

<p>1 Tuesday, 27 November 2012                  2 (10.00 am)                  3 (Proceedings delayed)                  4 (10.35 am)                  5 MR PAUL MYLREA (called)                  6 MR POLLARD: Paul, good morning, and thank you for coming in                  7 to talk to us. As you know, we are making good progress                  8 and have seen plenty of people, so we're motoring along                  9 nicely. Most of the questioning today will be done by                  10 Mr Maclean. I will dive in as and when appropriate and                  11 Mr Spafford has a couple of procedural points, things to                  12 mention to you, first.                  13 MR SPAFFORD: A couple of points. Thank you for coming.                  14 Obviously, we are having your evidence transcribed and                  15 my friends here are dealing with that. You will see in                  16 front of you there is a screen with real-time so you can                  17 follow it and stop it if you want to. That will be                  18 prepared today. It will be ready this evening to be                  19 provided to you or Justin as appropriate for                  20 typographical errors. There will also be the occasional                  21 break to give people a chance just to have a short rest                  22 from typing.                  23 The other issue is confidentiality. You have kindly                  24 provided an agreement. Obviously, it is very important                  25 that it be noted that the discussions we're having today</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 <b>A. Hardy went to Audio and Music and Paddy Feeney came in</b>                  2 <b>from outside on a short term contract to work as head of</b>                  3 <b>News.</b>                  4 Q. He came in in September this year --                  5 <b>A. That is right.</b>                  6 Q. -- on a 12-month contract.                  7 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  8 Q. I don't know whether you knew in late December and                  9 January and February of this year that there were                  10 stories there in the press about the Jimmy Savile piece.                  11 Were you aware of those at the time, The Sunday Mirror                  12 The People, The Daily Mirror, The Guardian, The                  13 Telegraph?                  14 <b>A. It's not clear -- I was aware of the first one, if you</b>                  15 <b>look at the logs it makes it clear that this was dealt</b>                  16 <b>with through the News team, which would be right and</b>                  17 <b>proper. In my summary I explained what there is in</b>                  18 <b>terms of a daily call and a daily review of the media.</b>                  19 <b>I would have been aware certainly in January but I think</b>                  20 <b>the important thing to note is that, as I explained in</b>                  21 <b>the summary, the News team -- each team handles its own</b>                  22 <b>issues. They are raised to the centre if their issue of</b>                  23 <b>is concern or significance, but there is an additional</b>                  24 <b>element to the News team which in some cases they are</b>                  25 <b>slightly separate because of the importance of editorial</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 and the transcript as well are strictly confidential in                  2 accordance with the terms of that agreement. Is that                  3 understood?                  4 <b>A. Understood.</b>                  5 MR SPAFFORD: Great.                  6 Questions by MR MACLEAN                  7 MR MACLEAN: Mr Mylrea, can I ask you just to tell me who                  8 fits in where in the organisation that you sit at the                  9 top of? Mr Payne, you --                  10 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  11 Q. -- and also how Mr Hardy and the News press office fits                  12 into the organisation?                  13 <b>A. Okay. As Director of Communications -- as I was and</b>                  14 <b>then subsequently changed to Director of Public</b>                  15 <b>Affairs -- I oversee the communications team.</b>                  16 <b>Julian Payne is the Head of Press and Media Relations,</b>                  17 <b>heads the corporate press office. The corporate press</b>                  18 <b>office deals with any issue at the centre, any</b>                  19 <b>organisational corporate issue.</b>                  20 <b>The News operation is another of my direct reports.</b>                  21 <b>James Hardy was the Head of News and then Head of Comms</b>                  22 <b>for News, and then it was changed to Paddy Feeney</b>                  23 <b>because of a re-organisation -- not a re-organisation,</b>                  24 <b>but because somebody moved.</b>                  25 Q. Where did Mr Hardy go?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 <b>confidentiality.</b>                  2 <b>In this case, I would have been told at the time</b>                  3 <b>when we had both the line saying that there was no</b>                  4 <b>foundation in the stories, and also the strong rebuttal</b>                  5 <b>from the editor, who I think gave a three sentence</b>                  6 <b>rebuttal saying there was no foundation in these</b>                  7 <b>allegations, that the story was not substantiated and to</b>                  8 <b>allege otherwise was damaging and false.</b>                  9 Q. If Justin would pass you A18, if you turn to page 46.                  10 We've got literally hundreds of pages of this stuff.                  11 Between 46 and 107, I think it is, is very helpfully                  12 gathered together by you or somebody working for you --                  13 <b>A. It is from me.</b>                  14 Q. -- are the press logs.                  15 <b>A. That's right, yes.</b>                  16 Q. We can see how these work. For example, if we take the                  17 second one, 16 January: Matt Hall is the author of this                  18 log; he then recalls that he's had an enquiry from so                  19 and so, in this case Mr Goslett; he then summarises what                  20 the question is; he then, five lines down sets out who                  21 he consulted; then he sets out the gist of the answer                  22 that he provided back to the enquiring journalist; and                  23 then, usually, in fact -- not in this case, but                  24 usually -- if you look at the next one down, it then                  25 records who is aware, in other words who he has copied</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 in and put in the picture.                  2 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  3 Q. So if we look at these logs, we can then tell who is                  4 responding to the particular press query --                  5 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  6 Q. -- and who is, in the lingo, aware.                  7 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  8 Q. Is this right, then: I have a whole list of these                  9 articles but there was one in The Sunday Mirror on                  10 8 January which was then picked up by some other press                  11 a couple of days later --                  12 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  13 Q. -- the Mail, The Guardian, The Telegraph on the 10th --                  14 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  15 Q. -- and then there was a piece by Mr Goslett in The Oldie                  16 in February?                  17 <b>A. That is right.</b>                  18 Q. At that point, the press handling was News Press Office                  19 as opposed to the Corporate Press Office.                  20 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  21 Q. So it was Mr Hardy's rather than Mr Payne's operation?                  22 <b>A. That's right.</b>                  23 Q. Do you have a view then about what the view was in the                  24 press office by, say, January or February about                  25 Mr Jones's role in all of this, for example?                  Page 5</p>	<p>1 <b>people in News, but who, we don't know --</b>                  2 Q. Right.                  3 <b>A. -- and one of the issues in the media team is that, you</b>                  4 <b>know, there are regularly stories leaking out of the</b>                  5 <b>BBC.</b>                  6 Q. Mr Hardy had formed a pretty clear view, though, about                  7 who was doing the leaking, hadn't he?                  8 <b>A. I'm not aware that he had. I don't know what he had.</b>                  9 <b>But that's not something that I'm aware of coming to me</b>                  10 <b>at all.</b>                  11 Q. Helen Deller was pretty clear what was going on, wasn't                  12 she?                  13 <b>A. I think it's important to say that, you know, the News</b>                  14 <b>team, first of all, sit in a different place, have</b>                  15 <b>a different set of views and what they are expected to</b>                  16 <b>bring up to me are issues which are of corporate</b>                  17 <b>significance and which are of reputational risk to the</b>                  18 <b>BBC. I certainly have no recollection of anybody</b>                  19 <b>bringing me any issues about individuals at that time.</b>                  20 Q. Can I ask you to look at 267, please? At the very                  21 bottom, first of all, which is Helen Deller's log, dated                  22 6 January, you see there has been an enquiry from                  23 Nick Owens and the Sunday Mirror:                  24 "Asked if Newsnight dropped investigation against                  25 Jimmy Savile because of planned Christmas specials."                  Page 7</p>
<p>1 <b>A. I don't think we'd have -- I'm not aware of any -- I am</b>                  2 <b>afraid I don't know what they would have thought about</b>                  3 <b>Mr Jones's role. All I would have known and all that's</b>                  4 <b>in the logs is the view on the strength of the story and</b>                  5 <b>whether the story had any, um -- any grounds, and as the</b>                  6 <b>logs show, I think what we would have done -- certainly</b>                  7 <b>what the News team would have done -- would have been to</b>                  8 <b>consult along the -- along the News line to find out</b>                  9 <b>what the view was.</b>                  10 Q. So if I can -- if you keep that to one side, because you                  11 might need to come back to the logs as we go along --                  12 <b>A. Sure.</b>                  13 Q. If you take bundle A4 --                  14 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  15 Q. -- and turn to page 265.                  16 This is the day that the Sunday Mirror published                  17 a piece. This is Sunday, 8 January. If you look at the                  18 bottom of the page, Mr Jones to Mr Rippon:                  19 "I am sure you have seen this."                  20 Then Rippon to Jones at 12.27:                  21 "There has been some internal briefing too which                  22 unsurprising but disappointing."                  23 Would it be surprising or unsurprising to you that                  24 there was internal briefing from Newsnight?                  25 <b>A. Throughout this story there has been briefing from</b>                  Page 6</p>	<p>1 <b>A. Um-hm.</b>                  2 Q. "Responded as previous log and added that ...(Reading to                  3 the words)...a meeting between Rippon and his line                  4 manager, Mitchell. Rippon, Mitchell and Karen Rosine                  5 are all aware."                  6 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  7 Q. What I wanted you to look at then is the email at 267                  8 from James Hardy to Helen Deller.                  9 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  10 Q. "Thanks very much, yes, saw the Sunday Mirror piece.                  11 Actually when you read it you just thought 'What's the                  12 point of this story?' The BBC investigated something                  13 and then didn't run it. I will however drip poison                  14 about Meirion's suspected role if I get the                  15 opportunity."                  16 Meirion's suspected role was in providing the basis                  17 of The Sunday Mirror story, presumably.                  18 <b>A. That's what I presume, yes. James told me about this</b>                  19 <b>email later, but I certainly wasn't aware of it at the</b>                  20 <b>time. But what this suggests is that that was Meirion's</b>                  21 <b>role as the source of the story.</b>                  22 Q. So you discussed this with Mr Hardy, have you?                  23 <b>A. Since, subsequently.</b>                  24 Q. Did he drop poison about Meirion's suspected role?                  25 <b>A. I'm not aware of what he did as a result. I think this</b>                  Page 8</p>



1 [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 [REDACTED]  
 16 [REDACTED]  
 17 [REDACTED]  
 18 [REDACTED]  
 19 [REDACTED]  
 20 Q. You presumably came to appreciate that there was  
 21 actually a very small number of people who were ever  
 22 very close to this story when it was being developed --  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. -- in November last year.  
 25 A. **Although there were others who it could have been, for**  
 Page 13

1 A. **Yes. I had not paid particular to that it that story in**  
 2 **Private Eye.**  
 3 Q. Jordan's point was that there were only two possible  
 4 sources of the Private Eye story and he was one of them  
 5 and it hadn't been him.  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. So there is fairly low level chatter in the press on  
 8 page 14, and so on, in January.  
 9 A. **I think it is also important to state that the first**  
 10 **story talked about inappropriate behaviour, and it was**  
 11 **only the subsequent stories that talked about sexual**  
 12 **abuse. (Pause)**  
 13 **So, as I said, the first story talked about**  
 14 **inappropriate behaviour and it was only subsequent**  
 15 **stories that talked about sexual abuse.**  
 16 Q. So the first story: you mean The Sunday Mirror one?  
 17 A. **That's right.**  
 18 Q. Yes. Now, The Oldie one in February -- The Oldie maybe  
 19 relative, tell me if I'm wrong, a slight press  
 20 backwater, it wasn't one of the main papers.  
 21 A. **And to be clear it's not picked up in the daily**  
 22 **summaries. It's not in the (inaudible).**  
 23 Q. But that was a more detailed story and I think that was  
 24 the first one, for example, which raised questions about  
 25 Mark Thompson's role, wasn't it?  
 Page 15

1 **example the, um -- the ITV --**  
 2 Q. There's Mark Williams-Thomas.  
 3 A. **That's right.**  
 4 Q. There's Hannah Livingston.  
 5 A. **Yes, I was not aware of Hannah Livingston until seeing**  
 6 **the bundle --**  
 7 Q. There's Liz MacKean --  
 8 A. **-- but Mark Williams-Thomas was also out there.**  
 9 Q. But Mark Williams-Thomas was -- you and I are now  
 10 speculating -- but Mark Williams-Thomas [REDACTED]  
 11 [REDACTED] was going to run the  
 12 story there. So one might think, at least before the  
 13 immediate run up to the ITV broadcast, that he was not  
 14 a very likely candidate to be leaking.  
 15 A. **I think we just felt that there was detail getting out**  
 16 **you there. Journalists work on a principle of**  
 17 **jigsawing, of pulling together facts from numerous**  
 18 **sources. I didn't have any firm detail.**  
 19 Q. I think there was a particular story in Private Eye  
 20 which especially got under the skin of Mr Jordan; do you  
 21 remember that?  
 22 A. **I discovered that afterwards, after the meeting between**  
 23 **David Jordan and Meirion in the newsroom about**  
 24 **a confidential meeting.**  
 25 Q. That was the altercation?  
 Page 14

1 A. **It raised questions about a number of people, of who**  
 2 **knew what, when, and it was the start, if you like, of**  
 3 **a whole series of questions about who knew what when.**  
 4 Q. Once Mark Thompson gets -- whether justified or not --  
 5 dragged into the press comment, is that one of the  
 6 reasons why it comes on to the Corporate Comms radar  
 7 screen?  
 8 A. **Yes. Once it's gone outside the remit -- the remit of**  
 9 **News, and it's starting to talk about the**  
 10 **Director General, then yes, it would have come on to the**  
 11 **Corporate press list.**  
 12 Q. That would be, what -- Mr Payne would be in charge of  
 13 that, reporting to you?  
 14 A. **That's right.**  
 15 Q. So when did you first really get this on your radar  
 16 screen?  
 17 A. **I don't have a clear recollection but looking back**  
 18 **through the logs it would have been around the time of**  
 19 **January/February. But I think the important thing is**  
 20 **what would have happened -- again, this is**  
 21 **recollection -- is that it would have been raised at**  
 22 **some point during the morning call. The News team would**  
 23 **have --**  
 24 Q. Your morning call?  
 25 A. **My morning call -- there's a 9 o'clock morning call of**  
 Page 16

1 comms, where all the team leads -- I think I set this  
 2 out in the summary -- where all the team leads discuss  
 3 issues in their area. It is obviously not a very long  
 4 call so people just raise the issues of significance and  
 5 if there are any issues then they explain what is being  
 6 done about it. So what would have happened would have  
 7 been that I expect -- obviously, I don't have a clear  
 8 recollection -- that the News team would have raised it,  
 9 would have said that they had checked with all of the  
 10 relevant parties and that there had been a very clear  
 11 denial of the substance of the allegations, which  
 12 I think is important, by the editor of the programme.  
 13 Q. So you explain in your statement that after that call  
 14 you then take part, usually anyway, in the  
 15 Director General's morning call, which is under  
 16 Mark Thompson at 9.15.  
 17 A. That's right.  
 18 Q. So the substance of the story, the sting that the press  
 19 office thought it was rebutting at this stage, was the  
 20 allegation of improper pressure being brought on the  
 21 editor of Newsnight --  
 22 A. It was principally -- well, there were two fundamental  
 23 things but the principal point was the improper pressure  
 24 being brought to bear on the programme to drop it, and  
 25 that the lines that the editor had made very clear were

Page 17

1 that the decision to drop it had been his, on the basis  
 2 of editorial judgement, and, in his words, that the  
 3 basis of the story was not substantiated, which was  
 4 an important -- important point for us.  
 5 It wasn't that -- he basically said in very clear  
 6 terms it was not substantiated, there was no pressure  
 7 and any suggestion, I think he said at the time, of any  
 8 evidence not being provided was also wrong and damaging  
 9 and false. It was quite a strong statement by the  
 10 editor.  
 11 Q. To the police?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. One thing that nobody seems to have picked up, but tell  
 14 me if somebody did that I have missed -- nobody seems  
 15 really to have focused on the aspect of the story about  
 16 abuse had been taking place at the BBC, which of course  
 17 once the ITV documentary was broadcast becomes a central  
 18 part of the story. Is that right, that that hadn't been  
 19 picked up?  
 20 A. It had been picked up in the sense that it had been  
 21 noted but again the editor had made it very clear that  
 22 all of the allegations -- so far as he was concerned,  
 23 the allegations were not founded, they were not  
 24 substantiated, and as the story developed -- and again  
 25 I can't tell you exactly when, but as the story

Page 18

1 developed -- and I think it's clear from Peter Rippon's  
 2 messages and a whole series of exchanges, that, um,  
 3 Peter Rippon had serious concerns about the credibility  
 4 of the witnesses.  
 5 This information, I think, was available to the News  
 6 team at the time, or certainly around that time it  
 7 became available, or it was certainly mentioned to us as  
 8 one of the reasons why, because of course we pushed why  
 9 was this -- you know, what happened? In summary the,  
 10 um, explanation was that they did not believe the  
 11 witness was credible, they believed that there was some  
 12 suggestion of -- I presume it is acceptable to say this  
 13 in this format -- I don't want to damage somebody's  
 14 reputation, I'm merely reporting what somebody says --  
 15 but there was a question of the credibility of the  
 16 witness because of her ability to remember, because of  
 17 what was believed to be a collusion between witnesses,  
 18 um, what was a sort of -- a life which had been marred  
 19 by drugs -- I think, therapeutic drugs -- and also  
 20 simple questions about the credibility of that witness.  
 21 So when somebody is saying the thing we seem to have  
 22 missed is that it was on BBC premises, I go back to the  
 23 point that we were assured that the allegations were  
 24 simply not believed at the time.  
 25 Q. That assurance hadn't been given directly to you,

Page 19

1 I assume --  
 2 A. No, it had gone through -- it had gone through the News  
 3 team but as we went further forward it became part of  
 4 the -- of the narrative.  
 5 Q. Your understanding was that that assurance had -- the  
 6 source of the assurance was Peter Rippon?  
 7 A. I was absolutely clear that that was the source of the  
 8 assurance.  
 9 MR POLLARD: When you talk about "that witness", I think you  
 10 mean [REDACTED]  
 11 A. I mean [REDACTED] and I think one of the key things is  
 12 that certainly right until -- I know we're leaping  
 13 ahead -- but right until towards the end, I was of the  
 14 understanding that there only was one witness on camera,  
 15 and in fact, um, a lot of the discussion about whether  
 16 there were two witnesses in -- as I said, I'm a bit  
 17 confused, I thought we only had one witness on camera.  
 18 This is right towards the end.  
 19 MR MACLEAN: This is when the ITV documentary is broadcast  
 20 or after that?  
 21 A. It is after that. I think it is in the Panorama or  
 22 Newsnight --  
 23 Q. It is 11 October, isn't it, when Liz MacKean does the  
 24 piece on Newsnight --  
 25 A. That's right, that's right --

Page 20

1 Q. -- and they use a clip from [REDACTED]  
 2 A. -- and there was a discussion at the time saying "What  
 3 is this clip?" You know, we were assured that there was  
 4 only one and, in fact, I remember a discussion with the  
 5 legal team who said "Well, we were told by Meirion Jones  
 6 that there was only one on camera", so that was the  
 7 first time we realised that there was more than one.  
 8 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask: the little summary you gave  
 9 just now about what you understood Peter Rippon's  
 10 reservations were about [REDACTED]'s evidence, when did  
 11 you become aware of that? Are we talking about the  
 12 start of 2012 or much nearer towards September/October?  
 13 A. Much -- much nearer towards the end. I was assured --  
 14 I think it is important to say that James Hardy is  
 15 somebody I have worked with for many years. He's -- was  
 16 a respected -- I mean hugely respected -- journalist,  
 17 and I think it's important to note that he was  
 18 a journalist. He was a political editor of The Mirror,  
 19 he was political editor of the Press Association, he was  
 20 home editor of The Telegraph, and I had worked with him  
 21 when I been political correspondent for Reuters. So  
 22 I knew his journalistic pedigree. So in other words, it  
 23 wasn't --  
 24 MR MACLEAN: He was someone you trusted.  
 25 A. He was somebody who I not only trusted but had the  
 Page 21

1 absolute faith. He then came to -- he then worked as  
 2 political correspondent for the BBC, so he knew how News  
 3 operated and how News worked. He had friends in News.  
 4 Then I had hired him to work with me in Government, in  
 5 the Department for International Development, where he  
 6 was my Head of News, where he had handled exceptionally  
 7 difficult things. He had been security cleared. So  
 8 this was -- this was not a junior press officer. This  
 9 was somebody with a long and distinguished journalistic  
 10 pedigree, who had deep knowledge and deep roots in news  
 11 and whose judgement I completely respected and had  
 12 always been able to respect.  
 13 Q. So he was your chief source of intelligence about this  
 14 particular story?  
 15 A. It's important to note, and I think I've made it clear  
 16 in my, um -- in my summary and timeline, that while the  
 17 communications team works as a team, it works together,  
 18 that the News team is -- does have moments when it sits  
 19 slightly apart, and it does that because of the need to  
 20 respect the editorial integrity of News.  
 21 So we frequently had occasions where News would not  
 22 be able, for example, to talk to us about certain  
 23 programmes or certain issues, particularly when those  
 24 programmes were investigations into issues that might be  
 25 critical or damaging to the BBC.  
 Page 22

1 Q. So an example would be the Panorama about  
 2 Mark Thompson's salary, for example?  
 3 A. The Panorama about Mark Thompson's salary was a key  
 4 example, where Panorama and myself had a difficult  
 5 series of exchanges, a very difficult series of  
 6 exchanges.  
 7 Q. Can I just take you back to the summary that you gave  
 8 about your understanding of what the editor was saying?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Can I just show you a document? You may not have seen  
 11 it before. It is in bundle 3, page 197. Once you get  
 12 there, if you go over the page, you should find 197.001.  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Then I want you to look at the very bottom of that page.  
 15 There is an email from Peter Rippon to Steve Mitchell,  
 16 copied to Sara Beck, on 29 November last year.  
 17 A. Um-hm.  
 18 Q. Just cast your eye over the page --  
 19 A. To which one, sorry? 002 or --  
 20 Q. Yes.  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Just cast your eye over that email and, in particular,  
 23 I want you to note the second paragraph beginning "We  
 24 have spoken", and the next but one paragraph beginning  
 25 "The women are credible".  
 Page 23

1 A. The next -- yes. Um-hm.  
 2 Q. Have you seen that email before?  
 3 A. No.  
 4 Q. What's interesting about it is that it is from  
 5 Peter Rippon to Steve Mitchell and says that they had  
 6 spoken to seven victims, two on tape. In fact, at that  
 7 stage, they only had one on tape but there was another  
 8 interview which took place in the next few days with  
 9 [REDACTED] who in fact wasn't a victim but was  
 10 a former Duncroft girl.  
 11 Then it says:  
 12 "The women are credible and have no motive for  
 13 speaking to us other than they want the truth to be  
 14 known."  
 15 That would appear to be inconsistent with what you  
 16 told us was your understanding -- and you are not the  
 17 only person to have this understanding -- of  
 18 Peter Rippon's view.  
 19 A. Um-hm.  
 20 Q. So is this right: the view that Peter Rippon expresses  
 21 here, on 29 November, isn't something that you were  
 22 aware of?  
 23 A. Well, no, I -- I wouldn't be aware of and shouldn't be  
 24 and couldn't have been aware of it, in that this would  
 25 have been part of the journalistic exchange which  
 Page 24

1 I wouldn't have been party to.  
 2 Q. But the understanding that you obtained, that  
 3 Peter Rippon had these concerns about the credibility of  
 4 [REDACTED] for various reasons, had it reached you that  
 5 Peter Rippon's view had, to some extent, vacillated or  
 6 oscillated?  
 7 A. No.  
 8 Q. So your understanding was that he had been consistent in  
 9 those views?  
 10 A. I think it is important just to go back again, I can't  
 11 sort of stress it enough, that the editorial integrity,  
 12 if you like, of the decision in News is something which  
 13 is jealously guarded by -- sorry, I have to project  
 14 better -- by News.  
 15 It can be sometimes frustrating and during the  
 16 course of managing this and trying to manage the  
 17 reputation of the BBC I did challenge on a couple of  
 18 occasions -- I challenged -- I asked whether in fact  
 19 Peter Rippon could not go out and do an interview  
 20 because I felt doing an interview would at least allow  
 21 him to be questioned, but that was refused. I also  
 22 asked whether we could understand the, um, editorial  
 23 decision, and again, through conversations with  
 24 Helen Boaden, was told that no, I had no right to do  
 25 that, that that was, you know, a central part --

Page 25

1 MR POLLARD: Sorry, can I ask in relation to that --  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 MR POLLARD: -- that having been the case, how did you --  
 4 how could you -- come to the summary conclusion that you  
 5 gave us about Peter Rippon's view of the reliability of  
 6 the women?  
 7 A. That had come through the News team. The point about  
 8 the News team being close to people in News is that they  
 9 will protect information so they won't pass information  
 10 on if it is at the heart of the editorial judgement.  
 11 Obviously, as this story developed and as we pushed  
 12 further, the view came not just from the News team but  
 13 also from, I think, Helen Boaden, and others "Look, you  
 14 know, we're saying all we have" -- at one point, for  
 15 example, "all we have is the blog, all we have -- you  
 16 know, the whole position of the BBC is based upon  
 17 statements given to us and confirmed by Peter Rippon, it  
 18 is based upon a blog given by Peter Rippon, we need  
 19 to -- you know, we need to be -- we need to understand  
 20 this", and we were given to understand, obviously this  
 21 information I think -- and I don't know how, who or to  
 22 whom, had been passed to the News team. It eventually  
 23 filtered through, it was confirm to me in conversations  
 24 by Helen Boaden that there were concerns about the  
 25 credibility of witnesses.

Page 26

1 So this was not something that was put down on  
 2 pieces of paper. It was backed up and it was, if you  
 3 like, circumstantial proof that we should believe  
 4 Peter Rippon. Where it came from, I can't tell you.  
 5 MR MACLEAN: I will come to the blog. Let me just ask you  
 6 about the blog for a moment.  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. What was your understanding of whose idea the blog was?  
 9 A. I think my view was we were pushing in the  
 10 communications team for something to explain, you know,  
 11 what had gone on, we were being questioned. As I said,  
 12 I had a conversation in which I said "Can we put  
 13 somebody up, can we put somebody up for interview? Can  
 14 we put Peter Rippon up?"  
 15 There was a series of text exchanges explaining that  
 16 this was refused, this was not a good idea, and  
 17 therefore, exactly where the idea of the blog came from,  
 18 I'm not sure, but we would have been pushing for  
 19 something and I think News suggested that a blog was  
 20 an idea. It was a standard procedure to have  
 21 an editor's blog.  
 22 Q. The Editors blog already existed.  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Did you know that Peter Rippon's blog was actually the  
 25 offspring of a slightly earlier -- very slightly earlier

Page 27

1 and longer document -- called a briefing note or a chain  
 2 of events?  
 3 A. No.  
 4 Q. Can I ask you to look at A7, at 178? This is 2 October,  
 5 which I think is a Tuesday.  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. It is the day before the ITV broadcast, but the ITV  
 8 stuff had been heavily trailed in the weekend press --  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. -- so you all had a fair idea what was coming.  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. 2 October at 8.43 in the morning, from Mitchell to  
 13 Rippon:  
 14 "Given the press this morning, this isn't yet going  
 15 away so it might be a good idea for you to draft  
 16 a briefing note for our use on the decision-making  
 17 process from commission to decision not to proceed, as  
 18 best you can recall. Obviously various members of staff  
 19 are putting their version out there."  
 20 It is explained to Peter Rippon, if you look at 180  
 21 that this briefing note is for internal consumption and  
 22 he says:  
 23 "For now I want Helen and George to know the full  
 24 story from you."  
 25 Then he produces a document called a chain of events

Page 28

1 at 191 --  
 2 **A. 191?**  
 3 Q. -- 191, at 12.15 on the same day.  
 4 **A. Yes.**  
 5 Q. So did you ever see that chain of events?  
 6 **A. Afterwards, not at the time.**  
 7 Q. Not at the time. You see that it mentions, amongst  
 8 other things, the "key witness" in the second and third  
 9 paragraphs, the paragraph beginning "Meirion then came  
 10 back ..."  
 11 **A. Yes.**  
 12 Q. "... and said there was more than one woman and the key  
 13 witness was alleging the police investigated it but had  
 14 dropped it on the grounds he was too old."  
 15 And then the next paragraph is a reference to "The  
 16 key witness" in the third line:  
 17 "We had no evidence that anyone from Duncroft home  
 18 should have known about it and the key witness said in  
 19 her original blog ..."  
 20 Did you come to have a view as to whether those were  
 21 in fact -- it reads as if it is a reference to the same  
 22 person.  
 23 **A. Yes.**  
 24 Q. Did you come to some view at some stage as to whether  
 25 that was correct?

Page 29

1 **A. Well, firstly, I didn't -- I hadn't seen this until**  
 2 **afterwards.**  
 3 Q. I know that, yes.  
 4 **A. So I can't speculate on what's here. What we had --**  
 5 **I think it's important to say that, given that the only**  
 6 **thing we had to rely on was a blog, what we had to do**  
 7 **was to look at whether that blog was consistent and**  
 8 **coherent. As I said, we had asked whether we could put**  
 9 **Peter Rippon up for interview for him to be challenged**  
 10 **on points and explain them. That had been turned down.**  
 11 **So all we had to go on was a blog, and because it came**  
 12 **from the News side, we were -- it was something that was**  
 13 **produced by the editor, that was it, we were given it,**  
 14 **we had to use it.**  
 15 **So I had -- you know, the information that we were**  
 16 **getting in terms of the details were coming from Peter**  
 17 **and from the blog.**  
 18 Q. Right. I'm not sure that quite grapples with the  
 19 question. I will come back to it.  
 20 **A. Yes.**  
 21 Q. So you didn't know that the blog was the offshoot of  
 22 this document, which is what it is --  
 23 **A. Yes.**  
 24 Q. -- I will show you that in a minute, and this document  
 25 had been produced by Peter Rippon on the morning of

Page 30

1 2 October within a couple of hours, on the basis of  
 2 a request for him to produce a briefing note "as best  
 3 you can recall". So it was asking for his recollections  
 4 and the briefing note is his recollection, and  
 5 Peter Rippon would say:  
 6 "I was asked to write down what I remembered, I did  
 7 that, it may be I didn't remember it accurately but  
 8 I did my honest best to produce what I remembered. What  
 9 I didn't expect was that what I had recalled in my  
 10 briefing note would be turned into some tablet of stone  
 11 by the BBC and then relied on as the Holy Book  
 12 thereafter."  
 13 **A. I can't comment on what Peter -- you know, what was**  
 14 **said. What I was provided with was a blog by the**  
 15 **editor. We were given the blog with all normal**  
 16 **assurances that this was the account that we could**  
 17 **follow. We'd certainly understood, in subsequently --**  
 18 **I can't tell you in which conversation but I certainly**  
 19 **had conversations with the legal team, in which I was**  
 20 **given to understand that Peter had checked with members**  
 21 **of his team on certain points and I have subsequently**  
 22 **seen email exchanges in the bundle that suggest he'd**  
 23 **checked with his team on certain elements of this story.**  
 24 **So I was not aware of these -- of these emails.**  
 25 Q. So you proceeded -- I'm not criticising you, I'm just

Page 31

1 seeking to ascertain the basis on which you proceeded --  
 2 you, comms, proceeded on the basis --  
 3 **A. Yes.**  
 4 Q. -- that the blog was a thorough --  
 5 **A. Yes.**  
 6 Q. -- account --  
 7 **A. Yes.**  
 8 Q. -- and not some quick and dirty briefing note to the  
 9 best of his recollection?  
 10 **A. No, we -- I think the important thing is to understand**  
 11 **what The Editors blog is, and The Editors blog is**  
 12 **an editorial product. It is expected to -- that the**  
 13 **reason why The Editors blog is not something which is**  
 14 **compiled and signed off, for example --**  
 15 Q. Signed off by?  
 16 **A. By a range of people through the normal compliance for**  
 17 **communications, in other words: have I seen it, is it**  
 18 **fine; has the responsible director seen it, is it fine?**  
 19 **An editor's blog is an editorial product and therefore**  
 20 **there is no right -- I have no right to sign it off or**  
 21 **to -- or to challenge it. I can make stylistic**  
 22 **suggestions but they can be refused. It is therefore**  
 23 **a product which is supposed to have the same principles**  
 24 **as the BBC News journalism.**  
 25 Q. So it follows from that, I think, that we have heard

Page 32



1 some evidence from others about the blog and it has been  
 2 unusual in the sense that the press people have some  
 3 input into the blog, albeit, as you say, stylistically  
 4 and so on. Let's accept that for the moment. That's  
 5 input that you wouldn't have into Newsnight's original  
 6 story, for example, had it run?  
 7 **A. No, I think --**  
 8 Q. It is --  
 9 **A. Well, no, in the sense that we would also make**  
 10 **suggestions to Newsnight on its publicity, for**  
 11 **example --**  
 12 Q. Yes.  
 13 **A. -- if it wasn't clear.**  
 14 Q. Yes.  
 15 **A. But we would not -- in other words, helping somebody**  
 16 **just to express something clearly, we would do, but we**  
 17 **would not have a -- we would not have input into the**  
 18 **editorial decision at all.**  
 19 Q. I think it follows from what you are saying and we have  
 20 heard this from others, because the blog is a piece of  
 21 editorial content, a piece of journalism -- it is not  
 22 purely a press thing --  
 23 **A. That's right.**  
 24 Q. -- it's a piece of journalism -- it follows from the  
 25 fact that it is a piece of journalism that the editorial

Page 33

1 chain of command, if you like, is the same in principle  
 2 as it would be for Newsnight story.  
 3 **A. Absolutely.**  
 4 Q. So it follows that the chain of command, if you like, is  
 5 not from Peter Rippon to somebody in your department --  
 6 **A. No.**  
 7 Q. -- it's from Peter Rippon to --  
 8 **A. To Steve Mitchell and then to Helen.**  
 9 Q. Let me just read you what Steve Mitchell says. This is  
 10 his statement to this review:  
 11 "By the beginning of October the press speculation  
 12 was intense. On 1 October I asked Peter Rippon to draft  
 13 a briefing note for me and the Director of News laying  
 14 out his decision-making."  
 15 In fact it was the 2nd, I have a just shown you  
 16 that:  
 17 "I received Peter's note on 2 October. Given the  
 18 public criticism, he also decided to write a blog which  
 19 would be publicised on the BBC Editors blog site in  
 20 order to make it clear that he entirely rejected the  
 21 allegation that pressure had been put on him to drop the  
 22 Savile investigation. The Editors blog is a site where  
 23 editors from across BBC News explain stories and share  
 24 their dilemmas and other issues with the public."  
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 34

1 Q. So far or so good?  
 2 "Their blogs are not always overseen or checked by  
 3 management and I do not believe that the detailed  
 4 supervision of a blog lies within my responsibilities.  
 5 Editors do liaise with the press office when publishing  
 6 their blogs. To the best of my recollection, I saw  
 7 Peter Rippon's blog when or perhaps shortly before it  
 8 was published."  
 9 **A. Yes.**  
 10 Q. Are you content with all of that?  
 11 **A. Yes, I think when he says "liaise" I think it is**  
 12 **important to point out this does not mean we have**  
 13 **editorial authority over the story.**  
 14 Q. So if there were any, if I can use the expression, screw  
 15 ups in the blog, obviously one looks first of all to the  
 16 person who wrote it, but in terms of any failing in the  
 17 managerial process, you would say that the first port of  
 18 call is, in this case, Steve Mitchell?  
 19 **A. I'm not going to speculate on -- on who is responsible.**  
 20 **All I'm saying is that our clear understanding is that**  
 21 **The Editors blog is a piece of journalism produced by**  
 22 **the editor. Given that I'm not in the editorial chain**  
 23 **of command -- I mean, I can't speculate on how that**  
 24 **chain of command carries out its work. But what I can**  
 25 **say is we were assured that was an editorial product and**

Page 35

1 **therefore that's what it was.**  
 2 Q. Did you understand the blog to be -- I assume you  
 3 understood it to be an accurate and truthful account?  
 4 **A. I wouldn't -- or would not have based -- I would**  
 5 **absolutely not have based comments -- defence of the**  
 6 **reputation of the BBC on something I believed to be**  
 7 **inaccurate, misleading or partial.**  
 8 Q. Did you understand it to be, as it were, the whole  
 9 truth, to tell the whole story?  
 10 **A. I understood it to be a thorough picture of what had**  
 11 **happened on the programme.**  
 12 Q. Setting out the full reasons why the piece hadn't run?  
 13 **A. I understood that there might be issues that might not**  
 14 **be able to be raised because of confidentiality or**  
 15 **because of issues of -- and in the blog itself it does**  
 16 **talk about -- I can't remember the exact phrase, but**  
 17 **"concerns". So I felt that they were covered but maybe**  
 18 **not all the details were in there because of issues of**  
 19 **confidentiality.**  
 20 Q. If you still have bundle 7, page 179 --  
 21 **A. Yes.**  
 22 Q. -- one of points that Peter Rippon makes right at the  
 23 beginning on 2 October, in his immediate response to  
 24 Mitchell's email saying "write the briefing note", is he  
 25 says:

Page 36

1 "It may be a good idea to get my side out there  
 2 [that is reference to the public] although it is tricky  
 3 because I cannot point to many of the weaknesses in this  
 4 story that meant I judged on balance not to run it."  
 5 A. Um-hm.  
 6 Q. If you go on a few pages, at page 198, I think it is,  
 7 when Mr Mitchell gets the chain of events or the  
 8 briefing note, he then says:  
 9 "The blog will obviously have to steer away from  
 10 some of the elements of witness reliability but in  
 11 essence can follow the same lines."  
 12 So the blog is deliberately holding something back,  
 13 isn't it, from a full exposition of the facts?  
 14 A. I think no more than a journalistic story would not  
 15 mention a medical condition or something that was  
 16 confidential, and I think it seems that's -- that's  
 17 certainly what I would understand by that.  
 18 MR POLLARD: I suppose where I still slightly struggle with  
 19 the principle behind the blog is, if you like, the  
 20 contrast between your statement, quite bluntly "It's  
 21 a piece of journalism", and the fact that that piece of  
 22 journalism was also acting or about to act as the, if  
 23 you like, the BBC's front of house statement.  
 24 A. Maybe -- maybe I can explain. When I say a "piece of  
 25 journalism", I know these days the word "journalism" has

Page 37

1 multiple meanings. But the BBC journalism -- and this  
 2 was exactly a conversation that I had with  
 3 Helen Boaden -- is supposed to be journalism which is  
 4 reliable, which is accurate, which is unbiased, and  
 5 which is independent, and in fact, um, the conversation  
 6 I had with Helen Boaden when I was saying, you know,  
 7 "Can't we -- can't we get more details, can't we get  
 8 deeper into the editorial decision" -- this was later  
 9 on, this was in the October --  
 10 MR MACLEAN: Give us a sense of time of this?  
 11 A. -- so this was after, so there were two conversations --  
 12 Q. Before or after ITV?  
 13 A. This was, I think, just before the 3rd -- it is in the  
 14 bundle. I think the 3rd was the first conversation.  
 15 I can't give you the exact dates.  
 16 MR POLLARD: So the blog was up, in other words?  
 17 A. Yes, I think the blog would have already been up. But  
 18 there were two conversations around that period in which  
 19 I had conversations with Helen Boaden, so it was  
 20 a second conversation about whether or not -- it was my  
 21 first conversation about whether Peter Rippon could go  
 22 up and do interviews, and subsequent to that I asked --  
 23 I said "We really need to understand the editorial  
 24 decision-making here", and I was very firmly told "You  
 25 can't ask that question" --

Page 38

1 MR POLLARD: Yes, I see.  
 2 A. -- "You don't understand independent journalism", and  
 3 frankly I was irritated and responded that I had spent  
 4 20 years at Reuters and I did understand independent  
 5 journalism.  
 6 MR MACLEAN: In the timeline you have, this is the 2nd,  
 7 I think:  
 8 "I had a number of conversations with Helen Boaden."  
 9 A. Yes, that is right.  
 10 MR POLLARD: What you would like to do, correct me if I'm  
 11 wrong, is you would have liked to have had a chat with  
 12 Peter Rippon, would you, just so you could get a sense  
 13 of really, going straight from the horses mouth, "How  
 14 did this decision come about, tell us how it all  
 15 emerged?"  
 16 A. Yes, I would have liked -- at that point I would have  
 17 liked Peter Rippon himself to go out and do thorough  
 18 interviews because our entire position was based upon  
 19 a written document.  
 20 MR POLLARD: Although I think it's fair to suggest --  
 21 perhaps you might disagree -- that the idea, as we have  
 22 perhaps seen in recent weeks, of putting somebody out  
 23 there to be interviewed, it could go in any one of  
 24 a hundred different directions. It is not necessarily  
 25 the best way to get a clear logical thought out

Page 39

1 explanation of what happened.  
 2 A. No, but I think one of the key things about  
 3 interviews -- and we could discuss different  
 4 interviews -- is that, in addition to the facts being  
 5 laid out, there is also the issue of the credibility of  
 6 the witness and the ability of somebody to explain and,  
 7 you know, we were getting constant challenges from the  
 8 press and we were saying, you know "We've got this line,  
 9 we've got this statement, here's the statement, here's  
 10 the blog".  
 11 If you can see somebody defending their decision --  
 12 we had been assured that Peter Rippon had taken  
 13 a perfectly reasonable decision at the time and our view  
 14 was that if that was the case then he would be very  
 15 credible in explaining this to people and also to other  
 16 journalists.  
 17 MR MACLEAN: Did you know that Jeremy Paxman was very keen  
 18 for Newsnight to deal with this story on certainly  
 19 2 October and, in particular, wanted to interview  
 20 Peter Rippon on his own programme?  
 21 A. No.  
 22 Q. Presumably you were not allowed to know that  
 23 information --  
 24 A. No.  
 25 Q. -- because that is across the divide?

Page 40

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. But you are not surprised that Jeremy Paxman should have  
 3 wanted to do that?  
 4 A. I can't speculate.  
 5 Q. It sounds as if his thought process is much the same as  
 6 yours, from a different perspective, to deal with the  
 7 story.  
 8 A. You will see in the exchange of texts and emails that  
 9 I was frustrated that we couldn't get Peter up there to  
 10 explain his side of the story.  
 11 MR POLLARD: Just so I'm clear again, am I right in sort of  
 12 putting it this way: you weren't able to sit down and  
 13 talk to Peter Rippon face to face, that was thought not  
 14 to be proper procedure?  
 15 A. It was thought not to be proper. It had to go through  
 16 the News line.  
 17 MR POLLARD: But could it go through your News press people?  
 18 A. What had happened was -- what had happened was that,  
 19 earlier on, the -- certainly Helen Deller had had  
 20 conversations with Peter Rippon but as we moved into  
 21 the -- sort of October, we were told that Peter Rippon  
 22 [REDACTED]  
 23 [REDACTED]  
 24 MR MACLEAN: Before we come to the blog, before we get to  
 25 the blog, there were some important developments in

Page 41

1 August when The Sunday Times came knocking at the door.  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. They sent an email on 22 August.  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. They actually are, I think, the first people to mention  
 6 to the BBC -- Meirion Jones may have known -- that ITV  
 7 was also planning something --  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. -- that's in their email.  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. You remember that?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. A reply got sent to The Sunday Times on 29 August --  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. -- and we can look at that in the bundle. Then ITV sent  
 16 a letter on 7 September.  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Now, this part of the story is, to me at least, still  
 19 a little opaque. If you take bundle 6. Where I'm going  
 20 with this is we want to understand -- and at the moment  
 21 we don't really understand fully -- what was happening  
 22 at the BBC from the time when the ITV letter comes in to  
 23 the immediate period before the ITV broadcast?  
 24 A. Um-hm.  
 25 Q. I have quite a good handle, I think, on what was

Page 42

1 happening on 1, 2, 3 October, but I have less of  
 2 a handle on the two or three weeks before.  
 3 A. Um-hm.  
 4 Q. So we know that the Sunday Times email comes in on the  
 5 22nd --  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. -- and that gets responded to on the 29th?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Then I think the next thing that really happens is the  
 10 ITV letter?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. Meanwhile, the Director General has, I think, just come  
 13 back from holiday but only has a few days left, and the  
 14 new Director General has not yet taken up his post?  
 15 A. That's correct.  
 16 Q. Can you help us, by reference to this letter or  
 17 otherwise, which you will find at page 230.001 --  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. That's the ITV letter. It is addressed to Mr Entwistle,  
 20 probably on the basis that ITV thought that he was the  
 21 Director General.  
 22 A. Yes, yes.  
 23 Q. Do you have 230.001?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. I think the covering email is at 229 --

Page 43

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. -- where the BBC press office -- and that is BBC  
 3 Corporate press office, presumably -- sends round to  
 4 a bunch of people, including Julian Payne who was your  
 5 immediate subordinate and lots of other people,  
 6 including Jessica Cecil in the DG's office and  
 7 Mr Entwistle:  
 8 "I was called by Lesley Gardner who sent me this  
 9 letter. I'm forwarding this on for you to review."  
 10 Then we can see that by the next day, page 239:  
 11 "Hi Peter [this is to Peter Rippon], Sarah Jones is  
 12 taking a look at the whole ITV query, she is a BBC  
 13 lawyer. We will touch base with her early next week to  
 14 discuss best responses."  
 15 You have mentioned, and indeed Mr Entwistle  
 16 mentioned, the fact that information was obtained from  
 17 Mr Jones, Meirion Jones, during this period. You  
 18 mentioned the same point that Mr Entwistle mentioned to  
 19 us about the one film --  
 20 A. Yes, yes.  
 21 Q. -- the one interview/two interview thing.  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. So tell me, if you can, what was going on in this period  
 24 between the ITV letter and the immediate run up to the  
 25 blog?

Page 44

1 A. Yes, my best recollection, um, is -- and this suggests  
 2 that that's correct -- is that what was happening was  
 3 that the legal team were looking into a range of things  
 4 and they were -- it was when they were beginning to  
 5 examine what there was on record, whether there was  
 6 anything -- any evidence of any knowledge of Savile, and  
 7 so my best recollection is this is when the legal team  
 8 began to, sort of, if you like, principally lead on this  
 9 project.  
 10 Q. They spoke to the principle players, Rippon and Jones  
 11 and --  
 12 A. Yes, we were not -- the Communications team wasn't party  
 13 to their discussions or deliberations.  
 14 Q. I'm not suggesting you were in the room --  
 15 A. No, no, no, not just that, we weren't -- you know, it  
 16 was approached from a legal perspective to look at  
 17 whether there was not just evidence but liability, what  
 18 was going on, what had happened, and they were leading  
 19 on that.  
 20 Q. So we understand from Mr Rippon that he spoke to,  
 21 I think, two of these BBC lawyers at some point in this  
 22 period.  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. There is an email I can show you, if you like, where he  
 25 sends -- I think it is in bundle 7/160. You see there

Page 45

1 is an email in the middle of page, it is in the middle  
 2 of a chain from Peter Rippon to Nadia Banno and  
 3 Valerie Nazareth, both of whom, as I understand it, are  
 4 BBC lawyers, on 11 September -- so this is four days  
 5 after the ITV letter, do you see in the middle?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. "This was the original memoir we got the story from.  
 8 Interestingly, she says she is certain the BBC had no  
 9 idea what was going on."  
 10 That is [redacted] web memoir?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. My question for you is: Peter Rippon told us that he had  
 13 a meeting with BBC lawyers as well --  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. -- and we can see he's in communication with them --  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. -- I am not suggesting that you or any of your people  
 18 were in these meetings, but on the assumption that notes  
 19 were taken of what Mr Rippon and whoever else it was --  
 20 notes were taken of what they said, was the product of  
 21 those meetings, in any shape or form --  
 22 A. No.  
 23 Q. -- ever shared with you going forward in presenting the  
 24 BBC's position to the world?  
 25 A. No. I mean, again it is on the best of my recollection

Page 46

1 but what happened was that this became a process where  
 2 the legal team were leading it and what would happen  
 3 would be that, you know, we would check our lines with  
 4 the legal team but we weren't receiving a stream of  
 5 documents from the legal team saying, you know, "Your  
 6 line is wrong" or "This is wrong".  
 7 What was happening was our statements were being  
 8 checked by the lawyers to see whether they were correct  
 9 or stayed -- or were in accordance with what they were  
 10 understanding, so we were relying upon them to tell us  
 11 if anything was -- that we had been saying was incorrect  
 12 or was not right.  
 13 Q. When did you first see the [redacted] web memoir?  
 14 A. I think after, you know, some time in October, late  
 15 October, some time in October.  
 16 Q. After the blog was up?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. After it was corrected perhaps even?  
 19 A. Yes, probably after that.  
 20 Q. So there is some sort of process going on led by the  
 21 lawyers --  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. -- which appears to involve discussing face to face with  
 24 the principal actors.  
 25 A. Yes.

Page 47

1 Q. But that's going on wholly separate from -- apart from  
 2 this, apart from your lines being checked by the  
 3 lawyers, it's going on separate from your part of the  
 4 organisation dealing with these press queries --  
 5 A. Yes, absolutely.  
 6 Q. -- morning, noon and night?  
 7 A. Yes, and in fact, I do -- I'm going to have to have  
 8 a break actually to go to the loo, but I do remember  
 9 actually being quite a sharp email exchange from the  
 10 legal team saying, you know, "Please check everything  
 11 with us, don't issue things unless we've -- we've seen  
 12 them".  
 13 (11.40 am)  
 14 (A short break)  
 15 (11.50 am)  
 16 A. So it is worth pointing out that I think I got -- the  
 17 copy of the chain of events was sent to me, I think, on  
 18 3 October by Steve Mitchell.  
 19 MR MACLEAN: By Steve Mitchell, all right, okay -- by which  
 20 time the blog was up?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Did you notice on the briefing note when you did see it,  
 23 or the chain of events, that it refers to the Managed  
 24 Risk Programme List?  
 25 A. Yes, but we checked that Managed Risk Programme List --

Page 48

1 in fact we checked quite hard on that -- and there is  
 2 a series of exchanges on the Managed Risk Programme List  
 3 and our understanding was -- not just understanding, we  
 4 looked at the lists for, I think, October and November,  
 5 which are the relevant periods, and it was not on the  
 6 central Managed Programme Risk List.  
 7 Q. Yes, and Mr Mostrous from The Times who was the one who  
 8 was particularly pushing at this door, he was told  
 9 pretty firmly --  
 10 A. That it was --  
 11 Q. -- that it was not on the Risk List?  
 12 A. That's right.  
 13 Q. But that was a reference, you say, to the central list  
 14 that goes to the Editorial Standards Board.  
 15 A. That's right.  
 16 Q. So the reason he was not told that the Savile story had  
 17 originally been on --  
 18 A. A News list --  
 19 Q. -- a lower iteration of the Managed Risk Programme  
 20 List --  
 21 A. As far as we were aware, that was what we considered the  
 22 Managed Programme Risk List. There was a series of  
 23 reports that fed into what was the MRPL which was  
 24 distributed, and we were talking about the Managed  
 25 Programme Risk List, and, I think, in fact there were

Page 49

1 some exchanges in the bundle that I was sent over the  
 2 weekend, suggesting that Newsnight had actually asked  
 3 for it not to go on the list, because of sensitivity.  
 4 Q. I don't think that is quite right, actually.  
 5 A. I think there was an email from Liz Gibbons --  
 6 Q. No, I think you will find that in A2/188 and A2/276 that  
 7 the chain of events is that the Newsnight Savile story  
 8 was fed up by Newsnight --  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. -- to Sara Beck in Steve Mitchell's office --  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. -- and it was on their contribution to the list with  
 13 a view to it going to News Group which is the next level  
 14 before it gets to the Editorial Standards Board, but it  
 15 was taken off the list at that stage by, it seems,  
 16 Mr Mitchell and Sara Beck --  
 17 A. Okay, that's -- that's what I'm referring to.  
 18 Q. -- essentially by Steve Mitchell.  
 19 A. That's what I'm referring to.  
 20 Q. So in October when these questions were being asked  
 21 about the Managed Risk Programme List the connection  
 22 doesn't seem to have been made with the fact that the  
 23 Savile story was actually on Newsnight's contribution to  
 24 that list for a period.  
 25 A. But what it was not on was the list as -- the central

Page 50

1 list as produced, and we specifically looked at those  
 2 lists and checked whether it was on those lists, or we  
 3 could -- what we had to do was to look at the list that  
 4 was produced and circulated and it wasn't on those  
 5 lists.  
 6 Q. But Steve Mitchell would have been able to tell you that  
 7 it was on the list at an earlier stage?  
 8 A. But it -- but it wasn't on the list that was circulated.  
 9 Q. Because he took it off and he knew that.  
 10 A. All I can say is that we were asked whether it was on  
 11 the Managed Programme Risk List, which is the central  
 12 list which is distributed around the BBC. We checked.  
 13 I think it's worth saying that, you know, in sort of  
 14 tribute to the Communications teams, that one of the  
 15 things we had a long discussion with subsequently was  
 16 whether in fact we should answer all the questions from  
 17 journalists, but we spent a vast amount of time through  
 18 this period actually answering the questions of  
 19 journalists and taking them very meticulously and  
 20 seriously, and so the question that we were asked was  
 21 "Was it on the central list?" and the answer was, "No,  
 22 it was not", and we checked the list and it was not  
 23 there.  
 24 Q. I don't think you were quite asked whether it was on the  
 25 central list. Isn't it right that the press office

Page 51

1 chose to interpret the question as being whether it was  
 2 on the central list?  
 3 A. I can't speculate on what -- you know, I think that's  
 4 putting a -- an interpretation onto events which I can't  
 5 speculate on. All I can say is what I knew and when  
 6 I checked again, because I wanted to double check that  
 7 it was not on the list -- was that the list that I was  
 8 aware of was the central list. I was not aware that  
 9 there were, sort of subsidiary lists that came into the  
 10 centre. All I knew was that there was a list.  
 11 I think it is important that actually the existence  
 12 of that central list, that is the list of record. That  
 13 is the list, therefore, and given that what The Times  
 14 were pushing for was about senior management knowledge  
 15 of a programme, if it was not on a list that was the  
 16 list that they saw, that was the point.  
 17 MR POLLARD: But you see the significance, do you --  
 18 A. I see the significance.  
 19 MR POLLARD: -- that if that story had just not been on the  
 20 list full stop, that's one thing. If that story had  
 21 been put into the system for the purposes of sharing  
 22 information that might be useful by one department to  
 23 another, and then had been taken off halfway up the  
 24 chain, you can see that that's a different significance.  
 25 A. Of course I can see it was a significance, but I can't

Page 52

1 see how I would have known that it was taken off the  
 2 chain, since what we were asked was "Was it actually on  
 3 the list?" I remember having a conversation with  
 4 David Jordan as to was it on the list, and he said no,  
 5 it certainly wasn't. So I said, "You know what, I want  
 6 to be absolutely certain it wasn't on the list,  
 7 can I see the list?" We saw the list, it wasn't there,  
 8 and that was the result.  
 9 To assume knowledge of something that had happened  
 10 further up the chain is, I think, to assume too far. We  
 11 simply were answering the question that we had been  
 12 asked.  
 13 MR MACLEAN: Let me show you some of documents about this in  
 14 bundle 14. The question is raised not just by  
 15 Mr Mostrous at The Times, but also by Panorama.  
 16 A. Which document are you reading?  
 17 Q. It was also raised by Panorama, wasn't it?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. 298 is Panorama. Karen Wightman, she's at Panorama --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- and she sent an email to Mr Jordan at EdPol on  
 22 19 October --  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. -- seeking a response to one further issue, which is:  
 25 "I understand that you oversee the Managed  
 Page 53

1 Programmes Risk List. Could you please tell us if the  
 2 Newsnight investigation into Jimmy Savile was entered on  
 3 to the MPRL? If yes, could you tell us on which date it  
 4 was entered and whether it was circulated to the  
 5 Director of Vision's office either separately/or by the  
 6 Broadcast Direction Group meeting that you chair? Could  
 7 you also tell us how the Newsnight investigation was  
 8 described on the MPRL? If it was not entered onto the  
 9 MPRL, could you tell us whether you believe that it  
 10 should have been?"  
 11 A. Um-hm.  
 12 Q. Were you involved in replying to these questions from  
 13 Panorama?  
 14 A. What happened with the Panorama questions was I had  
 15 an initial conversation with Karen and Clive. It was  
 16 a tense conversation -- I can't remember the date --  
 17 because of this issue of, um, the corporate centre  
 18 needing to respond on an issue of reputation for the BBC  
 19 to a programme which was being -- which was a BBC  
 20 programme investigating it.  
 21 Subsequent to that, the decision on the response to  
 22 Panorama was taken by the legal team, because the  
 23 letters that came in from Panorama were individual  
 24 letters, right of reply letters. We had lines that we  
 25 were working on, statements that we had been working on,  
 Page 54

1 on specific details, but it was a decision taken by the  
 2 legal team that these should be dealt with by the legal  
 3 team and, in fact, I had a subsequent conversation with  
 4 Peter Horrocks -- a certain level of frustration about  
 5 this, because I was worried about being empty chaired on  
 6 the programme. I was worried about us not being able to  
 7 give a point of view.  
 8 So I did have a subsequent conversation with  
 9 Peter Horrocks, who was then standing in as the head of  
 10 News, where we discussed how we could get out of this.  
 11 Because what I didn't want was to get into a fight with  
 12 Panorama. I wanted us to work professionally with  
 13 Panorama and try to help them with their programme but  
 14 at the same time we had to deal with the questions and  
 15 the reputational issues.  
 16 So I discussed whether we might, for example, have  
 17 a set of corporate questions that we could answer as  
 18 a corporate entity, and therefore we would not be  
 19 answering for individuals who might have their own  
 20 lawyers or their own views. Because it was becoming  
 21 clear by then that we were not going to get a shared  
 22 view from all of the participants.  
 23 Subsequent to that, a letter came in from Panorama  
 24 with some corporate questions, but again that series of  
 25 corporate questions were, um -- were taken over by the  
 Page 55

1 lawyers who eventually provided a brief answer on the  
 2 Monday morning when the blog was published.  
 3 Q. That's what we will come to, that's the corporate  
 4 statement --  
 5 A. That's the corporate statement.  
 6 Q. -- on the 22nd?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 MR POLLARD: Does that address the MPRL?  
 9 MR MACLEAN: No, it doesn't.  
 10 A. So the specific answers to these questions were not  
 11 given because they were -- they were then taken over by  
 12 the legal team in response to the fact these were right  
 13 of reply letters.  
 14 Q. I think, just picking up on the one to Mr Jordan, if you  
 15 go in the same bundle to 378 on the same day --  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. -- Julian Payne asks Jordan:  
 18 "Regarding our recent conversation" --  
 19 A. Sorry, 378?  
 20 Q. 14/378. We haven't seen David Jordan yet, but:  
 21 "Hi David, regarding our recent conversation, am  
 22 I correct in assuming it never featured on the list at  
 23 all or can we only speak with confidence about November  
 24 and December?"  
 25 Then the reply is over the page:  
 Page 56

1 "Correct, never."  
 2 Mr Mostrous' question is in the same bundle at 369.  
 3 Alexi Mostrous on 19 October in the afternoon:  
 4 "Hi Julian."  
 5 The lower one, first of all:  
 6 "Thanks very much for the briefing just now. Very  
 7 helpful. I realise you didn't have to do it. You said  
 8 that the Managed Risk Lists were circulated on a monthly  
 9 basis to all heads of department and senior BBC  
 10 management, including George Entwistle in his capacity  
 11 then as Head of Vision. You said, however, that the  
 12 November and December lists categorically contained no  
 13 mention of either Jimmy Savile or the Newsnight  
 14 investigation into his affairs. You said there was only  
 15 one central Managed Risk Programme List and Savile was  
 16 not on that. You said his name would not have been on  
 17 lists outside the November/December time period because  
 18 the list was defined by a programme's broadcast date,  
 19 since the Newsnight's investigation was due to be  
 20 broadcast in December, you said that it would have been  
 21 on that month's list, if at all."  
 22 He says:  
 23 "If that is wrong, please tell me."  
 24 He's told:  
 25 "Broadly, what you have said is right. The pan-BBC  
 Page 57

1 Managed Risk Programme List is circulated to senior  
 2 management. I can't say whether it goes to all  
 3 department heads. On the point of when it was on the  
 4 list, I said it was possible that the programme had been  
 5 on the list some time before that, but if it was, it  
 6 should have remained on it right up to its transmission  
 7 date, which would have meant November/December were  
 8 certainly the months when it would have been on there."  
 9 That is on the 19th. Then a little later in the  
 10 same afternoon, after the exchange with Mr Jordan that  
 11 I have shown you, Mostrous gets another email at 381:  
 12 "You aren't missing anything, Alexi. It was never  
 13 on there. Thanks, Julian."  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. So Mr Mostrous might be forgiven for thinking that the  
 16 final message he gets is that the Savile programme had  
 17 never featured on this list at all.  
 18 A. But that was our understanding. I think the important  
 19 thing is what -- you asked about multiple lists before  
 20 and I came back to the point that there is a central  
 21 list and what is important to note is that what  
 22 Mr Mostrous is asking and other journalists were asking  
 23 is whether other senior management knew of the existence  
 24 of the programme. Because I think this was about the  
 25 issue as to whether there had been interference in the  
 Page 58

1 editorial process from Vision or other departments.  
 2 The only list that other departments would have got  
 3 or would have seen was the Managed Programme Risk List.  
 4 So there was no -- the question was: had  
 5 George Entwistle seen this programme and, as a result,  
 6 acted to bring pressure onto Newsnight? The answer was:  
 7 it wasn't on the list.  
 8 MR POLLARD: The other way of looking at this, of course, as  
 9 you obviously realise, is that, had Savile not been  
 10 taken off the lower stages of the list --  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 MR POLLARD: -- and got to the centrally managed list --  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 MR POLLARD: -- it is quite possible that George Entwistle  
 15 would then have been alerted to the danger of running  
 16 tribute programmes at a time when Newsnight were --  
 17 A. Absolutely.  
 18 MR POLLARD: -- investigating paedophilia from the subject  
 19 of those tributes.  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 MR POLLARD: So the answers to Mostrous are, it seems to me,  
 22 accurate but they don't tell the whole story.  
 23 A. I think you also have to remember that, at this time,  
 24 um, Julian in particular was dealing with, on average,  
 25 30 to 40 requests a day from Ben -- Ben Webster.  
 Page 59

1 Let's just be clear, therefore, I think it is  
 2 difficult to assume that, on every single question, you  
 3 are sitting there saying "Well, he could be asking this,  
 4 he could be asking that". It is getting to the point at  
 5 this point where an exhausted team is saying, "You have  
 6 asked a question, we have given you the answer".  
 7 MR MACLEAN: But this is clearly something that Panorama are  
 8 onto -- it may be that the original source of all of  
 9 this one can speculate about -- but Panorama are onto it  
 10 on the 19th, Mostrous is onto it on the 19th and  
 11 Mr Wilson MP sends Mr Entwistle a letter, specifically  
 12 about this, also, curiously enough, on the 19th, in the  
 13 same bundle at page 325.002.  
 14 A. It is not that curious that Mr Wilson --  
 15 Q. I was being slightly ironic, I used the word ironically.  
 16 The letter that he sends to the Director General,  
 17 that presumably would be something that would be  
 18 directly on your plate, in terms of responding to that,  
 19 would it?  
 20 A. Yes. Although, again, as I said at that point, all of  
 21 the correspondence is being principally handled by the  
 22 legal team. So it is not a case that the communications  
 23 team -- you know, we are checking that what we're saying  
 24 is in agreement, but the actual correspondence is being  
 25 dealt with by the legal team --  
 Page 60

<p>1 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask you straight and plainly then, 2 as it were -- 3 A. Yes. 4 MR POLLARD: -- in relation to the Julian Payne answer to 5 Mostrous -- 6 A. Yes. 7 MR POLLARD: -- and your knowledge then, do you believe that 8 when Julian Payne answered Alexi Mostrous that he knew 9 the Savile story had been taken off the lower reaches of 10 it? 11 A. No, absolutely not. 12 MR POLLARD: So you think he was being completely honest -- 13 A. I think he was being completely honest -- 14 MR POLLARD: -- as to his state of knowledge then? 15 A. -- and the very fact that, you know, he asked 16 David Jordan -- and I remember saying at the time "Well 17 this is great, but shouldn't we get a copy of the list?" 18 Just, you know it is fine getting an email from somebody 19 saying "No, it wasn't on it", but one of the problems we 20 faced was shifting statements -- statements we had been 21 given over this period shifting, so I said "I think we 22 better get a copy of the Managed Programme Risk List for 23 these two months and just check", and Julian came back 24 and said "We've seen them, it's not on it". So he was 25 simply answering a direct question as to "Was the Page 61</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. You see it deals with the Managed Risk Lists -- 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. -- in the second paragraph. Then if you go on to 5 page 326, also on the 19th, I think, this is a tweet 6 from Guido Fawkes -- 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. -- yet another vessel by which these points are being 9 ventilated on this particular day: 10 "Hidden deep in the minutiae of BBC Editorial Policy 11 is the so-called Managed Risk Programme List. Airing 12 the now infamous Newsnight Savile report would 13 undoubtedly have posed an editorial, intrinsic and 14 reputational risk to the BBC ..." 15 Referring to Mr Wilson's letter. 16 A. Um-hm. 17 Q. I am afraid I can't remember. I suspect the reply to 18 Mr Wilson was that these are all matters for the Pollard 19 review. 20 A. I suspect it was. 21 Q. Is that right? 22 A. I suspect it was. 23 Q. So he didn't get a substantive response on the 19th 24 because, perhaps not surprisingly, whenever possible, 25 the answer that was being given was "These are matters Page 63</p>
<p>1 programme on this list?" 2 MR MACLEAN: Would that line that was sent to Mostrous and 3 perhaps others -- "No, it wasn't on the list" -- was 4 that one of the things that was run by legal before it 5 was put out, or would it only apply to more formal 6 statements. 7 A. I think all -- there was a heavy involvement of the 8 legal team throughout this process, and, you know, 9 Julian and I were working here -- Julian was handling 10 the bulk of the day to day queries. He would raise 11 specific concerns to me but the volume was such that it 12 was very intense. My understanding was that Julian was 13 letting legal know of everything that was being said, 14 because they were holding, if you like -- they were 15 holding the principle line. 16 Q. Was there some identified, as it were, named individual 17 at legal, who was -- 18 A. It was usually Nadia Banno, and I think Sarah Jones was 19 often copied in but Sarah was -- Sarah was extremely 20 busy so Nadia wanted to be copied in on things. As 21 I said, there were a couple of occasions when lines were 22 issued because they seemed purely factual lines and we 23 got a little note back saying "Don't issue lines at 24 all". 25 Q. The MP's letter is at page 325.002, on the 19th. Page 62</p>	<p>1 for the Pollard review". 2 A. Yes, not to load work on you, but on the grounds that, 3 you know, where there was factual clarity and the lines 4 had been agreed previously, you know, we in some cases 5 gave those lines, but in many cases it seemed that the 6 best thing was to wait for a definitive version of 7 accounts and for that to come out. 8 Q. There was a particular meeting, wasn't there, in the 9 Director General's office the morning after the ITV 10 documentary had broadcast, is that right -- 11 A. I am sure there was, I don't remember. 12 Q. -- which I think you were at and also Helen Boaden and 13 Mr Entwistle and perhaps others? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. That was the meeting where there was discussion about 16 the Director General making a statement, the effect of 17 which would be to force Peter Rippon to resign, wasn't 18 it? 19 A. I remember two, um -- I remember two meetings. I can't 20 exactly remember details, but I remember certainly on, 21 um -- I remember certainly on one of the meetings -- and 22 this would be the closest recall that I can -- the 23 closest thing that comes to this, talking about the 24 potential outcomes of this situation. 25 It seems to me, as the head of communication, my job Page 64</p>



1 is to lay out the options and I do remember saying, at  
 2 the time, um, you know, the review will find out what  
 3 the outcome -- what the actual events were but the chain  
 4 is very clear, and I remember pointing out that the  
 5 chain went from Peter Rippon to Steve Mitchell to  
 6 Helen --  
 7 Q. Which review?  
 8 A. This review.  
 9 Q. We are on 4 October. We haven't got the review yet.  
 10 A. Then it's a different meeting.  
 11 Q. We don't get any notion of the review until  
 12 Mr Entwistle's interview on Today when he hints at it,  
 13 and then it is announced on the 12th.  
 14 A. I am afraid I can't remember.  
 15 Q. This is the 4th, and Helen Boaden had a very clear  
 16 recollection of this meeting and that the plan was --  
 17 I can tell you exactly what she said:  
 18 "I had a very difficult conversation with George  
 19 immediately after the ITV programme when George asked me  
 20 to go to his office and Jessica [Jessica Cecil] and  
 21 Paul Mylrea were there and George said 'I'm going to do  
 22 a public statement and I have decided that I need to  
 23 protect the BBC and BBC News within it and I'm going to  
 24 do a statement that makes it impossible for Peter not to  
 25 resign'."

Page 65

1 A. I am sure he said that. I have no --  
 2 Q. Whose idea was that?  
 3 A. That would have been George's.  
 4 Q. Do you remember what became of that idea?  
 5 A. As I say, I can't actually recall that -- that meeting.  
 6 I mean I have no doubt that it happened. But my  
 7 understanding was that, um, the decision -- I think  
 8 there was a discussion, I vaguely remember a discussion  
 9 about -- there was a vague discussion -- I'm concerned  
 10 about saying something I can't remember, so I probably  
 11 don't want to go there, but the only conversation that  
 12 I remember firmly about Peter Rippon's departure was at  
 13 the time of the blog when, er, the -- it was clear that,  
 14 um, the -- that there were errors in the blog and that  
 15 therefore he needed to step aside because of those  
 16 errors.  
 17 Q. That is the end of the 20th and 21st?  
 18 A. That's later, yes.  
 19 Q. Did you give the idea to Mr Entwistle that this would be  
 20 a good idea to protect the BBC and BBC News, so in  
 21 effect force Peter Rippon out?  
 22 A. I had a conversation with George in which I said at some  
 23 point people are, you know, going to have to take  
 24 responsibility and I said "What you have to do is decide  
 25 where the responsibility lies", and this was the

Page 66

1 conversation I recalled earlier, and I said the -- you  
 2 know, the -- I remember saying:  
 3 "The responsibility line is the following: it starts  
 4 at Peter Rippon, it goes to Steve Mitchell, it goes to  
 5 Helen Boaden, and then to the Director General. At the  
 6 time when all of this was happening, you were the  
 7 Director of Vision. Those are the people. I think you  
 8 have to take a view as to whether people are responsible  
 9 and people need to take responsibility for that, and if  
 10 they do, that is the line."  
 11 Q. How do you get from that to making a statement that  
 12 Peter Rippon was going to have to resign as a result of?  
 13 A. Well, that was -- you know, as I say I don't recall the  
 14 conversation, but that's George's comments and not mine.  
 15 Q. Helen Boaden offered to resign then, didn't she?  
 16 A. Yes. And Helen Boaden offered to resign and again  
 17 I think, you know, my comment about -- I remember that  
 18 bit. I remember Helen Boaden offering to resign and  
 19 I said "Well, the problem is that nobody has proved that  
 20 anybody has done anything wrong and that if you go News  
 21 is unmanageable".  
 22 Q. But if nobody has proved that anybody has done anything  
 23 wrong, which may well have been the truth, what is the  
 24 Director General doing planning to make a statement  
 25 forcing the editor of Newsnight to resign?

Page 67

1 A. I am sure it is one of the things he was thinking about.  
 2 I think the important thing is after that he didn't make  
 3 a statement which meant that Peter Rippon resigned.  
 4 Q. Because Helen Boaden talked him out of it?  
 5 A. I presume that was the conversation. I certainly argued  
 6 against Helen Boaden going, and throughout this period  
 7 there was lots of discussions about how do you get out  
 8 of this, we seem to be on a downward path, what do we  
 9 do, where do we go, but the key point was that at that  
 10 point nobody felt anybody had done anything other than  
 11 what they were supposed to have done.  
 12 Q. So why does Mr Rippon have to walk the plank?  
 13 A. Well, I don't think he did.  
 14 Q. Well, he didn't in the end.  
 15 A. No, so these conversations are held. That was  
 16 presumably George's view at the time but it didn't  
 17 happen.  
 18 Q. It is important to understand what information you, and  
 19 perhaps more importantly Mr Entwistle, had at this  
 20 stage.  
 21 You have explained that in September there was this  
 22 legal-led process going on, and you have explained that  
 23 you, certainly, weren't furnished with the fruits of  
 24 that process?  
 25 A. Yes.

Page 68

1 Q. Was it your understanding that Mr Entwistle had been  
 2 furnished with the fruits of that process?  
 3 A. Yes, because I think George was -- my understanding was  
 4 certainly, I mean, you know, George spent a significant  
 5 amount of time with the legal team. It was very much a  
 6 legal-led process. This was the case, you know,  
 7 subsequently through to the Select Committee and the  
 8 second Today Programme interview.  
 9 So my understanding was, you know -- and there were  
 10 a couple of occasions when, you know, he was in a room  
 11 with lawyers and working with lawyers and he was very  
 12 keen to make sure that the legal position was  
 13 watertight. So my understanding was very much that he  
 14 was being, um -- he was not just across but right on top  
 15 of everything that the legal team was doing.  
 16 Q. And you, obviously, given your very important role as  
 17 communications director, would have been kept informed  
 18 by Mr Entwistle of his developing thinking all the time,  
 19 because you have to present it to the public. You had  
 20 a bird's eye view?  
 21 A. I was -- I was in the office quite a lot. I remember at  
 22 certain times a level of frustration. Um, I'm trying to  
 23 remember examples. I remember one specific example  
 24 later, but it was sort of -- the sort of thing that was  
 25 happening where, for example, when Stephen Mitchell and  
 Page 69

1 Helen Boaden stepped aside the statement had been  
 2 prepared by Legal and in fact hadn't been shared with me  
 3 and when it was leaked to Sky it took us a couple of  
 4 hours to get hold of the statement.  
 5 So I would say that I wasn't aware of everything  
 6 that was going on, everything that was being decided.  
 7 Q. The blog goes up on the 2nd --  
 8 A. Sorry, just to come back on that. I think it's  
 9 important that, you know, this was a -- this was  
 10 a developing process. You will see that the importance  
 11 of the legal team developed. I think you see that for  
 12 example the first Today programme -- I don't remember  
 13 all the dates -- but the first Today Programme interview  
 14 I gave a pretty detailed briefing for that interview,  
 15 but subsequently as it developed it was much more  
 16 a legal based briefing. In fact, for the Select  
 17 Committee we were unable to do a communications or  
 18 public affairs briefing with Mr Entwistle.  
 19 Q. Unable?  
 20 A. He didn't have time to do it.  
 21 MR POLLARD: Because he was really being briefed by Legal?  
 22 A. He was being briefed by Legal. He had counsel and we  
 23 did suggest doing briefings but, um, he didn't have time  
 24 to do it.  
 25 MR MACLEAN: Right. Then Mr Feeney comes on the scene in  
 Page 70

1 September replacing Mr Hardy, is that right?  
 2 A. James, yes, that's right.  
 3 Q. Can I just ask you to look in bundle 8, please? This is  
 4 a internal BBC email at page 64 from Mr Feeney to  
 5 Helen Deller.  
 6 A. Um-hm.  
 7 Q. Which curiously you might think says:  
 8 "A BBC journalist at Newsnight looked into how the  
 9 police investigated and then dropped the case against  
 10 Jimmy Savile. We interviewed a number of people but  
 11 ultimately could not prove a failure of institutions or  
 12 unequivocal evidence of abuse by Jimmy Savile. So  
 13 the Newsnight editor took the decision not to broadcast.  
 14 He wasn't influenced in any way by anyone at the BBC.  
 15 It is monstrous to suggest that our journalists would  
 16 have colluded to cover up abuse."  
 17 Does all of that accord with your understanding? Do  
 18 you think that's accurate?  
 19 A. That certainly was my understanding right the way  
 20 through the process until -- until the blog corrections  
 21 came out.  
 22 Q. When did you first realise that there was some, as it  
 23 were, real doubt being cast on the accuracy of blog?  
 24 A. It was, I think the -- I think the 19th. I think there  
 25 is an exchange by -- George had got hold of me, I don't  
 Page 71

1 know whether it was text or email but it is certainly in  
 2 the bundle, saying we have come to the conclusion that  
 3 there are serious -- I can't remember what he said, but  
 4 it's in the bundle saying that there are issues with the  
 5 blog which we have to correct.  
 6 Prior to this we had the process where up to the  
 7 Kenny -- to the best of my recollection, up to the Kenny  
 8 MacQuarrie issue we had a clear and settled position  
 9 within the BBC which was based upon the blog and there  
 10 was no question that that was the correct version.  
 11 The Ken MacQuarrie moment was the moment when  
 12 although I hadn't seen the emails there were challenges  
 13 into George's office which were then taken into the  
 14 legal team and then it was suggested that somebody look  
 15 into these to see whether there was a -- simply  
 16 a difference of opinion, or whether in fact there was  
 17 a substantial error.  
 18 There is a further exchange -- I am afraid I can't  
 19 remember the date -- which says that in conversations --  
 20 I think it is from Helen Boaden, there is a text to me  
 21 where she says:  
 22 "They've raised issues but Meirion Jones does not  
 23 believe Peter is lying, but Liz MacKean thinks he's out  
 24 of his depth."  
 25 So again, even at that point our understanding is  
 Page 72

1 that the substance of what we're saying is still  
 2 correct.  
 3 Subsequent to the Ken MacQuarrie investigation  
 4 essentially there is then a question of "Is there  
 5 a difference or is there factual errors?"  
 6 The blog was effectively then frozen moving toward  
 7 the Pollard Inquiry, and it was then on the 19th when  
 8 I get a message from George saying that the team -- the  
 9 legal team -- has come to the conclusion that there are  
 10 serious errors and it needs to be corrected.  
 11 Q. The MacQuarrie thing, I think that's the 9th --  
 12 A. That's right.  
 13 Q. -- that that goes to Mr Entwistle?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And MacQuarrie had spoken to MacKean and Jones the day  
 16 before?  
 17 A. That's right.  
 18 Q. Let me just ask you, just before we get to that,  
 19 Mr Entwistle sent round one of his notes to staff,  
 20 didn't he?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. On 5 October?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Do you remember that?  
 25 A. Yes.

Page 73

1 Q. And you had quite a hand in that statement?  
 2 A. Well, I had an initial draft which I gave him but  
 3 George -- George wrote his own version.  
 4 Q. If you have bundle 8 there, if you go to page 220,  
 5 please?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. 217, actually.  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Look at the email at the bottom of the page, first of  
 10 all?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. From George Entwistle to you and others --  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. -- on the 4th:  
 15 "I wonder if it is time for a personal statement  
 16 from me."  
 17 And then he sets out his draft?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. What I want to ask you about is the email above that --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- which Mr Entwistle places some reliance on, perhaps  
 22 not surprisingly. You reply to him at 11.03:  
 23 "A version of the Newsnight para ...(Reading to the  
 24 words)... from Helen and an amended version I have tried  
 25 to craft but think is too long,"

Page 74

1 And then Helen's version:  
 2 "It is now well known that BBC's Newsnight programme  
 3 looked into a police investigation into allegations  
 4 against Jimmy Savile. Individual editorial decisions  
 5 are finely balanced. This was an honest decision made  
 6 by an individual editor without any interference from  
 7 outside the programme. The Newsnight programme was not  
 8 broadcast for proper editorial reasons."  
 9 Now your version is:  
 10 "It is now well known that the BBC's Newsnight  
 11 programme looked into a police investigation into  
 12 allegations against Jimmy Savile. The programme found  
 13 that the police had properly investigated but decided  
 14 there were insufficient grounds to proceed. It was on  
 15 this basis that the editorial decision was taken to drop  
 16 the programme. There was no other reason and no  
 17 interference from outside Newsnight."  
 18 Now what was the basis of that crafting by you?  
 19 A. The basis of that crafting was, again back to the lines  
 20 that we had agreed and to -- I would assume that there  
 21 were discussions also with Paddy Feeney, and what we  
 22 were saying was that this was not a new position, this  
 23 was standing position, but that my view was that Helen's  
 24 version didn't include previous statements.  
 25 Q. But you don't suggest, or do you, that your couple of

Page 75

1 sentences you crafted were based on the blog, do you?  
 2 A. It's based on -- it's based on both the blog but also on  
 3 conversations with Paddy Feeney and the News team.  
 4 MR POLLARD: The News comms team?  
 5 A. The News comms team.  
 6 MR MACLEAN: Perhaps it is obvious, but you know what  
 7 Mr Jordan said subsequently in a couple of media  
 8 outlets.  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. He perhaps most strongly advocated the sort of line  
 11 which we find in your paragraphs, didn't he?  
 12 A. No, I think the -- I think if you take my line and you  
 13 take Helen's line, what is absolutely critical is the  
 14 first sentence, and that there is no difference in the  
 15 first and the second sentence.  
 16 Mine merely attempts to express -- I felt that the  
 17 first version of Helen didn't actually -- it says it was  
 18 well known and they looked into it, but didn't say what  
 19 happened as a result of looking into it. It was  
 20 a simple journalistic approach to a statement: you have  
 21 asked a question or you have posed something but you  
 22 don't say what has come as a result of it. I therefore  
 23 I tried to put in there what was the standing line, that  
 24 having looked into the investigation they decided there  
 25 was insufficient grounds to proceed, because I felt the

Page 76

1 first version left that -- didn't answer the question.  
 2 MR POLLARD: You don't think that that's a bridge too far?  
 3 That the police had properly investigated?  
 4 A. But that's what I was assured was the case. That's what  
 5 I was told was exactly the case by people in the News  
 6 team, by Helen, and that the understanding was that if  
 7 you look back to the blog there are two parts in the  
 8 paragraph about this which says that, you know -- and  
 9 I think the core issue between Meirion and Peter Rippon  
 10 is whether Peter is seeing the whole investigation at  
 11 the point at which it concludes, where he decides that  
 12 because the police response was a proper response -- and  
 13 this is what was summarised to us -- that that was the  
 14 reason he dropped it, whereas Meirion's view was it  
 15 began doing something else.  
 16 So what this was doing was not emphasising one  
 17 element of it to another. It was merely taking that  
 18 first sentence and expressing what the outcome of that  
 19 was according to the information given to us by the News  
 20 team and Peter Rippon.  
 21 MR MACLEAN: But, Mr Mylrea, I have to suggest to you that  
 22 your paragraph -- the meaning conveyed by your paragraph  
 23 is importantly different from the meaning conveyed by  
 24 Helen Boaden's paragraph.  
 25 In particular, your paragraph includes the words  
 Page 77

1 "there was no other reason", other than the fact that  
 2 the police had been found to have properly investigated.  
 3 You will not find, will you, support for that in the  
 4 blog? If you want to look at the final version of blog,  
 5 it is in A7/277, but it is not there?  
 6 A. I think if you take my line it says very clearly:  
 7 "The programme found the police had properly  
 8 investigated but decided there were insufficient grounds  
 9 to proceed."  
 10 That is a fact that was told to us by the News team.  
 11 In fact in the bundle list there is also something that  
 12 is communicated to Peter Rippon. We were told that it  
 13 was on this basis --  
 14 Q. Communicated to Peter Rippon?  
 15 A. To Peter Rippon. In the bundle there is an exchange  
 16 between Meirion and Peter Rippon about the CPS decision  
 17 and this is certainly something that we were told -- we  
 18 haven't seen those exchanges, but we were told that the  
 19 reason this had been dropped was because, as you have  
 20 seen in a range of discussions, concern about the  
 21 credibility of witnesses led to the desire to see  
 22 whether the police investigation was thorough and  
 23 proper, because if the police investigation wasn't  
 24 thorough or proper, that would compensate for the lack  
 25 of credibility of witnesses.  
 Page 78

1 The investigation into that police investigation  
 2 showed it was thorough and proper and was dropped and  
 3 that was our clear understanding. And I think that goes  
 4 back to the statement made by Peter Rippon earlier on,  
 5 which, if you look right back at the beginning at the  
 6 entire exchange of logs and the way the logs were  
 7 created, it starts from the beginning with Helen Deller  
 8 and Karen Rosine talking about this being an  
 9 investigation into the CPS decision, and that was the  
 10 basis on which we suggested this.  
 11 Q. So let me make sure I have --  
 12 A. Just to be clear, so three things are important. One,  
 13 the reason for putting this line in was because I didn't  
 14 believe that Helen's version actually gave what our line  
 15 was. That's the first point.  
 16 Secondly, the line that I wrote in there was based  
 17 clearly upon cleared lines and lines that we were using,  
 18 that we had been using and that we were given.  
 19 Thirdly, it is very important to see that this was  
 20 sent to Sarah Jones as a suggestion and given the  
 21 process that we were going through at this point, it was  
 22 the legal team who were deciding whether these things  
 23 were correct or not correct. So I'm making  
 24 a suggestion. I believe my suggestion is based upon the  
 25 information that I had and that we had been using  
 Page 79

1 throughout, and it had gone to the legal team as my  
 2 suggestion.  
 3 I think it is also important to point out that it's  
 4 not saying I'm not -- I'm not suggesting use Helen.  
 5 Here is Helen's version; here is my version. I think it  
 6 is too long. I don't see that there is a substantive  
 7 difference between my version and the lines that we had  
 8 already been putting out.  
 9 MR POLLARD: I would just say, from the way I look at it,  
 10 that the line that I haven't seen, I think, anywhere  
 11 before, which is to some extent an extension or  
 12 an extrapolation or a strengthening of it, is the line:  
 13 "The programme found that the police had properly  
 14 investigated."  
 15 It seems to me that is an interpretation by you?  
 16 A. That is an interpretation by me but it was based upon  
 17 information that was given to us by Peter Rippon and, as  
 18 I say, most importantly this was not a version given as  
 19 an ex cathedra comment: it was a version given as  
 20 a suggested drafting which would be reviewed by the  
 21 legal team who had full access to all the data.  
 22 Therefore, what I'm not saying is "Use this version,  
 23 this is the correct version"; it is "Here is a version  
 24 that I have drafted that I believe covers the point and  
 25 emphasises the points you wish to make. Is this  
 Page 80

1 correct, are you happy with this?"  
 2 **And in fact, I think in the final version George**  
 3 **used a different -- a completely different sentence.**  
 4 Q. You are quite right, he didn't pick up your language in  
 5 his note. The final version actually is in A9/146.  
 6 There are various drafts but I think this is the final  
 7 one. Yes, it is, because it is the one that Jones chose  
 8 in response to -- so 5 October --  
 9 **A. Yes, I think what is important is that that is**  
 10 **essentially the line -- Helen's line with, um, a slight**  
 11 **hardening of the "investigated Surrey Police's inquiry**  
 12 **into Jimmy Savile towards the end of 2011", which was**  
 13 **not in my suggested line. And in fact he's discarded**  
 14 **most of my suggestions.**  
 15 **So this was -- this was cleared by the team and**  
 16 **issued by his office, the internal comms team.**  
 17 Q. Do you accept the observation that what gets lost to  
 18 some extent -- perhaps to a greater extent in this  
 19 communication -- is the fact that the story originally  
 20 had two aspects: there was Jimmy Savile was a paedophile  
 21 and the evidence, the interview with [REDACTED] and the  
 22 other notes of interviews that had been obtained by  
 23 Hannah Livingston and Liz MacKean on the one hand; then  
 24 there was the ultimate question of the CPS police  
 25 investigation, which was the catalyst for Peter Rippon

Page 81

1 not running this story. It was, as he puts it in his  
 2 email of 30 November, that was the key to whether the  
 3 story stood up. But it was the inability of the second  
 4 limb to stand up that meant that the story was canned  
 5 but it was still a two-limbed story, and the fact that  
 6 it was a two-limbed story has got somewhat lost in the  
 7 fog by this stage, hasn't it?  
 8 **A. I completely agree but again I think it is really**  
 9 **important to emphasise -- I'm trying to find the logs --**  
 10 **it is very important --**  
 11 Q. We looked at them earlier in bundle 18, I think,  
 12 starting at page 46.  
 13 **A. I think the important thing is to realise how the story,**  
 14 **clearly with hindsight and knowing what -- sorry, 46?**  
 15 Q. I think they start at 46.  
 16 **A. Right. The story which, you know, with hindsight we now**  
 17 **know to be complicated was characterised at the**  
 18 **beginning -- I go back to the importance of this**  
 19 **editorial chain and back to the fact that I did ask for**  
 20 **Peter to go out and explain his decision, but you can**  
 21 **see how things develop. But from the beginning we've**  
 22 **got maybe another -- I think this is just the logs.**  
 23 **There is actually a -- yes, we have a statement by**  
 24 **Peter Rippon. There is another one, I must see if I can**  
 25 **find it.**

Page 82

1 Q. Are you talking about the one that gets repeated  
 2 ad nauseam, "The editor of Newsnight Peter Rippon says  
 3 the following ..."?  
 4 **A. But there was a longer briefing note which was written**  
 5 **by Karen Rosine which sets out --**  
 6 Q. I think that is probably on 16 October.  
 7 MR POLLARD: Is that in 14?  
 8 MR MACLEAN: Is it 13/187, PM1? I think that might be it.  
 9 Is that it?  
 10 **A. No, sorry about this.**  
 11 Q. Is it one of the documents you supplied to us?  
 12 **A. Yes, I'm sure it was one of the documents I supplied, or**  
 13 **by Paddy Feeney.**  
 14 Q. If you give us the PM1 number, we should be able to find  
 15 it.  
 16 **A. Here we are. I have PR1/038 and 039, which is**  
 17 **21 December 2011.**  
 18 Q. It is in bundle 4. 21 December?  
 19 **A. 21 December from Helen Deller to Peter Rippon: PR1/038.**  
 20 Q. Yes, it is in bundle 4, page 155.  
 21 **A. Yes.**  
 22 Q. Is this the one that starts:  
 23 "This is not now going to run tomorrow."  
 24 **A. Yes, that's the correct one.**  
 25 Q. 155.

Page 83

1 **A. So you can see the genesis of the CPS line on page**  
 2 **A4/156 at the top:**  
 3 **"We understood there was a relatively recent**  
 4 **CPS/Police investigation into historic indecent assault**  
 5 **that was not pursued for lack of evidence. It was**  
 6 **alleged ... If that's factually accurate."**  
 7 **Peter Rippon responds and talks about a police CPS**  
 8 **investigation but explains that there was a CPS**  
 9 **investigation. Now I wasn't -- I hadn't seen these at**  
 10 **the time, they were not copied to me, but this**  
 11 **demonstrates the thinking of the News team in generating**  
 12 **their line.**  
 13 **If you go on to A4/157, what is clear is that first**  
 14 **of all the line that is given is "in this case the angle**  
 15 **we were pursuing could not be substantiated", but**  
 16 **underneath on "Background":**  
 17 **"We did interview an individual about Savile with**  
 18 **a view to pursuing a story involving CPS and police. We**  
 19 **had been led to believe there had been a recent**  
 20 **investigation into the allegations but these were**  
 21 **dropped. However we could not gain sufficient**  
 22 **information to stand this up."**  
 23 Q. That is her draft. You are going back in time.  
 24 **A. I know I'm going back in time. But what I'm saying is**  
 25 **that this was confirmed by Peter. This was the line**

Page 84

1 that we then used as the basis.  
 2 Therefore, going back to my suggestion in my  
 3 proposed paragraph in George's email, was as far as  
 4 I was aware there was no change to this line; this was  
 5 still the line that as far as I was aware was stood up.  
 6 That in the blog he made it clear that there were things  
 7 that could not be substantiated but there were two  
 8 elements which we have already made clear: one, some  
 9 issue about the credibility of witnesses which led him  
 10 to investigate the CPS; but this CPS line was a key line  
 11 for him and was one which we had been given from  
 12 December 2011 and to my knowledge had not changed.  
 13 Q. But on that chain, the one at 156 and 157 is Deller  
 14 internally to the BBC.  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Rippon says it is not quite right.  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. She then has another go at the top of 156, and what she  
 19 says is:  
 20 "With that in mind I would brief yes a BBC crew did  
 21 interview an individual about Savile. We understood  
 22 there was a relatively recent CPS/police investigation  
 23 into historic indecent assault that was not pursued  
 24 for lack of evidence. It was alleged it was dropped  
 25 because of Savile's age but we could not stand this up.  
 Page 85

1 If that's factually accurate?"  
 2 Rippon is asked eventually at 155 was he okay  
 3 with that and he says, yes, fine. And that is the line  
 4 that is then fed to Goslett and we see that at 164?  
 5 A. Yes. So that is the line that underpins -- in other  
 6 words there is not a statement saying that but that is  
 7 a background statement which to my knowledge has never  
 8 been -- you know, when I'm writing the line for George  
 9 has not been rescinded by Peter and that is just a proof  
 10 that that was the line that I was told was the case.  
 11 Q. So if you look at 164 -- we can get it from the log as  
 12 well -- what goes to Goslett, is this your point, is if  
 13 you look in 164 at the two sentences in inverted  
 14 commas --  
 15 A. Sorry, which bundle are we in now?  
 16 Q. A4/164. That is the log.  
 17 A. Yes, okay, yes.  
 18 Q. This is the upshot of the emails we have just been  
 19 looking at, yes?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. The upshot is that Goslett is told:  
 22 "The BBC gathers information on hundreds of stories  
 23 and not all make it to air."  
 24 We can all agree that is true?  
 25 A. Yes.  
 Page 86

1 Q. "In this case the angle we are pursuing could not be  
 2 substantiated."  
 3 Your point is that "the angle" makes it sound like  
 4 a single one dimensional story, is that right?  
 5 A. My point is that the line that we had signed off by  
 6 Peter Rippon made it clear that that was the line that  
 7 the story was hanging on, that that was the line that  
 8 could not be substantiated and therefore the story fell  
 9 on that point. So that was my understanding, that  
 10 whilst there was, you know, a lack of credibility of  
 11 witnesses, therefore for -- for the editor to run this  
 12 story he needed to be absolutely certain. He needed to  
 13 understand that the investigation -- that the police  
 14 investigation had been somehow dropped for some  
 15 pressure, and that's the point that I was trying to  
 16 reflect in the statement.  
 17 Q. That's the angle he was pursuing in order to stand up  
 18 the story. But it wasn't the only angle in the story?  
 19 A. No, but I think -- the point that I'm making is that  
 20 what is now clear and what became clear publicly late to  
 21 my knowledge institutionally, in a way that was taken  
 22 seriously -- obviously with hindsight we might regret  
 23 that it wasn't taken seriously earlier, but it was taken  
 24 seriously institutionally, to my knowledge, by the  
 25 Ken MacQuarrie investigation -- and that was the first  
 Page 87

1 point at which there was a questioning -- again,  
 2 I didn't see the Ken MacQuarrie investigation, it was  
 3 never passed to me -- that was the point at which there  
 4 was a serious questioning of the editor's view, of the  
 5 editor's statement.  
 6 Q. What you have in mind is what we have now seen, the one  
 7 page document from MacQuarrie on Entwistle.  
 8 A. Yes, although, as I say, I didn't see it at the time.  
 9 Q. That's what you had in mind?  
 10 A. What I had in mind is you have the first -- the  
 11 institutional review of Meirion and Liz's view.  
 12 Q. So you didn't know at the time that Meirion Jones had  
 13 responded pretty promptly to Mr Entwistle's note to  
 14 staff of the 5th, I think, within 31 minutes --  
 15 Mr Entwistle on Friday 5th -- but Mr Entwistle doesn't  
 16 see that email, I think, until after he has been on The  
 17 Today Programme on the Monday morning --  
 18 A. That's right.  
 19 Q. -- and then he responds.  
 20 Mr Entwistle told us it wasn't so much the  
 21 Meirion Jones email but what struck him, as it were, was  
 22 the MacKean email of the 8th saying that there were  
 23 problems with the blog --  
 24 A. Which again had not been checked.  
 25 Q. -- that prompted Mr Entwistle to set up the MacQuarrie  
 Page 88

1 process. So we know that MacQuarrie got on with it  
 2 pretty shortly. Just before we get there, in  
 3 bundle 9 -- you can put anything with a number lower  
 4 than 9 away. Mr Entwistle's appearance on The Today  
 5 Programme on 8 October, whose idea was that?  
 6 **A. Er, there was -- I think it's important to go back. It**  
 7 **was certainly strongly urged by the Trust, and I think**  
 8 **there was a standing, um, expectation from the Trust to**  
 9 **do Today programme interviews. That had come from**  
 10 **a discussion around the time of the pageant, when I had**  
 11 **actually been on holiday but George had not done a Today**  
 12 **programme interview, despite being asked. George and**  
 13 **I were asked to go to the Trust and we were told that it**  
 14 **was the duty of the BBC to be accountable and, in**  
 15 **particular to The Today Programme, we should do The**  
 16 **Today Programme.**  
 17 **So the first interview was very much -- it was**  
 18 **a discussion. I cannot remember the exact discussions**  
 19 **but there was a very clear view by the Trust that George**  
 20 **should do it. I know there were other views expressed**  
 21 **such as Helen Boaden's saying she was, um, concerned**  
 22 **about it, that there was a risk. But George decided he**  
 23 **would do it.**  
 24 **Q. Helen Boaden thought that it was going to go badly,**  
 25 **didn't she?**

Page 89

1 **A. She was concerned about it, she was very concerned about**  
 2 **it.**  
 3 **Q. She sent you a text, didn't she --**  
 4 **A. Yes.**  
 5 **Q. -- saying, bundle 9/419:**  
 6 **"Hope it goes as well as it can. I think I know**  
 7 **what you are going to say, it was GE or LP would have**  
 8 **stepped in."**  
 9 **And "LP" is Lord Patten.**  
 10 **A. Yes.**  
 11 **Q. If you look at page 405 in bundle 9, the day before, on**  
 12 **the 7th, the Sunday night, at 9.45 at night. This is**  
 13 **an incoming text to you, is that right?**  
 14 **A. Yes.**  
 15 **Q. "Not sure about this Today interview. Will keep story**  
 16 **going further but suspect the Great Panjandrum has had**  
 17 **something to do with it."**  
 18 **That is a reference to Lord Patten.**  
 19 **A. I would presume so. I would note it is Helen Boaden's**  
 20 **email and not mine.**  
 21 **Q. Text, yes, I see that.**  
 22 **You supplied Mr Entwistle with, essentially,**  
 23 **a pretty fully-baked script at page 387 for this Today**  
 24 **programme?**  
 25 **A. Yes, yes, and I was able with this one also to do some**

Page 90

1 **briefing with him, to get some time with him to review**  
 2 **this. I think we had -- we brought in an external media**  
 3 **trainer, ex-Newsnight presenter, who we had on call to**  
 4 **work this through.**  
 5 **MR POLLARD: Who was that?**  
 6 **A. John Morrison, I can't remember now. We worked with**  
 7 **Donald Steel and -- I can get you the details.**  
 8 **MR MACLEAN: Okay.**  
 9 **A. It is important to say they had been -- we had had, um,**  
 10 **three sessions planned with them prior to George taking**  
 11 **over but those had been cancelled, so this was the first**  
 12 **media training session that we were able to do.**  
 13 **Q. I should have asked you, actually, about the handover**  
 14 **period. Mark Thompson comes back from holiday and**  
 15 **then --**  
 16 **A. Yes.**  
 17 **Q. -- he told us went to visit the Nations on somewhat**  
 18 **of a farewell tour. Mr Entwistle takes over at midnight**  
 19 **on 16 September, I think it is. His first day is the**  
 20 **17th and he makes a big speech on the 18th.**  
 21 **A. Um-hm.**  
 22 **Q. What kind of transition was there between the two**  
 23 **directors general?**  
 24 **A. In terms of handover of meetings?**  
 25 **Q. Yes. Was George Entwistle in effect doing the job of**

Page 91

1 Director General in the lead up to officially taking  
 2 over or --  
 3 **A. Only for a couple of weeks. What happened was, um, Mark**  
 4 **was available and ready to sort of support George.**  
 5 **George decided that he wanted to complete**  
 6 **a restructuring in Vision before taking over. I think**  
 7 **I suggested he needed time and that we could set up**  
 8 **a separate sort of space and a team for him if he wanted**  
 9 **to work into the Director General's role, but he felt**  
 10 **very firmly that he needed to conclude this**  
 11 **restructuring in Vision.**  
 12 **And then in the end there was a three-week --**  
 13 **I think a three-week period in which George was**  
 14 **principally, as I understood it, because I wasn't --**  
 15 **I can't remember the date I had a meeting with him. It**  
 16 **would be in the diary. I was outside the loop. There**  
 17 **was a consultants, I think Deloitte's, working on a 100**  
 18 **day plan and restructuring.**  
 19 **I'm trying to remember the exact dates. And I was**  
 20 **then brought in and told by George that he did want me**  
 21 **to stay but he wanted to change my role. Um, that he**  
 22 **felt that we focused too much on the media and that we**  
 23 **needed to focus more on a strategic engagement with**  
 24 **stakeholders and he wanted my role to move away from**  
 25 **media handling and towards mapping and engaging the**

Page 92

1 stakeholders.  
 2 MR POLLARD: What did he mean by that?  
 3 A. I think it had come from his presentation to the Trust  
 4 for his interview. There was a phrase which I think had  
 5 come from the headhunter, that's certainly what  
 6 I understood it to mean, which was that the BBC had --  
 7 the BBC was well known but had few friends. It was  
 8 something along those lines. And what he wanted was for  
 9 a more systemic engagement with partners, individuals,  
 10 and not the ad hoc relationship that people had at the  
 11 time. So that was what I was asked to focus on.  
 12 And there were also changes to the structure of the  
 13 BBC and the management board, for example, so the  
 14 management board took over from the BBC Direction  
 15 Group --  
 16 MR MACLEAN: And it was smaller, wasn't it?  
 17 A. It was much smaller. So I was taken off, other people  
 18 were taken off: head of strategy, head of marketing Alan  
 19 Yentob and various others.  
 20 Q. Just give me a flavour for these stakeholders that you  
 21 were to be having strategic communication with?  
 22 A. Everything from the Arts Council to, you know,  
 23 independent companies that we worked with.  
 24 Q. That you commissioned programmes from, that sort of  
 25 thing?

1 A. People we commissioned programmes from.  
 2 MR POLLARD: Parliament?  
 3 A. Parliament was already -- the feeling was that in my  
 4 team we already had a public affairs team. There was  
 5 a certain amount of confusion about the change in my  
 6 title because it was as if saying -- well, public  
 7 affairs has a very specific meaning and as a former  
 8 president of the Chartered Institute of PR I knew that,  
 9 but I was asked to change the title.  
 10 So the public affairs team had been handling  
 11 Parliament well and it was felt that we could approach  
 12 the -- or we could have the same sort of systematic  
 13 approach to other stakeholders.  
 14 MR POLLARD: Was the implication of that less focus on the  
 15 press?  
 16 A. Yes. The idea was -- and it was certainly a strong view  
 17 that came across and that was communicated to me -- was  
 18 that we were too driven by the press agenda.  
 19 MR POLLARD: Did you agree with that?  
 20 A. I have, um --  
 21 MR POLLARD: Is "no" the answer?  
 22 A. It's a difficult question to answer, but my view is that  
 23 much as I have -- it's back to Macmillan it's "Events,  
 24 dear boy, events".  
 25 I'm a firm believer in being prepared and expecting

1 things to go wrong. I used to describe myself as the  
 2 Cassandra, but it was a view and it was the view of the  
 3 Director General.  
 4 MR POLLARD: Okay.  
 5 A. Can I just add, sorry, but I think it is important  
 6 because I think it feeds into what people knew and  
 7 I think I made it clear in my summary and timeline that  
 8 therefore this led to a change in I think two key  
 9 meetings: one was the management board but also one was  
 10 the morning call.  
 11 So the morning call with Mark was at 9.15 and it was  
 12 a press call and media call. It was to discuss what  
 13 were the issues out there at the time. Under George it  
 14 changed to a call where it began with a discussion of  
 15 the operational issues around the operational directors,  
 16 so Vision, A&M, Online, dot, future media. And at the  
 17 end of the call it was "Okay, let's quickly go through  
 18 the press" and do it there.  
 19 Also that the management board -- at the BBC  
 20 Direction Group it would always begin with  
 21 a conversation what were the themes coming through the  
 22 press? Not just in terms --  
 23 MR POLLARD: Beforehand? When Mark was --  
 24 A. When Mark was there.  
 25 MR MACLEAN: That was item 1, you mean.

1 A. Item 1 was to talk about the press. Not just "What are  
 2 the headlines this week?", because it was fortnightly;  
 3 it was "What are the themes and issues coming through  
 4 the media that we need to be aware of and we need to  
 5 think about?" And it was always a standing item.  
 6 I would prepare by working with my team and coming up  
 7 with some points.  
 8 The change meant that the management board -- that  
 9 I did not sit at the management board but I was called  
 10 in at the end to discuss the progress of the public  
 11 affairs project.  
 12 MR POLLARD: So am I right in thinking in the new slimmed  
 13 down management board there wasn't somebody with  
 14 a specific responsibility for comms or --  
 15 A. There was nobody with an external focus on the  
 16 management board.  
 17 MR POLLARD: That's what I meant, yes.  
 18 A. So neither -- and neither marketing, strategy nor myself  
 19 were on the board. So the management board consisted of  
 20 the three operational directors of basically Vision, A&M  
 21 and Future Media; the three national directors,  
 22 Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; North and then  
 23 Director General obviously, Head of HR, and Head of  
 24 Finance. There was no -- there was no representative of  
 25 external facing --



1 MR POLLARD: And A&M is?  
 2 A. Sorry, this is typical BBC jargon. I still struggle  
 3 with it. Vision is television, A&M is radio -- radio  
 4 and orchestras -- Radio and Orchestras and Proms, so it  
 5 is audio and music. And Future Media is basically  
 6 online stuff.  
 7 MR POLLARD: And no representative of News?  
 8 A. Yes, News was there. Helen Boaden was there, sorry.  
 9 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask: do you think that change of  
 10 to some extent playing down the sort of media facing  
 11 role and the shift of emphasis away from that, do you  
 12 think that played a part in the problems that the BBC  
 13 had during, say, late September/October in managing its  
 14 public response properly?  
 15 A. I think it is an exceptionally difficult question for me  
 16 to answer, because, if you like, it's -- the only answer  
 17 is the Mandy Rice-Davies answer: "Well, they would say  
 18 that, wouldn't they?" If I give my view, that should be  
 19 your response. I mean, I have a view. I have a very  
 20 clear view.  
 21 MR POLLARD: We would be keen to hear it.  
 22 A. Is that -- I mean obviously, I mean it's difficult.  
 23 It's difficult because I'm effectively challenging  
 24 decisions which could, um, cause issues, but my view is  
 25 that there was a -- there was a fluid conversation and  
 Page 97

1 exchange with Mark Thompson who usually wanted to be  
 2 kept abreast of what was going on and would often in  
 3 some cases spot issues that you hadn't -- you know, you  
 4 thought were just press issues but he'd say "Hold on,  
 5 that's quite significant, if they are saying that ..."  
 6 And a key time around this would be the Leveson Inquiry  
 7 when he was absolutely focused on who was saying what  
 8 and what did this mean.  
 9 I felt there was a shift -- a significant shift.  
 10 I did not have, um, the same access and I felt -- you  
 11 know, I am concerned because I think, you know, there is  
 12 obviously potential impact on me, but I felt concerned  
 13 and tried to pull together a more strategic approach to  
 14 communications. By which I meant that, you know, I have  
 15 done major crises in the past both in Government and in  
 16 other situations and you need a number of things. You  
 17 need an external perspective that helps keep you on the  
 18 straight and narrow and gives you somebody else's  
 19 perspective. I felt that we had been reduced in number  
 20 and we were not allowed to bring in external support.  
 21 MR MACLEAN: You did in the end bring in Brunswick?  
 22 A. We brought in Brunswick.  
 23 Q. Was that at the 13-hour?  
 24 A. No, we brought in Brunswick fairly early on but it was  
 25 then terminated.  
 Page 98

1 Q. So who brought in Brunswick?  
 2 A. I made the call to David Yelland after a discussion with  
 3 Roger Mosey. We felt we needed external counsel because  
 4 basically there was just me trying to get the lines and  
 5 pull everything together. Julian was working flat out.  
 6 We had a team which was quite tight but then  
 7 subsequently a week later I was instructed to -- and  
 8 obviously this is commercially sensitive -- I was  
 9 instructed to call David and say that, um, er, that it  
 10 was not appropriate for him to -- for Brunswick to be  
 11 working for us.  
 12 MR MACLEAN: My note says -- and we only have this in the  
 13 documents that aren't in bundle because we have been  
 14 getting documents every day from the BBC -- these were  
 15 from archive documents but my note says that:  
 16 "On 16 October, Brunswick PR advisers were  
 17 appointed. Mr Yelland at Brunswick leading their team."  
 18 I know Mr Yelland's background and Mr Yelland was  
 19 slightly sensitive about his position becoming known, or  
 20 he said words to the effect of "Once it is out, we must  
 21 assume that my role will appear".  
 22 A. I think, you know, I had several conversations with  
 23 David. I think David had two concerns. One, he was  
 24 concerned about we had had one challenge on whether the  
 25 BBC was bringing in help and support. It seemed to me  
 Page 99

1 that it was a very appropriate and good thing to do to  
 2 get external advice. [REDACTED]  
 3 [REDACTED]  
 4 [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]  
 7 Q. Right.  
 8 A. I think that was the concern.  
 9 Q. So you got Brunswick in on about the 16th, which was six  
 10 days before the blog gets corrected?  
 11 A. Um-hm.  
 12 Q. And then you say that Brunswick were stood down. You  
 13 say this is about a week later?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Whose decision was that? How did that come about?  
 16 A. I was instructed by George to, um -- I mean, I was  
 17 instructed by George to tell them that we no longer  
 18 wanted to continue and that that instruction had come  
 19 from the Trust.  
 20 Q. What was, did you understand, the reason for that view?  
 21 A. That optically it was not acceptable for a public sector  
 22 organisation to hire external support.  
 23 Q. From a financial point of view or from a "We're big  
 24 enough to look after ourselves" or what?  
 25 A. I was not party to -- to the decision. But it was -- it  
 Page 100

1 was a very clear instruction. It was a very difficult  
 2 conversation. Um, I felt, um -- I didn't particularly  
 3 like telling one of the biggest PR companies in the  
 4 world that we had had them working for us for a week but  
 5 we didn't want them anymore.  
 6 Q. What had they been able to do or achieve in that period?  
 7 A. They had only just started. They had only just got the  
 8 team together and what they were doing -- which would  
 9 have been of great help -- was actually trying to pull  
 10 together some scenario planning. Given that we were,  
 11 you know, embedded in the day-to-day and the team was  
 12 running exhausted by this time, to have an external  
 13 counsel who could think with an external perspective to  
 14 give us that view from out there as to "You are too  
 15 inside the loop. What does it look like outside? Have  
 16 you thought, are you considering this?" You know,  
 17 "Let's bring a team in. Let's review everything and  
 18 let's give you that external counsel." That was what  
 19 I felt they could bring.  
 20 Q. There was a view out there, wasn't there -- Bell  
 21 Pottinger, I think, pitched to you for the same kind of  
 22 crisis management type services?  
 23 A. About 26 companies sent me emails saying, "Paul, we know  
 24 you. How are you? Do you want to have a coffee and can  
 25 we offer you crisis management?"

Page 101

1 Q. Obviously they were chasing some work?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. Quite obviously. But to someone in your position with  
 4 your -- standing where you sit, if you like, it was  
 5 obvious, was it, that the BBC needed this type of  
 6 assistance?  
 7 A. It was -- I felt -- I felt concerned that the team -- we  
 8 had a real issue with, um -- I mean, as I say, I am  
 9 concerned because of, you know, the potential  
 10 repercussions on me afterwards, but I'm trying to be as  
 11 full and frank as I can.  
 12 We had a very tight team. We had taken  
 13 24/25 per cent out. We lost some senior people not just  
 14 at the direct line management level but actually beneath  
 15 that. We were very thin on senior people. 70 per cent  
 16 of the, um, Vision team was acting up.  
 17 Q. Acting?  
 18 A. In other words was stepping up to another level or  
 19 another job.  
 20 MR POLLARD: The press office people, the comms people in  
 21 Vision?  
 22 A. The comms people in Vision. 70 per cent --  
 23 MR MACLEAN: 70?  
 24 A. -- were stepping up to a level, you know, that they were  
 25 in jobs that weren't theirs. We'd got only in Audio and

Page 102

1 Music, I think in Radio 2, at one point somebody --  
 2 either Jamie or James, sorry, I had rather a lot of  
 3 James, came to me and said they only had two months  
 4 worth of experience in the Radio 2 team.  
 5 So it meant that we had very few people. It meant  
 6 that we were running tired. I had nobody to step in for  
 7 me and we didn't have a strategic -- all we had was the  
 8 sort of diary function. We didn't have a team pulling  
 9 together scenarios and whatever. And I think the  
 10 problem to me is that when you get tired when you are in  
 11 a crisis and when you are within the organisation and  
 12 receiving the information from the organisation, the  
 13 failure to have an external perspective is a huge risk.  
 14 MR POLLARD: So when Brunswick was stood down, it wasn't, as  
 15 far as you could see, because anybody was dissatisfied  
 16 with what they were doing --  
 17 A. Absolutely not. They had hardly started. They --  
 18 I think there was no contract and no financial exchange.  
 19 But what I think David had very kindly done was provide  
 20 us with a sort of first think piece of some of the  
 21 things we needed to think about, and I think that was  
 22 the problem. That was what we lacked from then on,  
 23 which nobody outside saying "Hold on a minute, this is  
 24 not going in the right direction" or "You need to think  
 25 about this" or "have you thought about that?" So no

Page 103

1 external challenge to the issue, and no -- you know,  
 2 having done, for example 7/7 for Transport for London,  
 3 we had a -- we had a communications gold team, where all  
 4 of the communications people from the different agencies  
 5 came together to discuss the communications response.  
 6 Here, communications was effectively me on a gold  
 7 response --  
 8 MR MACLEAN: This is Mr Entwistle's gold, silver and bronze  
 9 team and --  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. -- you were on the gold team.  
 12 A. I was on the gold team, but it was me giving advice at  
 13 the same time trying to get the statements, trying to  
 14 clear statements, so that Julian could issue them to the  
 15 press.  
 16 MR POLLARD: So strategy and fire-fighting, as it were --  
 17 A. Both at the same time.  
 18 MR POLLARD: -- were both you?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 MR MACLEAN: So the email -- I am afraid I can't show you it  
 21 in the bundle because I only got it the other day --  
 22 there is an email from David Yelland to people whose  
 23 names I don't recognise: Nick Claydon, Kim Barnes(?) and  
 24 Alex Finnegan.  
 25 A. If you pass it to me, I can probably tell you who they

Page 104

1 are.  
 2 Q. Then it is pinged onto you. Then at the top of the page  
 3 it goes to Mr Entwistle from you. So you and  
 4 George Entwistle -- is this right: he was quite happy  
 5 with this proposal?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Then how does that square with this one, which again  
 8 only came in -- I think I saw it on Sunday.  
 9 A. Yes, I think that is exactly the line:  
 10 "The BBC felt it needed external advice at its most  
 11 senior level at this exceptional moment. It is happy to  
 12 confirm that."  
 13 Q. Now, this one is three days later from Jessica Cecil to  
 14 the executive board:  
 15 "George and Fiona ..."  
 16 I'm not sure --  
 17 A. Fiona Reynolds would be the --  
 18 Q. I know, on the Trust?  
 19 A. The incoming Senior Independent Director.  
 20 Q. Right:  
 21 "... would like to find a way of keeping us all in  
 22 touch with the implications."  
 23 This is the executive board around the Jimmy Savile  
 24 story.  
 25 "We will be aiming to hold a 30-minute call once  
 Page 105

1 a week expressly for this purpose and we will make sure  
 2 your office is informed."  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. How does that -- the Executive Board -- that's --  
 5 A. Well, again, I'm not on the Executive Board and --  
 6 Q. How does that relate to the slimmed down management?  
 7 A. The Executive Board, um, sets the strategic direction of  
 8 the BBC and the Management Board carries out, if you  
 9 like, the operational decision -- or the day to day  
 10 management of the organisation.  
 11 Q. But that's --  
 12 A. So the Executive Board includes non-executive directors:  
 13 Marcus Agius, Fiona Reynolds and various others.  
 14 Q. We are not quite finished, I am afraid, but we need to  
 15 have another break.  
 16 A. That is absolutely fine.  
 17 Q. It is 1.10, I see.  
 18 MR POLLARD: Half an hour.  
 19 (1.14 pm)  
 20 (The short adjournment)  
 21 (1.44 pm)  
 22 MR MACLEAN: Can I just ask you about an exchange you had  
 23 with Helen Boaden by text, which is concerned with the  
 24 awards lunch.  
 25 A. Yes.  
 Page 106

1 Q. I understand you are not at the lunch. This exchange  
 2 takes place some time later. But as you might imagine  
 3 we have had accounts of this lunch from more than one  
 4 person.  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. I just want to show you bundle 11, page 190. It looks  
 7 to me as if you are involved here in drafting or drafted  
 8 a line to be sent to Ben, who I assume is Ben Webster --  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. -- at The Times dealing with this discussion. We can  
 11 see what you had written and you had made a change from  
 12 the previous draft, which had been agreed by  
 13 Helen Boaden, which was to change --  
 14 A. Just to be clear, the change is a change made by Helen.  
 15 Q. Yes. She -- your original draft has mentioned that, and  
 16 she changed that to "told", is that it?  
 17 A. That's right, and also took out the word "further" from  
 18 the words "further details" -- "no further details". So  
 19 in the third line she had removed the word "further"  
 20 saying:  
 21 "Helen offered George no details of the  
 22 investigation."  
 23 Q. So that was the line as it stood. Now, does that go  
 24 together with the text message at 221? Is there  
 25 a relationship between them? Your email that we just  
 Page 107

1 looked at is at 14.35 on the 10th and 221 is a text  
 2 message, the same day, 18.25, so a few hours later. It  
 3 may be obvious but what is the relationship between the  
 4 text message and the email exchange?  
 5 A. I don't think -- I think -- I have to say, I'm not  
 6 entirely clear when -- this is 10 October, when was the  
 7 Select Committee? I'm trying to remember.  
 8 MR POLLARD: 21st --  
 9 A. So it is not then. Okay, this does relate to the  
 10 conversation but I think this is about questions that  
 11 were coming in about "but surely the programme was  
 12 ready, surely it was edited and ready to go?" and my  
 13 understanding of this was -- I mean, I'm not entirely  
 14 clear --  
 15 MR MACLEAN: Who is the "him" in the text message?  
 16 A. I presume it's George but I have to say -- let me just  
 17 see if I can find -- sorry.  
 18 Q. She has copied in Jenica Pugh.  
 19 MR POLLARD: Not still on your phone by any chance, is it?  
 20 You could have a look.  
 21 A. I have not deleted them but I have a horrible feeling  
 22 some of them have dropped off. But I would -- no, I am  
 23 afraid --  
 24 MR MACLEAN: You had obviously had a conversation with  
 25 Helen Boaden. We can see that from the email I showed  
 Page 108

1 you at 190 --  
 2 **A. I'm not sure that that refers to George. I am afraid**  
 3 **I can't actually, um, recall because there are a number**  
 4 **of conversations which this could relate to, and it**  
 5 **could have been Peter Rippon. It could have been -- it**  
 6 **must have been George but I'm not sure whether it**  
 7 **relates to the same thing. I think it relates to**  
 8 **a later moment about when the -- you know, when the**  
 9 **Newsnight film was ready and the fact that it never was**  
 10 **ready because it was never edited. So I'm not entirely**  
 11 **sure what it refers to.**  
 12 Q. You spoke to Helen Boaden and asked her what she had  
 13 said to George Entwistle.  
 14 **A. Yes.**  
 15 Q. What, if any sense, did she give you about her view when  
 16 she spoke to George Entwistle about whether the  
 17 Newsnight story was going to, or was likely to, or was  
 18 not likely to, or was not going to run.  
 19 **A. As to whether the Newsnight was going to run?**  
 20 Q. Yes, the piece, the Savile piece.  
 21 **A. So at the time of the lunch --**  
 22 Q. Yes.  
 23 **A. -- did she have a view on whether the Newsnight was**  
 24 **going to run?**  
 25 Q. What account did she give you of what she said?  
 Page 109

1 **A. My understanding was that she couldn't exactly remember**  
 2 **the conversation but she'd mentioned that there was**  
 3 **a Newsnight investigation underway. So my understanding**  
 4 **of what she said at that point was that she was**  
 5 **indicating to George that there was an investigation**  
 6 **"FYI". So at that time, um, I would have thought that**  
 7 **there was one. I mean, the timing doesn't quite work**  
 8 **but -- but that was my understanding at the time.**  
 9 Q. Why do you say "the timing doesn't quite work"?  
 10 **A. I'm trying to remember when it was actually canned.**  
 11 MR POLLARD: 9 December.  
 12 **A. It does, doesn't. It does actually work.**  
 13 MR MACLEAN: The CPS thing doesn't come in until the 9th.  
 14 **A. That's right. So it does work.**  
 15 Q. If I was to say that Helen Boaden told us that, when she  
 16 had the conversation with George Entwistle, she had the  
 17 view that the Newsnight piece -- of course it might not  
 18 happen, there were all sorts of reasons why it might not  
 19 happen, but the working assumption was that it was  
 20 coming down the track.  
 21 **A. Yes, I have no reason to agree with that.**  
 22 Q. So if I show you bundle 3 and you go to the penultimate  
 23 page, you might not have seen this before --  
 24 **A. No, I haven't.**  
 25 Q. -- the top email is 3 December, ie the day after the  
 Page 110

1 lunch --  
 2 **A. Um-hm.**  
 3 Q. -- from Mitchell to Rippon, and he's asking Rippon:  
 4 "Where are you with this, I'm not sure where you are  
 5 with this [ie the story]. Helen told George E about it  
 6 yesterday but said she didn't think anything would come  
 7 of it. S [Steve]."  
 8 That aspect of saying to George Entwistle on  
 9 2 December that she didn't think anything would come of  
 10 it, is that an account that you recognise?  
 11 **A. Well, this is -- this is the first time I've seen this**  
 12 **and this is the first time I've seen that**  
 13 **construction --**  
 14 Q. So that's a --  
 15 **A. -- put on the conversation.**  
 16 Q. -- new account?  
 17 **A. That's a new account.**  
 18 Q. It was not something Helen Boaden mentioned to you  
 19 when --  
 20 **A. No, she was consistent in saying she couldn't exactly**  
 21 **remember what she'd said.**  
 22 Q. It is unfair, I think, to ask you too much about the  
 23 archaeology. I just wanted to know if there was news to  
 24 you and you have told us that it is?  
 25 **A. Yes.**  
 Page 111

1 Q. If you still have bundle 11 --  
 2 **A. Just while we're on page 217, one of the points I think**  
 3 **it is worth making is, whilst the blog was already there**  
 4 **by the time I had seen the, um -- the note from --**  
 5 Q. This is --  
 6 **A. -- the chain of events --**  
 7 Q. -- your paragraph.  
 8 **A. -- but I think if you read the chain of events which**  
 9 **clearly I read at some point on the 3rd or 4th, that**  
 10 **informs the paragraph -- the proposed paragraph -- for**  
 11 **the email for George --**  
 12 MR POLLARD: Your proposed paragraph?  
 13 **A. Yes. In other words, clearly this came to me at**  
 14 **lunchtime on the 3rd, and my proposed paragraph goes out**  
 15 **in the morning of the 4th.**  
 16 MR MACLEAN: Hang on, just let me catch up with you. I'm  
 17 looking at 217, which is your paragraph, and your point  
 18 is that you have the chain of events, when?  
 19 **A. 13.41, it came in. I'm not saying I opened it at that**  
 20 **point but it sort of arrived at 13.41 on the 3rd.**  
 21 Q. Page 81, yes.  
 22 **A. If you read that, it very much focuses on the CPS -- it**  
 23 **has the statement from the CPS and focuses very much on**  
 24 **the police investigation, so I can only conclude that**  
 25 **that was certainly informing the lines that I suggested**  
 Page 112

1 in the paragraph that I have put to George Entwistle.  
 2 Q. Right. Just while we're looking at it, you remember  
 3 that Mr Mitchell had indicated that the briefing note  
 4 was originally for "Helen and George and me",  
 5 ie Mitchell. Then when Mr Rippon produced it and sent  
 6 it to him, he said it was "not for on passing", do you  
 7 remember?  
 8 A. I don't remember that.  
 9 Q. In bundle A7, around page 198, I think it is.  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. But it looks as if he obviously did on pass it. He on  
 12 passed it to you?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. It looks from that page as if there had been  
 15 a discussion. Do you remember the discussion?  
 16 A. No, I am afraid I can't. I mean, as discussed --  
 17 Q. You mean he must have mentioned it to you --  
 18 A. He must have mentioned it to me and then said "Here you  
 19 are, this is it", but I don't remember any --  
 20 I certainly don't remember a substantive conversation  
 21 with Steve Mitchell because I didn't have very many.  
 22 I normally talked to Helen, so I don't remember  
 23 a detailed conversation. I think it must have been  
 24 something mentioned in passing.  
 25 Q. So your point about this is that you did, or may well

Page 113

1 have, I think -- did or may well have --  
 2 A. May well have read this --  
 3 Q. -- dropped on on this --  
 4 A. -- and if you look at the timing, it is likely that that  
 5 very much influenced the lines in my proposal. But as  
 6 I say, this was a suggestion which then went back into  
 7 the legal team around George for approval, for whatever.  
 8 Interestingly, I think, in the final version of it -- as  
 9 I say, it is very different. In fact it goes into very  
 10 specific detail in George's email about the  
 11 Surrey Police, which was not included in my version.  
 12 Q. Yes.  
 13 A. I just thought it was worth pointing that out.  
 14 Q. It's a fair point.  
 15 Now, in bundle 11 at page 191, that's the MacQuarrie  
 16 note.  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Maybe we can take this quite quickly. That gets  
 19 produced by Mr MacQuarrie, obviously, and sent to  
 20 Mr Entwistle that evening.  
 21 A. Sorry?  
 22 Q. 191, that's the one page of MacQuarrie, bundle 11.  
 23 A. 11, sorry.  
 24 Q. 191. It is a very short note of MacQuarrie's  
 25 conversations with MacKean and George, and that, if you

Page 114

1 want to see it, was sent to Mr Entwistle that evening  
 2 actually by Sarah Jones --  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. -- that is page 237, and Mr Entwistle responds pretty  
 5 quickly at page 239 to say that he's going to be looking  
 6 at it:  
 7 "I will read tonight and call Kenny to discuss in  
 8 the morning."  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Page 239. Now, between that stage, which is the 9th,  
 11 and the weekend leading up to the correction of the blog  
 12 on 22nd --  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. -- what happened from your perspective, where was the  
 15 action going on?  
 16 A. Er, first of all, the -- MacQuarrie had his discussions.  
 17 We weren't party to them. We didn't see the note. What  
 18 we did get was -- this is another occasion when there  
 19 was an immediate leak of meetings. We -- again, this  
 20 was another case --  
 21 Q. This was The Guardian leak?  
 22 A. I can't remember.  
 23 Q. If you go to 291, same bundle, I think it probably is.  
 24 A. I remember --  
 25 Q. If you go to -- is that it?

Page 115

1 A. There we are.  
 2 Q. [REDACTED]  
 3 [REDACTED]  
 4 A. That's right. This came out -- I remember this one  
 5 firmly because I remember sort of exploding with  
 6 frustration because this happened extremely quickly --  
 7 I mean, I mentioned this earlier -- extremely quickly  
 8 after meetings which we were not party to and so we  
 9 were -- we were effectively being challenged, our lines  
 10 were being challenged by sources from a meeting that was  
 11 confidential and we were not party to and there was  
 12 a discussion around this time of "We are finding it  
 13 exceptionally difficult to manage this situation because  
 14 we have a line, we agree a line, it goes through the  
 15 process, and then we get challenged".  
 16 So this was the point at which I think -- and  
 17 I think this was germane to that -- that it was decided  
 18 that actually we were not going to resolve this by  
 19 Ken MacQuarrie writing a quick report. I am afraid  
 20 that's why you're here, because the decision was taken  
 21 that we just needed a review once and for all to stop  
 22 this and to get to the bottom of what had happened.  
 23 So my understanding was that, from the moment sort  
 24 of -- there was a couple of days when Ken MacQuarrie was  
 25 sort of in play, if you like. Then this came out. What

Page 116

1 then happened, there was effectively a lockdown where  
 2 our lines were "Look, you know, we moved towards  
 3 an inquiry", I can't remember when we made the  
 4 announcement.  
 5 Q. The 12th.  
 6 A. From that point, our view was "This is going to be  
 7 sorted out by an inquiry" because quite frankly we can't  
 8 just constantly say something and have it immediately  
 9 challenged by sources close to Newsnight, and that  
 10 remained the position, this sort of lockdown in "This is  
 11 going to go to the review", until the 19th when  
 12 I received the communication from George saying "The  
 13 legal team has now concluded, after an investigation,  
 14 that, you know, we're going to change the blog".  
 15 Q. So that investigation had been done without visibility  
 16 by you?  
 17 A. Absolutely.  
 18 Q. So let me show you what was visible to you then. This  
 19 Guardian piece -- just let me show you page 407 --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- you said -- you were almost exploding in frustration,  
 22 I think you said.  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Mr Rippon was also reported to be very upset that day,  
 25 you see from 407 --

Page 117

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. -- you might think with some -- understandably so?  
 3 A. What you've got now is you've got a level of, I think --  
 4 you know, people are questioning people, people are  
 5 asking who is leaking what, what is going on? Clearly,  
 6 now we can see that both Liz MacKean and Meirion thought  
 7 we were briefing the media, which we were not, and this  
 8 is a question from Karen Rosine asking "Has this come  
 9 from the Corporate press office?" and this goes back to  
 10 this idea that the News press office at times is just  
 11 slightly separate from the Corporate press office and  
 12 she's asking "Has this been briefed out by us?" The  
 13 answer was "Absolutely not, we're as frustrated as you  
 14 are about this".  
 15 Q. You see at the top:  
 16 "So you know, Peter is v upset, have done best to  
 17 calm down."  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. At this stage Mr Rippon is being assailed from --  
 20 A. I think if you -- talk from the bottom, I think, it's  
 21 important. So Karen Rosine, who is the deputy in charge  
 22 of News, is asking Paddy Feeney, the Head of News,  
 23 whether this leak has come from the centre --  
 24 MR POLLARD: The one we just looked at, is that right?  
 25 MR MACLEAN: The Guardian piece --

Page 118

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. -- the same one.  
 3 A. Yes, on page 407, so if you start from the bottom, the  
 4 double chevrons:  
 5 "Has this come from the Corporate centre?"  
 6 In other words somebody at the centre -- usually  
 7 when it's the centre, it is usually the Comms team that  
 8 get the blame for it.  
 9 "Paddy's view is it must have done."  
 10 Paddy then talks to Helen, Helen has obviously had  
 11 a conversation with Peter Rippon and out of that  
 12 conversation Helen's view is that it was [REDACTED]  
 13 [REDACTED]  
 14 Q. Peter Rippon hadn't been interviewed by Mr MacQuarrie.  
 15 He had only interviewed or spoken to -- "interviewed"  
 16 may be too grand a word for it -- MacKean and Jones.  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. At this stage, Panorama is also happening and  
 19 Meirion Jones has gone off to work for Panorama --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- where he presents -- well, he has an involvement in  
 22 the programme which, if you are in Peter Rippon's shoes,  
 23 appears to be a prosecution of him?  
 24 A. Well, not just Peter Rippon's shoes. I mean, if you  
 25 have come from my background in journalism where you

Page 119

1 expect balanced journalism, I found it -- I found it  
 2 difficult to understand how, if there was a dispute  
 3 between members of the programme, that one side of that  
 4 dispute would go to another programme to report on it.  
 5 It didn't seem -- it seemed -- and a number of people,  
 6 though, were raising that point.  
 7 Q. I know you didn't make the decision, you were  
 8 a different part of the jungle, but what was your  
 9 understanding of who had allowed that to happen:  
 10 Meirion Jones at Panorama?  
 11 A. Well, my understanding was it was in the News management  
 12 team, but exactly who and where -- because by this time  
 13 I have to say there was a lot of, um, confusion as to  
 14 who was responsible for what, with Steve Mitchell and  
 15 Helen sort of resiling themselves from --  
 16 Q. They were off Savile by that time?  
 17 A. They were off Savile, and I have to say that that -- it  
 18 became a very difficult time to -- I mean, to give you  
 19 an example, within the press team, because -- I think it  
 20 is worth explaining, because the Panorama issue created  
 21 another issue for us, in terms of thinning out our  
 22 resources even further, because in order to do the  
 23 publicity for the Panorama programme, we couldn't have  
 24 it done through the News team because the News team was  
 25 involved in responding or trying to find the responses

Page 120

1 to the questions.  
 2 So we had to ask another team -- in this case, the  
 3 Vision or Television team -- to handle the publicity for  
 4 the Panorama team which meant that the Vision team had  
 5 to be taken out and put in behind a Chinese wall --  
 6 Q. You had to send out for more bricks, did you?  
 7 A. We got to the point where I actually said -- because  
 8 what then -- subsequently happened was then a question  
 9 from Panorama about who took the scheduling decision on  
 10 television for the tribute programmes, which we then had  
 11 to ask the Radio team to find out the answer for and at  
 12 which point I said "If anybody asks any more questions,  
 13 I simply haven't got anybody else left to answer the  
 14 questions".  
 15 So I think that was also echoed within the News  
 16 structure of, I think, people -- I certainly wasn't  
 17 clear who had taken that decision. It just seemed to  
 18 me, commenting as an outsider, the most bizarre  
 19 decision, but my understanding -- I don't know where it  
 20 came from later -- was that that had been partially  
 21 changed or whatever.  
 22 Q. By changing Mr Jones's title from "producer" to  
 23 "contributor" --  
 24 A. Something like that, yes.  
 25 Q. -- which doesn't sound like a terribly substantive  
 Page 121

1 change, but that's not a matter for you.  
 2 Just let me ask you a bit about the blog  
 3 corrections.  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. This Guardian piece on the 11th, if you go to page 406,  
 6 the page before, Mr Feeney has:  
 7 "Spoken to Steve [Mitchell, I assume], who suggests  
 8 we say for follow-up something like:  
 9 ""The Editors blog was written in good faith and the  
 10 following conversations to recall the sequence of events  
 11 between Newsnight staff."  
 12 So that is clearly a softening of the position if  
 13 that goes out -- hang on.  
 14 So it is beginning to move away from "the blog is  
 15 correct" to "the blog was an honest attempt to set out  
 16 the position".  
 17 Then let me show you 408 --  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. -- from Peter Rippon, late at night on the 11th -- well,  
 20 not all that late at night -- sent to a bundle of people  
 21 including you. He says, in response to the one I have  
 22 just shown you:  
 23 "Okay fine. We then need to take a view about  
 24 whether we need to amend the blog if it is inaccurate  
 25 and I would suggest simply changing the word 'all' for  
 Page 122

1 'some!.'  
 2 That is dealing with "all the women had spoken to  
 3 the police" to "some":  
 4 "I do not think it wise that I start negotiating  
 5 with Liz and Meirion. I suspect they will just start  
 6 trying to pick everything else everything else apart."  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. "We need to keep in mind that if we did have something  
 9 we should have given to the police, Liz and Meirion  
 10 failed to make that clear to me. We were asked the  
 11 question many months ago and Meirion has always strongly  
 12 maintained to me that we did not."  
 13 Peter Rippon's attitude by this stage was that he  
 14 was perfectly amenable to changing the blog in  
 15 principle; is that right?  
 16 A. I think the key point -- and this is the key point on  
 17 page 408 -- is, first of all, if it is inaccurate, and  
 18 that the inaccuracy that he points to is changing the  
 19 word "all" for "some", which doesn't seem a hugely  
 20 substantive change. But in addition to that, in the  
 21 subsequent paragraph, he makes it clear that there is  
 22 still actually a dispute between him and Meirion about  
 23 whether, in fact, this was brought to his attention or  
 24 not.  
 25 So at this point, my understanding of this -- my  
 Page 123

1 understanding of what Paddy was trying to do -- was that  
 2 it was still not believed that it was significantly or  
 3 substantially inaccurate, that there was a small point  
 4 about "all" or "some", and that the problem was then  
 5 that we were getting towards the review, the review was  
 6 announced, as you say, on the 12th -- so the idea that  
 7 we would start taking apart the blog for what was  
 8 a small change, which actually, because of paragraph 3  
 9 might not in the end turn out to be the correct  
 10 answer -- in other words we might be correcting and then  
 11 have to correct back --  
 12 Q. Paragraph 3 of?  
 13 A. This email here. You need to keep in mind we were  
 14 asked:  
 15 "Meirion has always strongly maintained to me that  
 16 we did not."  
 17 So we could change it from "all" to "some" but that  
 18 might not be right. So the one inaccuracy is  
 19 an inaccuracy he's saying on the basis of stuff in the  
 20 media. But then he's saying, we could do it, if you  
 21 want to, we will, but I'm not prepared to negotiate, and  
 22 his comment about them picking everything apart, our  
 23 understanding of this was we had reached the point where  
 24 it was impossible to resolve this issue between Meirion  
 25 and Peter. Nothing in this email suggested to me that  
 Page 124

1 there was a significant substantive issue in the blog,  
 2 therefore that the blog needed to come down, there might  
 3 have been an inaccuracy as to "all" or "some".  
 4 Therefore, to buy us some time until we got into the  
 5 review and we could look at the thing in extenso, the  
 6 line was written which is "written in good faith". But;  
 7 it was not that the blog was substantially wrong.  
 8 Q. You described a couple of times there the change of  
 9 "all" to "some" as being -- you used the words  
 10 "relatively minor" --  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. -- that was your impression of that change?  
 13 A. It wasn't that it was minor, it was the fact that we  
 14 seemed to have a dispute. So in other words, if it had  
 15 been a clear "This is wrong and this needs to change" --  
 16 again, I know it sounds awful but to go back to my  
 17 journalistic background, at Reuters you always  
 18 corrected, you always made clear what was the  
 19 correction, why was the correction made and what was the  
 20 change.  
 21 What we had here was not absolute clarity in "This  
 22 needs to be changed", but there still seemed to be  
 23 a dispute between the two of them -- or Meirion and Liz  
 24 and Peter Rippon -- and what I would have -- you know,  
 25 this is obviously looking back in recollection. What  
 Page 125

1 I think I would have assumed is that what had happened  
 2 is that that suggestion from Peter had then gone  
 3 correctly back into the News management line. There had  
 4 been a discussion and it had been decided there that  
 5 there was not a need for a full correction, what there  
 6 was was a need to explain that this was written in good  
 7 faith. In other words, it was not clear whether  
 8 a correction was needed and it would be for the review  
 9 to sort this out.  
 10 Q. I understand why, from your perspective -- and Comms',  
 11 generally, perspective -- the focus had been on whether  
 12 there was improper pressure.  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. That was really the --  
 15 A. That was the key thing.  
 16 Q. That was the key. Actually, if you just think about the  
 17 story for a moment, this change from "all" to "some"  
 18 might be thought to be absolutely fundamental because  
 19 looking for the CPS and the reason why the CPS doesn't  
 20 pursue Savile -- and the CPS says "Answer: not enough  
 21 evidence" and Peter Rippon says, "Well, I'm going to can  
 22 the story now" -- that may be thought to make a lot of  
 23 sense if the police have investigated all the women's  
 24 stories but once you realise that they haven't then it  
 25 makes less sense.  
 Page 126

1 A. But the response back is that that may make -- may be of  
 2 great relevance if you are, as we are now, buried in the  
 3 details of, you know, what this person said and what  
 4 that person said and what -- where we were was  
 5 effectively in the fog of war --  
 6 Q. I'm not trying to tax you.  
 7 A. No, no --  
 8 Q. I'm just trying to ask you: did you get the impression  
 9 that Peter Rippon appreciated that, in terms of the  
 10 analysis of why this story hadn't run, that this change  
 11 from "all" to "some" was actually quite profound?  
 12 A. But I think -- the point is for me, what was key in this  
 13 email is the third paragraph. For me, that  
 14 fundamentally changed that second paragraph. Because  
 15 what he's saying is, you know, "If we did have  
 16 something, then that was not made clear to me", and  
 17 I asked that specific question "Why was that, you know,  
 18 not happening?" For me, that also undermined then  
 19 a suggestion that you change some to all, because what  
 20 we were -- what we'd got, clearly here, was a dispute  
 21 between two people of what had been said, who had said  
 22 it, when they had said it and what was going on.  
 23 To make a fundamental change in -- in that document  
 24 which had been the -- you know, the thing on which we  
 25 relied, we needed absolute and utter certainty that we  
 Page 127

1 were not going to make a change which would then  
 2 subsequently turn out to be inaccurate itself.  
 3 Q. You said a minute ago that after this email you,  
 4 I think, assumed -- would have assumed -- that this  
 5 debate would then go into News --  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. -- and if they decided to change the blog they would  
 8 change the blog and if they didn't, they wouldn't.  
 9 A. So we spoke to Steve, who suggested we save for  
 10 follow-up.  
 11 Q. Steve Mitchell told us in his statement that  
 12 Ken MacQuarrie comes on the scene on the 9th.  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Ken MacQuarrie is a member of the management board. He  
 15 was interviewing MacKean and Jones "at the behest of the  
 16 Director General".  
 17 A. Correct.  
 18 Q. He obviously was:  
 19 "It appeared to me that the attempts I was making to  
 20 understand the differences between the members of the  
 21 Newsnight team had been overtaken by Corporate process  
 22 involving the DG. I contacted Rippon, MacKean and Jones  
 23 to make this clear. On 11 November my attention was  
 24 drawn to an article in The Guardian which questioned the  
 25 accuracy of the blog. I agreed a response which said  
 Page 128



1 that the blog had been written in good faith following  
 2 conversations between those involved in the  
 3 investigation."  
 4 Then this:  
 5 "That continued to be the position through the  
 6 following week and to the best of my knowledge it  
 7 remained Peter Rippon's view that he wrote the blog  
 8 based on what he knew at the time. Although he  
 9 expressed a willingness to change the blog if it was  
 10 inaccurate, I'm not aware that he was asked to do so,  
 11 either by the press office or as a result of the enquiry  
 12 conducted by MacQuarrie. By that time I was no longer  
 13 directly involved in the BBC's reporting and news  
 14 management of the controversy surrounding Savile and  
 15 Newsnight, having recused myself from the editorial role  
 16 on the story on 12 October, and so did Helen Boaden."  
 17 **A. I think that is completely consistent with what I have**  
 18 **said, which is that: we have a blog, until the point of**  
 19 **the Ken MacQuarrie intervention we believe that the blog**  
 20 **stands. The Ken MacQuarrie intervention is designed to**  
 21 **get to the bottom of what is going on. The**  
 22 **Ken MacQuarrie intervention doesn't conclude, as far as**  
 23 **we're aware, and essentially everything is exactly as**  
 24 **Stephen says locked down or frozen for a week while**  
 25 **there is a decision on what on earth we do about this.**

Page 129

1 **The 12th is the announcement of the review. Right**  
 2 **well, you know, we are just getting nowhere. Every time**  
 3 **someone tries to look into this, it all changes shape**  
 4 **again.**  
 5 MR POLLARD: Just so I'm clear, after this point on  
 6 11 October, where this effectively is a discussion  
 7 between the various Comms team and Steve Mitchell and  
 8 Peter Rippon --  
 9 **A. That's right.**  
 10 MR POLLARD: -- in other words no legal involvement at  
 11 all --  
 12 **A. No.**  
 13 MR POLLARD: -- the following day, does this -- the whole  
 14 issue of the blog and blog corrections disappear into  
 15 the legal team?  
 16 **A. It disappears into effectively the legal team and the**  
 17 **decision whether we are going to take this -- the**  
 18 **discussions as to whether we're going to take this into**  
 19 **review, because I was saying at the time, you know, we**  
 20 **were getting in the Comms team very frustrated that**  
 21 **effectively we were trying to hold lines which we were**  
 22 **given and we had complied, we had got through, everybody**  
 23 **was telling us was exactly the line and we had been told**  
 24 **we couldn't have somebody out to interview, and then the**  
 25 **next minute, you know, somebody was challenging the**

Page 130

1 **line. What was not clear to me from this email at**  
 2 **all -- and effectively the statement is a holding**  
 3 **position to cover something until somebody can, for**  
 4 **God's sake, tell us what is it going on here --**  
 5 MR POLLARD: This is?  
 6 **A. Yes. "It was written in good faith" means will somebody**  
 7 **get to the bottom of what is hell is going on here and**  
 8 **tell us, because we keep getting chipped away. We look**  
 9 **as if we're untrustworthy and not telling the truth.**  
 10 **We're merely saying what we are being told is happening,**  
 11 **and then it shifts again.**  
 12 MR MACLEAN: Let's move on a bit. Did you know that  
 13 Mr Jones tried to speak with Mr Entwistle on the 16th?  
 14 **A. No, I didn't. I subsequently knew that when he wrote --**  
 15 **in fact, I think the first time I'm aware of it, that**  
 16 **I can remember, is when I saw a note that he wrote about**  
 17 **the blog to the Chairman.**  
 18 Q. Right.  
 19 **A. I didn't know -- what date would this be?**  
 20 Q. The 16th, I think it was. He said he waited for him in  
 21 the lift.  
 22 **A. The Panorama programme was?**  
 23 Q. The 22nd.  
 24 **A. I think it is important, because I didn't actually know**  
 25 **what Meirion looked like until the Panorama programme.**

Page 131

1 Q. Until you saw him on the telly?  
 2 **A. Yes. I probably walked past him in the corridor several**  
 3 **times.**  
 4 Q. Let me show you, I'm certainly going to 15, but let me  
 5 see if I need to show you this document at 14, but  
 6 definitely take 15. Let me show you in 14, first of  
 7 all. This is 19 October, which is --  
 8 **A. The day before Panorama?**  
 9 Q. -- a Friday, I think.  
 10 **A. The 19th is a Friday -- 20th Saturday, 21st -- and the**  
 11 **22nd is the Monday, yes.**  
 12 Q. It's Friday evening, page 370.  
 13 **A. Yes.**  
 14 Q. So this is from Andrew Scadding.  
 15 **A. Yes.**  
 16 Q. Just remind me where he sits.  
 17 **A. He's the Head of Public -- Head of Corporate Affairs.**  
 18 Q. Then a reference to Donald Steel. You mentioned him  
 19 earlier, he's one of the people you brought in to --  
 20 **A. Yes, Donald. After we rescinded the contract with**  
 21 **Brunswick, we were desperately trying to get some**  
 22 **support. It had been suggested -- I don't know the**  
 23 **exact timing --**  
 24 Q. I think you told us earlier that Mr Steel was one of the  
 25 two who helped Mr Entwistle prepare for his first Today

Page 132

1 interview.

2 **A. Yes, but let me explain why.**

3 Q. Brunswick are still here at this stage, they were only

4 appointed three days before this.

5 **A. But still it would be worthwhile explaining who Donald**

6 **is. Donald was the Head of the Corporate Press Office,**

7 **effectively the Julian Payne, when I took over that role**

8 **four years ago. He retired shortly afterwards and set**

9 **up a consultancy. He does a number of things on a sort**

10 **of continuing contract with the BBC, one of which is**

11 **provide media training and he brings in somebody else to**

12 **work with him on media training. But he was**

13 **definitely -- his presence at events was one of the**

14 **suggestions I made after -- so in other words he's there**

15 **to do media training, but only to do media training, not**

16 **as an adviser. When the Brunswick contract is**

17 **rescinded, I said "Well, if we can't bring in somebody**

18 **from outside, the only person we have is Donald, lets**

19 **have Donald in the room".**

20 **But at that point he's probably -- I'm not sure what**

21 **the date of that is.**

22 Q. So this is all in preparation for Mr Entwistle going to

23 the committee --

24 **A. Yes.**

25 Q. -- that's what you are leading up to here?

Page 133

1 **A. Yes. Well, this is -- this is -- this is the material**

2 **that was prepared for the committee, but actually, um,**

3 **wasn't -- wasn't used. We didn't get to do a, um --**

4 **a preparation because, as I said, George spent his time**

5 **with the legal team.**

6 Q. Right, okay.

7 **A. We had a meeting, in fact, the evening before the Select**

8 **Committee with a certain level of frustration, when we**

9 **said --**

10 Q. That was the night Panorama was on?

11 **A. Yes. Our concern was that handling the Select Committee**

12 **is not just a question of having legally approved lines,**

13 **or statements, but it is also about understanding the**

14 **individuals, how they question, the kinds of questions**

15 **that come, and also the fact that, quite simply, the**

16 **select committees are often not forensic or quasi**

17 **judicial processes, but there is a certain level of**

18 **theatre and whatever.**

19 Q. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this. I just

20 want to show you the document at 371, which is a note

21 prepared by Mr Scadding.

22 **A. Yes.**

23 Q. Just in light of the discussion we had a little earlier

24 about your exchange in texts with Helen Boaden about

25 what was said, do you see, about three-quarters of the

Page 134

1 way down the page --

2 **A. Yes.**

3 Q. -- what is being said to Mr Entwistle here is that:

4 "She undertook to come back to me if story stood up,

5 and of course had no reason to come back to me as the

6 story was not broadcast."

7 **A. Yes.**

8 Q. This might be thought to not be entirely consistent with

9 that email of 3 December that I showed you.

10 **A. I think it is important to explain what these notes are.**

11 **These are notes written by somebody in the public**

12 **affairs team who is trying to prepare -- trying to think**

13 **of what is a reasonable narrative. This would have**

14 **been, in normal process, put before George to review and**

15 **revise, according to his facts. So this is written by**

16 **somebody who has not been at the heart of this, but is**

17 **writing it in terms of "This is how I would present this**

18 **to the Select Committee", so I can't --**

19 Q. It didn't go anywhere?

20 **A. It didn't go anywhere.**

21 Q. Now, there were leaks from Panorama, weren't there, to

22 the press, which caused further frustration?

23 **A. Yes.**

24 Q. Then if we go then to 20 October, which is the weekend,

25 in bundle 15, did you know that one of Mr Entwistle's

Page 135

1 predecessors had been giving him some advice? Not his

2 immediate predecessor.

3 **A. I notice from the bundle I was sent at the weekend**

4 **was -- that John Birt had given him some prep for the**

5 **Select Committee.**

6 Q. Yes.

7 **A. What George said to me was "I had a very nice**

8 **conversation with John". My understanding of it was**

9 **John had sort of rung him up and wished him luck. I was**

10 **not aware that he had been prepared by John Birt.**

11 Q. You have now see seen in very recent days that, in fact,

12 Mr Birt gave him a few pointers as how to play his hand;

13 is that right?

14 **A. Yes.**

15 Q. One of the pointers that he gave him, if you look at 178

16 of the bundle, which I think is Mr Entwistle's own

17 notebook --

18 **A. Yes, I think this notebook is very interesting.**

19 Q. Mr Birt:

20 "It is tough, steel yourself, it could be very

21 long", et cetera.

22 The fourth one is interesting. Then the last one:

23 "... make a virtue of having to correct the blog."

24 **A. Um-hm.**

25 Q. That's what Mr Entwistle did, wasn't it, at the

Page 136

<p>1 committee, by highlighting --</p> <p>2 <b>A. Yes, but this is the 22nd and by that date the blog had</b></p> <p>3 <b>been corrected.</b></p> <p>4 Q. Yes, but this is all in preparation for the committee.</p> <p>5 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>6 Q. So:</p> <p>7 "At the committee make a virtue of having to correct</p> <p>8 the blog."</p> <p>9 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>10 Q. In other words, shuffle as much of the weight of what</p> <p>11 has gone to on onto Mr Rippon's shoulders as possible.</p> <p>12 <b>A. I would not necessarily see it as that. I would see it</b></p> <p>13 <b>as "You have corrected the blog, you know, there are two</b></p> <p>14 <b>ways of seeing this, you can be crucified or you can</b></p> <p>15 <b>make a virtue of it". Obviously, I wasn't party to the</b></p> <p>16 <b>conversation, but --</b></p> <p>17 Q. But in your Comms department --</p> <p>18 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>19 Q. -- by 20 October you and Mr Payne were discussing</p> <p>20 a scenario whereby Mr Rippon would essentially get the</p> <p>21 chop, take the blame, and the rest of you would all move</p> <p>22 on, weren't you?</p> <p>23 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>24 Q. That's page 157. This is a text from Mr Payne to you:</p> <p>25 "Thought of the hour: PR changes blog and accepts he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 The -- and I think it's important to emphasise what</p> <p>2 the process of correction of the blog was, that</p> <p>3 I received a communication from George on the 19th,</p> <p>4 there was then a series of exchanges which said "It's</p> <p>5 not ready yet, it's not ready yet", got to Saturday</p> <p>6 night, a slightly frustrated George sends me a text</p> <p>7 saying, "You know, it will be ready very soon, would you</p> <p>8 recommend putting it out on a Saturday night?" and</p> <p>9 I said "Well, not really, we'll get accused of burying</p> <p>10 it. We need to be clear, so let's do it Sunday". So</p> <p>11 then Sunday ran through Sunday, we are sitting there</p> <p>12 waiting for the blog correction, it was being done by</p> <p>13 the legal team.</p> <p>14 At around 5 o'clock, 5.20, I received an email from</p> <p>15 Peter Rippon saying "These are my suggested amendments</p> <p>16 to the blog", but then it was taken back into the legal</p> <p>17 team again because it was felt that we needed</p> <p>18 a corporate position rather than Peter's position.</p> <p>19 So Julian and I were effectively sitting there</p> <p>20 trying to work out, you know, what we're going to say,</p> <p>21 how we're going to say it, what was going to be our</p> <p>22 story, what was the line, what were we going to take.</p> <p>23 So Julian's note of the 20th is a sort of, you know,</p> <p>24 let's imagine this happens. Does this work: Peter</p> <p>25 changes the blog and goes?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 was wrong and goes, giving Panorama a scalp. GE then</p> <p>2 goes into Select saying he backed his editor as you</p> <p>3 would expect, turns out he was wrong, sad, but he did</p> <p>4 the right thing and we all move on."</p> <p>5 <b>A. Um-hm.</b></p> <p>6 Q. Similarly, in the next bundle, 16, at page 52, there is</p> <p>7 another --</p> <p>8 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>9 Q. -- text from Mr Payne to you. This is on the 22nd. So</p> <p>10 this is the day of the blog correction.</p> <p>11 <b>A. Yes.</b></p> <p>12 Q. "I think I'm going to need to be hard today. That PR</p> <p>13 blog was the basis for all our position on this. Only</p> <p>14 way to protect GE", et cetera.</p> <p>15 <b>A. Um-hm.</b></p> <p>16 Q. So this may not be a criticism -- it is certainly not</p> <p>17 necessarily, perhaps not at all -- you and Mr Payne are</p> <p>18 doing your job, you have a particular perspective. But</p> <p>19 what was going on was that the corporate centre of the</p> <p>20 BBC was seeking to highlight, as much as possible, the</p> <p>21 errors in the blog, because that was the best way of</p> <p>22 protecting Mr Entwistle's position.</p> <p>23 <b>A. No, I wouldn't see it as this at all. I mean what you</b></p> <p>24 <b>had was a certain level of frustration between Julian</b></p> <p>25 <b>and myself about how we responded to the media.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 Now, the point is that, first of all, this didn't go</p> <p>2 to anyone else, it was a private exchange between Julian</p> <p>3 and myself. There are often discussions about "What</p> <p>4 would happen if this happened?" "Well, this would be the</p> <p>5 outcome" or "This would be the way it would be</p> <p>6 reported".</p> <p>7 So this is a suggestion from Julian that, you know,</p> <p>8 would this get us off the hook? Would we all move on?</p> <p>9 Would we all stop having to cover this story for ages?</p> <p>10 So I don't see anything wrong with that.</p> <p>11 Then the second one is that great concern, given</p> <p>12 the -- given the blog correction -- that it had led to,</p> <p>13 as expected, a strong sort of wave of criticism that all</p> <p>14 of the lines that we had been using were based on this</p> <p>15 blog and these were wrong, and it put Julian and the</p> <p>16 Corporate press team in a very difficult -- and the News</p> <p>17 press team -- in a very difficult position because they</p> <p>18 for months had been fighting back against pretty</p> <p>19 aggressive journalists who had been saying "You're</p> <p>20 lying, you're lying, you're lying". I had had one</p> <p>21 particular sharp exchange with a journalist where I had</p> <p>22 taken him to task for accusing my team was lying and</p> <p>23 here we had a blog which was corrected. So effectively</p> <p>24 we had been misleading.</p> <p>25 Q. That was The Times spat you are referring to?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

1 A. Yes. So again, I just interpret Julian's note as "I'm  
 2 going to have to brief hard on this?" It's the only  
 3 thing we can say. What he's saying is "We have nothing  
 4 else, we have corrected it, it is wrong we are going to  
 5 have to brief hard". I don't read anything  
 6 particularly --  
 7 Q. It might be suggested that, a bit like the proposal for  
 8 the statement that never was on 4 October, that the  
 9 BBC's first thought in the corporate centre was to hang  
 10 Mr Rippon out to dry in the hope that everybody else  
 11 would get away with it.  
 12 A. First of all, that -- that -- there is a clear, um,  
 13 I think -- some people believe that the corporate centre  
 14 and the communications team are blessed with sort of  
 15 omniscience and omnipotence and can do what they wish.  
 16 Our role consists of offering advice, which is sometimes  
 17 taken and sometimes not. One of the things we try to do  
 18 is to speculate on what are the scenarios that might  
 19 come up and might not come up.  
 20 It would be more convincing to suggest that we had  
 21 a clear line if these exchanges had been with other  
 22 people or had been passed on to other people, but these  
 23 were just private exchanges between Julian and myself as  
 24 we tried to get through the day and tried to get through  
 25 the press brief.

Page 141

1 Mr Rippon to go, take the blame and everyone else would  
 2 move on.  
 3 A. No, no, no. I think that is a misinterpretation of what  
 4 Julian is saying. He is having a private discussion  
 5 with me between two comms professionals saying "Here is  
 6 one scenario, what do you think, does it work?"  
 7 Q. But it is the ideal scenario from your point of view.  
 8 A. It's not the ideal -- it is a scenario.  
 9 Q. The desired scenario.  
 10 A. It's not the desired scenario. What we're trying to do  
 11 is trying work out how we protected the reputation of  
 12 the BBC, and you know my position throughout has been  
 13 very clear, that my first responsibility -- in fact  
 14 I had conversations about this -- was to the  
 15 institution.  
 16 It is only -- my responsibility to the individuals  
 17 is dependent on, um, those individuals serving the  
 18 institution. It may sound prissy, but it is very clear  
 19 and I have been in a number of situations -- to try to  
 20 explain it: [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

Page 143

1 Q. It might be said that there is quite a startling --  
 2 quite a striking anyway -- change of tone in what  
 3 Mr Entwistle says on the Today programme on the 8th,  
 4 when he says he supports Mr Rippon's judgement, to the  
 5 picture he paints to the Select Committee on the 23rd.  
 6 A. I think there is a stark change. One of the things we  
 7 were trying to get clear in our lines -- and what we had  
 8 to -- I remember we had to work quite hard on  
 9 afterwards, was to understand whether it was -- whose  
 10 decision it was that Peter should go, and George made it  
 11 very clear that it was his decision that Peter should  
 12 go, but I remember trying to -- we got asked: whose  
 13 decision was it? We didn't have that as a corporate  
 14 line and we had to go back and say "Well, whose decision  
 15 was it?"  
 16 Again, if the corporate centre was a cohesive whole  
 17 with the communications sort of leaning on it,  
 18 I wouldn't have needed to ask anybody else what was  
 19 happening but, in this case, we had to check: whose  
 20 decision was it; was it Peter's decision; was it  
 21 George's decision? George said "I want to be very clear  
 22 it was my decision".  
 23 Q. Let me be clear about your position, doing your job in  
 24 Comms. Your position was, in line with your exchange  
 25 with Mr Payne, that what, as it were, was needed was for

Page 142

1 [REDACTED]  
 2 [REDACTED]  
 3 Therefore, what we were trying -- what we were  
 4 discussing between two communications professionals was,  
 5 first of all, not something that we had any influence  
 6 over, because we didn't have the decision on what would  
 7 be the outcome. We didn't have a decision on whether  
 8 Peter would go or stay or anybody else would go or stay.  
 9 What we're saying is: how does this work? Does this  
 10 story work? That's why he says "Thought of the hour".  
 11 It's not, you know --  
 12 Q. Just let me understand what, in your mind, Mr Rippon had  
 13 done wrong, because Mr Entwistle's position on the Today  
 14 programme on the 8th was, I think -- we can look at the  
 15 transcript if necessary -- that he supported the  
 16 editorial judgement --  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. -- defended the editorial judgement that Mr Rippon had  
 19 taken.  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. When he gets to the Select Committee, having seen  
 22 Panorama, which apparently strikes Mr Entwistle as being  
 23 a very powerful piece of journalism, the editorial  
 24 decision that Rippon had taken the year before appears  
 25 to now be cast into doubt. But, in a sense, the blog

Page 144

<p>1 and whatever inaccuracies there were in the blog is all                  2 slightly to one side.                  3 <b>A. I don't think that -- I don't think that. That's not my                  4 interpretation of it. My interpretation of it is -- as                  5 I say we didn't have the chance to go through and                  6 therefore question and challenge the -- the statements                  7 that George was going to make to the Select Committee.                  8 So my view of what he said in the Select Committee                  9 was that he was left with -- once he had to correct the                  10 blog, in other words once there was a -- you know, we                  11 had stood on the principle that it was an editorial                  12 product, therefore it was for the editor to say what had                  13 happened and that the editor was the best person to know                  14 what had happened.                  15 The point at which the blog, which had formed the                  16 basis of the corporate position right the way through,                  17 was undermined, and the moment at which the blog had to                  18 be changed, my understanding was it affected the                  19 confidence in Peter. It did not mean that they did not                  20 believe that his judgement was wrong, because they said                  21 he was not being fired or disciplined, he was merely                  22 being -- stepping aside until the conclusion of the                  23 review.                  24 I mean, I can't remember the exact words of what was                  25 said in the Select Committee, but the point was that</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Page 145</p> </p>	<p>1 <b>Panorama letter -- sorry, is that okay? The line in the                  2 Panorama letter was that we were somehow deliberately                  3 withholding it --</b>                  4 <b>Q. The accusation was that the line in the statement "We                  5 now accept that the Newsnight investigation did not                  6 start out as an investigation into the Surrey Police's                  7 handling of the case against Mr Savile", this is the                  8 accusation, as I understand it --</b>                  9 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  10 <b>Q. -- was slipped out at the last minute as Panorama was                  11 going on air, put on the website the following day,                  12 which allowed all day on the day of the Panorama                  13 transmission this story to be the correction of                  14 Mr Rippon's blog, thereby, it is suggested, deflecting                  15 some of the heat from the BBC and more of it onto                  16 Mr Rippon's shoulders. That, I think, is the                  17 accusation.</b>                  18 <b>A. It is a glorious accusation, I wish I had the power to                  19 deflect and shift blame in this way. The fact was I was                  20 presented with two statements, in which I didn't have                  21 any input. The first was a statement which was                  22 a correction of the blog and the second was a response                  23 to Panorama and it was a direct response to direct                  24 questions from Panorama, and that was the approved line.                  25 The reason that Panorama line was not put out was</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Page 147</p> </p>
<p>1 <b>George did not believe that Peter Rippon could continue                  2 as editor of the programme when he had had to withdraw                  3 an account of a previous editorial decision. That                  4 seemed perfectly consistent.</b>                  5 <b>Q. Well --</b>                  6 <b>A. It is important to say it is also different to what                  7 Julian was speculating about in his text.</b>                  8 <b>Q. I just want to ask you a couple of points about the                  9 corrections for the blog. You have mentioned, and                  10 I have seen these emails, the exchange with Peter Rippon                  11 over the weekend with suggestions to change the blog.</b>                  12 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  13 <b>Q. You said that, in fact, that gets taken back into the                  14 legal process?</b>                  15 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  16 <b>Q. What was your understanding of who had actually                  17 formulated the three corrections that were made on the                  18 Monday, where did they come from?</b>                  19 <b>A. They came from the legal team, both the -- and we had                  20 problems with that, because, um, we had three                  21 corrections to the blog and then we had a letter to                  22 Panorama --</b>                  23 <b>Q. Yes?</b>                  24 <b>A. -- and The Times, who were in full conspiracy mode by                  25 this time, made much of the fact that the line in the</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Page 146</p> </p>	<p>1 <b>because it is absolutely normal practice that, if                  2 a newspaper or programme or journalist asks a question,                  3 you give the answer to that individual, to that                  4 programme. You don't -- you don't make it available to                  5 others until after that journalist or that programme                  6 has -- has written their article or produced their                  7 programme.</b>                  8 <b>Again, with hindsight, I think, had there been                  9 a different approach, I think we would have wanted to                  10 have done things differently, but the fact was that was                  11 what we were given.</b>                  12 <b>When we came back to discuss it later, the argument                  13 we were given was that the blog itself had included both                  14 lines in it, so it wasn't just, um, that it had been                  15 a CPS but it had included the two -- the paragraph in                  16 the blog, and that that was why the correction of the                  17 blog had not included that line and why that line had                  18 been specifically included for the Panorama. So there                  19 was no subterfuge or strategic decision to do something.</b>                  20 <b>Q. All right. Now, the statement that eventually gets put                  21 out about the correction of the blog is bundle 16,                  22 page 85.</b>                  23 <b>A. Yes.</b>                  24 <b>Q. Now, the three corrections --</b>                  25 <b>A. Yes.</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">Page 148</p> </p>

1 Q. -- were: the question of the BBC premises --  
 2 **A. Yes, I think it was --**  
 3 Q. -- and -- just let me find it.  
 4 **A. Yes, it was -- whether anybody at Duncroft was aware,**  
 5 **the BBC premises and I think the third was whether all**  
 6 **the women had been passed onto police.**  
 7 Q. Yes. Meirion Jones took issue with, as he saw it, the  
 8 inadequacy of the corrections that had been made. You  
 9 get this at page 112 of bundle 16. It wasn't sent to  
 10 you at the time but I assume you have seen it since.  
 11 **A. Yes.**  
 12 Q. 22 October, the very same day, this correction -- he  
 13 sent this to Horrocks, who is, apart from anything else,  
 14 overseeing the Panorama programme, that is about to  
 15 broadcast and of course he's working on it:  
 16 "The correction does not deal with the most glaring  
 17 inaccuracy in the blog. The blogs says the whole  
 18 motivation of the investigation was that the key witness  
 19 told us the police had investigated the claims but the  
 20 case had been dropped on the grounds that he was too  
 21 old. That is completely false.  
 22 "Any correction would say that the key witness had  
 23 not spoken to the police and therefore the whole story  
 24 in the blog about why Newsnight set out on the  
 25 investigation cannot be right.

1 quickly as we can: the corrections that were to be made  
 2 were, as it were, served up --  
 3 **A. They were served up. We were frustrated by it.**  
 4 **I remember waiting to try and, you know, help -- but**  
 5 **they were served up to us, "This is it, this is what you**  
 6 **will issue".**  
 7 Q. Help me with this, it may be my final question,  
 8 Mr Mylrea: If BBC Legal had done this investigation  
 9 over this period of time leading up to the correction of  
 10 the blog on the 22nd, what is your understanding of why  
 11 Mr Pollard's review was subsequently asked to look, not  
 12 only at the management of the Newsnight story but also  
 13 the question of the blog, if the BBC Legal department  
 14 had already crawled all over it?  
 15 **A. Because I think the subsequent emails -- you know, here**  
 16 **is that, even after the correction of the blog, there**  
 17 **still remained a belief, certainly on one side that, um,**  
 18 **the corrections hadn't corrected the -- the facts, at**  
 19 **which point I think you sort of throw your hands in the**  
 20 **air and say "I'm going to bang my head against a brick**  
 21 **wall until it stops hurting". Apologies if that is**  
 22 **a description of what you have ended up doing.**  
 23 MR MACLEAN: It seems like a rather apt place to end.  
 24 MR POLLARD: I think that is fine, yes. Thank you.  
 25 **A. Great.**

1 "The phrase [et cetera] does not tell us that  
 2 includes the key witness.  
 3 "In any case, burying the vital point at the end,  
 4 rather than starting with it -- let alone starting the  
 5 correction with a subtle reference to the weekend  
 6 smears -- is deliberately obfuscatory."  
 7 Now, the "key witness" aspect of the blog remained  
 8 when the corrections had been made. You understood,  
 9 I think, by this time, that there was controversy about  
 10 that. What was your understanding of why this key  
 11 witness point wasn't the subject of correction?  
 12 **A. My understanding was that, given the difficulty of**  
 13 **reconciling views, that this had been a legal**  
 14 **investigation because it was no longer possible to**  
 15 **reconcile the opinions of the different sides, and**  
 16 **therefore that what had happened was that legal team had**  
 17 **done an investigation which included talking to people**  
 18 **and included looking at what documentary evidence there**  
 19 **was and that therefore we had to rely on what the legal**  
 20 **team was providing us and therefore we were not about to**  
 21 **start changing other aspects of the blog.**  
 22 Q. I'm not suggesting you should have done.  
 23 **A. No, no, no. I think the point by this time was we were**  
 24 **sort of, um, frustrated.**  
 25 Q. Is this what it comes to then, I will take this as

1 MR POLLARD: Thanks Paul.  
 2 **A. Thanks, thanks very much.**  
 3 MR MACLEAN: If you want to say anything else, now is your  
 4 chance.  
 5 **A. No, I think we have covered the key point about the**  
 6 **chain of events, I think that is it.**  
 7 MR POLLARD: Thank you.  
 8 **A. Good luck.**  
 9 MR POLLARD: Thanks very much, very kind.  
 10 (2.46 pm)  
 11 (The inquiry adjourned until 2.00 pm,  
 12 Wednesday, 28 November 2012)  
 13 I N D E X  
 14 MR PAUL MYLREA (called) .....1  
 15 Questions by MR MACLEAN .....2  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25