David Jordan?

Page 126

1 **A. Yes. I had no contact with him about this story.**
 2 Q. So far as you were concerned, this whole event up to and
 3 including the definitive ending of the story, the
 4 decision not to run the story, was entirely within the
 5 news part of the BBC?
 6 **A. Um-hm, as far as I was aware, yes.**
 7 Q. And the only people you had actually yourself interacted
 8 with -- apart from, as it were, down the chain to the
 9 source or sources, the women, and
 10 Mark Williams-Thomas -- the only person you had only
 11 actually enter acted with or people you had interacted
 12 to were other Newsnight colleagues up to Peter Rippon's
 13 level?
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. On the 30th -- the same day -- page 232, you emailed
 16 ROUGHSAVILE 5 to yourself and to Meirion Jones?
 17 **A. Um-hm.**
 18 Q. Why did you email it to yourself? Were you working from
 19 home or remotely or something?
 20 **A. Um, no, I would have been in the office. I would have**
 21 **done it as a Word document and by emailing it to myself**
 22 **I would have access to it at home if I wanted to, for**
 23 **reference.**
 24 Q. Those are two different emails addresses?
 25 **A. No, it's my BBC email address but the script was written**

Page 127

1 **on a Word document on my BBC computer. So by sending it**
 2 **to myself I would be able to download it at home --**
 3 Q. But it would be in your sent box anyway. You could
 4 still have found it.
 5 **A. Yes, yes.**
 6 Q. You are clogging up the BBC server there, I think.
 7 **A. Point taken.**
 8 Q. So you emailed the ROUGHSAVILE 5. We have seen the
 9 previous drafts. What had really changed, if any, by
 10 this stage?
 11 **A. I had simply fleshed it out, that was the main thing.**
 12 **I was just trying to make it fuller, to visualise it**
 13 **further and to work towards the edit.**
 14 Q. So in other words a bit more prose, rather than notes
 15 and so on?
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. So how close to a final -- it is obviously not a final
 18 script, but if it were to be suggested to us that this
 19 was really not a script at all, this isn't a script,
 20 would that be right or not right?
 21 **A. No. I mean I can see -- the Mark Williams-Thomas -- he**
 22 **have written down things that Meirion was certain he**
 23 **would say based on conversations with him, more or less.**
 24 **But obviously we hadn't done that interview, so in that**
 25 **sense it was not a final script.**

Page 128

1 Q. There were two things you hadn't done. You hadn't got
 2 Williams-Thomas on film and you hadn't got the other
 3 girl either, who is --
 4 A. [REDACTED] interview? No, that was done the
 5 following day. And we hadn't recorded my pieces to
 6 camera. So I would have fiddled with those when it came
 7 to filming them. But in terms of it's not a script,
 8 I mean, you know, you can go into an edit with all sorts
 9 of stuff that, you know doesn't necessarily pass as
 10 a full script. This is relatively a full script --
 11 Q. So if I was --
 12 A. -- ahead of an edit.
 13 Q. If I was the executive producer of all of your pieces
 14 over a 2-year period, would this be typical or atypical
 15 of the sort of thing I would get at the pretty much
 16 final decision to go ahead stage?
 17 A. Yes. Pretty much. It is obviously not always the same
 18 because we turn around things at different speeds.
 19 Sometimes I might go into an edit with a very complete
 20 script but without doubt you know the thing gets made --
 21 we have a two day edit process. I think three days had
 22 been set aside for this. The first day would have been
 23 ingesting, feeding all the rushes into edit machines,
 24 and you polish it up in the script and you also find
 25 things don't work as you had intended.

Page 129

1 Q. Who would actually be there in this? I have a mental
 2 picture of a darkroom, but who is there?
 3 A. That is broadly right. There would be the picture
 4 editor who assembles everything, and Meirion and myself.
 5 Q. And that's all?
 6 A. Um-hm.
 7 Q. Not the commissioning editor?
 8 A. No. They might put their head around the door to see
 9 how it is going. They would hope to have a viewing in
 10 time to make any changes, but obviously sometimes that's
 11 just not possible in the time available.
 12 Q. Now, the editor of the programme, is this right -- not
 13 just the commissioning person -- in this case it is one
 14 and the same, but the editor of the programme would see
 15 all these pieces before they were broadcast?
 16 A. No. No. That's not the case.
 17 Q. Wouldn't necessarily see -- so the 10 or 12-minute
 18 package, whatever this might have ended up have being,
 19 wouldn't necessarily have been seen by the programme
 20 editor?
 21 A. No, I imagine if something is controversial he would
 22 want to see it, but normally a film, you know, it would
 23 be checked over by the executive producer --
 24 Q. It would always be seen by the --
 25 A. -- not the editor.

Page 130

1 Q. It would always seen by the executive producer. So, as
 2 we have discussed earlier, it is really the executive
 3 producer who is de facto the critical person from the
 4 editing point of view --
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. -- above the reporter and the producer?
 7 MR POLLARD: Not the editor of the day?
 8 A. Sometimes they would, sometimes they are really too
 9 busy. It just depends. Quite typically a film would
 10 not be made ready until sometimes even during the
 11 evening it is due to go out and in those circumstances
 12 it might not be possible.
 13 MR MACLEAN: This script does not actually get developed in
 14 the end beyond ROUGHSAVILE 5, does it?
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. So this is pretty much where it rests. Did
 17 ROUGHSAVILE 5 go to Mr Rippon?
 18 A. I didn't send it to him, no.
 19 Q. You didn't send it to him. Do you understand that
 20 anybody else did or not?
 21 A. I don't know.
 22 Q. You don't know. Then if you go to 274, this is the next
 23 day. Help me, which day of the week is this?
 24 A. This is Thursday.
 25 Q. This is Thursday. Still no word. That's obviously

Page 131

1 a reference back to the --
 2 A. The CPS.
 3 Q. -- the one the day before:
 4 "I think we should stop work on other elements until
 5 we know for sure".
 6 What were the other elements?
 7 A. Well, all other parts of the story. I mean there was
 8 the interview with [REDACTED] but looking at the
 9 time of this email that might already have been --
 10 Q. That has been done that day?
 11 A. -- in the can. And the Mark Williams-Thomas interview
 12 and --
 13 Q. Somebody has hired the Rolls Royce to go driving around?
 14 A. And Meirion has hired the Rolls Royce, yes.
 15 Q. When was that to be filmed?
 16 A. I think on the 2nd, the Friday, the day after.
 17 Q. The Rolls Royce had been booked, I think?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. We have something somewhere. And the driver did go and
 20 some shots were filmed around about Duncroft.
 21 A. Yes, that is right.
 22 Q. Mr Rippon says:
 23 "I think we should stop working on other elements
 24 until we know for sure what we are likely to get from
 25 them because we don't really have a strong enough story

Page 132

1 without it."
 2 So at this stage Mr Rippon is putting, as it were,
 3 the decisive emphasis on the CPS and that's the --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. -- the deal breaker, as it were, for him?
 6 A. Yes. I mean, I know that we interpreted this email as
 7 a pretty negative event, in that it seemed that Peter
 8 was being more assertive now about it was that or bust.
 9 And certainly it seemed that we had gone some way away
 10 from the original commission and the evidence that we'd
 11 collated about Savile himself.
 12 Q. If you look over the page, we can see that Mr Jones
 13 dissented from this and wanted to have a chat --
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. -- and he told us yesterday that there was a chat. Were
 16 you around that day on the 1st?
 17 A. No, I wasn't.
 18 Q. You don't work on Thursday, do you?
 19 A. I don't typically work on Thursday and Friday because
 20 I'm part time. In reality I work any day of the week if
 21 I'm needed on a story, so this week I will work to
 22 Thursday because there is something I need to do, but,
 23 yes, routinely I wouldn't be in.
 24 Q. You would be at home or whatever --
 25 A. Exactly.

Page 133

1 Q. -- doing non-work things?
 2 A. But on the phone. So I was aware of everything that was
 3 happening.
 4 Q. But you were, to some extent, out of the loop on the
 5 1st?
 6 A. Well, I was not in the office but I was on the end of a
 7 phone.
 8 Q. Did you have any phone conversations, with Mr Rippon?
 9 A. No, no, no, not with Peter. I certainly did have phone
 10 calls with Peter possibly over this coming weekend, as I
 11 recall. You know I was in touch with him --
 12 Q. So your next day back in the office is due to be --
 13 A. The 5th.
 14 Q. Monday the 5th?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. Where you are going to record your piece to camera?
 17 A. Yes. Where the edit will begin in terms of feeding in
 18 the rushes. Peter says here that he'll pull it.
 19 I don't quite remember what happened but it was back on,
 20 on the Monday. We were -- the rushes were being fed
 21 into the machine.
 22 Q. If you go to page 285 -- have the inserts made it into
 23 your bundle? Do you have something that says 285.001?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. Good. You appreciate documents are coming into us the

Page 134

1 whole time?
 2 A. Sure.
 3 Q. These ones just emerged recently. Do you see in the
 4 middle of the page there is an email from
 5 Shaminder Nahal to Liz Gibbons on 1 December, in the
 6 evening at 19.50:
 7 "We have editing. Euro coverage. Great, we have
 8 editing. When is it?"
 9 Just below that, 15 minutes earlier, Liz Gibbons
 10 said:
 11 "I think it would work really well in a board room
 12 maybe it id do-able in a short turn around. We have
 13 spare editing now because of Jimmy!"
 14 So that tends to suggest that your editing was being
 15 offered up to somebody else by the evening of the first?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. The Thursday?
 18 A. So Peter had acted on what he'd said in that email and
 19 pulled editing.
 20 Q. You said it was back on by the Monday?
 21 A. Yes, definitely, because the stuff was fed into the
 22 machine. So I think there was obviously a lot of
 23 discussion, you know, push me, pull you; we were trying
 24 to keep it going.
 25 Q. Now, we know that you and Meirion Jones didn't want it

Page 135

1 to stop, as it were, and wanted to keep it going. But
 2 I'm intrigued by it being back on by the Monday. Was
 3 that something that Peter Rippon knew about?
 4 A. I just don't know.
 5 Q. Or was this, as it were --
 6 A. A freelance.
 7 Q. -- a freelance operation?
 8 A. I mean, it might have been. But that would be
 9 unprecedented. You never -- we have no authority over
 10 the edit suites. They are booked by Liz and obviously
 11 it looks from this like she had unbooked them. And
 12 I don't know how it would have come about that the stuff
 13 was getting ingested.
 14 Q. In the end, on the Monday, were you actually in the edit
 15 suite working on the Jimmy Savile story?
 16 A. No, because we didn't get that far. I think it stopped
 17 at lunch time, ie before the point at which I would have
 18 gone in to begin editing. The rushes would have still
 19 being fed in.
 20 Q. It is booked, possibly unbooked --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. -- but you are not dealing with that. So far as you are
 23 aware, when you came in on Monday morning it was on
 24 again, but it didn't happen?
 25 A. That's right.

Page 136

1 Q. Right. Then I think we can put 3 away. If we go to 4.
 2 Look at page 24, is Mr Rippon's diary, I think, of
 3 the 5th. Meirion Jones explained to us that these
 4 investigation routine meetings quite often did not
 5 happen. The Liz there is not you?
 6 A. No.
 7 Q. That is Liz Gibbons. But do you remember what happened
 8 on that Monday morning when you went in to work?
 9 A. Yes. I know that I was in early, which in Newsnight
 10 terms is 9ish or earlier. At some point shortly
 11 afterwards I saw Peter and we had a conversation in the
 12 production office.
 13 Q. To what effect?
 14 A. Well, I argued again to run our story. And I went again
 15 to what I thought were key points in its favour,
 16 particularly the fact that we had stuff the police
 17 didn't have.
 18 Q. So if you look in what I call your statement --
 19 A. My statement, yes.
 20 Q. -- at paragraph 26, page 5 you refer to many
 21 conversations. You don't distinguish them. That's
 22 perhaps not surprising:
 23 "Many conversations between Meirion and myself and
 24 Peter Rippon, some together and some separate, when we
 25 tried to persuade him to keep our story on track."

1 I used earlier, between a rock and a hard place, and he
 2 actually said, "I wish I'd never let Meirion talk me
 3 into running this story."
 4 Q. So you and Meirion were the rock and who was the hard
 5 place?
 6 A. Minimum perhaps the attitude of Liz, the deputy editor,
 7 that, you know, the thing was in bad taste and I know
 8 other people on the programme thought the same. They
 9 didn't know what we had, or in detail what we were
 10 doing, but there was certainly a view: why are we doing
 11 this story, the guy is just dead?
 12 Q. Was it that, or was it: what's Newsnight doing exposing
 13 paedophiles as paedophiles, that's not what we do?
 14 A. That might have been, but it was more the question of
 15 taste. That was the one I picked up on. Because it
 16 is -- I would say it is Newsnight's business to uncover.
 17 Back to what you said about an aged rock star, it wasn't
 18 that, it was an important, powerful celebrated figure,
 19 not least within the BBC.
 20 Q. We have been round that.
 21 MR POLLARD: I was just going to say, at this moment when
 22 the story is clearly dying, on its last legs, just
 23 before or just after, did you or Meirion say as sort of
 24 clearly as this, "Look, just come and see our main
 25 interview"?

1 And then you set out the arguments.
 2 A. Um-hm.
 3 Q. Which of those six points that you emphasise there did
 4 you highlight; did you emphasise them all equally, or --
 5 what were the killer points from your point of view?
 6 A. I think point B was the main point. But certainly C and
 7 D, because obviously Peter, by setting this test of the
 8 CPS he didn't at the time talk about institutional
 9 failure, that came later, but I wanted to stress that,
 10 you know, there were serious matters to be put to the
 11 authorities -- various authorities.
 12 In other words, I knew because he'd shown no
 13 interest in it that just saying, "Look, these women,
 14 this, that, the other", I knew that wasn't going to cut
 15 much ice and the arguments that might be more effective
 16 were the fact that we did need to go to, you know, both
 17 the BBC, the authorities at Duncroft.
 18 Q. You say at paragraph 28 that Peter was unresponsive --
 19 A. Um-hm.
 20 Q. -- as though his mind was already made up. How did he
 21 demonstrate the unresponsiveness?
 22 A. He just looked uninterested, mostly.
 23 Q. What did he say?
 24 A. Well, what I remember of that morning of the 5th was he
 25 just -- he did seem a bit sort of like, the phrase

1 A. I don't remember doing that, no.
 2 MR POLLARD: Would that have been a key card to play, or was
 3 there some reason not to say that? You have nothing to
 4 lose at that stage, because the story is clearly going
 5 to be dropped by the looks of it.
 6 A. No, we didn't. I mean we'd given sort of verbally
 7 a very glowing account of it. We'd put details from it
 8 in the script.
 9 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 10 A. So I think we thought he must have hoisted in what we
 11 had.
 12 MR POLLARD: But you have one interviewee and only one, and
 13 you presumably needed -- it's academic now, it is
 14 clearly not going to happen -- you needed to convince
 15 him this is only one interviewee on camera but she is
 16 very credible when you see her. That would be what you
 17 would presumably want to say. You must have said that
 18 to him?
 19 A. Well we certainly said that to him, but I don't recall
 20 ever suggesting he sit down and view it.
 21 MR MACLEAN: You had [redacted] by now of course, but as we
 22 discussed she was not herself a victim.
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. If you have 28 of your statement you say:
 25 "By now a lot of our colleagues in the wider

1 newsroom were aware of the story because of the
 2 involvement of the Impact team."
 3 That's not the Newsnight newsroom office, that's the
 4 BBC News operation?
 5 **A. Yes. People were asking us about it. You know, people**
 6 **we knew in other bits of the BBC. So word had got out.**
 7 Q. Where did Newsnight live at this stage?
 8 **A. Television Centre on the ground floor. And the main**
 9 **newsroom was one or two floors above.**
 10 Q. That's the answer to the question. Please go to
 11 bundle 4 and go to page 13. This is still Monday 5th.
 12 Meirion Jones emails you and Hannah and
 13 Mark Williams-Thomas at 17.03. He's now got a statement
 14 from the Surrey Police. But it doesn't say why no
 15 further action was taken.
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. We can see that he's chased that up and he'd rung the
 18 CPS and Mr Carter and he's hoping to hear more from
 19 them.
 20 **A. Um-hm.**
 21 Q. So this didn't take those proponents of this story very
 22 much further. This, on its own, wasn't going to change
 23 Mr Rippon's mind.
 24 **A. No, because this was simply confirmation of what we**
 25 **already had.**

Page 141

1 Q. You already knew, exactly.
 2 Then on the next day, the 6th, if you go to page 19?
 3 Who is Michael Hughes?
 4 **A. He's a very good friend who used to work on Newsnight.**
 5 Q. Where was he working at this stage?
 6 **A. At this stage at RTE in Dublin.**
 7 Q. So this isn't, as it were, an official email? Is this
 8 a friend to friend email?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. I'm not sure we have the start of this. Did you just
 11 kick this off or are you responding to something from
 12 him or what? It sounds as if you are starting it by
 13 saying, "How is Hughes"?
 14 **A. Yes, I can't exactly remember. [REDACTED]**
 15 **[REDACTED]**
 16 **[REDACTED]**
 17 **So I was just sort of jogging him, you know, saying hi.**
 18 Q. And then you say:
 19 "My story with Meirion that Jimmy Savile was
 20 investigated for sexual offences is terrifying the
 21 bosses."
 22 **A. Um-hm.**
 23 Q. We saw the word "bosses" before. Who are bosses here?
 24 **A. Well, I think I'm not thinking of individuals beyond**
 25 **just the general hierarchy of the BBC. Because in my**

Page 142

1 **mind I thought this wasn't just down to Peter.**
 2 Q. Is it a synonym for management or not really?
 3 **A. Yes, yes it is.**
 4 Q. Management would include Peter Rippon --
 5 **A. Stephen and Helen.**
 6 Q. In a sense was he your manager?
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. He was your line manager?
 9 **A. Um-hm.**
 10 Q. "Basically BBC1 is preparing a Jim'll Fix It special for
 11 Christmas. Having commissioned the story, Peter Rippon
 12 keeps saying he's lukewarm about it and is trying to
 13 kill it by making impossible editorial demands. When we
 14 rebut his points he resorts to saying, well it was
 15 40 years ago, the girls were teenagers, not too young,
 16 they weren't the worst kind of sexual offences
 17 et cetera."
 18 I will come to the rest of it in a minute which is
 19 also important. I think Nick asked you this earlier,
 20 but just so I can be clear, the "Impossible editorial
 21 demands", were nothing to do with the setting the bar at
 22 the same level you would for a paedophile who was still
 23 alive, but were instead the CPS aspect, is that right?
 24 **A. Yes, specifically the CPS confirming that they hadn't**
 25 **prosecuted because he was too old.**

Page 143

1 Q. So although you use "demands" in the plural --
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. I'm trying to construe this like a statute, but in fact
 4 there was one impossible editorial demand, was there?
 5 **A. Yes.**
 6 Q. So it is demand in the singular actually?
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. Namely the CPS?
 9 **A. And the decision not to prosecute.**
 10 Q. And the decision not to prosecute?
 11 MR POLLARD: How was that impossible, if you had been
 12 flagging up the existence of this letter for several
 13 weeks quite enthusiastically?
 14 **A. Well, my understanding of the letter, from the**
 15 **recollections of people who said they'd had one, was**
 16 **that it had come from the police, rather than directly**
 17 **the CPS.**
 18 MR POLLARD: Right.
 19 **A. So I'd wondered was it a more informal letter from the**
 20 **police officer who had spoken to them. That was**
 21 **speculation. It always seemed to me most unlikely the**
 22 **CPS would say openly the guy was too old.**
 23 MR POLLARD: I'm just making a general point. It seems
 24 a little hard, perhaps, to accuse Peter Rippon of making
 25 impossible editorial demands when that particular thing

Page 144

1 is only reflecting something that you and Meirion had
 2 mentioned to him as a probable element quite a long way
 3 through this process.
 4 **A. I think what I meant was that it -- it had no place as**
 5 **being the reason not to run the story.**
 6 MR POLLARD: Yes, I see, yes.
 7 MR MACLEAN: Look at the next bit, please:
 8 "He hasn't warned BBC1 about the story, so they are
 9 beavering away on the special oblivious."
 10 Just pause there. I think you say, correct me if
 11 I'm wrong, you had asked Peter Rippon at some point if
 12 he had -- yes, paragraph 31 of your statement:
 13 "During the day I asked Peter if he had contacted
 14 the controller of BBC1 about the possible conflict
 15 between our programme and Savile tributes and he said he
 16 hadn't."
 17 **A. Um-hm.**
 18 Q. You had especially raised that with Rippon. Hence you
 19 did that on the 5th and so it's not surprising you
 20 should be referring to that in an email the following
 21 day.
 22 Did you understand that it was, as it were,
 23 Peter Rippon's business to warn BBC1 about the story?
 24 **A. Yes. I thought it was a -- you know, a duty. Surely**
 25 **that he should flag up -- because Meirion and I, you**
 Page 145

1 know, we didn't just want to run the story for our own
 2 sakes but, you know, we were very aware of this
 3 uncomfortable juxtaposition of the tributes versus what
 4 we are trying to get on air.
 5 Q. Yes.
 6 **A. We thought, you know, there comes a point where it has**
 7 **to be raised and surely that would be Peter's job, just**
 8 **out of consideration. Because we had thought -- I can't**
 9 **remember if I still thought it by this stage but**
 10 **certainly earlier -- well, there's no way these tributes**
 11 **can run.**
 12 Q. Right look at the next sentence:
 13 "Liz G has said to Meirion, I want nothing to do
 14 with this. I don't want to piss off Danny Cohen, it is
 15 down to Peter".
 16 On its own that reads like a rather different reason
 17 for not running the story than the question of taste.
 18 Maybe that is what you were referring to earlier about
 19 your perception that Liz Gibbons had come to another
 20 reason for not advancing the story, is that right?
 21 **A. That was my impression.**
 22 Q. Because not pissing off Danny Cohen is not a fantastic
 23 reason for not running a story on Newsnight, is it?
 24 **A. Not at all. That's why at the time we had the feeling**
 25 **that there were other considerations, non-journalistic**
 Page 146

1 considerations, that were making this story sensitive.
 2 Q. So you are sure that Liz Gibbons had said, "I don't want
 3 to piss off Danny Cohen", or words to that effect?
 4 **A. As Meirion told it to me. To me directly there had been**
 5 **a conversation a little while earlier, which I think we**
 6 **may have touched on earlier, where she just said, you**
 7 **know, "This is not my story, if you want to talk**
 8 **about it, it is Peter's story".**
 9 Q. We talked about the hospital pass earlier.
 10 **A. Yes, it was part of that conversation. This is more**
 11 **overt.**
 12 Q. And a slight elaboration at that point, that it is not
 13 just a hospital pass, in the sense that something awful
 14 might happen here if the problem is not identified, but
 15 specifically Danny Cohen being mentioned.
 16 **A. Um-hm.**
 17 Q. We come back again to the point that you had not had any
 18 contact with Danny Cohen and you didn't know -- perhaps
 19 no reason why you should have known -- whether Danny
 20 Cohen knew what Newsnight was up to at all?
 21 **A. No, except I had at some point asked Peter.**
 22 Q. And he had said he hadn't mentioned it --
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. -- to the controller of BBC1. So far as you were
 25 concerned Danny Cohen was in ignorance of all of this?
 Page 147

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. And you were concerned about that?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. Right. If you go on a couple of pages, you will see --
 5 I don't know whether you have seen this before, just as
 6 we are passing it anyway -- if you go to page 21, this
 7 is BBC1 getting its publicity in order for Christmas.
 8 If you go to 22, you see that Jim'll Fix It with
 9 Shane Ritchie and there was outstanding interest in the
 10 one off special and there were oodles of Fix It requests
 11 and massive -- I assume that is quite a large number --
 12 12K of ticket applications and they were getting ready
 13 with this production.
 14 You presumably didn't know those details?
 15 **A. No.**
 16 Q. If we go on to page 26, if you go over the page there
 17 should be one numbered 26.001, is there?
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. Keep going, please, to 004. That's the end of an email
 20 chain. So then turn back to 3 and that is the email we
 21 just looked at, at the top of the page, do you see,
 22 "Terrifying the bosses"?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. So this is the same email chain. Then go back to
 25 page 2. We see at the bottom of 002 that's the email we
 Page 148

1 just looked at, "How is Hughes?" And here is Mr Hughes'
 2 reply. We got this from the BBC just the other day, I
 3 don't think we got this from you. How is it that we got
 4 from you the one at page 19 -- maybe we didn't, we got
 5 that from Mr Jones actually. The one we just looked at
 6 we got from Meirion Jones.
 7 **A. Yes, which is part of this trail.**
 8 **Q. Yes. But you don't seem to have supplied this email**
 9 **exchange to the BBC. That's what I'm saying.**
 10 **A. No. I -- perhaps I didn't. I mean I did go through**
 11 **everything as carefully as I could.**
 12 **Q. But it does come from -- we can see from 002 for example**
 13 **that your email to Mr Hughes did come from your BBC**
 14 **email address.**
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 **Q. So when you did this search, for some reason you must**
 17 **have missed these ones?**
 18 **A. Exactly. I mean, I -- you know I had no reason not to**
 19 **disclose everything. I did go through, but perhaps**
 20 **I missed it.**
 21 **Q. Did you do a word search or something? Did you search**
 22 **for the word Savile or something?**
 23 **A. Yes, I did different -- and JS as well.**
 24 **Q. Anyway, we have it now. Let's look at Mr Hughes' reply.**
 25 **Do you see in the middle of 002:**
 Page 149

1 "A cracker of a story there re sir Jimmy. For some
 2 reason I would have expected his victims to be male.
 3 Rippon for the high jump surely. Can you appeal above
 4 him or can you flounce? [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 **Q. What we see is he raises the question that Nick raised**
 14 **with you earlier about, as he puts it, appealing above**
 15 **him, et cetera, et cetera.**
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 **Q. Then you reply, first of all talking about a budget**
 18 **special I think in RTE that Mr Hughes had been working**
 19 **on. Then top of 02:**
 20 **"Re JS. I think Rippon is such a political ..."**
 21 **Do you see it?**
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 **Q. Your email starts at the bottom of the page before and**
 24 **goes on to this page again:**
 25 **"Re JS. I think Rippon is such a political operator**
 Page 150

1 he will be sure to be referring up all the time. At
 2 this rate [you say rather presciently] someone higher up
 3 might get taken out. I'll keep you posted. Naturally
 4 I'm expecting things to backfire at any time."
 5 Yes.
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 **Q. You don't address the, "Can you appeal above him?"**
 8 **Exactly, you don't answer that query.**
 9 **A. No.**
 10 **Q. Why not?**
 11 **A. I think I had already formed the view, as I said**
 12 **earlier, that it wouldn't make any difference.**
 13 **Q. But you had formed the view -- as you say to Mr Hughes,**
 14 **you were expecting anyway things to backfire.**
 15 **A. Yes, that's a reference to the fact that they were**
 16 **pressing ahead with the tributes regardless and that**
 17 **struck me as a problem.**
 18 **Q. That's the point I put to you a bit earlier. Even**
 19 **although your story has been canned, or is about to be**
 20 **canned or whatever, there is still the problem of the**
 21 **expectation of the backfire for the BBC. You and**
 22 **Meirion Jones think that you can see that problem**
 23 **coming.**
 24 **A. Um-hm.**
 25 **Q. So surely you would have wanted to draw to the attention**
 Page 151

1 of whoever you could your real concerns about this
 2 backfire in order to avert it?
 3 **A. Well, we had expected Peter to take our views elsewhere,**
 4 **that this would be a potential problem. Meirion wrote**
 5 **his red flag memo that in the end he didn't send, so he**
 6 **obviously had thought about going over Peter's head.**
 7 **But I mean, I think by now we just felt sort of slightly**
 8 **squashed and that it didn't matter what we thought and**
 9 **it won't make any difference.**
 10 **Q. So the backfire -- just to be clear about the backfire,**
 11 **by this stage your assumption was that your story was**
 12 **not going to air?**
 13 **A. I think it was on the 6th. Yes, it looked bad.**
 14 **Q. So the backfire wasn't going to be, as it were, a clash**
 15 **between Newsnight doing a story and the BBC's tribute,**
 16 **because Newsnight wasn't going to do the story anymore.**
 17 **So the backfire was going to be what?**
 18 **A. Well potentially we had thought, um, that this story**
 19 **would come out. Because we knew other journalists had**
 20 **spoken to the women.**
 21 **Q. Yes.**
 22 **A. We expected them to be pretty unhappy that we hadn't got**
 23 **their story on air. At some point we knew that**
 24 **Mark Williams-Thomas was going to try to do the story.**
 25 **I can't remember at what point we knew that. I don't**
 Page 152

1 think this early. And so it's possible then that I'm --
 2 you know, I thought it would come out that we'd had
 3 allegations that obviously by now I didn't think would
 4 run, but yet the tributes looked on course to run.
 5 Q. Okay. Go to page 31, please, the next day, the 7th.
 6 The BBC's publicity machine is still cranking itself up
 7 for the Newsnight story.
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. There's an email that was copied to you which refers to
 10 rumours circulating in the media for years and talks
 11 about the complaints team. That is anticipating
 12 complaints about running the story, I think?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Peter Rippon's reply over the page was that the cart was
 15 being put before the horse. Far from clear it will ever
 16 be strong enough for us even to run it and he wasn't
 17 satisfied that it was. So he's telling her to hold her
 18 horses, if I can continue the analogy?
 19 A. Um-hm.
 20 Q. Did you notice that he had copied his reply to Steven
 21 Mitchell?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. What did you draw from that?
 24 A. Well, it confirmed that the decision had gone higher
 25 than Peter. Which, as I say, I had assumed, but that

Page 153

1 was just significant to me in that it was the first time
 2 I'd seen Stephen's name.
 3 Q. But you didn't think that was -- I mean you disagreed
 4 with the decision, of course, but the fact that it had
 5 been referred up to Stephen Mitchell wasn't in itself,
 6 as it were, a sinister part of the story?
 7 A. Not necessarily. It didn't mean that Stephen had said
 8 to Peter.
 9 Q. Done something outrageous --
 10 A. No.
 11 Q. -- done something inappropriate or broken the rules?
 12 A. No, just that Peter was involving higher layers.
 13 Q. As you would expect.
 14 A. Um-hm.
 15 MR POLLARD: Did you know Stephen Mitchell pretty well?
 16 A. No. Not at all.
 17 MR MACLEAN: You said you had only had three or four
 18 conversations.
 19 A. Yes, and I think all but one postdate that.
 20 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 21 MR MACLEAN: So he was -- was he himself a journalist
 22 originally?
 23 A. Yes. And, you know, a very experienced editor on the
 24 radio side and at this point in charge of all radio and
 25 television news programmes.

Page 154

1 Q. And Peter Rippon's background was in radio?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. And I think Helen Boaden's background is in radio?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. Did that fact have any impact on Newsnight?
 6 A. Do you mean from the radio point of view or from the
 7 fact their friendships would go back a long way?
 8 Q. Not so much the friendships, but did the fact that this
 9 chain of command was radio --
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. -- in background, did that have any adverse implications
 12 for Newsnight. Did that make it more difficult for
 13 television journalists? Was there something they didn't
 14 understand or --
 15 A. [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 Q. But your story, the pictures in it of you and the

Page 155

1 Rolls Royce, and so on, your story could have aired on
 2 the radio just as easily?
 3 A. Yes, I don't think it was a particularly fair view.
 4 I think the people who tended to think it mostly were,
 5 if you like, classic film makers. Films take time and
 6 money and those are exactly the sorts of resources that
 7 are being cut back all the time. [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 A. No, not particularly. I mean, Meirion, you know, would
 20 have -- I would have said was supportive to Peter
 21 generally.
 22 Q. I'm trying to get away from the personal about -- I'm
 23 not suggesting that this is any personal antipathy
 24 towards Peter Rippon, [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 156

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 A. Well, I suppose so. I mean I think -- you know, a lot
 8 of people think that Newsnight has gone slightly
 9 downhill, that it's much more of a discussion-based
 10 programme at the expense of the thing that makes
 11 television television, ie films and pictures. [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 Q. I see.
 17 A. -- and compared to radio television is much better
 18 resourced so there is often a tension between the radio
 19 and telly side.
 20 Q. I think you said earlier -- we can check -- that
 21 Peter Rippon didn't very often perform the executive
 22 producer role, may not have ever done so in a film with
 23 you?
 24 A. I can think of one that he did, actually, but only one.
 25 Q. Was he, in your opinion, as it were, up to the job of

Page 157

1 performing that role, the executive producer role? Not
 2 the editor of Newsnight, but the executor producer role
 3 in a film like this; did he have the skills for it?
 4 A. Yes, I think so. I wouldn't have expected him -- say we
 5 had made the film, he had come in to look at it as the
 6 executive producer, I would not have expected him to
 7 have much of a role in the way we put the film together
 8 because I have sat in that viewing with him before
 9 where, you know, the thing is playing on the screens and
 10 he's reading the script, which suggests the sort of --
 11 the craft, if you like, of the pictures isn't as much of
 12 a priority to him. But, you know, journalistically,
 13 yes, he absolutely could have sat there as the exec and
 14 said it was okay.
 15 Q. [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 158

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 Q. Somebody has told us that they think, Newsnight must be
 6 led, "At all times with panache, determination and
 7 mental toughness". Do you agree with that?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 159

1 Q. [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED] He's very aware of the management
 11 above him. Whereas for instance, to compare and
 12 contrast, the previous editor --
 13 Q. Peter Barren?
 14 A. Yes, he positively relished the programme being a bit
 15 apart and slightly maverick.
 16 Q. His talents have been extolled to us.
 17 A. He would have panache. When you say panache,
 18 Peter Barren had flair and he had self-confidence. [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 Q. By November 2011 did he look like -- often you can tell,
 24 sometimes you can't tell, but often you can tell that
 25 people you work are under pressure because they start to

Page 160

1 behave differently.
 2 A. I'm not really sure. You know, I was so narrowly
 3 focused on trying to get the story. [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 Q. Okay. Let's move on to page 34, where Mr Rippon sends
 11 Meirion Jones an email:
 12 "What is the latest, did the CPS get back? There
 13 a limit to how much time it is sensible to continue
 14 chasing this."
 15 Then Meirion replied at page 42, and in this email
 16 he does -- it's not the red flag email by any stretch of
 17 the imagination, but he does say:
 18 "As you know, I already think the story not strong
 19 enough and danger of not running it is substantial
 20 damage to BBC reputation. But at no point having that
 21 discussion until I have final word from CPS."
 22 You had been party to -- it's one of the points you
 23 had been making, isn't it, to Peter Rippon? One of the
 24 ones in your statement?
 25 A. Yes.

Page 161

1 Q. One of the six points. If you go to page 38 we have
 2 your rather pithy response to the cart before the horse
 3 email?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. You sent an email, which I am afraid I can't put my
 6 finger on just at the moment, but we will dig out to
 7 you. You sent an email to Poppy Sebag Montefiore.
 8 Which is why I mentioned her earlier.
 9 A. Yes, you did, yes.
 10 Q. Which I can't put my finger on, but I'm pretty sure it
 11 said that PR was, "Trying everything to kill it".
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. It's not in itself different to the other things that we
 14 have been seeing. But I assume that was the attitude
 15 you had, that he was trying everything to kill it?
 16 A. When I had had the conversation with him on Monday the
 17 5th and he talked about, you know, it was 40 years ago,
 18 they weren't the youngest victims; that conversation,
 19 I really thought, yes, he's desperate to kill this. And
 20 if you like it doesn't matter how, it's almost like
 21 a scatter gun approach editorially.
 22 Q. Clutching at any many threads?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Yes. I am afraid I can't -- I promise you there is one
 25 to Poppy Seebag-Montefiore somewhere.

Page 162

1 Now the CPS comes out with a statement on the 9th,
 2 I think, at page 60. Which, I wouldn't say
 3 characteristically, that would be unfair, contains an
 4 error.
 5 A. Yes, the Kent thing.
 6 Q. It's not Kent it's --
 7 A. But I think that's quite a significant error.
 8 Q. Why?
 9 A. Well, it is entirely the wrong police force and it
 10 suggests that it's not a very thorough statement --
 11 Q. No.
 12 A. -- bearing in mind that this is the one that according
 13 to Peter's test will kill or save the story.
 14 Q. Anyway, there was --
 15 A. It was annoying.
 16 Q. There was a mistake and they do correct it later.
 17 Meirion sent that on to Peter Rippon. Do you see that,
 18 page 61, and predictably perhaps for Peter Rippon that
 19 was putting, as my granny would say, the tin hat on it.
 20 A. Um-hm.
 21 Q. If you go to page 66, Peter Rippon, Stephen Mitchell:
 22 "For your information Meirion has accepted my view
 23 and agreed not to pursue anymore."
 24 So there wasn't any discussion along the lines of,
 25 "We're not running this on the 7th", there's not enough

Page 163

1 here, go away and keep digging", it was, "That's it."
 2 A. No, it was killed. In that way it was unlike the normal
 3 approach to stories. I mean, if you are not --
 4 generally if you are not there with a story, you keep
 5 going. But I think Peter was so against the story that
 6 it was quite clear to us he didn't want us to keep
 7 going.
 8 Q. But he'd become against it, as we discussed earlier.
 9 The first manifestation of his being against it was on
 10 the 30th.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. Up until then he'd apparently been on side, as it were?
 13 A. Yes, very apparently. You know, we were on course to
 14 deliver the story and we were hoping to get the police
 15 to agree they had done an investigation.
 16 Q. Yes?
 17 A. And we were there.
 18 Q. Who is Stuart Denman?
 19 A. He's a friend of mine. He works on the programme.
 20 Q. He works?
 21 A. On the programme.
 22 Q. He's a BBC employee?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. So if you go to page 77, he has:
 25 "The very enticing prospect of a spicy beef

Page 164

1 burrito."
 2 **A. Yes, he's keen on those.**
 3 Q. You reply on 12th. Is this new or is this more of the
 4 same:
 5 "PR said to me and Mi, I'm not going to wall on this
 6 one."
 7 **A. Its just a sort of up sum of other things.**
 8 Q. Do I detect that there is criticism from you, obviously,
 9 of -- well, you disagree with Peter Rippon's decision?
 10 **A. Yes.**
 11 Q. But you are also critical, aren't you, of Liz Gibbons,
 12 you thought she lacked moral courage in this one, did
 13 you?
 14 **A. I was just suspicious that there were non-journalistic**
 15 **considerations in the mix. And, rightly or wrongly,**
 16 **I had thought by this point the reason she didn't want**
 17 **to have anything to do with the story, and was leaving**
 18 **it to Peter, was because it was politically awkward**
 19 **internally.**
 20 Q. There are two deputy editors?
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 Q. We see almost no mention of Shaminder Nahal. Is the
 23 explanation of the relative visibility of Liz Gibbons
 24 and the relative invisibility of Shaminder Nahal that
 25 Liz Gibbons had this role as commissioning editor?

Page 165

1 **A. I think so.**
 2 MR POLLARD: So there are two clips, is that right?
 3 **A. Yes, there were.**
 4 MR POLLARD: All right.
 5 MR MACLEAN: We now come to just before Christmas and then
 6 into January. We can see from the documents that there
 7 were stories in the press --
 8 **A. In January.**
 9 Q. -- in January. There is one in The Mirror, there is
 10 a piece in The Oldie that gets published in February.
 11 There is a piece in The Mail at some point. We can go
 12 through them and we can speculate about who was feeding
 13 information to those newspapers. But so far as this
 14 story and the BBC is concerned, when the BBC was
 15 developing its response, or one might say defence, to
 16 what was in these newspaper stories, did they do that
 17 with recourse to you at all?
 18 **A. No. I mean we didn't know -- obviously I have now seen**
 19 **the email that you sent over the weekend --**
 20 Q. Which one?
 21 **A. Is it the 21st, between Peter and Helen Deller and**
 22 **various others in the press office.**
 23 Q. Look at 131 and tell me that's the one you had in mind?
 24 **A. We hadn't been aware until recently.**
 25 Q. I think it must be this one --

Page 167

1 **A. Yes, and would deal with reporters on stories.**
 2 Q. So we should not read anything into the invisibility of
 3 Shaminder Nahal one way or the other?
 4 **A. No.**
 5 Q. Right. Now Hannah Livingston is still ploughing her way
 6 through Klunk Clicks in the background?
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. If you go to page 86, on the 13th, I think it is, you
 9 see she emails Meirion Jones.
 10 "It is them, isn't it, in Klunk Click I mean? In
 11 the photo, [redacted] on the left and [redacted] standing on the
 12 right and in the video [redacted] on the left and [redacted] on
 13 the right."
 14 And that's a reference to [redacted] and
 15 [redacted]?
 16 **A. With [redacted] yes.**
 17 MR POLLARD: I was a bit puzzled by that. Hasn't that been
 18 seen and discovered some time earlier?
 19 **A. I think maybe the earlier one was [redacted] and that**
 20 **one relates to [redacted]**
 21 MR MACLEAN: So both [redacted] and [redacted] both of them, attended
 22 [redacted]?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. The Jimmy Savile show with [redacted] and both of
 25 them also attended the one with [redacted]

Page 166

1 **A. A Spectator article that in fact enquiries were being**
 2 **made before Christmas.**
 3 Q. Is this the one you had in mind?
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. James Hardy, he is head of press?
 6 **A. He's in the comms, I don't know --**
 7 Q. A senior comms person. Sarah Beck works closely with
 8 Stephen Mitchell, I think; is that right?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. And Karin Rosine's is a press officer, I think. So you
 11 didn't know about this December stuff?
 12 **A. No.**
 13 Q. And you weren't involved in developing the line which we
 14 can -- it gets developed but we can see it here in the
 15 statement:
 16 "The BBC gathers information on hundreds of stories,
 17 not all make it to air. In this case the angle we were
 18 pursuing could not be substantiated."
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. That was not something you had anything to do with?
 21 **A. Absolutely nothing, no.**
 22 Q. If you go to 137, you see at the bottom it is the same
 23 email, the Helen Deller one, do you see?
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. And Karin Rosine said, "I'm happy if others are." And

Page 168

1 then Peter Rippon adds:
 2 "That was not quite right. There was a police CPS
 3 investigation recently, in 2007 it was into an historic
 4 indecent assault. However it was not pursued for lack
 5 of evidence. We were trying to establish if it was
 6 true, as the women alleged, that it was dropped because
 7 of Savile's age, celebrity status. We could not
 8 establish that that was the case.
 9 "PS the main allegation she made about herself did
 10 not take place at the BBC. She alleged some other
 11 incidents did involving others."
 12 Now there is a confusion. There is an elision,
 13 between the first woman, in the second line, who is
 14 probably [redacted] and the, "She made about herself", in
 15 the penultimate line, who is [redacted] isn't there?
 16 **A. I hadn't thought [redacted] was being referenced here.**
 17 Q. It may not be [redacted] Just read it carefully.
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. Start in the middle of the second line:
 20 "We were trying to establish if it was true, as the
 21 woman alleged that it was dropped because of Savile's
 22 age and celebrity status."
 23 [redacted] certainly never alleged that.
 24 **A. No.**
 25 Q. Somebody else did. It may have been [redacted] or someone

Page 169

1 else, it doesn't matter really who else it was.
 2 **A. Could it have been women, plural?**
 3 Q. Well, maybe. But it says, "The woman".
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. But then the PS:
 6 "The main allegation she [so I don't think it can be
 7 women. She, ie the singular, woman] made about herself
 8 did not take place at the BBC."
 9 That looks to me like a reference to [redacted]
 10 **A. Um-hm.**
 11 Q. Yes, you would agree?
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. So there is a confusion, isn't there, in this email?
 14 **A. Yes, definitely because, as we know, [redacted] didn't talk**
 15 **to the police.**
 16 Q. And there is an eliding, consciously or unconsciously,
 17 an elision between the accounts between two different
 18 women --
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. -- which Peter Rippon is feeding into the proposed
 21 response of the BBC and that leads to errors appearing.
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. Obviously if this is the wrong end of the stick, he has
 24 it by 21 December.
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 170

1 Q. At that stage, after the story being -- after the CPS on
 2 the 9th I think, after that what contact or discussion
 3 did you have with Peter Rippon about the Savile story?
 4 **A. I don't remember any contact at all.**
 5 Q. The next time you discussed the Savile story with anyone
 6 other than Meirion Jones --
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. -- were you talking to Williams-Thomas?
 9 **A. I didn't talk to Williams-Thomas, no.**
 10 Q. So after 9 December?
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. Is that it for you on Jimmy Savile?
 13 **A. No, I mean I spoke to Caroline Hawley later on in**
 14 **December.**
 15 Q. Right.
 16 **A. Certainly I do not remember talking to Peter again**
 17 **about it until the New Year when reports began appearing**
 18 **in newspapers.**
 19 Q. And you didn't have any input at any stage, I don't
 20 think, into the BBC's press operation responding to
 21 this?
 22 **A. No, none.**
 23 Q. Did you think that was -- did you get the impression
 24 that you had been -- you were being treated with
 25 suspicion by the BBC press office? You were seen as not

Page 171

1 being onside or whatever? Or not really?
 2 **A. I formed no view about the press office. I mean, you**
 3 **know, I had had the contact with Helen Deller on**
 4 **7 December, but, you know, we didn't know that this**
 5 **version of our story was being discussed and, if you**
 6 **like, fed into the system. So all I knew was when I saw**
 7 **it coming out the other end in newspaper reports and**
 8 **I was very concerned about it.**
 9 Q. There was a piece in The Mirror in January, I think, the
 10 Sunday Mirror?
 11 **A. On the 8th.**
 12 Q. On the 8th. If you go to page 265, you saw The Mirror
 13 piece. Meirion Jones emailed Peter Rippon, we see at
 14 the bottom of the page -- I am sure you have seen
 15 this -- and he replied:
 16 "There has been some internal briefing too, which is
 17 unsurprising but disappointing."
 18 **A. Um-hm.**
 19 Q. Do you recognise the description of internal briefing?
 20 **A. Well you mean from inside the BBC? I mean that's**
 21 **obviously what that relates to.**
 22 Q. Internal at the BBC, so somebody at the BBC is briefing
 23 The Mirror, that is what Peter Rippon is complaining
 24 about?
 25 **A. Yes, I can't remember the detail of the story but**

Page 172

1 obviously someone knew something and it was coming out.

2 I think there had been a phone call to the office to one

3 of my colleagues from The Mirror, which I think would

4 have been in the new year, so we knew that questions

5 were being asked.

6 Q. You see Meirion Jones' response to Peter Rippon at the

7 top of the page. You have seen that before, I imagine?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. "Sounds like someone who thought we shouldn't have done

10 it in the first place, probably not someone from

11 Newsnight".

12 What view did you have about who was helping The

13 Mirror to write these pieces?

14 A. I don't know. I mean -- I mean obviously someone had

15 been talking. You know, they'd had information, but

16 I can't remember if I thought it had to have come from

17 within the BBC or whether it could have come from

18 possible other routes.

19 Q. The Oldie piece, which appeared a few weeks later, was

20 not completely accurate but it was very well sourced,

21 wasn't it?

22 A. Yes, from what I remember. But when you say, "Well

23 sourced", he'd spoken to women, hadn't he? Some of

24 them; had he spoken to [REDACTED]?

25 Q. It was pretty detailed in terms of what Newsnight was up

Page 173

1 to as well, wasn't it? We will come to it. Let's not

2 take it out of sync.

3 If you go over the page to 267, look at the one at

4 17.09. Have you seen that before?

5 A. No. I haven't seen that.

6 Q. You have never seen that before?

7 A. No.

8 Q. It mentions Meirion's suspected role. The inference is

9 that some people in comms or the press office thought

10 that Meirion Jones was leaking this stuff, or providing

11 this material?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And they were happy to drip poison about him, given half

14 a chance. Do you know or suspect if you were suspected

15 of --

16 A. I don't know. No one ever said anything to me.

17 Q. No one challenged you?

18 A. No one challenged me openly. I mean I have never

19 leaked -- I should say until the recent period, I have

20 never discussed the BBC with journalists.

21 Q. You discussed your story with Jackie Long and that

22 Mr Hughes.

23 A. Yes, I discuss them with friends. Obviously they didn't

24 go further. But in terms of, you know, journalists

25 looking to run stories about the BBC, it's just

Page 174

1 something I have never done. [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 Q. Now, let me just see what you say in your statement. In

16 your statement you deal at paragraph 34 with

17 12 December, which is you having one last shot at [REDACTED]

18 about the letter.

19 A. Um-hm.

20 Q. You refer to the email about suppressing the story --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- which has been the Stuart Denman line, but I think we

23 have looked at that.

24 Then over the page, all that you say -- you see 36

25 and 37, those are the only paragraphs that lie between

Page 175

1 December 2011 and 30 September this year.

2 So what I get from that is that you had very little

3 to do with the background chatter, if I can put it like

4 that, about the Jimmy Savile story through the early

5 part of 2012, is that right?

6 A. That is right. I mean I -- you know, I did go and see

7 Peter because as far as I was concerned the story was

8 being misdescribed.

9 Q. By the BBC?

10 A. Yes, by the BBC, and a false impression was being given

11 about the nature of what we had been doing, and of

12 course I wondered why.

13 MR POLLARD: Were you still working alongside Meirion most

14 of the time, were you?

15 A. No. We have worked on projects since then, but, no, at

16 that time I was working on other things, as was he.

17 MR POLLARD: Both still working for Newsnight but just doing

18 separate things?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR POLLARD: Did he mention to you the Susan Thompson

21 approach?

22 A. Yes.

23 MR POLLARD: Which seems quite dramatic when you see the

24 story that she was telling. I wonder whether that

25 hadn't been worth, if you like, a last gasp attempt to

Page 176

1 revive the story or breathe life into it, because it was
 2 an eye witness account by a BBC person, admittedly
 3 a long time ago, but it -- I think it was judged by
 4 Meirion, perhaps you as well, that it wouldn't change
 5 Peter's mind. I think it -- did it not, get passed on
 6 to Mark Williams-Thomas?
 7 A. Yes, it did.
 8 MR POLLARD: Do you agree with that approach?
 9 A. Passing it on to Mark Williams-Thomas?
 10 MR POLLARD: Well that it wouldn't -- an assumption that it
 11 wouldn't revive the story within the BBC.
 12 A. Yes. I mean we both thought that once those tributes
 13 ran, it was over for good. Because it would only then
 14 come out that we'd known this stuff ahead of them.
 15 MR MACLEAN: Yes. I think you can put bundle 4 away,
 16 please, and take 5. The Susan Thompson approach that
 17 Nick has just referred to is at page 168. It came into
 18 Newsnight. It came in as a Newsnight email and it gets
 19 passed on by Anna Bolton to Meirion Jones. Then he
 20 replied to Susan Thompson, we see over the page at 169,
 21 and then there's a bit of follow-up over the next few
 22 pages and then it goes to Mark Williams-Thomas?
 23 A. Right. We had always thought that once some allegations
 24 were put out there, other people would come forward.
 25 That just seemed the nature of it. We thought we were

Page 177

1 building up an impression where he was, as I said
 2 before, going around different institutions working his
 3 way in there, and accessing vulnerable people and
 4 abusing them. So when that -- when the Thompson email
 5 came in, there was another one that came in alleging
 6 rape in Sussex, I think in his camper van or caravan.
 7 We thought that that was part of that process of what
 8 would happen.
 9 Q. What about the police in all of this? What was your
 10 attitude about the police investigating Jimmy Savile,
 11 which as I understand it -- well in the last few weeks
 12 we have seen in the press that that was a suggestion;
 13 that there was something for the police to investigate
 14 vis-a-vis Jimmy Savile, who was of course dead.
 15 What was your attitude to that? Did you think about
 16 that at all?
 17 A. Not really, no. I mean, in terms of the claims that we
 18 were hearing, I thought we'd hoped to put them on the
 19 air and then the police would have known about them.
 20 But because Savile was dead there didn't seem any way
 21 forward.
 22 But in terms of the individual women, I did think
 23 well, it would be up to them to go to the police, not to
 24 me.
 25 Q. Did you give any -- going to the police to say that one

Page 178

1 was assaulted by somebody who is dead sounds like
 2 probably a waste of shoe leather, doesn't it?
 3 A. Yes, I didn't seriously think about it. But in relation
 4 to [REDACTED] account of [REDACTED] --
 5 Q. I'm coming to [REDACTED]
 6 A. Right.
 7 Q. That's why I dealt with Savile first.
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. But as far as [REDACTED] is concerned, right from the
 10 very beginning you had credibly sourced -- because you
 11 obviously thought [REDACTED] was a credible source
 12 because otherwise you couldn't possibly have ever been
 13 pitching this or taking this story forward, she was a,
 14 if not the, fulcrum of it, all right?
 15 A. Um-hm.
 16 Q. Right from the very beginning you had a credible account
 17 that [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED] had committed a very serious sexual assault on
 19 somebody whom you believed to be an underage girl and
 20 had at least a lead as to the name of that person?
 21 A. Um-hm.
 22 Q. That was, surely, information that the police would or
 23 at least might have been very interested in, wasn't it?
 24 A. Yes, and I didn't give it any consideration at all,
 25 rightly or wrongly.

Page 179

1 Q. But later on, I think one of the few things that Meirion
 2 Jones and Peter Rippon agreed about when the questions
 3 started to be asked, was that you didn't have any
 4 information that could have been of any use to the
 5 police.
 6 Just take it in stages. First of all they did agree
 7 that, didn't they?
 8 A. That was in that conversation after the blog, yes.
 9 Q. But it wasn't right, was it? It wasn't correct?
 10 A. No, I think it was a slight evasion -- you know, if you
 11 are going to be strict about it, it was a slight evasion
 12 of responsibility. We didn't know who the person was
 13 for sure, we didn't know for sure that it was someone
 14 underage --
 15 Q. But knowing for sure --
 16 A. -- but the chances were that it was.
 17 Q. Knowing for sure, of course, that's not even the police
 18 or the CPS's job, all they have to do -- it is about all
 19 they have to do -- is have an investigation. The
 20 police, as you know, send it to the CPS, they then have
 21 to apply certain tests as to whether there is
 22 a realistic prospect of conviction. The only people
 23 that have to be sure is the jury, right?
 24 A. Um-hm.
 25 Q. It was not Meirion Jones' business or Peter Rippon's

Page 180

1 business or anybody else's business in the BBC to be
 2 applying that test, was it; in terms of providing
 3 information to the police?
 4 A. No. I mean, I think we should have considered it.
 5 I can see why we should have considered it, but we
 6 didn't.
 7 Q. Did you -- you are not a lawyer, so I'm not asking you
 8 whether you know the law, but did you consider yourself
 9 to be under a legal obligation to supply information to
 10 the police?
 11 A. No.
 12 Q. What did you -- what do you understand, if you do have
 13 any understanding of it at all, the legal obligation to
 14 be about furnishing information to the police?
 15 A. My understanding of it, based on other stories, is that
 16 if they want stuff we have they have to apply for it.
 17 Q. We see, in our documents, that the BBC's traditional
 18 line is precisely that. It is one of essentially
 19 reactive --
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. That if the police come knocking at the door, the BBC
 22 then considers whether they have information that they
 23 are willing to furnish to the police?
 24 A. Yes, but remember this information had come from
 25 [redacted] who we had badly let down, by not running her

Page 181

1 story. I just didn't consider taking her story to the
 2 police and then the police knocking on her door.
 3 Q. Right. But is this fair. Leave aside what the legal
 4 obligation may or may not have been, which is not
 5 a matter which it were fair to tax you with, but is it
 6 fair to say that, at least looking back on it, you felt
 7 a little uncomfortable about the way in which the
 8 [redacted] information had been dealt with?
 9 A. By..?
 10 Q. By you and Meirion Jones?
 11 A. Yes. I did feel a little uncomfortable, I thought --
 12 I thought we were evading a responsibility and if we
 13 were being, you know, good citizens we -- we clearly had
 14 an account which we believed of a crime having taken
 15 place.
 16 Q. That takes me rather neatly, if I may say so, to the
 17 next point. Which is leave aside legal obligations: do
 18 you accept that as a matter of either journalistic
 19 ethics, or just simple good citizenship, the information
 20 that had been obtained right at the beginning [redacted]
 21 [redacted] probably ought to have been taken to the
 22 police rather earlier than it was?
 23 A. Yes, I mean I see that. I mean, I -- as I say I didn't
 24 think of it in those terms, but, yes.
 25 Q. You -- I think it was you, but tell me if I'm wrong --

Page 182

1 had actually done a bit of research [redacted]
 2 [redacted]
 3 [redacted]
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. [redacted]
 6 [redacted]
 7 [redacted] What did that -- what
 8 was the use that you put -- what did you make of the
 9 information [redacted]
 10 [redacted]
 11 A. Um, well it -- it had been -- I'd seen it in the paper
 12 and obviously he was in our minds because of this story.
 13 I didn't think, therefore, we should go to the police.
 14 Q. When Meirion and Peter Rippon agreed with each other
 15 that they didn't have anything that was of evidential
 16 value to the police, did you dissent from that? Say,
 17 "Hang on --"
 18 A. Not openly. Meirion and I had a conversation about it
 19 after. In that conversation -- it was sort of trying
 20 for all concerned, in that, you know, I was very unhappy
 21 about the blog, which I regarded as a completely false
 22 account of events and total misleading of the public.
 23 I was more interested in that than whether we should go
 24 to the police [redacted]
 25 Q. Right. So?

Page 183

1 A. So I sort of let them decide that. I think collectively
 2 we evaded our responsibility, and you know I hold my
 3 hands up for that.
 4 MR SPAFFORD: Can we have a short five minute break?
 5 MR MACLEAN: 5 minutes, then we will come to the blog and
 6 then I think we will be done.
 7 (3.07 pm)
 8 (A short break)
 9 (3.15 pm)
 10 MR POLLARD: After the [redacted] interview on the
 11 14 November, did you have any further contact with her?
 12 Either you or Meirion, until the story was stood down?
 13 Did you sort of tell her how things were going or ask
 14 any follow-up questions at all?
 15 A. [redacted]
 16 she was sort of out of the loop. And I don't think
 17 there was contact until afterwards.
 18 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 19 MR MACLEAN: In the end, I think she got a text from
 20 Meirion Jones, didn't she, to say it was a non-runner --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. -- which she was less than impressed with. But that was
 23 the only other contact with her?
 24 A. I mean I have been in contact with her in recent weeks
 25 and spoken to her. But, yes, that was the only --

Page 184

1 Q. Right.
 2 Were you aware of a Freedom of Information request
 3 made by a Mr Goslett in April of this year --
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. -- made to the BBC?
 6 A. No.
 7 Q. If you take bundle 5 and go to 218, that is Mr Goslett's
 8 FOI request. You will see that there are three bits of
 9 it. The first is asking questions about Mark Thomson,
 10 Helen Boaden, Peter Rippon and Danny Cohen.
 11 The next one is a list of meetings about the
 12 unscreened Newsnight piece and then thirdly concerns the
 13 BBC's contact with police. You have never seen that
 14 before?
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. Nobody asked you for any input into the rather long and
 17 slightly tortuous process by which the BBC responded to
 18 that?
 19 A. No.
 20 Q. Have you had any contact with -- if you go to 237, which
 21 is on the 18th May, more than a month later. This is
 22 the eventual response by the BBC, which might,
 23 uncharitably perhaps, be described as telling Mr Goslett
 24 politely to get lost. And it comes from somebody called
 25 Stephanie Harris, who is head of accountability.

Page 185

1 A. I have not come across her.
 2 Q. She's not somebody you had any contact with?
 3 A. No.
 4 Q. Did you know that towards the end of August the
 5 Sunday Times started raising questions with
 6 Helen Deller?
 7 A. No, I think I have known that subsequently.
 8 Q. Yes. But at the --
 9 A. Yeah, no. No.
 10 Q. Right.
 11 A. Because what I'm thinking of is -- or am I confusing it
 12 with ITN, the request to the BBC informing them of the
 13 programme --
 14 Q. If you go -- let's see if my reference is right -- to A4
 15 again, page 133. Do you know who Mark Edmunds is?
 16 A. No.
 17 Q. No. You are not familiar with him?
 18 A. No.
 19 Q. Look in the middle of the page, you see there is an
 20 email from him to Helen Deller on 22 August.
 21 A. I think this was in what I was sent over the weekend.
 22 Yes.
 23 Q. I am afraid I don't know.
 24 A. Yes, it is this one, that is why I am remembering the
 25 Sunday Times.

Page 186

1 Q. If you look at 133 you'll see Mr Edmunds' email to
 2 Helen Deller and he's talking about a piece that is
 3 going to be published in The Sunday Times magazine, and
 4 he also mentions in the next paragraph, "You may also
 5 know that ITV..."
 6 So he flags that as well.
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. I think later there is a letter from ITV to the BBC,
 9 saying that we, ITV, are going to do this story.
 10 A. Um-hm.
 11 Q. But you were unaware of Edmunds' existence and him
 12 writing this piece and unaware of the ITV story as well?
 13 A. No, I knew the ITV story was happening. I knew it was
 14 in production.
 15 Q. Because of Mark Williams-Thomas?
 16 A. Yes. I knew it was in production and due to come out in
 17 the autumn.
 18 Q. Right. So when did you know that -- and from whom did
 19 you know -- that ITV were going to broadcast on
 20 3 October?
 21 A. Meirion and I would have been discussing the fact it was
 22 coming out. I know he'd had a conversation with
 23 Steve Mitchell about it, because he'd told me at the
 24 time and that he had spoken to Peter. I didn't speak to
 25 Peter at all. As for 3 October, I think I would have

Page 187

1 known when everyone else knew --
 2 Q. You didn't hear from Mark Williams-Thomas?
 3 A. No, I haven't directly spoken to Mark Williams-Thomas.
 4 Everything I know about him is through Meirion.
 5 Q. So in that weekend before that, it must have been Sunday
 6 30th --
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. It is all pretty much trailed in the Sunday papers, and
 9 I think even perhaps the end of the week before, that
 10 this ITV documentary is coming.
 11 You say in your statement at paragraph 38:
 12 "It was widely reported that ITV were to broadcast
 13 an exposure documentary into Jimmy Savile."
 14 You say:
 15 "The main BBC News outlets were also reporting the
 16 allegations..."
 17 By which you mean the ordinary news, News at Ten or
 18 whatever?
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. "... But they were not given access to material we had
 21 on Newsnight. Meirion told me that this was decided by
 22 Peter Rippon."
 23 Are you sure about that? Are you sure you were told
 24 by Meirion?
 25 A. To the best, yes to the best of my recollection. But

Page 188

1 I was subsequently told by David Sillitoe.
 2 Q. Who is?
 3 A. He is arts correspondent on the main network news.
 4 Q. He was trying to do his job?
 5 A. And get on with -- he knew we had material.
 6 Q. And he told you that he was blocked by Peter Rippon?
 7 A. I'm pretty sure he said by Peter. But he definitely
 8 said that he was blocked and not allowed to be in touch
 9 with us directly.
 10 Q. What is wrong or odd about Peter Rippon taking that
 11 view, if anything?
 12 A. Well, when I was told that -- I think I'm right that
 13 I was told it -- I would have seen it as Peter's
 14 attitude to the story again, blocking it, not wanting it
 15 out there. So that would be what's wrong with it. It
 16 might be that in terms of BBC process he's perfectly
 17 entitled to say to other bits of the BBC: go through the
 18 press office in the normal way.
 19 Q. That point, about go to the press office in the normal
 20 way, those are the rules, aren't they?
 21 A. They are the rules, yes.
 22 Q. So Peter Rippon was simply obeying the rules. Perhaps
 23 to the frustration of somebody in Mr Sillitoe's
 24 position, I can understand that.
 25 A. Sure.

1 blog. We know that it was corrected by the BBC.
 2 A. It was partially corrected.
 3 Q. I'm coming to that. There were corrections to it by the
 4 BBC, which Meirion Jones certainly thought didn't go far
 5 yourself, and I think you thought didn't go far enough.
 6 There were still mistakes and errors in it, right?
 7 A. Um-hm.
 8 Q. So you say that there were -- the blog was published and
 9 there were errors in it, it was inaccurate. It might be
 10 that the falsities in it, or the inaccuracies in it,
 11 which ever word you want to choose, one possibility is
 12 that they were knowingly false and the whole thing was,
 13 as it were, a deliberate pack of lies. That is one
 14 possibility.
 15 Another possibility is that Mr Rippon was doing his
 16 best to recall what the facts were and in some respects
 17 got them wrong. There is no doubt any other number of
 18 possibilities in between, but what's your position if
 19 you have one about how those --
 20 A. Well, I think at the very least he got things wrong and
 21 I think there's a degree of wilfulness about it,
 22 because, you know, putting something on the public
 23 record like that, it's a very serious statement. As we
 24 know, the BBC built their entire public position in some
 25 cases very aggressively around the account that Peter

1 Q. But he was playing by the rules?
 2 A. Playing by the rules, but in a convenient way given that
 3 I firmly had the impression he didn't want the nature of
 4 our story to be in the public domain.
 5 Q. You say convenient, he might say appropriate?
 6 A. Indeed. But my view is that he's gone to quite
 7 considerable lengths to stop an accurate public account
 8 of what Meirion and I were doing last year.
 9 Q. Well that comes quite close, doesn't it, to an
 10 allegation of bad faith about the blog. Maybe that is
 11 what you are saying. But Peter Rippon, we know, sets
 12 out on 2 October the blog. Did you know that he had
 13 actually provided something that was pretty similar to
 14 the blog, but slightly different, to Steve Mitchell and
 15 Helen Boaden on the 1st?
 16 A. No.
 17 Q. He was asked to do -- I forget how it is described -- an
 18 account. He's asked to produce some sort of an account
 19 which goes to Mitchell and Boaden. Then it gets kind of
 20 worked into the blog. It's not all there, but it is
 21 worked into the blog that is published on the 2nd.
 22 Do you suggest that Peter Rippon couldn't honestly
 23 have set out the account in the blog that he did?
 24 A. You mean am I accusing him of bad faith?
 25 Q. You say that there were all sorts of problems with the

1 set out. So I think he had a duty to make it as
 2 accurate as possible and he didn't consult -- well, I
 3 don't think he consulted Meirion, although I think there
 4 was one account suggesting he did. He certainly didn't
 5 consult me and I would never have agreed that he should
 6 say what he said because it was so far from correct.
 7 So in other words, if it was in good faith, which as
 8 you say is a possibility, at the very least he's guilty
 9 of gross carelessness, especially given how that then,
 10 you know, caused all sorts of other senior BBC people to
 11 mislead the public.
 12 Q. Tell me this is wrong: the facts that you know are that
 13 Mr Rippon published the blog?
 14 A. Um-hm.
 15 Q. You -- tell me if this is wrong, but my understanding is
 16 you don't have any direct knowledge yourself as to
 17 exactly how that blog came about, is that right?
 18 Although when you saw it you immediately could spot that
 19 there were any number of problems with it, which you
 20 have set out. Let's assume for the moment you are right
 21 about that and, as I say, the BBC did make some
 22 corrections eventually.
 23 A. Um-hm.
 24 Q. What direct knowledge do you have about what happened
 25 with Peter Rippon and above after the publication of the

1 blog until the corrections?
 2 **A. I know very little. Except I -- you know, I did go over**
 3 **Peter's head on this, because as soon as I read it**
 4 **I knew that he was, you know, putting forward a totally**
 5 **misleading account, which to me built on the earlier**
 6 **misleading statements from the press office.**
 7 Q. Over his head, you mean involving Steve Mitchell?
 8 **A. Involving Steve Mitchell. Initially I copied him in on**
 9 **an email and then I stewed for a bit and arranged to see**
 10 **Steve that day.**
 11 Q. Right. That day --
 12 **A. The 3rd.**
 13 Q. -- must be the 3rd.
 14 Now let me just show you a couple of things in
 15 bundle 7. It was something called a chain of events.
 16 That's the terminology I was struggling for a minute
 17 ago. If we go to 191, that was the phrase I couldn't
 18 dig out from my memory a moment ago.
 19 On 2 October in the afternoon at 12.15 he sent to
 20 Mr Mitchell and to Helen Boaden something called
 21 a Savile narrative, the chain of events, and he said he
 22 would now work on the blog. We don't need to dwell
 23 on it. I just need to show you two paragraphs. You see
 24 there it is "key witness" and "key witness", the same
 25 point we had before.

1 I take it you didn't have any involvement in the
 2 development of this line? Do you remember seeing this
 3 line put out at the time and if so what did you make of
 4 it?
 5 **A. Um, I don't remember precisely.**
 6 Q. It's a bit odd, isn't it? This line?
 7 **A. That criminal actions --**
 8 Q. Because, as we discussed earlier, what were the police
 9 going to do in terms of investigating criminal actions
 10 by Jimmy Savile?
 11 When Mr Rippon wrote his blog, which is at page 84,
 12 he sent it -- at least a draft of it -- yes, to make
 13 sense of this you see at 86 a draft of the blog.
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. Peter Rippon, Steve Mitchell, Helen Boaden, Paddy Feeney
 16 and Paul Mylrea. Paddy Feeney, we can see from the top
 17 of the page that he is head of communications?
 18 **A. Yes, I think Paul Mylrea maybe works for the director**
 19 **general directly. He was there in the Select Committee.**
 20 Q. Yes, he was. And he was heavily involved in preparing
 21 for that appearance by the BBC.
 22 You were not involved in the development of the blog
 23 and neither was Meirion Jones?
 24 **A. Um-hm.**
 25 Q. So when it gets published -- sorry, let me show you one

1 Then if you go to 203, this is still 2 October,
 2 Paul Mylrea, he's a director of public affairs. How
 3 does that relate to the press office, do you know?
 4 **A. No, I don't know.**
 5 Q. Or comms? Is he the head of comms or something?
 6 **A. I don't know.**
 7 Q. Jessica Cecil, she's in the DG's office?
 8 **A. Um-hm.**
 9 Q. George Entwistle was the director general at this stage.
 10 And Nadia Banno and Sarah Jones are BBC lawyers and
 11 David Jordan is the editorial policy man, or head of
 12 editorial policy.
 13 The line here is that:
 14 "A number of serious and disturbing allegations have
 15 been made over the past few days about sexual abuse of
 16 teenage girls by Jimmy Savile."
 17 Nothing to do with Gary Glitter here:
 18 "Some of the allegations related to activity at the
 19 BBC premises in the '70s and '80s."
 20 Appalled and so on:
 21 "These are criminal actions which are the
 22 responsibility of the police..."
 23 I'm not sure they quite mean that.
 24 "... who have the powers to investigate anyone
 25 involved".

1 more thing. This is the day before you go to Steven
 2 Mitchell because you speak to him on the 3rd?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. On the 2nd, and you see at the bottom, you see the
 5 reference from Helen Deller:
 6 "There are procedures in place regarding requests
 7 for the release of material gathered for our
 8 investigations. All requests for BBC untransmitted
 9 material are dealt with by our legal department."
 10 That is the point we were on earlier; that the BBC
 11 line is what you thought it was, namely reactive not
 12 proactive.
 13 But what I really want to show you here is
 14 Steve Mitchell's email:
 15 "If we need it, that is fine Helen, and for briefing
 16 Paddy and I were discussing the fact that request for
 17 material from Newsnight is unlikely as the new rape
 18 allegation to spark the BBC offer to co-operate with the
 19 meth only emerged today and isn't one that Newsnight
 20 were aware of when they were pursuing the Savile story."
 21 Pausing there, I think what has happened is that ITV
 22 has not broadcast yet, but the fact of the allegation of
 23 rape, as it is put, in BBC premises had been trailed.
 24 **A. And it -- it referred to the [redacted] one, refresh**
 25 **me, yes?**

1 Q. Yes. That is right. And the ITV documentary ran the
 2 allegation -- the rape allegation he's referring to is
 3 one that exposure ran which was exactly the same, wasn't
 4 it, as the one that you had known about from the
 5 beginning?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. So it's not right, is it, that the new rape allegation,
 8 (a), had only emerged today --
 9 A. Correct.
 10 Q. -- because you've had it for merely a year.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. And it's certainly not one that Newsnight wasn't aware
 13 of?
 14 A. No. This is another uncomfortable thing. But the ITV
 15 programme was based so strongly on the planks of our
 16 investigation. It went further and it went wider, but
 17 it was completely built on it.
 18 Q. Yes?
 19 A. Which is why the account of it, in the way that it was
 20 portrayed by the blog and in other statements was to
 21 deny that truth.
 22 Q. If we take this document and compare it to the very
 23 first email, from Meirion Jones to you and Peter Rippon,
 24 copying out chunks of [redacted] stuff from the
 25 internet, we have somehow got from that email and its
 Page 197

1 information which has this allegation referred to as [redacted]
 2 [redacted] and we have reached this
 3 position in 11 months and to say the least something has
 4 been lost in translation.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. But not, as it were, thanks to you because you weren't
 7 involved in this?
 8 A. No, not involved.
 9 Q. Take bundle 8 then. We see your sparky response to the
 10 blog.
 11 A. To George?
 12 Q. To the blog.
 13 A. Do you mean the response to George Entwistle?
 14 Q. No, not yet. Not yet.
 15 A. Yes. God, I had forgotten I said that.
 16 Q. Just for the transcript, it is actually not the first
 17 time that we've encountered this word, I think, so far.
 18 Your response was that:
 19 "The blog, insofar as it claimed, 'We are confident
 20 all the women we had spoken to had gone to the police',
 21 was utter bollocks."
 22 A. Um-hm.
 23 Q. You said so to Meirion Jones and of course he was of the
 24 same view. You and he were on the same page on all
 25 this, obviously?
 Page 198

1 A. Totally, yes.
 2 Q. Now, Peter Rippon sent an email at page 41 in response
 3 not directly to your email, because you that one had
 4 gone to Meirion Jones, but in response to the one that
 5 Meirion had sent him further down the page --
 6 A. No, that's the one I sent to Peter.
 7 Q. Sorry you are quite right, he is responding to you.
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. Yes. Sorry. He says -- the point is he says to you:
 10 "This is not what Meirion told me on Monday."
 11 He says, Peter Rippon says, that Meirion said:
 12 "We were confident all the women had been spoken to
 13 by the police. He also said the [redacted] claims were
 14 nothing a police investigation could use and the other
 15 allegations against the other person were not serious
 16 anyway."
 17 Meirion Jones takes issue with that at page 58,
 18 where he clarifies that the first half was one. In
 19 other words dissenting from the proposition that he had
 20 said to Rippon that "we were confident all the women
 21 were spoken to by the police"?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. You were not a party to that conversation --
 24 A. On the Monday.
 25 Q. -- between Meirion and Peter Rippon?
 Page 199

1 A. No, no.
 2 Q. And Mr Mitchell wanted this sorted, didn't he?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. If we look at page 46. Now he wasn't around that day
 5 but he was copied into this email thread before now and
 6 this is his response to you and to Peter Rippon, where
 7 he's essentially saying, "Sort this out". But he
 8 doesn't copy in Meirion into his email. I take it
 9 that's an indication of the lack of trust he had for
 10 Jones, is it?
 11 A. No, I don't know that that's right. He did send another
 12 email to me which you should have:
 13 "I'm trying to get hold of Meirion, is there
 14 something he's not telling me?"
 15 I think he was having reception problems and
 16 couldn't get -- he wasn't able to get an email to
 17 Meirion.
 18 Q. Right. Then at 57 is Meirion's email in the morning of
 19 3 October to you and Peter Rippon and Steve Mitchell.
 20 He makes the point that the on camera interviewee had
 21 never talked to the police. You always had more
 22 information than Surrey Police passed to the CPS.
 23 A. Yes, I'm astounded at this point that Peter apparently
 24 hasn't hoisted that in. It was such a big issue for us
 25 last year.
 Page 200

1 Q. Just that email at 57, do you see in the fourth line of
 2 the second paragraph the sentence, "I was of the
 3 belief..."
 4 A. "I am of the believe that... "
 5 Sorry, one down.
 6 Q. Yes, one down:
 7 "I was of the believe [this is Meirion Jones
 8 speaking] that another woman had told the police about
 9 Gary Glitter."
 10 Did you say that?
 11 A. I wasn't sure -- no, no, I couldn't remember it. But we
 12 did have a second account of Gary Glitter. There was
 13 obviously the [redacted] account, but one of the other
 14 people we had spoken to had alluded to Glitter, but
 15 I don't know if she had spoken to the police or not.
 16 Q. So you didn't share the belief that another woman had
 17 told the police about Glitter. That was not something
 18 you picked up?
 19 A. No.
 20 Q. It doesn't appear to be reflected in any of the notes
 21 that I have seen anyway.
 22 A. No.
 23 Q. And it's not something you recognise either?
 24 A. No.
 25 Q. Then there's another one at page 61, and this is what
 Page 201

1 I was alluding to a little earlier, Meirion Jones to
 2 Stephen Mitchell:
 3 "I did notice you didn't copy me in. Two points
 4 here to be absolutely clear, Peter is wrong to say all
 5 our witnesses spoke to the police, but more importantly,
 6 Peter is right to say we did not believe that we were
 7 withholding anything from the police that could result
 8 in a prosecution of anyone who is alive, for reasons
 9 outlined in my other email."
 10 That was the point we were on just before we broke.
 11 I suggest to you -- and I think you more or less
 12 accept -- that that second bit is not right?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Yes?
 15 A. Yes. Well, let me be clear. I think it's arguable.
 16 And I think, you know, that being good citizens we
 17 perhaps should have considered taking it to the police.
 18 Q. So if you go to 88, then, the same day. Rippon to
 19 Mitchell, copied to you and Meirion Jones and
 20 Helen Deller. He says:
 21 "Liz, Meirion and I have discussed this. We are
 22 agreed that we have never had any information about
 23 anyone alive that the police should have been told
 24 about".
 25 Now, again we touched on this earlier. He is
 Page 202

1 suggesting you were party to such an agreement, which
 2 I think you basically were?
 3 A. I basically was. I was in the room. And they were
 4 agreeing it. And I was more -- my attention -- I was
 5 less concerned about that and much more concerned about
 6 other inaccuracies in the blog. So I mean I was --
 7 I was there and part of it, but I'm not an active part.
 8 Q. I appreciate there is a lot going on here.
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. But in retrospect, it is unfortunate, isn't it, that --
 11 well, we see that Stephen Mitchell at page 91 just says
 12 "okay, that's fine". So he's received and as it were
 13 understood that message, which isn't actually correct.
 14 You said it was arguable, but what makes it arguable is
 15 the aspect of not being sure who the victim was?
 16 A. And her age.
 17 Q. That's the element of doubt?
 18 A. I think the element of doubt is we don't know she was
 19 under age, but I think frankly we can assume that she
 20 was under age, because the girls from Duncroft were
 21 under the age of 16.
 22 Q. If she was of age, as it were, then there is still the
 23 element, given the picture you painted earlier of the
 24 alleged perpetrator, that even if the victim was 16, it
 25 still might have been something the police might have
 Page 203

1 been concerned about.
 2 A. Yes, I mean it wouldn't have been --
 3 Q. The question of consent and informed consent and so on?
 4 A. It wouldn't have been statutory -- well, exactly.
 5 Q. They would have come into play, wouldn't they?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Let me show you 179. The lines are getting developed
 8 for The Sun, I think. Again, I'm not -- tell me if I'm
 9 wrong, but I don't think any of this had any relation to
 10 you at all.
 11 Peter Rippon says, "We should add that they can't
 12 speak to him ..."
 13 This was Meirion Jones, I think:
 14 "Also it is really odd her criticising us for not
 15 handing over our investigation to the police."
 16 This is [redacted] it's talking about?
 17 A. Yes, this is after her ITN interview.
 18 Q. Yes. Before it has been broadcast, I think, that
 19 evening?
 20 A. No, no, no. Her interview went out on the lunchtime
 21 bulletins.
 22 Q. Before the ITV exposure broadcast, but it has been
 23 trailed, yes?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. "She was our investigation and could have gone to the
 Page 204

1 police at any point in the last 40 years. I don't know
 2 if we can gently point this out, I guess not."
 3 I think one of points Meirion Jones was pressing
 4 this email upon us, and I think his point is that it is
 5 hard to reconcile with the blog, which says that all the
 6 women went to the police?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And here the point is that she could have done but
 9 didn't. Maybe you can't really help us with any of
 10 this?
 11 A. Well, it doesn't coincide with the blog. I mean, I have
 12 always been willing to be open about the idea that the
 13 blog was mistaken -- wilfully mistaken errors, I would
 14 say, because it takes some kind of carelessness not to
 15 check such basic facts when all he had to do was ask us.
 16 But I mean that, yes, he seems to be saying she didn't
 17 go to the police, having, in his blog, said she did
 18 along with "all other women".
 19 Q. Sorry, I didn't mean to speak over you.
 20 A. That's all right.
 21 Q. It is fair to say, isn't it, that 2 October was
 22 a particularly busy day at Newsnight, is that right?
 23 A. Well, I don't know. Newsnight didn't cover this story,
 24 you see. So there was a lot of pressure on the
 25 programme. It was in every newspaper --

1 that he dashed it off --
 2 Q. Yes?
 3 A. -- I thought it was very carefully written, very
 4 carefully argued, that if you didn't know the facts it
 5 would read like a reasonable account of events.
 6 Q. Do you know anything about efforts, perhaps even
 7 repeated efforts, by Mr Rippon to correct inaccuracies
 8 in the blog when they transpired?
 9 A. You mean as soon as we pointed out to him the errors?
 10 Q. Yes?
 11 A. I'm not aware of that.
 12 Q. You are not aware of what he did with that information?
 13 Whether he just said, "You know... "
 14 A. My impression was he appeared to shrug it off to matter
 15 in that he said, "Well, I'll tell the press office not
 16 to keep saying that line", the line about all the women
 17 having gone to the police. Which didn't sound like
 18 a thorough correction.
 19 Q. Yes. So to the extent that it might be suggest to us
 20 that there were repeated efforts by him to do something
 21 about the inaccuracies --
 22 A. Were there?
 23 Q. Well, to the extent that it might be suggested that
 24 there were, those are not matters that you could help us
 25 with?

1 Q. But --
 2 A. -- but it wasn't giving any coverage to this story.
 3 Q. There were some practical things which meant it was
 4 busy. Newsnight was in the throes of moving, wasn't it,
 5 from Television Centre to Broadcasting House, new
 6 Broadcasting House?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And you were -- you, Newsnight -- were running pilot
 9 programmes --
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. -- as well as the real programme?
 12 A. Um-hm.
 13 Q. So for the editor of Newsnight, perhaps the last thing
 14 he wanted to have to do was sit down and write an
 15 account of something that happened 11 months ago. He
 16 had a lot on his plate?
 17 A. He had a lot on his plate, but I would have thought this
 18 was surely more important than anything. I mean the
 19 move was important, the pilot was important, but there
 20 were other people that could oversee those. And, you
 21 know, given what the headlines were like for the
 22 programme -- the programme at the time felt under siege
 23 and I would have thought -- I can't see why that
 24 wouldn't have been the most important thing.
 25 And in terms of -- was he under so much pressure

1 A. No, I'm not aware of efforts.
 2 Q. Right. Right.
 3 Now, ITV broadcasts on the 3rd. You have set out in
 4 paragraph 141 what you say the inaccuracies in the blog
 5 were. I'm not going to go through them, we have read
 6 that, we understand what you say.
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. You have mentioned the inaccuracies that you -- you talk
 9 about the corrections and that you are, as it were,
 10 still not satisfied.
 11 A. Um-hm.
 12 Q. Then you went to see Steve Mitchell on 3 October,
 13 paragraph 45?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. You say:
 16 "He attempted to justify the blog, talking about
 17 how, in Peter's mind, the story had come to be about the
 18 CPS."
 19 You say:
 20 "He conceded that if he and Peter had shown more
 21 imagination they might have grasped that the story was
 22 an important one. Twice he told me orally, in relation
 23 to press charges of cover-up ahead of the tribute
 24 programmes, 'Liz it is important that you are aware that
 25 corporately the BBC is all right on this.'"

1 What did that mean?
 2 **A. Well, it was a striking phrase. As I say, it was said**
 3 **to me twice. I took it to mean there was no email that**
 4 **would say, you know -- Helen Boaden or someone else**
 5 **saying to Peter Rippon, "Kill that story."**
 6 Q. In other words, no smoking gun?
 7 **A. Yes. I didn't take it to mean that there hadn't been**
 8 **any pressure on Peter. Only that the BBC was all right**
 9 **on this, as he said.**
 10 Q. But you can be all right in the sense of, "I did it, but
 11 I'm not going to get caught", or you can be all right in
 12 the sense of, "I didn't do it."
 13 **A. Yes, and either of those interpretations was possible.**
 14 Q. And you were uncomfortable with what you saw as an
 15 attempt to rewrite history. Did you explain to him that
 16 there were some pretty fundamental errors with the blog
 17 so far as you were concerned?
 18 **A. Yes, I said it was creating a completely false**
 19 **impression of our story.**
 20 Q. Did you say, "You have to get this fixed Steve"?
 21 **A. Yes, I mean I can't remember the words I used, but it**
 22 **was, it's wrong and it can't stand and, you know, it's**
 23 **misleading the public.**
 24 Q. What did he say or immediately do about it?
 25 **A. He didn't. The conversation moved on. But I thought**
 Page 209

1 **he'd registered the fact that I was saying the blog**
 2 **cannot be allowed to stand as it is.**
 3 Q. This was a pretty unusual thing for you to have done in
 4 your BBC career --
 5 **A. Yes.**
 6 Q. -- to go to Steve Mitchell?
 7 **A. Yes, it was the first time ever.**
 8 Q. And you expected him to take it up the chain?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. To the next port of call, Helen Boaden?
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. Do you know that he did?
 13 **A. No, I don't.**
 14 Q. But you don't know that he didn't, as it were?
 15 **A. Well, I presumed he hadn't when senior managers**
 16 **continued to completely misrepresent our story.**
 17 Q. You mean David Jordan on Today?
 18 **A. David Jordan on Today and on The Media Programme;**
 19 **George Entwistle, in his email to staff a couple of days**
 20 **later, when he talked about it being widely known the**
 21 **Newsnight story into the Surrey Police.**
 22 Q. And he was also on Today himself, Mr Entwistle --
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. -- and then the parliamentary committee?
 25 **A. Um-hm. The account was corrected ahead of the**
 Page 210

1 **parliamentary committee.**
 2 Q. Which was on --
 3 **A. It was the day after Panorama. The 21st -- sorry, the**
 4 **23rd, you are right, Nick, that was the Tuesday after**
 5 **the Panorama. The blog was partially corrected on the**
 6 **21st.**
 7 Q. Yes.
 8 **A. The line that the BBC now accepts that Newsnight's story**
 9 **began as an investigation into Savile alone, that was**
 10 **put out on the QT, directly to Panorama.**
 11 Q. On the QT?
 12 **A. On the quiet. It wasn't actually put up on the website**
 13 **for public consumption. Bear in mind it was the biggest**
 14 **correction of the lot, it wasn't publicly available**
 15 **until the Tuesday.**
 16 Q. The day of the Panorama?
 17 **A. The morning after the Panorama.**
 18 Q. If you take bundle 12, please, you spoke to
 19 Ken MacQuarrie?
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. I want to show you page 140. That's a email to you on
 22 12 October at 18.15. Do you see in the middle of
 23 page --
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. -- from Nicola Cain, she is a BBC lawyer. She says:
 Page 211

1 "As Meirion knows, I'm working on identifying and
 2 collating the materials obtained during Newsnight's 2011
 3 investigation into Savile for disclosure to the police
 4 any inquiries et cetera. Important we ensure that all
 5 materials are retained safely and not destroyed. I need
 6 to know from both of you exactly what was obtained and
 7 created during the course of your 2011 investigation
 8 will, whether you think it may be relevant or not."
 9 Then she sets out what she is already has and asks
 10 a series of questions, essentially have you got anything
 11 else, and if so please now could you cough it up?
 12 That was done expressly for the purpose of police
 13 and any enquiries, as she puts it. Had a similar
 14 exercise been done for the purpose of the blog or the
 15 BBC's public statements leading up to that?
 16 **A. No, we hadn't been consulted -- or I hadn't been**
 17 **consulted on anything.**
 18 Q. Can you think of any good reason why Peter Rippon
 19 shouldn't have consulted you when he was preparing the
 20 blog first of all?
 21 **A. Well, the only reason I can think is that he would know**
 22 **that we would have disagreed with his points. And that**
 23 **he couldn't have put out the statement that he put out.**
 24 **Because from the beginning of the year -- well twice at**
 25 **the beginning of the year -- I had said to him, "The BBC**
 Page 212

1 is not being accurate about what we were looking into".
 2 Q. Can you think of any good reason why once the blog was
 3 out those who were considering it shouldn't have come
 4 back to you and asked you what you thought about it?
 5 A. Well, no. George Entwistle's account to MPs was that
 6 that's not the done thing. He expects to rely on the
 7 editor.
 8 Q. As directed -- as the director general, that's what the
 9 director general would expect to do?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And we have this obviously. You prepared a note which
 12 went to George Entwistle before he went to the
 13 committee.
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. And Meirion Jones did the same. Was that the first
 16 direct input you'd had at that level?
 17 A. No, I'd sent George an email after his 5 October email
 18 where he misdescribed our investigation.
 19 Q. Right. So if we look --
 20 A. So I mailed him on 8 October, ahead of the -- that's
 21 when he said, "Right, Ken MacQuarrie will talk to you".
 22 Q. I see. So his response was Ken MacQuarrie will come and
 23 see you, and then Ken MacQuarrie did indeed come and see
 24 you.
 25 A. The next day.

Page 213

1 Q. Yes. Bundle 16, page 1. We have a page 0 in this
 2 bundle now for some reason. It is page 1.
 3 A. Um-hm.
 4 Q. Do you see there is an email from Peter Horrocks to
 5 George Entwistle on Sunday 21 October, and in it he
 6 says -- this is the Sunday night -- and in it he says --
 7 the committee was the 23rd, was it?
 8 A. Yes, the day after Panorama. Yes.
 9 Q. It was the Tuesday. He says:
 10 "I should briefly explain how this document came
 11 about."
 12 This is Meirion's note:
 13 "On Thursday you formally asked me to take on
 14 responsibility as acting director of news re Savile, in
 15 other words doing Helen Boaden's job for Savile
 16 purposes. I soon understood that ever since the
 17 Newsnight investigation was dropped, no BBC newsman had
 18 sat down with Meirion and Liz and asked them to give
 19 their account of what happened. I also realised that no
 20 BBC manager had asked them to give their account in
 21 their own words, and in discussion it soon became clear
 22 that they would be more than happy to cooperate and they
 23 rapidly agreed to do so."
 24 Is that accurate?
 25 A. Yes.

Page 214

1 Q. So until MacQuarrie and then Peter Horrocks, nobody had
 2 attempted to download from you what the --
 3 A. No, I had attempted to download to Steve Mitchell.
 4 Q. Yes?
 5 A. And to George, via email.
 6 Q. Yes. That I think is all I want to ask you.
 7 A. Right.
 8 Q. I have not been through your statement paragraph by
 9 paragraph, because we have read it.
 10 A. You can read it, yes.
 11 Q. We can read.
 12 I have not taken you to every email because we can
 13 read those too.
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Nick may have some questions for you, but before he
 16 does, is there anything else that you want to tell us?
 17 A. Well, you can stop me if you think these points have
 18 been well enough covered.
 19 Q. Right.
 20 A. But I mean it's something that I have, you know, I have
 21 thought throughout really, that there are two main
 22 things.
 23 One that I think, you know, in the BBC we have
 24 failed in relation to the women we spoke to. I think
 25 their accounts were never properly considered by BBC

Page 215

1 management, ie Peter Rippon. [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED] --
 7 MR MACLEAN: : Hang on, do you have an example of that?
 8 A. Yes. In the documents that I was given --
 9 Q. Give us a date?
 10 A. 21 October to Paul Mylrea.
 11 Q. What time? Do you have a time?
 12 A. No, I'm sorry, it was in the lot I was sent. I put, "3
 13 out of 9". Sorry, more -- a bigger one was on
 14 1 October, to David Jordan.
 15 MR POLLARD: From?
 16 A. Peter.
 17 MR MACLEAN: 1 October?
 18 MR POLLARD: And the other one was Peter to Paul Mylrea.
 19 A. Yes, on the 21st Peter to Paul Mylrea. Then again to
 20 Helen Boaden on 29 August, and Steve Mitchell, where he
 21 says the allegations are more sexual harassment than
 22 assaults; the allegations given to us.
 23 Well, (a), that is not actually true, and (b), they
 24 are still serious allegations. Sexual harassment isn't
 25 all right. And I just felt throughout that there was,

Page 216

1 from his lack of interest in the detail of our material,
 2 that he very likely minimised their experiences by
 3 suggesting:
 4 "Well, they weren't the youngest victims, it wasn't
 5 the worst kind of abuse".
 6 I just think for a senior editor in the BBC that
 7 that's, you know, those attitudes struck me as being
 8 inappropriate and not something I have come across
 9 before.
 10 MR MACLEAN: You are making a point -- there are various
 11 points one could make out of that. One is that you
 12 might say that doesn't show a firm grasp of the material
 13 you had gathered, whether it was about males or females
 14 or whoever. But you are making a slightly deeper point.
 15 A. [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 24 A. No, not exactly. More that this attitude, that well it
 25 was more sexual harassment than sexual assault, as to
 Page 217

1 harassment is nothing, that it was not the youngest
 2 victims, therefore it was less of a Newsnight story, it
 3 was not the worst kind of abuse, therefore -- that was
 4 the reason for him pulling back from the story as he
 5 described it to me.
 6 Q. Right.
 7 A. I find that odd. But the only other point, but I am
 8 sure it is probably being made anyway, is this refusal
 9 to acknowledge publicly that we were looking into
 10 allegations that Jimmy Savile abused children on and off
 11 BBC premises. It just seems that all the public
 12 statements from the beginning of the year were designed
 13 to throw the public off the scent, and conceal that
 14 fact, and the blog then built on that.
 15 Q. Yes. We can all speculate -- if that is right, we can
 16 all speculate as to why that might be the case. It
 17 simply might be an institution that defends itself in
 18 a particular way; it sees itself as being under attack
 19 so it hunkers down.
 20 A. Yes, but misleading the public is effectively -- this is
 21 one thing the BBC should never knowingly do and I think
 22 it has been knowingly done in this case.
 23 Q. I see.
 24 A. The expectation was that, I suppose, that Meirion and
 25 I would pipe down.
 Page 218

1 Q. Okay. We will look at those -- they are on the
 2 transcript. We will look at those particular examples
 3 you have given. As I said to you earlier -- you will
 4 get this transcript at some point. These ladies have to
 5 put it together, it will come to you at some point. If
 6 you take issue with anything on it, we can have
 7 a discussion.
 8 (4.03 pm)
 9 Questions by MR POLLARD
 10 MR POLLARD: Sorry, just a couple of points I wanted to
 11 raise.
 12 Just, in a way, to go back, because we obviously
 13 will be talking to Peter Rippon pretty soon -- just to
 14 go back to what I think will probably be one of the key
 15 parts of what he says to us, without in any way
 16 prejudging that. My guess is that he is likely to
 17 concentrate to some extent on his belief, as he would
 18 see it -- and he might say to us -- that all the way
 19 through he had this idea that the CPS dropping the
 20 investigation because Savile was too old and infirm was
 21 a sort of trigger in his mind. That that would be what
 22 would move it from a, "This might or might not make",
 23 to, "Of course this is a story." And it is
 24 institutional failure, it is the acknowledgment that
 25 a case was made successfully but dropped for, if you
 Page 219

1 like, a non-legal reason.
 2 Are you sure that that wasn't in his mind all along?
 3 A. Well, it can't have been in his mind all along, because
 4 the story started out as per Meirion's original email.
 5 We didn't know anything about the -- despite what the
 6 blog says, we didn't know anything about the police
 7 investigation until we began hearing from some of the
 8 women who were at Duncroft.
 9 MR POLLARD: Just remind me. Within the Friends Reunited
 10 blog, are there not references in there to, "He was let
 11 off because he was too old"?
 12 A. I'm not sure, Nick, I can't remember. I just remember
 13 becoming aware of this police investigation once we'd
 14 started going.
 15 MR POLLARD: That it was triggered by the [REDACTED] book
 16 extract, effectively.
 17 A. Not the police aspect, no.
 18 MR POLLARD: No, the story was.
 19 A. Yes, exactly.
 20 MR POLLARD: And that was what was shown to Peter.
 21 A. Yes.
 22 MR POLLARD: I understand.
 23 A. Obviously he, it's clear, attached a lot of importance
 24 to that CPS aspect as time went on, but remember we had
 25 more than the CPS had and it just seemed an odd
 Page 220

1 attachment to a flawed situation.
 2 MR POLLARD: Yes. One of our difficulties, speaking
 3 personally, is that the amount that's on the record, if
 4 you like, during that month of November about the
 5 development of the story is quite a lot, involving you
 6 and Meirion and Hannah and so on. His actual sort of
 7 response -- and the two-way process that might have
 8 taken place, there's not much of that documented.
 9 Presumably quite a lot of that is in the conversations
 10 that you had updating him with what was happening and
 11 getting, you thought, a quite positive response back.
 12 So are you convinced in your own mind that during
 13 those conversations the level of enthusiasm for Peter
 14 was pretty high all the way through to nearly the end,
 15 in other words to 28/29 November?
 16 A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with
 17 a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to
 18 broadcast the film.
 19 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 20 A. We would not have had that much contact with him before,
 21 except we were telling him -- you know, if I bumped into
 22 him in the corridor I would say --
 23 MR POLLARD: Rather oddly there is a step after that which
 24 should have increased rather than decreased the
 25 enthusiasm, which is the announcement that the case was

Page 221

1 dropped. You hadn't yet got the CPS, "No evidence"
 2 line, but in a way the fact that the case was dropped
 3 fitted in perfectly with what you were expecting to
 4 uncover, which was the CPS's, "Old and infirm" line.
 5 A. Yes, as I say, I never thought the CPS would say that.
 6 MR POLLARD: Yes, okay.
 7 I suppose my only other point is that -- and it is
 8 a general point and it's overlaid with heavy, heavy
 9 20.20 hindsight. Obviously the events of the past
 10 12 months have shown the Savile story is a major story.
 11 But equally in the past week or so we have had an
 12 example of a story in a sort of similar territory where
 13 a much greater level of caution would have been --
 14 A. Advised.
 15 MR POLLARD: -- invaluable. Has that in any way revised
 16 your view of things?
 17 A. Well, the key difference between the two things was that
 18 we weren't relying on one person. We weren't relying
 19 just on [redacted] we weren't relying on any one woman
 20 and [redacted] was the major part of it. But we had
 21 built up, we felt, evidence around it to justify doing
 22 the story. So it was quite different. Two or three
 23 accounts, I don't think, would have been enough,
 24 especially given the sensitivities with the fact that
 25 the guy was just dead. I don't think we could have gone

Page 222

1 with it. But the numbers that we had ...
 2 MR POLLARD: I understand that.
 3 Just on that subject, am I right in saying that
 4 apart from [redacted] and [redacted] the other women
 5 weren't -- none of them were met face to face? Is that
 6 right?
 7 A. That is right.
 8 MR POLLARD: It was all done on the phone.
 9 A. Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: Do you have any doubts about the wisdom of
 11 relying on non-face to face evidence gathered?
 12 I appreciate the difficulty of talking --
 13 A. Yes.
 14 MR POLLARD: Some of them presumably didn't want to meet.
 15 But in such a sensitive area I guess there is
 16 potentially a difference between being able to look
 17 somebody in the eye, as you were with [redacted] and
 18 obviously [redacted] and make a personal judgment about
 19 their credibility and the way they told their case, told
 20 their story, and somebody talking on a phone, detached
 21 in some way.
 22 A. Um, well I felt I heard believable accounts. And, you
 23 know, some of the conversations were short, some of them
 24 were much -- obviously [redacted] but others of them were
 25 longer, and in cases they involved email exchanges as

Page 223

1 well. In other words it wasn't a sort of one hit
 2 contact, there were several exchanges, and certainly --
 3 I felt I believed the material.
 4 MR POLLARD: Okay, thank you.
 5 MR MACLEAN: I just -- I suspect -- and you will see that we
 6 have this point on board -- that's the one you had in
 7 mind, is it?
 8 A. Yes, yes.
 9 Q. Is this another one?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Is that one of the others?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Do you have the third one?
 14 A. Was it to David Jordan?
 15 Q. We just can't track it down immediately.
 16 A. 1 October.
 17 Q. 1 October. We will find it.
 18 MR POLLARD: Thank you Liz. That is very kind. Thank you
 19 for spending top of time with us.
 20 A. I don't envy you your job.
 21 MR POLLARD: Thank you.
 22 MR MACLEAN: Just before you go --
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. This one. That one. (Handed).
 25 A. Yes.

Page 224

1	MR MACLEAN: Okay.	
2	A. Okay, thank you.	
3	MR POLLARD: Thank you very much indeed.	
4	A. Thank you very much indeed.	
5	(4.13 pm)	
6	(The Tribunal adjourned until 10.00 am,	
7	Wednesday 14 November 2012)	
8	I N D E X	
9	MS LIZ MACKEAN (called)1	
10	Opening remarks1	
11	Questions by MR MACLEAN2	
12	Questions by MR POLLARD219	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
Page 225		