

<p>1 Tuesday, 30 October 2012 2 (2.00 pm) 3 (Delayed start) 4 (2.07 pm) 5 NICK POLLARD: Thank you very much, not only for coming 6 along today but for all the work you have done to get 7 documents ready which have been a huge help and in rough 8 times we were hoping to, sort of, get through this 9 afternoon in about an hour and a half or thereabouts, 10 but if we find we are in full flow we are happy to 11 extend. I wonder if we can ask Richard to give us a few 12 ground rules first, to set the scene. 13 RICHARD SPAFFORD: I will just talk a bit about roles. 14 Obviously you know Nick, the remaining team present are 15 all advising and assisting Nick in his review. Alan and 16 Richard here, these two here, are barristers who are 17 playing a barrister role to the review. Ben and I are 18 solicitors who are providing legal services and 19 secretariat services to the review. 20 Two points just to raise at the beginning, the first 21 is documents. Can I just repeat what Nick has said 22 about thank you very much for the work that you have 23 done so quickly. As you may know, may have mentioned to 24 you, we do have a document return process which is 25 people who are, in our view, likely to have material</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 RICHARD SPAFFORD: The other side of that is this is 2 a review and people giving us information are not 3 entitled to confidence in relation to what they say to 4 us. So anything you say to us obviously is being 5 recorded, as you can hear, and Nick as necessary will be 6 able to refer to what you say or any document you give 7 us if he considers that necessary in his report. So, 8 again, it is important that you accept that. 9 PETER HORROCKS: I understand that and I accept it, yes. 10 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Okay. I think those were my two 11 preliminary points, any preliminary points you want to 12 add Alan? 13 ALAN MACLEAN: No, thank you. 14 NICK POLLARD: What I suggest we do, Peter, because we are 15 interviewing at an early stage and without a full 16 collection of documents and scrupulous timeline, as it 17 were, I found your two timelines which you sent 18 extremely useful, raised a lot of issues. I wonder if 19 it would just be useful if we took you through that. 20 PETER HORROCKS: Sure. 21 NICK POLLARD: Have you brought a copy of that? 22 PETER HORROCKS: I think I have, I have a copy on iPad as 23 well. 24 NICK POLLARD: The first one started prior to October 17, 25 was your first line there. That runs through 17th to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 documents and are sending those document returns, asking 2 them to fill that document return in, to sign it and to 3 certify they have given all relevant documents as 4 confirmed in that return. Obviously what you have given 5 us does not constitute compliance with that procedure so 6 what I would like to do is give you a copy of that 7 document so you have it. Our intention is that we will 8 certainly, with thanks, take what you have given and 9 then ask you probably on your return from holiday to 10 fill out a return properly when you have time. 11 PETER HORROCKS: Okay. 12 RICHARD SPAFFORD: And to add to that any additional 13 documents which are responsive and you have not given 14 us, okay? 15 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. 16 RICHARD SPAFFORD: The second issue I wanted to raise as 17 a preliminary point is the confidentiality of this 18 process. There are two sides to that. The first is the 19 discussions that we have here are, on the one hand, we 20 would like you, please, to keep these confidential so we 21 do not want you to be talking about what you tell us or 22 what you hear from us from anybody else. It is very 23 important that you confirm that, are you happy with 24 that? 25 PETER HORROCKS: I am happy to do that, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 about the 26th. 2 PETER HORROCKS: Can I get some water? 3 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Yes, of course. (Pause). 4 NICK POLLARD: So should I just -- you have that there. 5 Shall I kick it off with a, sort of, general question. 6 You make the point that before October 17 you had only 7 short knowledge of what had gone on. Out of interest, 8 you had presumably heard within the BBC of the, sort of, 9 rumbling of Newsnight, the Savile story, because it 10 reappeared in the early months of this year when there 11 was starting to be a bit of press comment about it. 12 Were you aware of that in a low level background sense? 13 PETER HORROCKS: I was. Can I just preface that by saying 14 I think there are various categories and periods of 15 information I have, one is the period you are talking to 16 that I was aware of things, background as part of the 17 BBC News Group board in the period when things really 18 started breaking, exposure and so on, although broadly 19 where that happens. Then there is a period where I am 20 starting to get editorially involved and then when I am 21 specifically given responsibility. In that period, 22 there are two categories of information I am dealing 23 with and that you see in some of the documents. There 24 is the direct involvement in the editorial process, 25 directly Panorama but also driving the daily BBC News</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

<p>1 coverage which I was responsible for up to yesterday 2 morning.</p> <p>3 Then a slightly different category of information 4 where I have come upon the information and I think, 5 without invalidating my role, I let management be aware 6 of things. So they create slightly different issues, 7 especially the ones about the process in relation to 8 confidentiality. I didn't write that in, it is 9 a preliminary matter I just wanted to state that.</p> <p>10 NICK POLLARD: Is it difficult to manage those two roles? 11 I get the sense from what you have written in the 12 timeline that, perhaps because the corporate side of it 13 was not particularly well organised, that you were 14 having to take on --</p> <p>15 PETER HORROCKS: You may say that, I could not possibly 16 comment. I am going to try not to speculate about it. 17 What I was trying to do, it was tricky, was to think the 18 things that I am pointing out to the organisation 19 management, corporately I regard the people running the, 20 you know, the BBC's management of the whole thing as the 21 corporate side but in terms of my personal managerial 22 responsibility I thought when I had worked things out 23 from publicly available information and I deduced things 24 because I was focusing on things more closely than 25 anybody else was it was legitimate, particularly in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 that should have been in front of the board.</p> <p>2 NICK POLLARD: Just explain to me the relationship between 3 those two things is. Is the editorial board a sub-group 4 of News Group?</p> <p>5 PETER HORROCKS: I think it is in technical terms, but in 6 effect that is what it is. A wider configuration of 7 people, it includes people that don't report in 8 managerially to Helen Boaden, so David Jordan for 9 instance, the editorial controllers from Scotland, Wales 10 and Northern Ireland. It is a broader group of people.</p> <p>11 ALAN MACLEAN: The News Group board is headed --</p> <p>12 PETER HORROCKS: Both are chaired by Helen, the editorial 13 board has an editorial role because it reports about 14 audience performance. It also has, I am sure you will 15 come across this, documentation that may be relevant to 16 this. There is a document called the Managed Risk 17 Programme List which is where stories of sensitivities 18 of various descriptions, reputational sensitivity, 19 should be lodged. That document is also shared with 20 another board I sit on, the Editorial Standards Board, 21 where all of the BBC's content divisions come together 22 and maybe we get to the exchange of information between 23 the news and the BBC, we talk about that in more detail.</p> <p>24 The other document which may be relevant, I don't 25 know, I certainly have not looked back at the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 speaking to Sarah Jones council to say, "I think you 2 need to be thinking about this." You see some of the 3 stuff in the second timeline.</p> <p>4 But going back to the, kind of, period before the 5 period really starts to break I am vaguely aware of 6 things and I have been wracking my brains about what I 7 was aware of. I knew there was a story that had not 8 appeared, I think I must have picked up on the press 9 coverage.</p> <p>10 ALAN MACLEAN: Your role then was?</p> <p>11 PETER HORROCKS: Director of Global News and World Service 12 throughout this period, so I don't have any specific 13 editorial or managerial responsibilities in relation to 14 Newsnight. This would not be a story transmitted on the 15 international services.</p> <p>16 ALAN MACLEAN: So it is nothing to do with you?</p> <p>17 PETER HORROCKS: That is one of the reasons why I am brought 18 in to handle the editorial role later on.</p> <p>19 NICK POLLARD: The news editorial board you were on?</p> <p>20 PETER HORROCKS: I sit on the News Group board, the main 21 board for BBC News Group and also on the editorial board 22 of the BBC News Group. So one of the things I have been 23 asking myself, and I also asked colleagues in one of the 24 board meetings we have had since this exploded, to go 25 back and look for documentation in relation to things</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 documentation from this time, is that there is a press 2 report or a reputational analysis that is done by the 3 comms team each month and that would either pick up 4 potential stories or sensitive stories that have 5 appeared in the press. I have asked the next editorial 6 report which there has not been one since this story has 7 really been at its height should look at that.</p> <p>8 ALAN MACLEAN: That is Paddy Feeny?</p> <p>9 PETER HORROCKS: Correct, he is now the head of comms but he 10 was not through this period. James Hardy, head of comms 11 for the News Division was head of comms at the time, 12 particularly through December to September period for 13 the whole of the news, yes, yes. So to go back to your 14 original question, I remember being aware of it but 15 I don't remember there being a discussion at either the 16 news board or the News Group editorial board and, like 17 all of us involved in it, I have been asking myself was 18 there more I should have realised or should I have 19 exercised more curiosity? I think if there had been 20 a formal item or if it had come up as a part of 21 discussion, especially because of my interests in the 22 programme Newsnight, I think I would have asked about 23 it. I don't remember that, I can't be absolutely 24 certain about that.</p> <p>25 NICK POLLARD: You recorded, it is interesting, the two, if</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

1 you like, passing references to the two, I suspect quite
 2 important, Helen had; one with Peter Rippon about the
 3 Savile programme and the other one that she had, the
 4 famous "ten second conversation". She told you about
 5 both of those, is that right?
 6 PETER HORROCKS: She did, this is moving into the second
 7 stage where Exposure has transmitted. I was in Cairo
 8 when that happened, I remember having the odd message
 9 from some correspondents saying it is not looking very
 10 good and it is going to get worse and I had not realised
 11 the potential significance. I knew it was a tricky
 12 story.
 13 ALAN MACLEAN: This is ITV?
 14 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, the Exposure broadcast makes the whole
 15 thing a major public issue. Then on my return from
 16 Cairo things were starting to go, build up
 17 significantly. So these conversations I had with Helen,
 18 I have not been able to place these exactly yet, were
 19 after my return from Cairo. In the week after exposure,
 20 it must have been.
 21 NICK POLLARD: So really the first kick off point, in a way,
 22 is Wednesday October 10 when really you don't have
 23 an official involvement but you are texting Peter just
 24 to express support, really?
 25 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, just as a colleague. I know him well,
 Page 9

1 I am one of the few former editors of Newsnight who is
 2 still in the organisation so Peter would often share
 3 problems with me and kick things around. I don't recall
 4 the Savile investigation coming up in that process, I
 5 was usually talking to him about presenters and those
 6 sorts of things.
 7 NICK POLLARD: I see, yes, yes.
 8 ALAN MACLEAN: Can I just take you back to last year, just
 9 before we dive into this. I assume, tell me if I am
 10 wrong, there was no discussion at any of these news or
 11 editorial boards, no discussion about Savile at all,
 12 Jimmy Savile at all, because the tribute programmes and
 13 so on were for another part of the organisation?
 14 PETER HORROCKS: My recollection is they were not discussed,
 15 but I can't be 100 per sure.
 16 ALAN MACLEAN: Would there be any reason why there should
 17 have been?
 18 PETER HORROCKS: I think through the press report, that
 19 might have been more likely to come up in January
 20 or February when the story started to the run about the
 21 BBC dropping something. The non-appearance of the
 22 programme is something in terms of documentation that
 23 does not necessarily -- but I do know, and this is from
 24 information from last Thursday's News Group board, the
 25 first time they have met since the height of the crisis,
 Page 10

1 I asked the question about the Managed Risk Programme
 2 List, I asked as a process point to Helen Boaden could
 3 the next editorial board see the Managed Risk Programme
 4 List for last December and she said that yes, that will
 5 be shared, but we know that the Newsnight definitely was
 6 not on the News Group level list. The Programmes
 7 Department of which Newsnight is a part, apparently it
 8 was listed there, it didn't get to News Group level. It
 9 might be a tiny issue, but by the time the issues were
 10 being compiled the story was not going ahead.
 11 ALAN MACLEAN: Can you unpack that, it sounds like it was on
 12 one list and not another?
 13 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, there is a tiering. In the Programmes
 14 Department people get confused, it is easier to think
 15 about it as the current affairs department, amalgamates
 16 its information about programmes of potential
 17 sensitivity and then there is a triaging process and
 18 more significant of those then get amalgamated into
 19 News Group managed risks programme and that gets
 20 consolidated into a BBC-wide list, news and current
 21 affairs items generate greater sense.
 22 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Was this a risk at the lower level that
 23 didn't make it to the risk higher up the chain?
 24 PETER HORROCKS: I don't know, I just know the information I
 25 was given last Thursday, it was on the programmes list
 Page 11

1 but not the News List. That could be a timing issue, by
 2 the time the consolidated News Group list was put
 3 together the decision had been taken this programme was
 4 not going to go ahead. By definition it would fall away
 5 or it could be somebody made a judgment it was not to be
 6 escalated, that would be something to ask people with
 7 direct knowledge.
 8 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Do you know how often the list is
 9 updated?
 10 PETER HORROCKS: It is a monthly list, there is a cycle with
 11 it going through to the top level, the configuration of
 12 that and how rapidly that gets escalated is something
 13 that needs to be thought about carefully.
 14 NICK POLLARD: Prepared for the News Group?
 15 PETER HORROCKS: I don't know, within programmes it is used
 16 for a meeting. It may be information for head of
 17 department, Steve Mitchell. There is an item each month
 18 at the News Group editorial board and we look at it and
 19 people can ask questions if they choose to and then, as
 20 I say, it gets consolidated into the wider list. A lot
 21 of those programmes are long-term domestics, Panoramas
 22 or series for BBC2 or 4 that has sensitivity. It is
 23 harder to use a monthly device for a daily news
 24 programme with investigative elements. The
 25 non-appearance may be a timing issue as opposed to
 Page 12

1 a judgment issue.
 2 The News Group itself in the editorial board intends
 3 to scrutinise that and the questions it asks, this was
 4 not one that actually came to it, this is better talked
 5 about in context of conversation with George Entwistle
 6 and Helen Boaden, it is shared at a BBC-wide level.
 7 Obviously because of this particular item it never got
 8 to the News Group level, it never got to the
 9 consolidated BBC level, but there is a process for
 10 information to be shared across the organisation of
 11 items of sensitivity, we talk about, maybe you are
 12 interested in that episode, we can talk about that in
 13 a bit more detail, whatever you want.
 14 NICK POLLARD: Sure, sure, okay. I think we will come back
 15 to that. Then effectively your official role in this
 16 started on October 17?
 17 PETER HORROCKS: Semi-official at that stage. There was
 18 a two day period where Fran Unsworth had been allocated
 19 the role, I think by Helen, because other people like
 20 Helen were being used, increasingly in the last few
 21 weeks, and because it was going to involve heavy duty
 22 investigation and I had experienced this at the height
 23 of Panorama. She asked me to help her out but it was
 24 not until later, as I set out in the timeline, I was
 25 given the formal responsibility. Fran's role and mine

Page 13

1 flipped; I became responsible for the current affairs
 2 and news with Fran supporting me.
 3 NICK POLLARD: When it says, "I was asked to investigate
 4 current affairs aspect" that implied that, I guess, did
 5 you already suspect that Panorama would be looking at it
 6 or that the news would be inevitably having to do some
 7 digging about the BBC itself?
 8 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, absolutely by that point, that is why
 9 Fran wanted my help I think because there are
 10 unprecedented issues about whether it was appropriate or
 11 not for people who had been working on Newsnight to be
 12 contributing to Panorama. It is worth going back a bit,
 13 here I am trying to tell the story with my direct
 14 involvement and knowledge, but I can add a bit to help
 15 your context. As I understand it -- I think my times
 16 help with this which I have also provided for you --
 17 there was a feeling after the Newsnight had not gone out
 18 that there was an attempt within Newsnight to, kind of,
 19 recover some of the ground lost by the fact they had not
 20 got the story. You will hear more from people directly
 21 involved in that, but that was not happening in the way
 22 he hoped it would do so he took the story to Panorama
 23 and Panorama picked it up. Steve Mitchell, as the head
 24 of department --
 25 ALAN MACLEAN: When is this? I mean, not to --

Page 14

1 PETER HORROCKS: This must be at the end of the week
 2 previously, so the Friday before Wednesday October 2nd.
 3 So it would be Friday October 12.
 4 NICK POLLARD: Well after the IT V programme had been
 5 produced?
 6 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes, yes. So well after the ITV.
 7 NICK POLLARD: Was there debate how much the BBC should
 8 investigate a response, but the story itself?
 9 PETER HORROCKS: But there was a shift -- this is the
 10 crucial thing -- on October 12 because when
 11 Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean were moving from Newsnight
 12 to Panorama with, I should stress, the agreement with
 13 Steve Mitchell, the head of department, and the blessing
 14 of the editor of Newsnight, in effect the intention was
 15 to say "we didn't do the original investigation story
 16 and we need to get that done." Although it is shutting
 17 the door after the horse has bolted, it would be better
 18 for the BBC to do that and bring some of the material
 19 Newsnight had gathered to light, a different assessment
 20 of the legal risks in relation to that once ITV have
 21 published.
 22 Then the row about the BBC's mishandling of it is
 23 escalating and he is escalating in parallel and it is on
 24 the Friday evening that George Entwistle announces what
 25 leads to your appointment and so, you know, the story

Page 15

1 starts to take on a different dimension. Meirion Jones
 2 and Liz MacKean have gone to Panorama as a production
 3 team and then some people start to question, and I said
 4 about this in the timeline, whether that is appropriate.
 5 Should they be allowed to be, as it were, reporting on
 6 something where they are now part of the story?
 7 So what happens is that there is debate about that
 8 before I formally get involved and it is decided that
 9 they can be contributors to the programme but they
 10 should not be in editorial control of it. So I am
 11 joining and getting involved on Wednesday, Fran is aware
 12 of these internal arguments with people with different
 13 perspectives, whether this is appropriate, and she says,
 14 "This is a tangle, can you help me?"
 15 ALAN MACLEAN: Who decided it was going to be a Panorama
 16 programme, that was before you involved?
 17 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, the editor of the programme would have
 18 decided he would do that, you need to ask Tom Giles
 19 whether he ran it by Steve Mitchell. Normally you get
 20 on with it, but this has BBC sensitivity. I imagine he
 21 talked with Steve, he must have done at some stage
 22 because the request from staff to transfer from one
 23 programme within the department to another was
 24 definitely agreed by Steve so those conversations must
 25 have been happening in the week of the 8th October,

Page 16

1 I can't remember exactly when that was and how that
 2 related to the timeline of the alerts going to
 3 management and all those sorts of things. You will need
 4 to unpick that, I don't have all the details of that.
 5 NICK POLLARD: Okay. So do you know when work on that
 6 Panorama programme started?
 7 PETER HORROCKS: I don't, to be honest, no. I think Tom
 8 picked it up and said, "This is something we need to be
 9 doing and seen to be doing" but by the time I was asked
 10 to get involved on that Wednesday 17th the programme was
 11 already up and running and, you know, the dual aspect of
 12 it which became the programme as transmitted, IE that
 13 there was, you know, the basic Jimmy Savile story, the
 14 historical stuff but also the BBC's handling of it more
 15 recently, those elements were established by the time
 16 I joined it.
 17 NICK POLLARD: Fran was dealing with the daily news side of
 18 it, or were you increasingly taking that over as well?
 19 PETER HORROCKS: I was taking that over, but she was dealing
 20 with the interplay between Newsnight and Panorama. So
 21 by that stage some of the Newsnight team had started to
 22 believe things about how the investigation had been done
 23 which made them question the way that Meirion Jones and
 24 Liz MacKean had done some of those things. Indeed,
 25 I will come to this, I have my own questions about
 Page 17

1 whether they at all times did the right thing. I am not
 2 coming in here and saying one group of people that did
 3 it right and one group of people did it wrong, there is
 4 issues and questions for everyone.
 5 So Fran was dealing with some of the Newsnight team
 6 saying this is not appropriate and also throwing up
 7 questions about things like the interview with the aunt
 8 that I refer to in the later timeline, and I don't know
 9 if you want to go down those particular rabbit holes at
 10 this stage. There are one or two rabbits I had to knock
 11 on the head during the course of it, they ended up being
 12 distractions from what the key issues were.
 13 NICK POLLARD: I guess there was, just to make things
 14 harder, a fair bit of unofficial briefing going on of
 15 newspapers and other contacts by people with, you might
 16 say, with a bit of an axe to grind from one side or the
 17 other?
 18 PETER HORROCKS: I was certainly aware of that and something
 19 I was having to manage through the course of this was
 20 people who had different perspectives on it who felt
 21 their positions were being accurately reported. The
 22 producer felt they were being maligned but equally there
 23 were people close to the original Newsnight and who felt
 24 that the leaking that was happening was, you know,
 25 producing them. So there was an atmosphere between
 Page 18

1 different teams that was complicating the ability to get
 2 to the bottom of things and understand the facts and
 3 that is relevant to the good conduct of an investigation
 4 that was always going to be tricky because it was
 5 an investigation into an organisation and I think it had
 6 some bearing on the corporate mindset towards the story
 7 and the Corporation's understanding of the facts and
 8 that influenced its ability to be able to clarify its
 9 public position. We are jumping ahead a bit here.
 10 ALAN MACLEAN: Can I just ask about whether you have any
 11 view about the extent to which the decision to stop the
 12 story, not to broadcast the Newsnight story last year,
 13 was that a decision that was accepted or welcomed or not
 14 welcomed or not accepted, first of all by the Newsnight
 15 journalists as a whole and then, secondly, by the
 16 management? Or were you not able to form a view about
 17 that?
 18 PETER HORROCKS: You have asked an extremely broad question
 19 in terms of the number of people who would have a view
 20 on that.
 21 ALAN MACLEAN: There is some suggestion, for example,
 22 Mr Rippon's blog, that his decision was supported by
 23 some and not supported by others at the time.
 24 PETER HORROCKS: Well, again, I don't have direct knowledge
 25 of this obviously so I can only rely on the few
 Page 19

1 conversations I have had with people.
 2 ALAN MACLEAN: Some of us agree strongly and some of us --
 3 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes, so, again, this is useful context
 4 and bound to come out through conversations that you
 5 will have, so it is less about my direct knowledge, it
 6 is a legitimate context to assist you in being able to
 7 understand what has happened and ask relevant questions
 8 in relation to that. It is not any secret that
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED] there had been quite a lot of press
 11 stories, things that had emerged from journalists that
 12 worked on the programme or left the programme and that
 13 is an important context on how he is communicating with
 14 his team and potentially about the communication above
 15 as well. So you need to ask the people directly
 16 involved what their particular perspectives on that
 17 were, but that was definitely a background to it.
 18 From what I understand -- this is predominantly from
 19 a conversation last week with the now acting editor,
 20 Liz Gibbons, who had some awareness of it being the
 21 deputy editor at the time this happened -- most of this
 22 was being handled by Peter Rippon in direct relationship
 23 with the team and there was not necessarily that
 24 widespread knowledge until the moment when the story was
 25 not going ahead. It is clear that there must have been
 Page 20

<p>1 a letter that Panorama would send out, probably to 2 anybody that they were doing an investigation about. 3 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, sorry, I didn't actually address the 4 question in my early view of it. I am being influenced 5 to some extent by some of the concerns that people are 6 expressing about whether it is being fair to 7 Peter Rippon, I have not yet got my own hands on the 8 evidence, I have not read any of the transcripts of the 9 interviews or at this stage have I had the face-to-face 10 meeting with Meirion Jones. I am just reacting to the 11 letter. It just seemed a bit hostile. Looking back in 12 hindsight, I think I used the word "loaded" and I think 13 there were one or two phrases which, looking back on it 14 with more understanding of things now, I probably would 15 say are loaded. But the, kind of, the list of 16 accusations, as it were, they were legitimate ones, 17 I think, to have raised. 18 NICK POLLARD: You said to Clive Edwards that you thought it 19 was -- and that was in your capacity then as effectively 20 editorial head of Savile coverage? 21 PETER HORROCKS: I can't be absolutely sure, Nick, I would 22 have to look at the time of day when George Entwistle 23 sent -- George sent me the email at 14.15, no, this is 24 before I am given that responsibility so I am still in 25 a deputy capacity on the Friday. I am getting involved</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 a rota of the senior BBC News representatives attending 2 that call and although procedures had been put in place 3 where people were in different units there were people 4 on the corporate side and editorial side I was on the 5 rota for that. I thought do I need to go in? 6 ALAN MACLEAN: Can I ask you about this DG communications 7 call, you said you were on the rota. This happens every 8 morning, does it? 9 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, the same time every morning. 10 ALAN MACLEAN: This gives a heads-up what is going on? 11 NICK POLLARD: It is a conference call. 12 PETER HORROCKS: It is a morning meeting and it was 13 instituted, I think, after a previous set of public 14 reputational issues the BBC had to face and the 15 importance of all the senior leaders coming together 16 very rapidly in effect of communications and press tends 17 to dominate. If there has been a blackout on the 18 website, those sorts of things will be raised as well. 19 ALAN MACLEAN: An opportunity to put things on to the 20 Director General's plate? 21 PETER HORROCKS: It is, the new Director General was saying, 22 "I don't want it to just be dominated by the cuttings of 23 The Daily Mail, I want to hear about other things." 24 This meeting was dominated by what was happening in the 25 press, it is meant to be --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 in it. I think it is loaded, Clive says, "Don't be 2 ridiculous, there are serious things to run and we need 3 to get on with it." By lunchtime I have sat down with 4 Meirion, that is for me the significant moment for me 5 understanding what has happened and that shifts my 6 perspective. 7 NICK POLLARD: Friday morning you get this email from Roger, 8 slightly out of the blue, saying you are now handling 9 Panorama. Did that come as a bit of a surprise? 10 PETER HORROCKS: By the way, well, it didn't totally no. 11 I could see Fran was keen for support and I had, 12 I looked after the John Ware programme that proceeded 13 the Hutton report that had some impact on BBC governance 14 eight years ago. I had been put in this position 15 previously so I was not totally surprised, to be honest. 16 NICK POLLARD: Okay. Interestingly, that note at 9.20 about 17 Paul Milrea, is that how you -- 18 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. 19 NICK POLLARD: Milray. This, it seems to me, kicks off this 20 issue about the BBC's public handling of press matters. 21 PETER HORROCKS: That was a piece of information which 22 I battled with myself whether to include, I decided it 23 is sufficiently important that even though that is me 24 passing on to the inquiry information which I gained in 25 my senior corporate capacity, because it was just, it is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 ALAN MACLEAN: How often would you be on the rota? 2 PETER HORROCKS: Once a week. I am formally Helen Boaden's 3 deputy and she joins most of the calls, that particular 4 Friday morning was one where I was rostered so I decided 5 it was important for BBC News to be represented for 6 a whole range of issues. 7 ALAN MACLEAN: When you listen in you are not a participant 8 in the discussion, you are not -- 9 PETER HORROCKS: No, no, I could have said something but -- 10 and this is very important to say -- that I did not pass 11 that information on to the editorial team in Panorama 12 having heard that. I use that in my corporate capacity 13 subsequently in the conversations I describe later on 14 that day. 15 ALAN MACLEAN: So it is important to your mindset and those 16 who participated in that discussion that you are wearing 17 a particular hat? 18 PETER HORROCKS: I don't think they were particularly 19 thinking about it, to be honest. They knew I was on the 20 call, everybody announces themselves. 21 ALAN MACLEAN: You were there wearing your corporate hat -- 22 PETER HORROCKS: Not my -- well, I was not formally leading 23 Panorama at that point. I think, yes, I don't think 24 I knew that. I knew about the Panorama because Fran had 25 been asking me about it and I had had some phone calls</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 through the course of Thursday, as I said, I was 2 traveling and appearing at the literary festivals. 3 I had had calls about it, I was gaining knowledge, when 4 I read the story in The Times and then read the way it 5 was being described on the call I thought there may be 6 a gap between my emerging understanding and how I took 7 the corporate position to be. 8 ALAN MACLEAN: What was the thrust of the times story? 9 PETER HORROCKS: The thrust was what was being referred to 10 when it was described as ridiculous was the definition 11 of the story, the nature of the investigation, IE 12 focused on Surrey Police and their handling of it. 13 NICK POLLARD: The suggestion by The Times was that it was 14 not true? 15 PETER HORROCKS: It was the first of the series of emails 16 that started to appear which showed the production did 17 not hold that view. 18 ALAN MACLEAN: So The Times was questioning the story or the 19 line that had been put out that Newsnight was looking at 20 what the police had been doing and The Times was saying 21 we have a document that suggests it was doing something 22 different? 23 PETER HORROCKS: It was probably the Liz MacKean email, 24 something like that, that subsequently appeared in 25 a number of other places and also my sense was the --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 was not even handed about the nature of the 2 investigation. 3 NICK POLLARD: As it turns out, if you look at the position 4 that the BBC later reached, later acknowledged, it was 5 the very opposite of ridiculous. I mean, ridiculous was 6 a very considerable overstatement, was it not? 7 PETER HORROCKS: Well, I said to people that I thought 8 ridiculous was the wrong description, as you see from my 9 subsequent communication with the general council and 10 the conversation I had with Jessica Cecil, the chief of 11 staff to the Director General. I noted it was being 12 described as ridiculous, I assessed that myself because 13 I was trying not to take a position on anything, as you 14 can see. I initially thought the Panorama view was 15 loaded, I was trying to keep as neutral a view as 16 possible and find out what was going on. I thought 17 talking to Meirion might be useful. 18 NICK POLLARD: Just before you leave the press call, who do 19 you think Milray would have got that line from, do you 20 think? 21 PETER HORROCKS: I don't have a clear view of how the 22 corporate perspective has come together through this. 23 My main understanding of the corporate perspective is 24 largely through communication with Milrea of a different 25 nature, not a conference call but interacting with him</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 sorry, was that the context of leaking, and I can't 2 remember what other stories had already appeared by this 3 stage so please forgive me, doing a pull of the press 4 stuff against the time would help with this, but my 5 sense was I don't know if I can talk about it. I then 6 have some conversations and write some emails and send 7 some texts in the afternoon, after I have spoken to 8 Meirion, to a number of people on the corporate side. 9 ALAN MACLEAN: What was ridiculous? What was described as 10 ridiculous? 11 PETER HORROCKS: I suppose what was being said was that 12 The Times was read to have swallowed the version of the 13 story because we know from the BBC corporate point of 14 view that is not true, was what I read into the use of 15 the word ridiculous. 16 ALAN MACLEAN: But Mr Milrea is a comms man, not somebody 17 directly involved in the events the year before. 18 PETER HORROCKS: This is a conversation that is happening 19 about the BBC's handle before. As I say, the 20 Director General did correct him or adjust his view, he 21 said, "I think you ought to nuance this, there are 22 people who have different views." There was a sense by 23 that stage, now he know the direct information available 24 by that stage, but it was still for me there was still 25 a -- it was still clear the corporate mindset certainly</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 and how the corporate side has organised itself, has not 2 been immediately apparent to me, that has been kept 3 separate for obvious reasons. I know the BBC has an 4 instant command system, gold command, so if is appointed 5 as gold command my understanding is that has not been 6 Director General because they are involved in the story 7 and it is not good practice for somebody caught up in 8 something to be taking those even-handed decisions. My 9 understanding is for part of this period Roger Mosey was 10 that person which is the reason why the email came to me 11 from Roger saying I was given responsibility for 12 Panorama. 13 ALAN MACLEAN: He is? 14 PETER HORROCKS: Acting Director for BBC Vision. He was 15 previously responsible for BBC's coverage of the 16 Olympics. 17 NICK POLLARD: When George Entwistle moved up from Director 18 of Vision -- 19 ALAN MACLEAN: The George Entwistle -- 20 PETER HORROCKS: His substantive role is Director of Vision. 21 In this role, as I understand it, he has taken on the 22 acting DG responsibility because of George. Once he has 23 commissioned you guys he is no longer allowed to be 24 taking decisions in relation to that, although there are 25 some things he communicates to me so I am not quite sure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

1 behind the corporate veil, as it were, whether decisions
 2 are taken by Roger and given to George. In this
 3 context, I think Roger may well have taken some of these
 4 decisions.
 5 NICK POLLARD: Then you say Meirion and a lot of things
 6 surprise you about that, not least that you are really
 7 the first manager he has spoken to, is that right?
 8 PETER HORROCKS: I am the first BBC News manager he has
 9 spoken to. He has spoken to Ken MacQuarrie and
 10 I think -- when was that? I seem to remember that was
 11 10 October. It is in Meirion chronology I forwarded to
 12 you. We are now on the 19th, is that right? I am
 13 thinking is it really nine days. He definitely talks to
 14 Meirion before George Entwistle's press conference on
 15 9 October and the corporate mindset is still not even
 16 handed in relation to the issues in question but,
 17 anyway, Meirion says to me in effect, you know, it is
 18 good to be talking to you, Peter, because no-one in
 19 BBC News -- I have not had an opportunity to talk to
 20 anybody in BBC News, either his editor or above his
 21 editor, since December last year when the story was
 22 pulled. He has a timeline in front of him which he is
 23 going to be developing already. I ask him whether he is
 24 happy for that, something like that, to -- George is
 25 going to be appearing before the committee on Tuesday

Page 33

1 and he says, "Of course, of course, I have been trying
 2 to make sure the BBC is clear about its position."
 3 RICHARD SPAFFORD: The meeting with MacQuarrie is on
 4 19 October?
 5 ALAN MACLEAN: Why are you astonished about this revelation?
 6 You say when he says you are the first BBC News manager
 7 he has spoken to since last December you say you are
 8 astonished?
 9 PETER HORROCKS: There could have been a number of
 10 opportunities where such a conversation could have
 11 happened, either before the Christmas of December when
 12 the story is being pulled and clearly there has been
 13 a quite strong debate about it. A decision has been
 14 taken, sat down with a reporter and producer to talk
 15 through, even if it is just to handle their discomfort
 16 about it. Certainly when the stories start to appear in
 17 the Mirror and the Oldie I imagine there would have been
 18 some comms consideration: what is the BBC's response
 19 going to be to this? There would be discussion with the
 20 people involved as well as the editor in the run up to
 21 the exposure of documentary and then, importantly, once
 22 the blog was published, you see from the blog later on
 23 Meirion and Liz flag up a different perspective on it.
 24 I always try and take the view throughout this it is not
 25 obvious that their view is the only one that matters,

Page 34

1 either from or producer, the editor has a view and that
 2 is to be expressed. Nobody sits down and says, "Can we
 3 straighten out and talk about this?"
 4 ALAN MACLEAN: Would you have expected somebody in the
 5 editor's position to go and speak to Jones, somebody in
 6 Jones's position to go and speak to Rippon?
 7 PETER HORROCKS: I am expressing surprise, whoever prompted
 8 it. In the cultures I have worked in, plenty of
 9 arguments with people over dropping stories or making
 10 judgments but if you have a disagreement you sit down
 11 and talk about it.
 12 NICK POLLARD: Had Meirion Jones carried on working for
 13 Newsnight after the Savile story was dropped?
 14 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, and he was doing other stories. [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 Also the concerns that he has expressed about the duty
 23 to the victims, but then I am not aware that he did
 24 anything directly about that himself and he could have
 25 chosen to do that as a citizen as opposed to a BBC

Page 35

1 journalist.
 2 There are questions there about the citizen duty
 3 and, you know, doing something about it. He didn't take
 4 it to Tom Giles at Panorama, he said later on he was
 5 interested in the story, why didn't that happen? It may
 6 be he had a sense from the way the decision had come
 7 about that was something a BBC News view overall,
 8 Panorama and Newsnight report to the same point, so he
 9 may have made an assumption about that. I think, my
 10 view would be there was a duty upon him and his reporter
 11 to raise their concerns in a wider range of ways than
 12 they did, as well as a significant duty on BBC News to
 13 bring the facts to bear by talking to people.
 14 NICK POLLARD: You may not know this, but do you think
 15 either Meirion or Liz, one or the other, or Helen Boaden
 16 took the story to ITV or --
 17 PETER HORROCKS: I don't know, I don't know. I know there
 18 was one attempt Meirion made to flag it up outside the
 19 managerial change which is he rang the BBC editorial
 20 policy team and asked whether the BBC has
 21 a whistleblowing procedure and was told no, there is not
 22 a whistleblowing procedure, which was not correct.
 23 I think the person he spoke to may have thought the
 24 whistleblowing procedure was due to, you know, that kind
 25 of whistleblowing. It is meant to be for editorial and

Page 36

1 non-editorial, that was a mistake, but even in that
 2 event there was room for an investigative journalist, if
 3 you come to see me or come to see Tom Giles at least
 4 there would have been another kind of scrutiny.
 5 NICK POLLARD: We will ask in detail about his reaction.
 6 Okay. Just take us through the things that you did, if
 7 you like, as a result of your conversation with Meirion
 8 --
 9 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Do you mind, you said in the
 10 conversation, "It appears he has some strong points."
 11 I think you say in your timeline, 14, 15, "Meirion --
 12 convinced me he had some strong points about it not
 13 going ahead and..." Can you tell me about the strong
 14 points about the item not going ahead?
 15 PETER HORROCKS: Well, he tells me about the fact there were
 16 two interviews, the strength of the testimony he has
 17 other research information that was not on camera but
 18 was helping to substantiate it and I think his point is
 19 why were we stopped, why didn't we continue it? At
 20 least if there were legitimate doubts about it why
 21 didn't we, they seemed to be legitimate. It is actually
 22 on the second side of it that I am getting an even
 23 stronger concern about whether the BBC's position is
 24 an appropriate one because so much of the information
 25 that he has does contradict both the blog and also other

Page 37

1 inaccuracies that the BBC is committing itself to in
 2 public and it is that second aspect of it that becomes
 3 in many ways my strong concern in relation to the
 4 corporate position.
 5 RICHARD SPAFFORD: What you are saying here is you think
 6 there is strength in the first point as well, is that
 7 right?
 8 PETER HORROCKS: I do, I do. This is not to say the reasons
 9 Peter Rippon may have had in his mind were invalid,
 10 there could have been other reasons, but the questions
 11 Meirion is raising are legitimate ones that would lead
 12 me not to be so absolute the statements the BBC is
 13 currently making, in other words there is at least
 14 enough to create some doubt about the position the BBC
 15 is taking.
 16 NICK POLLARD: At around about this time you are getting
 17 increasingly exercised, I think, about the BBC's
 18 position. Just so I am clear, the blog, the blog has
 19 been up in its original form for how long by then?
 20 PETER HORROCKS: 2 October, I think.
 21 ALAN MACLEAN: It is dated 2 October. When you were
 22 Newsnight editor when blogs were not around did you have
 23 one?
 24 PETER HORROCKS: No, but I had responsibility --
 25 ALAN MACLEAN: So it has been around for a while, has it?

Page 38

1 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, it is used as a noticeboard when the
 2 BBC wants to get a point of view about launching a new
 3 programme or something like that. Also when there is
 4 something awkward, say inappropriate pictures on the
 5 10 o'clock news, somebody will confess their sins in
 6 public.
 7 ALAN MACLEAN: It is a way of doing things in public?
 8 PETER HORROCKS: It is significant. We do have a policy of
 9 linking to it prominently, particularly if it is
 10 something to do with the core BBC News. If there has
 11 been a mistake about something you will see the links to
 12 other aspects of the story. Editor's blog apology,
 13 something like that, if it is relevant.
 14 ALAN MACLEAN: It is an established mechanism?
 15 PETER HORROCKS: It is a serious accountability and
 16 transparency mechanism the BBC uses, it is not a sop, it
 17 is serious and people take it seriously. We often have
 18 a discussion about how far should we go and the
 19 press office are often saying, "Come on, we don't have
 20 to go that far" and we have tried to encourage a culture
 21 of editors honestly describing their mistakes because
 22 having a trusting relationship with the audience by
 23 being clear and honest about error is important for us
 24 to do. It is important for us to have.
 25 ALAN MACLEAN: I think I have read some suggestion this

Page 39

1 particular blog was to some extent subject to drafting
 2 by committee. Do you know who actually --
 3 PETER HORROCKS: I don't have any knowledge of that.
 4 ALAN MACLEAN: What would you expect, would you expect the
 5 editor himself to sit down and write it?
 6 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, I would, yes, with input from whoever
 7 else has information and I would also expect the comms
 8 team would have sight of it. In fact, I think there was
 9 something that was introduced in our first flush of
 10 enthusiasm for transparency, I think blogs were written
 11 without the press team having sight of them and signing
 12 them off and when I was head of the newsroom, which
 13 included responsibility for online, digital and radio,
 14 the comms team said, "We need to see these in advance."
 15 Exactly what happened in this case, whether there was
 16 involvement, I don't know.
 17 ALAN MACLEAN: They need to see them so they can handle
 18 questions --
 19 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes, I am saying where we got to, the
 20 editor needs to be able to express clearly and honestly
 21 the explanation for what it might be, positive or
 22 negative, but the comms team should know about that and
 23 be able to handle follow up queries. Sometimes it would
 24 be, in effect, have you thought about this, thought
 25 about that, the comms team would say to look at that

Page 40

1 drafting, but the commitment is always to a transparent
 2 relationship with the audience.
 3 ALAN MACLEAN: It is not supposed to be a lines to take
 4 document?
 5 PETER HORROCKS: No, it is not. I have explained its
 6 origins and the intention of it. It was originally
 7 designed to open up the BBC's editorial processes. We
 8 thought it was something we might update two or three
 9 times a day, thinking about this, thinking about that,
 10 but that didn't happen. It became more of
 11 an alternative communications tool but with the
 12 intention of it being, I suppose, not like a press
 13 release or a press statement. It is more in the
 14 authentic voice of the editor who is talking directly to
 15 the audience.
 16 NICK POLLARD: This was clearly Peter's authentic voice, is
 17 that right?
 18 PETER HORROCKS: In reading it I never thought it was in
 19 somebody else's hands, the questions you are asking, I
 20 have not heard second-hand about that either. I have
 21 not genuinely heard any discussion about that. That is
 22 partly because you need to speak to Meirion James and
 23 there is a key part of this, their view is they had very
 24 little knowledge themselves and most of my information
 25 has come from them rather than people in the corporate

Page 41

1 machine because by the time I was involved in it I was
 2 in a separate box from the corporate machine and they
 3 had not been telling me what was going on.
 4 NICK POLLARD: Did you get the impression when you talked to
 5 him that as soon as this blog had gone up he had
 6 realised that it effectively ran counter to his view --
 7 PETER HORROCKS: It is all in his communications with
 8 management about inaccuracies with BBC position.
 9 I think yesterday I sent it through to you, he quotes
 10 very clearly the number of efforts he makes. This is
 11 both before and after the publication of the blog to try
 12 and get that across, the meeting which was previously
 13 confidential with David Jordan, the email to George
 14 Entwistle and the attempted doorstep of the
 15 Director General within the building to alert him to it.
 16 2 October, "Talk to George in the fourth floor lifts."
 17 ALAN MACLEAN: "Briefly".
 18 PETER HORROCKS: So it is, you know.
 19 NICK POLLARD: So there are two parallel things going on,
 20 you see. There is the blog which is there in print as
 21 the existing BBC view of why the thing was dropped and
 22 then, of course, there is a whole range of other
 23 statements being made, interviews given by David Jordan
 24 and the Director General --
 25 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes.

Page 42

1 NICK POLLARD: -- and then you get involved in a fire
 2 fighting, as it were, of trying to make sure that the
 3 right version or a not quite as conspicuously wrong
 4 version takes precedence, is that right?
 5 PETER HORROCKS: It takes intellectual and emotional energy,
 6 that is how it feels after two weeks of this. There is
 7 difference between the Newsnight and Panorama teams,
 8 that is one of those, and then as I say --
 9 ALAN MACLEAN: You, as it were, discovers -- this is 14 and
 10 15 on the 19th, on the Friday.
 11 PETER HORROCKS: Yes.
 12 ALAN MACLEAN: There was a second. Jones had told you
 13 already there were two --
 14 PETER HORROCKS: No, I don't think he had and at that stage
 15 I had not been cross-examining his story. What I had
 16 done was establish there was enough credible on him
 17 casting doubt on the BBC's account of events and I was
 18 asking him to write his account. It was a short
 19 meeting, it was sufficient to say he had doubts about
 20 the BBC was saying, I had not tested him about that.
 21 The testing starts when the information comes to me
 22 through different routes. On Thursday night, on the
 23 18th, Newsnight do the Savile story for the first time
 24 and Liz MacKean appears on Newsnight and it is through
 25 the editorial process the so-called second interview is

Page 43

1 discovered. So there is turmoil on Newsnight.
 2 ALAN MACLEAN: Discovered by Newsnight --
 3 PETER HORROCKS: Yes.
 4 ALAN MACLEAN: He stood down though --
 5 PETER HORROCKS: No, no, not at this stage. I am going back
 6 to the previous. No, no. So, Thursday October 18,
 7 after the exposure has been transmitted more than a week
 8 earlier, Newsnight finally do an item on Savile and
 9 Meirion details this and debate in the programme whether
 10 it is appropriate. Peter says he does not want to do
 11 it. Eventually he is recused because of Pollard being
 12 set out. He makes that item, in making that item the
 13 second interview is discovered --
 14 NICK POLLARD: Has it been lying somewhere --
 15 PETER HORROCKS: I don't think Meirion is involved, he
 16 appears as the reporter on process.
 17 ALAN MACLEAN: You say Mr Rippon has been recused, by the
 18 time of this broadcast he is not --
 19 PETER HORROCKS: I think that is right, I am not a direct
 20 witness to that, about the atmosphere within Newsnight.
 21 As I understand, you will have to speak to people more
 22 directly involved. The interview with people who worked
 23 at the aunt's home in Surrey is used as part of, well,
 24 this is what Newsnight found out but somebody realises
 25 there is also a section in that interview which refers

Page 44

<p>1 to possibility that the aunt has been complicit with 2 Savile. So a huge turnaround and Newsnight are now 3 saying they want to do on Friday evening the story of 4 how Meirion Jones withheld this interview but included 5 the information about the aunt. It is clearly a serious 6 allegation and it goes to the relationship between 7 Rippon and Meirion Jones. 8 Just to draw a line under it quickly, you can come 9 back to it at some other stage, what I established was 10 it was not germane to the issue of why Newsnight dropped 11 the film. It might have been wrong for Meirion Jones 12 not to disclose it, he said there were reasons: it was 13 done when the story was being killed, it was not 14 relevant. He says the fact of him doing this 15 investigation has [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] He insists the fact Peter Rippon did not know 18 about it is nothing to do about why the story was 19 dropped. It has only come out on Thursday 18th, ages 20 after the issues that are in dispute. 21 So I work that through and I think, okay, it might 22 be something Panorama might touch on if they feel the 23 chemistry between the producer and the editor is 24 relevant but in the end that is all far too intricate 25 inside BBC stuff and dismiss it. Fran says to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 not lose a moment's sleep over the Christmas schedules 2 being disrupted if it was a sign of strength. 3 So all of those things, the stories the papers are 4 telling, makes people think it is all wrong in the words 5 used. What was not ridiculous is there were legitimate 6 concerns about how the decision had been reached and how 7 it had then subsequently been described. That is what 8 I say to the chief of staff, the Director General and 9 also on the Saturday morning -- 10 ALAN MACLEAN: When was that conversation? 11 PETER HORROCKS: 5 o'clock, 6 o'clock on the Friday. 12 ALAN MACLEAN: Your concern was that the enemy is at the 13 gate in the form of the press, we must react because 14 they are throwing spears into the castle, we must throw 15 something out, without taking a step back and looking at 16 the underlying facts? 17 PETER HORROCKS: Correct. 18 NICK POLLARD: That is what got the BBC dug deeper and 19 deeper in a hole? 20 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. I was on the news board at that time, 21 I remember it well. I didn't have direct involvement 22 except, as I say, in producing Panorama which helped 23 create circumstances where -- I certainly had 24 an awareness of that, I certainly thought it is 25 happening again.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 Liz Gibbons that Panorama will look into it, trust 2 Peter Horrocks to look into it, Newsnight is not going 3 to do that story on Friday night and two hours of a load 4 of nonsense to deal with that to get back to the more 5 important thing which is my perception of the position 6 has not properly taken into account the concerns -- has 7 not taken into account the possibility that things have 8 not been understood. 9 There is a conversation I have not included in this, 10 probably because I have been working off my email and 11 text account of things, I did have a conversation with 12 Jessica Cecil, chief of staff, and I say to her that 13 I think this is like Greg Dyke and Richard Sambrook 14 with the aftermath of the Alistair Campbell complaint. 15 The organisation has gone into a bunker mentality 16 because the stories are being run very, very hard, 17 especially by the Mail and The Times, and you are 18 rightly and understandably concerned about leaking 19 coming from some of the protagonists. 20 Those things are true and there is also the big 21 claim that the Newsnight was pulled because of the 22 Christmas schedules. Everybody who knows anything about 23 BBC News knows that is never likely to have happened. 24 People may have interpreted that, but BBC News is proud 25 of its independence and the director of BBC's News would</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 NICK POLLARD: Can you send us an addendum to this timeline 2 with the details of this? 3 PETER HORROCKS: I won't be able to recall it more than we 4 have, if you can just take it from the notes. 5 NICK POLLARD: It was a conversation with George, was it? 6 PETER HORROCKS: No, no, with Jessica Cecil. If I just 7 briefly explain, it is like an episode of 8 The Thick Of It where I work because there is an open 9 plan office space where I work and Helen Boaden works 10 and then there is a glass screen and outside is the 11 Director General work. There are a small number of 12 meeting rooms, we are going in and out, playing 13 different roles, Chinese walls where there are no walls. 14 ALAN MACLEAN: You don't want to knock on one of the glass 15 walls, you send a text to somebody instead. 16 NICK POLLARD: There is not a Malcolm Tucker figure in this, 17 is there, identifiably? 18 Okay. Saturday, presumably, I mean, you are working 19 unbelievably long hours to the middle of the night. 20 PETER HORROCKS: On Thursday, on Saturday I go to Oxford for 21 my daughter's graduation. I do bang off something in 22 the morning. 23 NICK POLLARD: You could not sleep at 3.09. 24 PETER HORROCKS: You will see similarly for the course of 25 the next ten days or so because it has been so intense.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>1 NICK POLLARD: Just a question about that list of questions 2 sent to the Corporation. In what capacity were you 3 doing that then? Is this, if you like, partly -- 4 PETER HORROCKS: Editorial, editorial, clearly editorial. 5 NICK POLLARD: Okay. 6 PETER HORROCKS: So the letter actually comes from 7 Karen Wightman but the team is saying we have written 8 these right to reply letters and I am saying I can see 9 why the BBC is not going to respond to those individual 10 letters because the position of the individuals about to 11 be arraigned in front of Pollard. But the Corporation 12 should be asked whether it stands by the public 13 statements of its employees and so I consolidate the 14 right of replies into a set of questions for the 15 Corporation. 16 NICK POLLARD: Were you forming a view by this time that 17 actually, well, I think you probably were because of the 18 way you express the previous day, that the BBC is wrong 19 in the public position it is taking and digging itself 20 a big hole? I think it probably is clear what you say. 21 PETER HORROCKS: If you look at 9.30, Sarah Jones general 22 council, I see a BBC person describes yesterday's Times 23 story as being ridiculous. 24 ALAN MACLEAN: Embattled, that is pure -- 25 PETER HORROCKS: Exactly, exactly. I am deliberately using</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 There are streams and streams of emails, trying to find 2 the ones germane to your interests. I am even more 3 anxious about it because I am aware the 4 Director General is going to be appearing in front of 5 Parliament on Tuesday and in terms of responses and lack 6 of responses I have had so far I am not sure the 7 organisation has properly understood the discrepancies, 8 at least that are in existence. I have expressed that 9 concern through the course of Saturday, as it were, 10 wearing a corporate hat. Send the Corporation the 11 letter from Panorama and I am thinking, "What more can 12 I do to try and get this through to people?" 13 Then it suddenly comes to me I have been asked to 14 take editorial responsibility for the BBC News Savile 15 coverage so I have the authority to decide: if it is 16 inaccurate it should be taken down. That is why I say 17 it should be taken down but I realise I can't take that 18 decision in my own right, not for editorial reasons 19 because it would have implications for the BBC's 20 corporate position which is why I ask for advice from 21 the general council in relation to it. Because I don't 22 get a response to that and I am also starting to realise 23 other things, it is not just the blog, you see it at 24 06.18 I am beginning to realise the way the BBC is 25 defining it -- no, that is not true. I am wrong to be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 that language to try and get through the mindset that 2 I am aware of. I do think, to be fair, that some of our 3 corporate mindset was already shifting -- and this is 4 speculative -- but my sense of it was that already 5 started and what I overheard the Director General saying 6 on Friday morning, this position needs to be nuanced, 7 different perspective, is starting to be understood. My 8 sense of it is it is not being understood as rapidly as 9 I am understanding from the facts I have brought about 10 and the way I have tried to understand the conflicting 11 view. 12 NICK POLLARD: Is Lucy Adams a colleague of Sarah Jones? 13 PETER HORROCKS: She is the Director of Human Resources for 14 the BBC. 15 ALAN MACLEAN: By the middle of the night, Sunday morning by 16 5.41, you decided the blog needs to be dealt with. That 17 is the conclusion you had come by then, is that right, 18 at this time you decide this it needs to be grappled 19 with? 20 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, so I wake up again -- what is also not 21 in this is all the stuff dealing with the Panorama, so 22 there is plenty of other activities going on through 23 this period, driving the Panorama and making sure the 24 Panorama is in. I am talking to people about that, 25 leave that to one side, I had left that out of it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 focusing solely on the blog, that there are other 2 statements that senior BBC people have made that are 3 different from and could be construed as possibly more 4 inaccurate than the blog itself. 5 ALAN MACLEAN: So the blog is a symptom? 6 PETER HORROCKS: It is part of a set of BBC inaccuracies. 7 NICK POLLARD: At the very least, they are not following the 8 same line? 9 PETER HORROCKS: Not the same line. So the blog is 10 referring to two rationales, two motives for the 11 investigation: the nature of the allegations and the 12 Surrey Police. The statements by the 13 Director General and Lord Patten, although I had not 14 spotted it at this stage, and -- those are more 15 inaccurate than the blog. I am thinking to myself, 16 "I need to get a response to this for Panorama" which is 17 one responsibility but I also, as a senior BBC person, 18 want the organisation to understand that if 48 hours 19 before going before Parliament that is the mindset it is 20 important to get that across. 21 That is what leads me to the view that it is 22 legitimate to write a letter to Lord Patten from 23 Panorama because of his role in holding the 24 Director General in particular accountable for the 25 accuracy of his statements and the BBC's and that is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 a way of trying to jog the organisation. I draft it, 2 talk about it with the Panorama team, say, "Do you want 3 to send the letter?" They say, "No, we would rather you 4 sent it." I talk to Tim Davie, director of audio music, 5 reporting line to the executive who has kept those two 6 things a Chinese wall in his own mind. He says that is 7 an editorially correct thing to do, so I send that 8 email. Not to the Chairman, I don't have his email 9 address, but Nicholas Kroll, director of trust and the 10 (inaudible) the person I ranked with for world service. 11 Then I wait to see what happened. 12 ALAN MACLEAN: If this was done in studied calm, which 13 clearly it was not for obvious reasons, you would expect 14 Mr Kroll and the Director General -- and Lord Patten, 15 indeed -- to be singing in public from the same 16 hymn sheet that it had been prepared and agreed. One of 17 the things you spot is they are not saying the same 18 things and not saying the same things, they are not 19 taking the blog and saying, "This is our position, we 20 will say that." I mean, Lord Patten presumably is not 21 going to be producing the document he speaks to in 22 interview. So who would you expect to provide the 23 information to those people who have been put out in 24 public and -- 25 PETER HORROCKS: I don't know, I don't want to speculate too</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 NICK POLLARD: This is presumably where Meirion told 2 David Jordan, "This is completely wrong and it ought to 3 be corrected" and somehow that meeting is deemed to be 4 confidential, until referred to later on? 5 PETER HORROCKS: You can ask Meirion and David, I imagine, 6 what the nature of the confidentiality was. My 7 understanding is it was in relation to the meeting 8 having happened rather than the information passed on in 9 the meeting, otherwise what is the point of having 10 a meeting if the information is not acted on? Anyway, 11 all of that and it is only Meirion's version of it. 12 I know the way some of that was interpreted by some of 13 the people handling it on the corporate side would not 14 be the same as Meirion has put it, that needs to be 15 tested through your process. Things were flagged up 16 over a number of days and the organisation -- well, let 17 us put it this way. When I asked the questions or 18 Panorama asked the questions of the individuals of the 19 Corporation and then finally of the Chairman, the BBC 20 did not respond immediately with a complete single 21 clarification of its position. It came out over 22 a period and was then -- there was not a single 23 statement, there was a correction to the blog and then 24 a subsequent clarification which was not described as 25 a correction we can come to.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 much in this area. There is a communications team in 2 the BBC and a communications team within the BBC trust, 3 that would be one route of communication or it would be, 4 as it were, between the principals. 5 NICK POLLARD: It is clear to you by that point, if not 6 earlier, this whole process is severely dysfunctional? 7 Without putting words into your mouth. 8 PETER HORROCKS: I think you are putting words into my 9 mouth. I was aware there were discrepancies and I was 10 trying to alert the Corporation to them. 11 NICK POLLARD: Yes, yes. Am I right in thinking that by 12 this Sunday morning you are aware of the criticism about 13 the blog's accuracy? Has that criticism gone further up 14 the chain? I mean, is David Jordan aware of the 15 criticisms of the blog and, if necessary, 16 George Entwistle as well? 17 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, this is all in the timeline, that is 18 probably the best thing to refer to. 19 NICK POLLARD: That is the source? 20 PETER HORROCKS: All those things have happened well before 21 I get involved. I don't know about all of those things 22 and there is one confidential meeting which only gets 23 disclosed, you know, quite a lot later on the media show 24 and then leads to the ruckus in the Panorama office, the 25 meeting of 4 October.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 All I would observe from those facts is at the time 2 Panorama was asking the questions the organisation was 3 not in a position to provide a timely single accurate 4 account of what had happened. 5 ALAN MACLEAN: One of those questions was about the witness 6 to the Boaden/Entwistle conversation at this lunch. 7 PETER HORROCKS: What -- 8 ALAN MACLEAN: 1305. 9 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. 10 ALAN MACLEAN: Who was that witness? 11 PETER HORROCKS: I can't say. I know who it was but I can't 12 say. Peter Rippon was at the lunch with Helen Boaden 13 and George Entwistle. 14 ALAN MACLEAN: And overheard the conversation? 15 PETER HORROCKS: No. As I understand it, he was next to 16 Helen Boaden. Helen Boaden went around to the other 17 side of the table, had a rapid conversation and 18 whispered in George Entwistle's ear and then returned to 19 sit down next to it. 20 ALAN MACLEAN: So you mean saw it, literally? He was 21 a spectator? 22 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. But having established that through 23 someone else, you know, I asked that it be checked, and 24 you also see that I -- no, this is later, is it not? 25 No, that is not right. I have already established that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

<p>1 with Helen Boaden about the location and then 2 subsequently this information about the duration of the 3 conversation comes from another source. 4 NICK POLLARD: On that, there is quite significant 5 developments, it seems to me, whereby you are thinking 6 you will take the blog down but Milrea suggests it 7 should be corrected rather than taken down. Is that 8 right? 9 PETER HORROCKS: Quite a lot of this was through phone 10 conversations, I have not been able to go back and 11 establish the date of all of those because what is saved 12 on my phone does not go back that far because there have 13 been so many calls recently. There is to-ing and 14 fro-ing about it. I brought the News Online senior 15 editors in to prepare to destroy the blog, something we 16 had never done before -- 17 NICK POLLARD: The dynamite. 18 PETER HORROCKS: It was technically difficult, they were 19 finding it difficult to get a blog out of the system. 20 They tried it out. There was the first approach we were 21 going to take and then I heard there was likely to be 22 a correction. There was some to-ing and fro-ing over 23 Peter Rippon correcting the blog in his own name which 24 was an earlier version of the BBC statement and the 25 wording of that is given to me, I reply to that at Page 57</p>	<p>1 That eventually does not happen, late on the Sunday 2 The Daily Mail is clearly briefed in a certain way with 3 something that is corrected with his employment status, 4 it is eventually clarified, I am not sure what "standing 5 aside" means. 6 The long and short of it is eventually the blog is 7 corrected via BBC statement rather than via Peter Rippon 8 and he has not been able to do what I, wearing 9 a managerial hat, suggested to an intermediary that once 10 I know that there were inaccuracies -- I think it must 11 have been through a phone conversation so I don't 12 remember when it was, I remember saying Peter must 13 realise some of this blog is not right and would it not 14 be better for him to correct it in his own name as soon 15 as possible, and I will make that happen as soon as 16 possible. 17 It is all getting tangled up in lawyers, so the 18 moment is lost for Peter Rippon, which I think would 19 have been the best thing for his own editorial and 20 professional status: to correct something in his own 21 name once he realised it was inaccurate, which is after 22 all the BBC's policy as referred to in another document 23 about timely corrections. You know, it is something the 24 editorial policy has responsibility for, the BBC's 25 editorial guidelines, policy guidelines and that is Page 59</p>
<p>1 15.56. The wording of that is not the wording 2 subsequently used. Not that I am saying it was, you 3 know -- 4 NICK POLLARD: That correction sort of appears via 5 Paul Milrea. We will ask him where that came from but 6 it is a, sort of, slightly strange osmotic process, is 7 it not? 8 PETER HORROCKS: The first strange thing about it is the 9 person who is asking for the clarification from the BBC 10 through the editorial process I am also, in effect, 11 being asked to provide the clarification because I know 12 more about what is going on than the organisation does. 13 I say that I am not going to do that. Then there is, 14 well, is Peter Rippon going to write it or not and 15 I can't remember, I think I picked up from somebody 16 close to Peter Rippon he was considering doing that, or 17 perhaps that was Monday I picked up on that. There is 18 clearly some to-ing and fro-ing. I have not unpicked 19 this and I do not have complete state of knowledge to 20 draw inference on the information I have available to 21 me. 22 It seems there was discussion about an agreed 23 approach with Peter Rippon which would have been about 24 reaching some agreed statement about his employment 25 status and him putting his name to the blog correction. Page 58</p>	<p>1 about correcting things as soon as possible. That is 2 something that I don't think we corrected as the BBC did 3 not correct its position as soon as it might have done. 4 We come to the later correction, if you wish, later on. 5 NICK POLLARD: So Sunday passes without the blog actually 6 being changed, is that right? 7 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, I personally have regrets about not 8 pushing things harder. I did feel quite exposed on 9 Sunday, particularly after writing the letter to the 10 Chairman. I kept being told the blog was going to be 11 collected. 12 NICK POLLARD: Told by? 13 PETER HORROCKS: Paul Milrea, I think. Then in the evening 14 I am told -- I don't think I put it in the timeline the 15 right way. No, by late afternoon he tells me the blog 16 corrections will not happen until Monday morning. That 17 must have been 5.30, I remember talking about the news 18 editor best placed to do it was ending shift, Paul said 19 it will be after that and it won't be until morning. 20 Should I have put something up but, of course, it would 21 have been even more chaos. Anyway, I didn't, I didn't. 22 NICK POLLARD: Yes. Okay, Monday Liz sends to the 23 Director General -- 24 PETER HORROCKS: And it has already gone in by this point so 25 the organisation has a reasonably full account. It is Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1 not a massive timeline, but key things. That went in on
 2 Sunday afternoon and --
 3 ALAN MACLEAN: That is the day before the Director General
 4 goes to Parliament?
 5 PETER HORROCKS: So Meirion's brief comes on Sunday evening,
 6 I send it at 7.45 and then as Liz MacKean sends it to me
 7 I think I forward it on at lunchtime. So by 7.45
 8 Meirion's brief is with the Corporation and
 9 Liz MacKean's is by lunchtime. They broadly cover the
 10 same thing so it is not really material.
 11 NICK POLLARD: When you see the corrected blog on Monday
 12 morning, were you pleased to see that at that time?
 13 PETER HORROCKS: There was a timing thing, get on and look
 14 at it. I must admit some of the things that I read into
 15 the personality and comparisons with the blog,
 16 particularly when I have the Panorama statement and the
 17 additional statement by the BBC that is published at
 18 08.07 on the Tuesday morning, I don't see at all the
 19 significance at that stage, some of it I do, but
 20 I suppose I am thinking the blog has been corrected.
 21 But then Meirion emails me at 12.05 which I refer to as
 22 being -- describing the blog correction as "half-hearted
 23 and grudging" and I start to try and get my head around
 24 all of that.
 25 I am also starting to realise that it is also

1 Lord Patten's interview, I went back to listen to the
 2 media show. I am trying to juggle, this is the thing
 3 not coming through with this, producing an hour long
 4 Panorama and keeping the editorial control and legal
 5 judgments around that is the thing preoccupying me.
 6 That is what I am paid to do, not to be pursuing all
 7 this stuff and contextual analysis. So I realise that
 8 Patten interview is also part of it, although in the end
 9 that does not form part of the Panorama. It is part of
 10 the picture of broader inaccuracies of Peter Rippon's
 11 blog.
 12 So I start to realise that is, you know, part of the
 13 picture as well as dealing with David Jordan about
 14 whether he is going to be interviewed by Panorama which
 15 is initially on the cards and then the team say they
 16 don't want to, to-ing and fro-ing and, then
 17 Jeremy Paxman moved having interviewed Conrad Black and
 18 then Caroline Hawley, back from Baghdad, wants to know
 19 if she put it to Mark Thompson. So some of this stuff
 20 about the differences between the corrections, it became
 21 known to me but not with significance because there was
 22 so much else going on.
 23 NICK POLLARD: Yes.
 24 PETER HORROCKS: By the way, if you want any of these
 25 specific emails -- and you may not need them at all --

1 then I can make sure you get them at the end of this.
 2 You may feel this is sufficient for your purposes.
 3 NICK POLLARD: Halfway through the Monday, that text to
 4 Sarah Jones really, sort of, crystallises --
 5 PETER HORROCKS: Sorry, what time?
 6 NICK POLLARD: 13.58, October 22nd.
 7 PETER HORROCKS: Hang on. I think actually we should go to
 8 the second document, because I think what I did with
 9 completing this, I put that text in, I dropped the text,
 10 the Sarah Jones one and Phil Harrold one, those are
 11 anti-chronologicals. It is better to use the second
 12 timeline from October 22nd.
 13 NICK POLLARD: Okay, fine, I have that.
 14 PETER HORROCKS: In fact, I mean, for the purposes of the
 15 documentation I think everything in relation
 16 to October 22nd in what I originally sent you was
 17 Pollard's statement, should be excised, so
 18 Rosie Taylor(?) sends final script to Panorama --
 19 NICK POLLARD: Yes.
 20 ALAN MACLEAN: I have read your text as well and, as you
 21 say, reading through you dropped those in --
 22 PETER HORROCKS: Not all of them because they are not
 23 germane, I thought it would be useful.
 24 ALAN MACLEAN: The Panorama was actually broadcast on --
 25 that is the 22nd?

1 PETER HORROCKS: Yes.
 2 ALAN MACLEAN: That was broadcast late at night, Newsnight
 3 came on and said, "If you switch over you will see
 4 Panorama."
 5 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes.
 6 ALAN MACLEAN: Which is what I did.
 7 NICK POLLARD: Yes. So the that text to Sarah Jones really
 8 crystallises your view of the problems that the BBC are
 9 -- it is 13.58.
 10 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, that is right. Yes, yes. So that is
 11 really my bringing it all together and letting the
 12 committee unpick all that. It was in control of the
 13 information in front of it but some of where this gets
 14 to is in particular in relation to the subsequent
 15 statement to the Panorama, IE the one that goes out at
 16 08.07 the next morning.
 17 NICK POLLARD: Yes.
 18 PETER HORROCKS: This is a separate statement that relates
 19 to the BBC's other inaccuracies, that is not clear but
 20 you can see from that text I am understanding how we
 21 corrected our inaccuracies and the timings of those is
 22 something --
 23 NICK POLLARD: Sorry, the 08.07?
 24 PETER HORROCKS: Sorry, I am jumping about.
 25 NICK POLLARD: Where is that, sorry?

<p>1 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Is it 37 you are talking about? 2 NICK POLLARD: On the 22nd? 3 PETER HORROCKS: No, on the 23rd. We will get to that when 4 we get to that, actually. 5 Sorry, we are nearly there. What happens is that 6 Panorama has had -- this is me going and looking back on 7 it now as opposed to what I was aware of at the time -- 8 Panorama has the statement from the BBC in the morning 9 of the 22nd, that is at 10.49 in the timeline on the 10 22nd, which includes the statement, "The BBC is 11 accepting the investigation did not start out as the 12 investigation Surrey Police is handling." Only Panorama 13 has that at that time. I don't clock, as it were, that 14 should be in addition to the blog and that has been 15 communicated to Panorama. 16 Then what happens is that the film has finished 17 transmission and Paul Milrea emails the BBC media 18 correspondent with a specific statement, we accept -- 19 the reason I mentioned 08.07 was that was when that 20 statement was put live on BBC press office site. 21 NICK POLLARD: So that is Tuesday? 22 ALAN MACLEAN: So that is the BBC catching up with what 23 Panorama is already saying and broadcast the night 24 before? 25 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, I say this section is not attributing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 it was about the abuse and, secondly, that it was about 2 investigation of Surrey Police handling. One is clearly 3 true, the second is false because that was not known to 4 the team when they started making the investigation. It 5 became how the editor saw the investigation and played 6 a part in judgment about why it should not go ahead. 7 The important thing is what is a legitimate rationale 8 from the BBC subsequently explaining why the programme 9 was not proceeded with and it becomes important for the 10 BBC to have something which a clear cut reason why it 11 didn't do it because if it says it was because the abuse 12 allegations were not stood up, or we didn't believe the 13 witnesses, that is more difficult to describe in public. 14 This is complicated, it takes minutes to describe 15 it, it may be to have a clear explanation of the reasons 16 for Newsnight not having gone ahead the position was 17 simplified. That may have been what happened but 18 I don't know, I was not involved in those conversations. 19 All I observe is the blog had two reasons, one which 20 definitely was a reason for the investigation and one 21 that was not. It moved to it either was or started as 22 an investigation into Surrey Police's handling. 23 ALAN MACLEAN: It makes it sound as if, to the man in the 24 street, it makes it sound as if poor old Peter Rippon 25 did not understand what the piece was about? Is that --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 inaccuracies to anybody, they largely get ignored. If 2 you look back at that statement, the preamble is all 3 about the Newsnight and then there is the sentence at 4 the end, "We also accept that" but it does not say who 5 has previously expressed the view. That was the BBC's 6 characterisation. You could be forgiven for not 7 noticing that was a correction of a broader set of BBC 8 inaccuracies as opposed to the ones that relate to the 9 blog and that is what leads, I think, a number of people 10 rather than instinct more than textual analysis 11 Peter Rippon is receiving the (inaudible) of the 12 responsibility here and in the DCS committee it is all 13 about inaccuracies from the blog. 14 Of course, I understand an important perspective is 15 the inaccuracies stemmed from the inaccuracies from the 16 blog, as we have already discussed. The way the BBC's 17 other statements investigated the reasons for dropping 18 it are different from the blog itself. 19 NICK POLLARD: The point you make is that actually in at 20 least two of them they are harder, they are more, shall 21 we say, more anti-Meirion and Liz MacKean than the blog 22 was? More critical? 23 PETER HORROCKS: I would not necessarily say that, I would 24 say -- this is somewhat speculative -- but there are 25 clearly two statements in Peter Rippon's blog, one that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 if you feel, to those who see his position as being 2 unfairly produced by this statement. Is this right? 3 I am trying to understand why you say people saw this as 4 being dumping on him, not your word. Whoever said that 5 it did start? 6 PETER HORROCKS: Statements by -- well, the blog talks about 7 two things. The blog talks about "the nature of the 8 abuse" I think is the phrase that it uses, and the 9 Surrey Police's handling. 10 ALAN MACLEAN: Do you have the blog to hand? 11 BEN SUMMERFIELD: Yes, I have it here. 12 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, because of the nature of the 13 allegations and because the police investigated the 14 claims and dropped on the basis he was too old. That is 15 abbreviated, the language I am using about the 16 Surrey Police's handling. So he refers to the nature of 17 the allegations, IE the abuse itself, and the police 18 issues. The simpler explanations given in the 19 Director General's email to all staff, the explanation 20 alluded to or happened in his interviews and most 21 strongly in the way the controller of policy described 22 it when he said, "It started as an investigation into 23 Surrey Police." They may be considered to be important 24 because Surrey Police, there was a legitimate reason for 25 not going ahead, if that was the only reason. If you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

1 accept that the only reason for the investigation was
 2 the Surrey Police then the fact that the CPS's
 3 explanation for the investigation, the prosecution not
 4 having proceeded, even if you think it is a bad reason
 5 for not going ahead it is a good knockdown because they
 6 gave information --
 7 NICK POLLARD: Yes.
 8 PETER HORROCKS: So that matters an enormous amount because
 9 if you are offering an explanation from Newsnight not
 10 having gone ahead, which is demonstrably the case, then
 11 you have a strong explanation for something which
 12 otherwise is embarrassing for the BBC. If the real
 13 nature of the investigation was a two pronged one, IE it
 14 was about the abuse itself, then if you are stuck with
 15 that people will say, "Hang on, did you not believe the
 16 abuse you were told about? What about the witnesses and
 17 all those things?" So the simplification to a single
 18 reason helps you if it is true that it started off being
 19 about the Surrey Police. If that is not the case, the
 20 thing is more a house of cards.
 21 ALAN MACLEAN: Your point is actually more sophisticated
 22 than that. When you look at the blog, the second reason
 23 given in the blog is not that it started out as
 24 an investigation into Surrey Police, it explicitly says,
 25 "The key witness told us."
 Page 69

1 PETER HORROCKS: Exactly, so how could it possibly be it
 2 started out as something because that was clearly
 3 discovered through the course of the investigation and
 4 it says in the blog itself.
 5 ALAN MACLEAN: Your point is it says two reasons given in
 6 the blog and this, maybe it is a poor attempt to
 7 summarise one of those reasons, but it is not actually
 8 an accurate summary?
 9 PETER HORROCKS: It slightly depends which of the
 10 descriptions of it you refer to. There is a description
 11 in the GD email, in Lord Patten's comments and my
 12 recollection is those are the ones -- soft is probably
 13 the wrong word, but the least absolute of them. There
 14 is the position which is the hardest one, the one
 15 adopted on the media show by the controller of standards
 16 who used the phrase, "Started out as."
 17 ALAN MACLEAN: So you take that, you said as you just said
 18 a minute ago, this, if it were right, would be a robust
 19 defence of the decision to drop the programme, but when
 20 you look at what the editor says in his blog it is not
 21 the thought process the editor says he went through.
 22 PETER HORROCKS: Our investigation was about Surrey Police's
 23 mishandling. We found out they had not so, therefore,
 24 not going ahead, no story. It is one of the things
 25 that, according at least to The Daily Mail's account,
 Page 70

1 the grant received was along those lines. It becomes
 2 a clearly explicable way of people explaining something
 3 which otherwise, in the context of the exposure document
 4 having gone out, why didn't the BBC broadcast this? If
 5 you define the reason for the investigation in a certain
 6 way, people may say that is an odd thing to have
 7 decided, at least it has an internal logic to it. If it
 8 was not the case in the first place that is not what it
 9 was about that undermines it and that is where we are in
 10 terms of the information we have in front of us at the
 11 moment.
 12 NICK POLLARD: Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean line, of
 13 course, is that the police thing was pretty much
 14 irrelevant. The evidence they had was strong enough on
 15 its own, the evidence of abuse was a justifiable --
 16 PETER HORROCKS: Of course, of course. But in a way, even
 17 if you accept -- and I think it is legitimate to accept
 18 that Peter Rippon as editor had the right to define what
 19 he thought was an appropriate story for Newsnight
 20 without playing mind games what might or might not have
 21 been the case in terms of editorial judgment -- if he
 22 thought it was the two things as described in the blog
 23 that is fair enough. It is only if you then knock away
 24 the first of those and you are only left with the
 25 Surrey Police handling as being the rationale if that
 Page 71

1 was the case, because it was never the starting point of
 2 it. That makes the justification being offered a less
 3 easily defensible one. That is, I think, where we get
 4 to.
 5 NICK POLLARD: Just to remind you what the 08.37 was,
 6 because --
 7 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, in effect it is a repetition,
 8 a re-publication, a broader publication of the email
 9 Torin Douglas had received eight hours earlier. For
 10 other media correspondents or people not picked up on
 11 Panorama, the first they know about it is two hours
 12 before the Director General appears. The statement --
 13 it does not call itself a correction -- it says, "We
 14 also accept that" without alluding to what that was
 15 about. So by the time that the Director General and the
 16 controller appeared in front of the committee, the thing
 17 very much in people's minds is the blog inaccuracies and
 18 one of the things I suggest to people that we need to do
 19 through the course of the coverage of this is to refer
 20 to the BBC inaccuracies rather than the blog
 21 inaccuracies because it is not -- there clearly are
 22 inaccuracies in the blog, I am not at all in the
 23 position of thinking the blog is no longer a problem
 24 because there are things that are significant
 25 inaccuracies and those are things that need to be looked
 Page 72

1 at. In terms of what is material for the investigation,
 2 it is a wider set of inaccuracies than just the blog
 3 itself, but the blog inaccuracies is the way in which it
 4 has been described at this stage.
 5 NICK POLLARD: What seems to be particularly opaque, and you
 6 don't seem to have any involvement in it, is the way
 7 that the lines taken by the Chairman, by David Jordan
 8 and the Director General in his email, how those lines
 9 emerged. We will probably be able to ask them.
 10 PETER HORROCKS: I have no knowledge of that at all, I am
 11 afraid. Quite a lot of it was happening before I even
 12 had any knowledge of it at all.
 13 ALAN MACLEAN: The question I asked earlier, your answer
 14 was, "I don't know" but you speculated. That might be
 15 what Mr Meirion was, a corporate --
 16 PETER HORROCKS: I really don't know. I don't know in terms
 17 of the different stages of it. I am not sure at what
 18 stage it became an incident that will be managed in that
 19 way. It might be in the early stages it was being
 20 managed through the normal corporate communications,
 21 public affairs processes. At some stage I imagine it
 22 became defined as being a serious incident, the
 23 different structures put in place. Again, all I can say
 24 is that is what would happen in terms of the system.
 25 ALAN MACLEAN: One of the supporting walls of the structure

Page 73

1 is you have the corporate people here and the editorial
 2 people there so when there is a problem with X, the
 3 people, Y, who know what the facts are, they are the
 4 ones X can talk to.
 5 PETER HORROCKS: You have to be careful what you are
 6 defining as editorial in this context: there is
 7 editorial and there is editorial. I am talking about
 8 Panorama being separate from the corporate side but
 9 throughout the thing, until perhaps there was
 10 a different perspective with Peter Rippon, the BBC press
 11 team, the corporate press team, were all as a single
 12 corporate hold, even if some of those people had
 13 editorial responsibilities. In this context, the
 14 editorial is the Panorama operation which I am taking
 15 responsibility for.
 16 ALAN MACLEAN: So the Chinese walls as between Panorama and
 17 everybody else?
 18 PETER HORROCKS: It is better thinking about it who was
 19 handling things coming from external requests.
 20 Everybody in BBC handling it and the corporate machine
 21 would have come together to agree, I think, but I don't
 22 know because I was on the other side of the fence.
 23 NICK POLLARD: Before you were involved when the statements
 24 were made, which turned out had to be corrected, it may
 25 not be a fair question for you, it is clear now the line

Page 74

1 was evolving despite the fact that it probably should
 2 have been clear that there were people within the
 3 Corporation who would vehemently object to the way that
 4 decision was being portrayed?
 5 PETER HORROCKS: Well, you have the information
 6 Meirion Jones and Liz MacKean made available during that
 7 period and exactly how the different expressions evolved
 8 and how that interaction worked between the information
 9 they had made available. There is obviously the meeting
 10 that Ken MacQuarrie, director of BBC Scotland, has
 11 during this period. I am sure they say similar things
 12 to him as were said to me. The meeting on the 9th, the
 13 Tuesday, the Director General's press conference on the
 14 Friday evening, he was asked, I think by Dan Sabbagh of
 15 The Guardian, about what the reporters say and he said,
 16 "Well, that is something which we will have to wait for
 17 the inquiry to look into." We know that at least
 18 a doubt about that had been lodged with the
 19 Director General and also with the controller of
 20 standards at that stage. It is possibly perfect they
 21 didn't believe what Meirion and Liz were saying, I think
 22 the question is when doubt was cast whether the
 23 corporate position and uncertainty of corporate position
 24 was adjusted. I think the right way would be
 25 a legitimate question to ask for.

Page 75

1 NICK POLLARD: You obviously had no involvement in the
 2 MacQuarrie meeting and we will pursue that separately.
 3 PETER HORROCKS: I had one meeting with him, that was on the
 4 Friday morning. I think what happened was I did not
 5 know I had been passed the ball, I was on a meeting
 6 about something completely different. He said, "Did you
 7 speak to Meirion and Liz?" I said yes and I wrote
 8 a file note. That was the only direct contact I had
 9 with Ken MacQuarrie.
 10 NICK POLLARD: Yes, we will see that file. You had the
 11 meeting on a Tuesday obviously with George to express
 12 some pretty serious concerns about the lack of
 13 coordination throughout, really?
 14 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. I mean, this may not be much of
 15 a direct concern to you, but it was in my mind the
 16 question of how BBC News was going to operate following
 17 the Director General's testimony when clearly the least
 18 significant questions were being posed about the
 19 information that had been available to him, when clearly
 20 that information was the responsibility of BBC News. So
 21 I was anxious to make sure BBC News was in a position to
 22 discuss that in its News Group and I attempted to get
 23 some clarity about whether there would be the space to
 24 be able to do that. That was last Thursday.
 25 But, anyway, on Tuesday afternoon at that stage

Page 76

<p>1 I had not been able to get people to realise I thought 2 things had changed significantly and some space needs to 3 be created for people not directly involved in this 4 episode to discuss it. I was making that point and it 5 was coming up through a variety of incidents where 6 I felt what was Savile editorial and what was Savile 7 related, the way that Savile was influencing a variety 8 of things across the organisation was becoming very 9 significant and I felt it was important for the future 10 credential management of BBC News to create some space 11 for those not directly involved to talk about it. That 12 is what I was trying to pursue.</p> <p>13 NICK POLLARD: With those editorial board meetings coming 14 up?</p> <p>15 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, we were Tuesday afternoon, this very 16 significant thing happened with the committee and 17 various things started to happen like the handling of 18 Liz MacKean, whether she was talking to the press or 19 not, and who was responsible for that. Then more 20 personal incidents, the news room the next day, the 21 issue around the disagreement in the Panorama office, et 22 cetera, that I felt was important to put in place 23 a clarity of responsibility and some space for those 24 people who needed to be able to discuss it and given 25 that some people were recused and had not had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 have already talked through with you but --</p> <p>2 ALAN MACLEAN: Which one is that?</p> <p>3 NICK POLLARD: The 30602 one.</p> <p>4 ALAN MACLEAN: Which day are we on now?</p> <p>5 PETER HORROCKS: October 23, I think we are.</p> <p>6 ALAN MACLEAN: Yes, okay.</p> <p>7 NICK POLLARD: October 24, after the long email to George.</p> <p>8 PETER HORROCKS: So I am reiterating some of the concerns 9 about the speed and accuracy of the blog. There is also 10 something that connects to, we have not talked about 11 anything that is about my view about why some of these 12 various different miscommunications might have happened 13 and I suppose what I am alluding to here is even after 14 all of this has come out the way that the organisation 15 is gripping it and providing clarity to BBC News to be 16 able to be managed effectively, there are clearly some 17 individual dynamics that are going on. So I was raising 18 issues which in my mind I was connecting together 19 because -- and this is about perception, my personal 20 perception, I think it is relevant -- I came to the 21 view, as expressed in one of these emails, that the 22 ability to be able to challenge differing views within 23 the organisation was one of the things that was a thread 24 through the story as a whole.</p> <p>25 So whether was the discussion that Helen Boaden and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 involvement with the inquiry. It was important and I 2 was making those points quite forcibly. I felt the 3 organisation was moving off the correction of the 4 inaccuracies and more about how the organisation was 5 starting to respond to the public --</p> <p>6 NICK POLLARD: You made those views known to George, both in 7 that chat you had at 5 o'clock and the email you had the 8 following morning?</p> <p>9 PETER HORROCKS: Exactly.</p> <p>10 NICK POLLARD: You did not have, in the end, responsibility 11 for talking to Liz MacKean about leaking to the press, 12 did you?</p> <p>13 PETER HORROCKS: It was never clarified until the last gasp, 14 until I spoke to and she came to the conclusion -- it 15 was not right professionally for her to continue to be 16 a protagonist here. She had withdrawn.</p> <p>17 NICK POLLARD: That was not on that day?</p> <p>18 PETER HORROCKS: Um -- I can't remember.</p> <p>19 ALAN MACLEAN: It is really in the process now, after the 20 corrections, the Director General, the committee and 21 Panorama, that is more or less it, is it not? In terms 22 of the, kind of, key facts?</p> <p>23 NICK POLLARD: You could well take that view, I would 24 understand why you might. I suppose my email to 25 Sarah Jones pulls together quite a lot of things that I</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 Peter Rippon had about the evidential standard to be 2 applied during the investigation or Meirion Jones 3 concerns about the decision and not to go ahead with it, 4 possibly some of the things about the interchange 5 between George Entwistle and Helen Boaden or 6 Mark Thompson and Helen Boaden and various other things. 7 Then in the aftermath of the committee evidence I was 8 trying to ensure that BBC News had the space to be able 9 to discuss these things and so I needed to challenge my 10 own boss in relation to that and that was not 11 successful, so I needed to go to the 12 Director General about it. I suppose my perception was 13 --</p> <p>14 NICK POLLARD: Your own boss being?</p> <p>15 PETER HORROCKS: Helen Boaden.</p> <p>16 NICK POLLARD: She had recused herself from this, or is that 17 the point you are alluding to?</p> <p>18 PETER HORROCKS: I think that is the point I am trying to 19 make. She had recused editorial control in relation to 20 Savile --</p> <p>21 ALAN MACLEAN: Your point is what was going to happen the 22 day after tomorrow.</p> <p>23 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, we are going to sit down, the agenda 24 is the linked and the update and we need to have 25 a discussion about this and the editorial and the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

<p>1 consequences to BBC News. The reply was, "Well, I am 2 responsible for management of BBC News and you have 3 responsibility for editorial coverage in respect of 4 Savile." I took that to mean there would not be space. 5 I escalated to the Director General, it was 24 hours 6 later IE on the Wednesday evening, a few hours before 7 the board meeting we had, where alteration was put in 8 place which meant it was okay. 9 ALAN MACLEAN: What was okay? 10 PETER HORROCKS: What happened on Thursday morning was there 11 was a brief agenda Helen shared and then a subsequent 12 meeting which I chaired -- 13 ALAN MACLEAN: Which Helen Boaden was not at? 14 PETER HORROCKS: She stepped aside, made comments before we 15 went into the session which she and Steve Mitchell did 16 not intend. They may sound -- you can dismiss it as 17 being my personal perspective in the aftermath of all of 18 this -- but I feel it is relevant because the ability to 19 be able to get into a conversation and express 20 a differing point of view in my perception of somebody 21 who has been at the BBC News Group and tables programmes 22 in question, I think that did not happen in 23 a multiplicity of ways throughout this story and even 24 after the Director General had made it clear he had 25 concerns about the system and the way the BBC News had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 Then we talked about what went wrong, the programme 2 list I told you about earlier. We went around the table 3 and asked everybody to identify the risks BBC News needs 4 to manage currently because we can't wait for all of you 5 to take however long it will take to wind through all of 6 this and tell us what we have to do. We have to create 7 the space for that to happen, I needed to push in the 8 way I have described. 9 ALAN MACLEAN: Can I ask, I meant to ask you earlier but the 10 moment had passed. You mentioned the Helen Boaden 11 discussion with Peter Rippon which -- 12 PETER HORROCKS: The Rippon one or the Entwistle one? 13 ALAN MACLEAN: The Rippon one. In your timeline you got 14 this from her and not from him, I think? 15 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, although I do also have some of this 16 indirectly from Peter as well. 17 ALAN MACLEAN: Taking the timeline from her account, she 18 gave him a view about the importance of evidence even 19 though he was dead. I remember you saying Helen 20 speculating whether Peter may have taken too strong a 21 state, she may have been forceful in her view. Do you 22 remember what she says and how -- 23 PETER HORROCKS: I don't, if I had remembered it more 24 clearly I would have tried to recall that and put that 25 in the statement. I don't think that the accounts that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 provided information to him, it was still not 2 immediately possible without taking quite a drastic step 3 and something, again, one felt quite exposed in doing 4 that in order to get an organisational change that 5 I thought was important. That is the only reason why 6 I am taking this. 7 NICK POLLARD: Just so I am clear, in that session after 8 Helen Boaden and Steve Mitchell absented themselves, you 9 were not necessarily, as I understand it, from what you 10 have said, just talking about pure Savile-related 11 developments, you were talking about a wider issue 12 within news? People being able to speak freely and 13 challenge decisions -- 14 PETER HORROCKS: That was the context I wanted that 15 discussion to happen. We talked about what you would 16 expect a management board to talk about following 17 a corporate crisis. We could not talk about some of the 18 things you are talking about, I invited the legal reps 19 from Global News to come along and give advice about 20 what might or might not be appropriate. We talked about 21 personal reactions, doorstepping colleagues, having to 22 consider whether Helen Boaden's photograph with 23 Jimmy Savile would form part of the news coverage. It 24 was not the simplest meeting to have on a Wednesday 25 morning, et cetera, et cetera.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 Helen gave me herself and I subsequently heard 2 indirectly from a representative of Peter Rippon were 3 necessarily at odds with each other and in the 4 description I heard of Peter Rippon's view of it, 5 certainly at the time that was given to me, the time it 6 was given to me it was a proper editorial conversation 7 that he did not regard it as being inappropriate. It 8 was possible for him to have interpreted as 9 an instruction or a very strong recommendation in terms 10 of an editorial course of action and I don't know 11 whether Peter absolutely feels it was the right thing to 12 do or it was something he wanted to subsequently 13 challenge. 14 I would simply observe, as I said, with 15 Meirion Jones not being spoken to by BBC management, 16 I don't know what further conversation happened about 17 the significance of that and the ability to discuss and 18 challenge openly is something I think could be part of 19 that. I explained he was an editor, he was not in 20 a strong position and as confident as he might have 21 been, that was a factor, plus Helen has a clear and 22 strong personality and she acknowledged herself she 23 expressed herself forcefully. 24 ALAN MACLEAN: You don't find that even surprising or 25 improper?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

1 PETER HORROCKS: No, I don't think it is improper but
 2 I think it is a factor, you know, to be looked into in
 3 terms of how people saw those conversations and there
 4 was, I think, possibly for me a greater relevance to the
 5 issue of the conversation between George Entwistle and
 6 Helen Boaden.
 7 RICHARD SPAFFORD: [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED] Can you
 9 just say how you think it is possible it was
 10 interpreted?
 11 PETER HORROCKS: [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED] This is through my
 13 understanding of Peter Rippon's understanding --
 14 RICHARD SPAFFORD: [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 PETER HORROCKS: That would be consistent with the way Helen
 17 described it as well. [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 RICHARD SPAFFORD: As far as you are aware, both Helen and
 20 Peter take the view that is how it could have been seen?
 21 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, and again neither of them suggested it
 22 was improper at all. [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED] So

Page 85

1 he --
 2 NICK POLLARD: With George?
 3 PETER HORROCKS: The one at the Television Awards. I have
 4 not asked about this, I don't know, this is something
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED] As
 10 I understand it, after she returns to the table she
 11 says, "I told him about Savile" or something to that
 12 effect.
 13 So the issue, the fact that Christmas schedules have
 14 been alluded to in some way, I assume must have been
 15 part of his understanding of why she had had that
 16 conversation [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 ALAN MACLEAN: Have you come across in the past the problem
 23 about doing a story about somebody alive, like Maxwell,
 24 they did write things but from a legal point of view.
 25 Have you had to grapple with a story you wanted to put

Page 86

1 out about somebody but felt you could not when they were
 2 alive, but apply a different criteria when the person
 3 died?
 4 PETER HORROCKS: I don't bring one to mind immediately but
 5 I am sure it must have happened. Not as a major
 6 investigation we were doing, clearly there was
 7 a particular circumstance here when Meirion Jones had
 8 this close personal knowledge of Savile's abuse because
 9 of through his aunt and he had been aware of or even
 10 witnessed, I am not quite sure, Savile's abuse as
 11 a 13 year old himself. He had been waiting, as he says,
 12 40 years to tell this story.
 13 ALAN MACLEAN: It was lined up. But this question about
 14 even though he was dead, we understand when he is dead
 15 you can forget --
 16 PETER HORROCKS: It is what is the proper standard for the
 17 BBC to apply to somebody who has only recently died
 18 where there is a strong public view.
 19 ALAN MACLEAN: Why did it matter if he had been dead for
 20 five minutes or five years?
 21 PETER HORROCKS: I don't know. Sorry, I can imagine,
 22 I don't know what was in the minds of the people having
 23 that conversation. I would imagine, especially for
 24 a programme like Newsnight which is about serious
 25 matters of public concern, that is a relevant

Page 87

1 consideration. If it looks as if it is flimsy or sordid
 2 or something like that you can imagine why that might be
 3 part of it and how close it is to the death might be
 4 a factor you would additionally take into account.
 5 I don't know if that was taken into account in the
 6 significant range of factors, the reliability, how the
 7 research was done --
 8 ALAN MACLEAN: But Newsnight would not do a story about
 9 football or something because that is not -- this was
 10 a BBC personality, that was at the heart of it, from the
 11 beginning.
 12 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes, I agree.
 13 NICK POLLARD: With access to BBC premises.
 14 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. I appeared on our accountability
 15 programme NewsWatch and talked about feeling embarrassed
 16 by it. I do feel embarrassed the programme did not get
 17 that story to air. I do not think it is subject to
 18 a single explanation of why that happened.
 19 NICK POLLARD: Sorry, I was just going to say, it is
 20 probably an unfair question. If you wipe all hindsight
 21 from your memory banks and put yourself in the position
 22 of Peter Rippon at the time he came to make a decision
 23 about running the story, would you have run it, do you
 24 think?
 25 PETER HORROCKS: I think that is an incredibly hard and

Page 88

1 difficult thing to say. My approach is to try and get
 2 stories on the air and other people may not necessarily
 3 have pushed Panorama in the way I did in order to make
 4 sure it is as strong as possible, that is my approach.
 5 People approach things in different ways, there are
 6 different views that could be taken.
 7 ALAN MACLEAN: But what is missing from the blog -- tell me
 8 if this is a fair characterisation of what you are
 9 saying -- what is missing, on the face of it, is
 10 an awareness of the fact that this was a BBC story
 11 because this guy was a BBC personality and that is what
 12 made him different from some expose of some other
 13 criminal or celebrity that had done something cruel or
 14 unpleasant.
 15 PETER HORROCKS: I think that is true, but something the
 16 production team or editor as a whole had not fully
 17 appreciated. I think that my starting point was the
 18 home, you know, it was his aunt's home and Savile and
 19 obviously the abuse, clearly information came to light
 20 in relation to BBC premises which they didn't act on and
 21 that is why I say I have questions about the reporter
 22 and producer as well as the editors because they didn't
 23 do enough: they didn't go to the police, they didn't act
 24 on it and didn't raise it in a way the BBC could examine
 25 it the potential implications of what happened on BBC's

Page 89

1 premises. I think it was a broadcasting issue and
 2 an issue of a particular Savile in the home rather than
 3 all the knowledge that we now have. I think it was
 4 wrong, but it was understandable.
 5 NICK POLLARD: You slightly touched on this, and this is
 6 very much a question for Meirion, but as an editor,
 7 senior editor, did it seem a bit odd to you that when
 8 the story was effectively put on ice nobody ever seemed
 9 to think of having another go at it or just finding one
 10 more -- the question of the second interviewee I think
 11 is a really odd one and I don't understand it, whether
 12 this was Rachel(?) isn't it?
 13 PETER HORROCKS: Yes, yes.
 14 NICK POLLARD: Because you would have thought that at the
 15 time the story was stood down the fact that you had
 16 a second interviewee supporting the first would be
 17 a huge factor. One interview on camera --
 18 PETER HORROCKS: I think the way it had been redefined and,
 19 as I said, in a funny way accepted, reluctantly his
 20 editor's view of how it could be defined and that second
 21 interview did not change the hurdle that Peter Rippon
 22 had put in its place. But, I agree, in the cold light
 23 of day clearly it was an important extra element and it
 24 should have been kept going and that is something: why
 25 was it not kept going and why were all the facts not

Page 90

1 brought together and people spoken to about it and all
 2 those sorts of things, which I am sure you will look
 3 into.
 4 I do want to briefly turn, because I have touched on
 5 it a couple of times without having an opportunity to
 6 say a bit more, the conversation, I can shed some light
 7 on this --
 8 NICK POLLARD: Please, please, yes.
 9 PETER HORROCKS: I think the main thing I would serve is the
 10 exchange of information on stories at a senior level at
 11 BBC is not at all ruled out. I have had plenty of
 12 instances of sensitive stories of BBC nature where there
 13 has been an exchange of information with the director of
 14 television or BBC1, [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 ALAN MACLEAN: It is not a time or place for such
 22 a conversation.
 23 PETER HORROCKS: Well, I don't know -- he has not been clear
 24 about this in his statement. [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 91

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED] Equally there are questions on his
 4 side: why it was done by the committee, why show
 5 curiosity or why he felt inhibited asking a senior
 6 person of BBC News about the story? It may be the
 7 context, he had a terrible cold I understand, it might
 8 be those sorts of factors. I think it is at least
 9 questionable whether the demarcation between the
 10 divisions needs to be anything like as clear as the
 11 Director General has explained it recently. That is how
 12 I see it.
 13 That is why I refer to the managed programme's list,
 14 it aggregates the BBC's sensitive stories across the
 15 piste. Occasionally they might be alluded to by more
 16 general descriptions of them more than spelling out what
 17 the story is, but that is exchanged at a high level,
 18 that information. Members of the BBC executive have
 19 overall management of the BBC and sensitive information
 20 is exchanging regularly and for some reason the director
 21 did not ask, having not given the very helpful
 22 opportunity to ask questions because of the way the
 23 information was passed over. He then chose not to ask
 24 the Director of News more about it when even without
 25 intruding into the editorial responsibilities of

Page 92

1 BBC News, questions such as, well, when will you be able
 2 to tell me more about it so I can make my judgment, or
 3 anything. You may not want to tell me what the nature
 4 of the investigation is but can you indicate whether it
 5 was substantiated, whether it would invalidate a tribute
 6 programme due to go out in time? So there is something
 7 I have not understood yet, from the explanations given
 8 about why -- it is not, why some curiosity was not
 9 exercised without infringing on the obstacle that
 10 George Entwistle seems to feel there was about
 11 intruding.

12 ALAN MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]

17 PETER HORROCKS: I understand that. [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]

22 ALAN MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]

24 PETER HORROCKS: There were ways he could have phrased it
 25 without it being seen intruding into editorial

Page 93

1 sensitivity not to influence Newsnight obviously, but in
 2 order for the judgments for the tribute programmes to be
 3 made properly and there may be other reasons in terms of
 4 the personal interaction where he may not have asked
 5 a question or elicited a particular response which may
 6 have been difficult.

7 RICHARD SPAFFORD: Can you think of other situations where
 8 this may have arisen, in the parameters you talked about
 9 greater steps to talk about --

10 PETER HORROCKS: Panorama is always doing programmes about
 11 great problems for the BBC, famously about football and
 12 IRC, corruption. For the people negotiating BBC's
 13 sports rights it is not so good if Panorama is going off
 14 on one again. That has to be talked about and somebody
 15 has to take the decision of will the programme be
 16 scheduled ten days before the tournament kicked off or
 17 whenever. That information has been changed in the past
 18 without it compromising the BBC's journalistic
 19 credibility.

20 NICK POLLARD: Because at the time of that conversation the
 21 Newsnight investigation was a live one, was it not?

22 ALAN MACLEAN: It was half alive.

23 PETER HORROCKS: Helen, from my understanding, Helen may
 24 have thought it was completely live. I am not sure.
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 94

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]

7 This may be relevant, it is all speculation, I am just
 8 trying to give you my insight from knowing these
 9 individuals well that when [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] We don't know what that was.

15 ALAN MACLEAN: If you leave aside the time and place, the
 16 legitimate reason for somebody in Helen Boaden's
 17 position to mention this would have been because of --

18 PETER HORROCKS: Because they are both members of the BBC
 19 executive, they have collective responsibility for the
 20 BBC. Although they have their several responsibility,
 21 the collective reputation of the BBC is something which
 22 I imagine they are charged with as members of the BBC
 23 executive. They should collectively be able to come
 24 together to manage the BBC's editorial activity and its
 25 overall reputation.

Page 95

1 ALAN MACLEAN: Is she pushing it across the table to
 2 a colleague or up the chimney to somebody above her?

3 PETER HORROCKS: Well, she is -- I don't know. I don't
 4 know. Clearly the information is being conveyed in
 5 a way which means that there is a separation between
 6 whatever BBC Vision is going to decide and BBC News is
 7 going to decide. So depending --

8 ALAN MACLEAN: How did they, just trying to get my head
 9 around it, BBC News is a subset of BBC Vision?

10 PETER HORROCKS: They are separate, there are content
 11 divisions; audio, visual and news.

12 ALAN MACLEAN: So she is not pushing it up, she is moving it
 13 across? So here is something, George, which I am giving
 14 you a heads-up about in my department?

15 PETER HORROCKS: Yes.

16 NICK POLLARD: Your point, which I think is a very
 17 interesting one, is from your own personal point of view
 18 there is, or should be, no Chinese walls which stop that
 19 conversation taking place because if there was, just to
 20 exaggerate it I suppose, and if the Savile inquiry had
 21 carried on, in theory Helen Boaden would not have been
 22 able to tell George Entwistle about it, would she?

23 PETER HORROCKS: Absolutely, I think that is something that
 24 the Director of Television needed to know and should
 25 have done. Would have gone further than an early

Page 96

1 heads-up, he did say come back to me. Trying to pull
 2 some of these threads together, the communication within
 3 BBC news of a sensitive issue and a sensitive decision
 4 was less complete than it might have been in terms of
 5 everybody's understanding of that and whether it was
 6 agreed with. There was communication, inadequate
 7 communication, between BBC News and the wider BBC,
 8 whether BBC Vision or the director, Mark Thompson, which
 9 did not lead to it being interrogated and understood.

10 During the early course of this year stories started
 11 to appear and when it was known ITV was exploring it or
 12 Sunday Times was asking questions, the state of
 13 knowledge in BBC News and the openness of dialogue both
 14 within BBC News and the wider BBC led to the BBC not
 15 understanding all of the facts that it had within its
 16 own possession. So by the time I was given the task of
 17 trying to pull this programme together and I became
 18 aware the organisation, even at that last gasp, did not
 19 know what was going on, that is the overall thread of it
 20 that I had in my mind so that when the testimony had
 21 happened in Parliament and I was trying to make sure
 22 there was a proper and full conversation about all the
 23 consequences of this my strong sense was there still was
 24 not the ability for there to be an open and full
 25 conversation in BBC to even deal with the consequences

Page 97

1 of the biggest editorial problem that we had probably
 2 ever had.

3 So that seemed to me to be a common thread lasting
 4 up until a few days ago, but it was difficult to have
 5 that kind of conversation in a sufficiently open and
 6 clear cut way. So I don't know if cultural or personal
 7 aspects come into your remit and the recommendations you
 8 make or anything you make, but understanding what has
 9 gone on here and why people were not having
 10 conversations with each other and what they assumed
 11 other people would say if they were to have that
 12 conversation, my understanding of it from my knowledge
 13 of the divisions involved is that is something that is
 14 at least worth asking about.

15 NICK POLLARD: Yes. Certainly the issue of the wider
 16 cultural aspects, whether they want programme or across
 17 the news department is something that we are thinking
 18 hard about and we have not quite decided, I think it is
 19 fair to say, how much fits precisely within the terms of
 20 reference. It is clearly there in front of us.

21 PETER HORROCKS: I imagine you use the word "robust
 22 editorial culture" where people can go and disagree with
 23 each other and have a pint after and it is okay. That
 24 is just how it is. All along the lines, different ways
 25 for different reasons, as I say, and I think quite a lot

Page 98

1 of it is about people imagining how other people will
 2 react if they say or ask something which the other
 3 person will find uncomfortable and there are threads or
 4 consistency through that which might form part of the
 5 explanation.

6 NICK POLLARD: Yes. Absolutely. Can I just ask you one
 7 specific thing, just briefly. This rather odd issue of
 8 Sarah Jones saying when he was talking, just after the
 9 blog was going to be taken down, we decided to do that
 10 before you did. Did you get any sense of who supposedly
 11 had taken that decision?

12 PETER HORROCKS: No, I didn't. It was also quite curious
 13 because we didn't think we could tell you because you
 14 were looking after the Panorama, that might give the
 15 clue. I don't see why that was relevant because the
 16 Panorama was not going out until afterwards and it does
 17 not seem when you identify an inaccuracy you would not
 18 correct it as soon as possible. I genuinely don't
 19 understand the reason offered there.

20 NICK POLLARD: And it was not taken down until the following
 21 day anyway, the Monday?

22 PETER HORROCKS: Yes. Either it may not be correct or the
 23 reason why it was not done, if it was known at that
 24 time, was for other reasons which I can't quite work my
 25 way through.

Page 99

1 NICK POLLARD: Yes. Okay. Alan, any further questions or
 2 observations?

3 ALAN MACLEAN: No.

4 NICK POLLARD: It is possible that by the time you come back
 5 I hope we will have talked to a lot more people and we
 6 will have a room full of documents so it may be we want
 7 to ask you back.

8 PETER HORROCKS: There may be things in terms of specific
 9 responsibility in News Group, why didn't you ask
 10 questions, things like that, I completely understand.
 11 You may need to ask those sort of things and I am more
 12 than happy to address those. I am not assuming it is
 13 over, if you need to I am happy to come back. I am back
 14 on Monday 19th November, back in the office.

15 ALAN MACLEAN: Will you be able to receive emails?

16 PETER HORROCKS: Yes.

17 NICK POLLARD: Peter, thank you very much for today and also
 18 the work you have done to help us with the timelines and
 19 your own documentation. I appreciate you have had
 20 a busy time over the past two or three weeks and we have
 21 added to that workload in the past couple of days.

22 PETER HORROCKS: I was very pleased you accommodated me
 23 before I was going away, going away knowing I had the
 24 bulk of my knowledge, as I said in my email, from the
 25 organisation's point of view being able to get through

Page 100

1 this as soon as possible is hugely important because --
2 not saying it off the record, as it were, private
3 comments not germane to what you are looking into --
4 because of this uncertain situation we are in, how
5 difficult that has been over the past few days,
6 everybody says we have to wait for Pollard and we don't
7 want to. There is stuff we can get on with but quite
8 a lot we can't because your view is determinative for
9 the future of BBC News. That is why I was keen to give
10 you whatever you could to get you going. The sooner we
11 get through this the better.
12 NICK POLLARD: Peter, thank you very much.
13 PETER HORROCKS: Thank you.
14 NICK POLLARD: I appreciate the time you have given us this
15 afternoon.
16 (4.41 pm)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25