

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Reed Smith Broadgate Tower 20 Primrose Street EC2A 2RS</p> <p>Thursday, 8 November 2012 (3.00 pm)</p> <p>LILLYWHITES INQUIRY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Interview with TOM GILES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NICK POLLARD - CHAIRPERSON RICHARD BLAKELEY - COUNSEL RICHARD SPAFFORD - REED SMITH</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>record.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: I'm sorry, I thought you'd done that.</p> <p>MR SPAFFORD: Just to be clear, Tom, thank you from me for coming in as well. Just to be clear, so it records your agreement, what you say to us is said to us on an open basis, and as necessary Nick is able, if he thinks it appropriate, to use that in his report. Albeit, please, for obvious reasons, what you hear from us, please, has to stay confidential.</p> <p>The third point is that this obviously is being transcribed, so a record is being taken. If you want to, you have the opportunity after the interview is over to receive a copy of the transcript to give you a chance to correct any typographical errors. That will have to be given to you, I am afraid, on a confidential basis as well, which we can talk about.</p> <p>At the end of the process, ie at the time when Nick produce his report, the transcripts are going to be provided to the BBC.</p> <p>Is that all agreed?</p> <p>MR GILES: That's all agreed.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: Okay. Your background at the BBC, very briefly, you worked on Newsnight before going to Panorama, is that right?</p> <p>MR GILES: I did. Essentially I was a print journalist.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>(3.05 pm)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">P R O C E E D I N G S</p> <p>MR POLLARD: Tom, formally, thanks for coming along to talk to us.</p> <p>MR GILES: Thank you.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: We have done a lot of work --</p> <p>MR GILES: I can imagine.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: -- I should stress, seen a lot of documents. We have started our interviews, but the absolute chronology and absolutely every bit of the jigsaw we're still putting together.</p> <p>MR GILES: Yes.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: You could almost categorise this as us being on receive from you.</p> <p>MR GILES: Okay.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: We have several questions, obviously, based on the note that you sent already.</p> <p>MR GILES: Yes.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: The outline that you've sent us of what you would like to tell us is spot on for us.</p> <p>MR GILES: Good.</p> <p>MR POLLARD: Before we get to your, if you like, five facts, or five issues, and then the timescale, just give us a little snapshot of your background --</p> <p>MR SPAFFORD: Just a couple of opening points for the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>I joined The Times as a trainee in 1989, I joined the BBC in 1991, in the BBC World Service. In 1992/beginning of 93, I joined BBC News and joined Newsnight in 1994, as a producer. And I was a producer on the programme basically making films and, you know, going off to all sorts of exciting places until about 1996, where I started output editing as well. So I did both. So I was an output editor on the programme for about a year, until March 98. I did, among other things, the Michael Howard interview, which was a weird time, and on top of that I carried on doing films as well and that was rather the direction I wanted to go in.</p> <p>So I joined Panorama in March 98 as a producer, a senior producer, following my editor, Peter Horrocks, who had also gone from Newsnight to Panorama. And I stayed there making films on and off for a couple of years, and then went into current affairs. Did a lot more films, I have worked in Factual and Science. I conceived of and made the first Andrew Marr's History of Modern Britain series. I've been back to Panorama to places like Iraq. I was there in the war, the Iraq war, with John Simpson, making a Panorama about a friendly fire incident that happened to us.</p> <p>Subsequent to that, I was made deputy editor of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 Panorama in 98. Became an executive producer on current 2 affairs during -- sorry, not 1998, 2008. Executive 3 producer in current affairs in 2009, and editor of 4 Panorama in 2010. 5 MR POLLARD: How far does your relationship, friendship, 6 with Meirion Jones go back? 7 MR GILES: It's not really, strictly speaking, 8 a relationship or a friendship. It is just 9 a professional acquaintance. 10 MR POLLARD: Okay. 11 MR GILES: I just happen to know him. It's a funny place, 12 Newsnight, because there's a sort of band of people that 13 you know from the time that you are there. It's a very, 14 very intense place to work. And you always sort of take 15 an interest in the sort of people that were working with 16 you in that intense period. 17 Among others that were there with me at the time, 18 George Entwistle, Jay Hunt, Peter Horrocks, 19 Peter Barron, Jim Gray. A lot of people who have gone 20 on to be very influential people in broadcasting, and it 21 is that sort of a place. 22 So Meirion was an assistant producer, joined the 23 programme in 1995 when I was a producer. And he came 24 from radio. He was a very intense perfectly likeable 25 guy, and I would speak to him quite a lot. And a lot of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 I might as well just ask him if he's interested in doing 2 anything for Panorama, if he has any ideas that he 3 thinks would be good for us, "Why don't you just come 4 and have a chat some time in the next month, some time 5 in the next couple of weeks." And he said, "Fine, 6 great, let's do that." 7 MR POLLARD: Does that equate, excuse the terminology, to 8 you about to poach him from Newsnight? 9 MR GILES: Not at all, no. It doesn't really work like 10 that, I don't really -- for a start it is quite 11 difficult to poach people in any meaningful sense in the 12 BBC, in the past couple of years, because there has been 13 a pretty tight compression on the numbers of people, and 14 if anything, as with anywhere else, the pressure has 15 been downward. 16 I think it was more that a couple of people that 17 I have known at Newsnight, Peter Marshall is another 18 one, have come tower to do individual projects. 19 MR POLLARD: Right, okay. 20 MR GILES: I think there is a chance he might have 21 interpreted that as me wanting him to come over and 22 stay. It was really more just a very informal, by the 23 by, if you have any ideas -- the fundamental position is 24 I don't really care where you are if you have an idea 25 that you think will work for me and I want you to do it,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 his sort of reputation as a sort of proper investigative 2 producer really post-dates my time on the programme. 3 But he's obviously someone I would know, he is someone 4 I would say "hi" to if I walked past in the corridor, 5 and, you know, for that reason he was someone who had -- 6 once I came on Panorama -- there was no particular 7 reason for him to be on my horizon up until that point. 8 I think I once did a film about Kosovo for BBC2 and he 9 was out there for Newsnight, but broadly our paths 10 didn't really cross. 11 I met his wife, who worked in the current affairs 12 department for a short time, Kate Middleton. I knew her 13 vaguely to talk to, but nothing more than that. He's 14 not someone I know outside of work. But I remember the 15 prelude to all this was the fact that he'd started doing 16 quite a few investigations for Newsnight, some of them 17 became pretty high profile, [REDACTED] became very high 18 profile. And just as part of my general keeping my ear 19 to the ground editorial responsibilities, I happened to 20 bump into him in the television centre cafe that time in 21 October 2011 -- I can't remember exactly what day, 22 broadly I think I would say it was the week before 23 Savile's death, for reasons which will become clear with 24 the email that was sent. And I just happened to go up 25 to him, I remember approaching him, just thinking</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 then obviously I will try and get you come on 2 the programme and make it. 3 MR POLLARD: Meirion coming and doing a project for you or 4 taking an idea to you would not necessarily put 5 Newsnight's nose out of joint? 6 MR GILES: Clearly it would, if he had not cleared it with 7 the editor, and if I had not cleared it with the editor. 8 MR POLLARD: Got it. 9 MR GILES: But I would not do that. I would not even -- 10 I would never have thought of doing that. Right now, at 11 the moment, Peter Marshall, again a Newsnight reporter, 12 is doing an hour-long film on [REDACTED] with us. 13 That was cleared with the editor. 14 MR POLLARD: Because Newsnight doesn't do things of that 15 length -- 16 MR GILES: No. 17 MR POLLARD: -- they do shorter -- 18 Okay, so he sends you a note when Savile dies. 19 MR GILES: Yes, on a Monday, 11.59, October 31. 20 MR POLLARD: You didn't see that immediately, did you or -- 21 MR GILES: It's hard to remember. One of the things I'm 22 still trying to explain, as you can imagine, I get 23 a huge amount of email traffic every day, 50 to 100, 24 sometimes 200, depending on how much is going on and 25 a fair proportion of those are ideas from all over the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 place. We use independents, I use freelancers anyway 2 who come up with ideas, so it was just another idea. 3 My memory of it was -- I can't remember when 4 I actually saw it. I can't remember if I saw it 5 immediately, I just remember being pretty busy, because 6 I was between two -- we have 40 programmes that are 7 half-hours a year, and another seven to nine that are 8 hours, and at that particular moment I was between two 9 hours. So we he just done a short quick turn around on 10 Dale Farm eviction, and we were about to do another hour 11 on benefit fraud. So that meant there were essentially 12 four programmes I was trying to be across, the two hours 13 and two half-hours. So I just remember it sort of 14 barely registering. 15 I remember thinking in my head it was kind of 16 typical of Meirion to be offering me Jimmy Savile 17 paedophile, literally two days after he died. 18 I remember having a sort of grim smile to myself about 19 that, if you like. 20 I think the crucial thing is I assumed this was just 21 something he was sending me by way of, "We're going to 22 meet up and we'll talk". That's how it registered and 23 I don't remember thinking for one second that this was 24 something I needed to urgently attend to because 25 otherwise it was going to shoot off somewhere else.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 MR POLLARD: No. 2 MR GILES: I never actually had a follow-up conversation 3 with it, because I assumed -- well I assumed that 4 because he had not come to me he got incredibly busy, 5 there were some sort of general talks about meets, but 6 he was too busy and so that moment passed. And 7 I assumed that either he had dropped it or -- and I have 8 some vague sense of this and I am afraid I can't put my 9 finger on it, partly because I do know people on the 10 programme and they might have mentioned it -- that he 11 was actually doing it for them anyway, which of course 12 he was. 13 MR POLLARD: In fact in the last line of his note -- 14 MR GILES: He says it is not really a Panorama. 15 MR POLLARD: Actually the more I think about it, the more it 16 is a doc -- 17 MR GILES: He starts off saying, "I don't know if this is 18 for you." Then he says, "Actually, the more I think 19 about it, this is more of a doc." That immediately is 20 going to slightly -- I'm used to people really, really 21 selling stuff and usually to be honest they come back 22 again anyway, they will just say, "Did you get my email 23 about?" 24 MR POLLARD: Sure. 25 MR GILES: And Meirion, although I did not know him well, he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 MR POLLARD: Sure. 2 MR GILES: As it turned out, he had frankly already pretty 3 much pitched it, certainly within -- I think you will 4 find that the email to the editor is at 12.33, but he 5 had already discussed it with Liz MacKean and he had 6 already been looking at the story whilst he was at 7 Newsnight. So I think he was just covering his bases. 8 I didn't know that, but pretty much he was up and 9 running by about 12.30, the same day, doing it for 10 Newsnight. 11 MR POLLARD: You mentioned a slight sensitivity about this 12 idea that it was offered to Panorama and Panorama didn't 13 do anything -- 14 MR GILES: To be honest, I have to remember when this first 15 came up again I remember thinking, did he actually -- 16 and looking back and saying, yes, God, he did, he did 17 offer this to me. And at that point, you know, I was 18 interested anyway, because I rang him pretty soon 19 afterwards, I think on October 1st 2012, to ask why he 20 had not come back. But I suppose I was conscious that 21 at some point, as we started doing the Panorama that 22 I needed to be pretty transparent about this. I could 23 imagine someone saying, "Ah well, it was offered to 24 Panorama and you turned it down." 25 Just to be clear, I never actually turned it down.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 had known me enough, I suppose, from the past to have 2 done that if he actually really wanted to take it 3 somewhere. 4 MR POLLARD: Yes. 5 MR GILES: So I kind of assumed that something had happened, 6 why he didn't come back and why we had not actually 7 managed to set up a meeting. 8 MR POLLARD: Okay. 9 MR GILES: I have to say one other thing actually about it. 10 MR POLLARD: Please. 11 MR GILES: I do remember slightly registering for me the 12 line about libel, which I did sort of think was -- I now 13 know that the passage in his mind that he had been on, 14 he had obviously been looking at this doc for a long 15 time, so for him suddenly there was a sense of we are in 16 a really realistic position to do this properly now. 17 For me being told, "He's dead so you can't libel 18 him" isn't necessarily the biggest story turn-on. It's 19 a bit of a strange way to pitch it cold to someone. 20 Meirion -- Meirion sometimes can come out with 21 slightly strange phrases, but I do have a vague memory 22 of that being a bit odd. 23 MR POLLARD: Of course, he's dead so he can't sue. 24 MR GILES: He can't sue. It's true, but it's never the most 25 immediately comforting thing for an editor in an opening</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

1 pitch of four lines.
 2 MR POLLARD: Sure. The story development rolls on at
 3 Newsnight. Did you hear anything --
 4 MR GILES: No.
 5 MR POLLARD: -- about that? Not --
 6 MR GILES: Other than a sort of vague sense that he was
 7 somehow working on it. But I can't put my finger on
 8 that. I heard nothing about it, until the press reports
 9 in January, until there was -- I just thought then, to
 10 be honest, I just bought the line that had been put
 11 forward by the BBC. I assumed this was right, I assumed
 12 because he hadn't come to me that...It seemed very odd
 13 that if he had stood something up and they had not run
 14 it that he wouldn't have tried to come back to me at
 15 that point and that's obviously something you might need
 16 to ask him.
 17 He's given me an explanation for that, which I'm
 18 happy to explain.
 19 MR POLLARD: Please.
 20 MR GILES: That was really the only time -- I have a vague
 21 sense of it, that he might be working on it for
 22 Newsnight, but no more than that, and then the press
 23 reports in January and February, and then I just
 24 assumed, well, they haven't got the evidence and look
 25 they've got themselves in a right mess as well, haven't

Page 13

1 they?
 2 MR POLLARD: At some stage, what was his reason for not
 3 bringing it to you? Because clearly he still believed
 4 in the story pretty passionately.
 5 MR GILES: I rang him. This is really why I contacted him.
 6 I remember I have been quite specific about this in the
 7 timeline I sent.
 8 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 9 MR GILES: Partly because I have a memory of it. I was in
 10 the pub. I was in the -- just over the road from new
 11 Broadcasting House, because we had just put out a film
 12 and I was with Richard Bilton who had done the film that
 13 had just gone out, 8.30 to 9.00. So we must have gone
 14 out shortly after, because we watched it in the Panorama
 15 office. And I remember texting him and saying words to
 16 the effect of: why on earth didn't he come to me with
 17 this before? Why didn't you come back to me with this
 18 story? And he rang me back straightaway.
 19 MR POLLARD: This date would be?
 20 MR GILES: 1 October, that would be the Monday. I think the
 21 press coverage really kicked off on the Sunday.
 22 MR POLLARD: For Exposure?
 23 MR GILES: Yes. That was prompted by Exposure.
 24 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 25 MR GILES: Can I mention one other thing, actually --

Page 14

1 MR POLLARD: Please.
 2 MR GILES: -- it going to come up. I have not put it in my
 3 personal timeline, because I have absolutely no personal
 4 knowledge of this at all. But it is something we have
 5 been open about, or we try to be.
 6 At some point in, I think, January or February there
 7 was a producer from news gathering, from BBC News, [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 15

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 MR POLLARD: [REDACTED]
 22 MR GILES: [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 16

1 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 2 MR GILES: So no one told me anything about this, but it
 3 became clear after we started work on the Panorama,
 4 partly because I showed Karen the email I had got from
 5 Meirion all the way back then and then she said someone
 6 had actually mentioned the Newsnight thing to her.
 7 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 8 MR GILES: So in other words, I'm only telling you that
 9 because in a sort of weird way you could say, well, were
 10 Panorama told about the story in June this year?
 11 Answer, barely, by someone who hadn't worked on it and
 12 was bringing no new information about it, but he was
 13 sort of pitching it.
 14 MR POLLARD: To be fair it wasn't a secret --
 15 MR GILES: No, no, it was in the press.
 16 MR POLLARD: -- at that stage anyway.
 17 MR GILES: No. In the current -- in the current atmosphere,
 18 you know, if you are trying to say Panorama was never,
 19 ever, offered this story after Meirion's email, I just
 20 don't want someone then to find out, hang on [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 MR POLLARD: [REDACTED]
 24 MR GILES: [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 17

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 I'm only saying that because all kind of rumours
 5 started flying around that we had been given this
 6 document earlier this year and hadn't done anything
 7 with it.
 8 MR POLLARD: The document was effectively information that
 9 he'd picked up from Meirion?
 10 MR GILES: Yes. Well, information from Meirion plus,
 11 I assume, what he read in the papers, but it was his
 12 sort of pitch. The problem with the pitch is that he
 13 didn't actually give us that document, he gave us
 14 a document about something completely different, about
 15 Haut de la Garenne.
 16 But when he gave it over to the news gathering
 17 person, I assume at the beginning of October this year,
 18 he said "I had mentioned this to Panorama". I think she
 19 thought, look, hang on Panorama were offered this.
 20 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 21 MR GILES: You have to understand there has been a certain
 22 amount of jostling around, because obviously if Panorama
 23 did the sort of film that it did, there is obviously
 24 going to be some sensitivity about that within the wider
 25 News family.

Page 18

1 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 2 MR GILES: Can I put it like that?
 3 MR POLLARD: Sure. Sure.
 4 MR GILES: So people kind of seize on things like this. So
 5 I'm saying that in passing, just in case -- just so
 6 you're aware. I think you were asking me what happened
 7 when I spoke to Meirion on October 1?
 8 MR POLLARD: Um-hm.
 9 MR GILES: Shall I get back to that?
 10 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 11 MR GILES: All right. I texted him, basically saying, "Why
 12 didn't you come back to me with this story?" He rang me
 13 straight back which slightly surprised me, essentially
 14 to check that it was me, strangely. So he must have
 15 known -- he had my number, because I think we had
 16 swapped numbers anyway --
 17 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 18 MR GILES: And I think -- I immediately got a sense of a man
 19 who's clearly slightly paranoid anyway at that point,
 20 and I can't remember if we carried on talking or if
 21 I called him back because I remember having to step
 22 outside of the pub, because I didn't want to do it in
 23 earshot. And essentially as I said by this stage the
 24 pre-publicity for exposure had become big news,
 25 Newsnight had been mentioned. I wanted to get to the

Page 19

1 bottom of why he didn't come back.
 2 And his argument then was that he assumed that my
 3 silence meant that I was part of what he called the BBC
 4 line, that the story was to be buried. I said, "That's
 5 just daft, isn't it?"
 6 MR POLLARD: Silence in respect of?
 7 MR GILES: My silence in respect of me not responding to his
 8 email.
 9 THE JUDGE: His original.
 10 MR GILES: His original email, at 11.59 on October 31. The
 11 fact that I had not responded he said he took some sense
 12 that I was not that interested and this was basically
 13 because he convinced himself, clearly, that the BBC were
 14 just not prepared to run this story. I said, well
 15 that's -- if I had known you had gone out and got what
 16 you'd got -- although I didn't know the full extent of
 17 it even then -- then of course I would have been
 18 interested if you had come back. I would have been
 19 interested to find out what had happened.
 20 He sort of -- he accepted that. And then he just
 21 talked -- what I wanted to work out was how far, because
 22 I recognised Duncroft -- I recognised the sort of nature
 23 of this children's home which was already featuring in
 24 the pre-publicity. [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 20

1 MR POLLARD: Did he mention, at that stage,
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 MR GILES: That's one of them, one of the many common
 5 factors. He mentioned -- I can't remember [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 I have to say my initial reaction to all of this
 10 was, you know, as an editor of a leading BBC current
 11 affairs programme, was: how on earth did we let this
 12 story go to an ITV current affairs programme that, you
 13 know, is attempting -- in its first season
 14 unsuccessfully, in its second season spectacularly
 15 successfully -- to set stuff itself up as a current
 16 affairs investigative brand in competition to the likes
 17 of Panorama?
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 It became clear to me fairly quickly that Meirion
 22 had gone out and dug this story up and somehow it ended
 23 up at ITV. So I remember being pretty surprised by
 24 that.
 25 MR POLLARD: Can I ask, at that stage, or at any stage, what
 Page 21

1 was your take on Meirion's view of his aunt's
 2 involvement?
 3 MR GILES: Of his aunt's involvement?
 4 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 5 MR GILES: I've never had any problem with this. I mean,
 6 apart from the fact that, you know -- about whether or
 7 not there should have been a conflict of interest.
 8 I never -- I never registered it in terms of the email
 9 he sent me. It just struck me that he therefore because
 10 of his aunt's interest, had an "in". Also, as a sort of
 11 direct witness to fact that this was not just cooked up
 12 by a collection of damaged people.
 13 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 14 MR GILES: This was real. My initial reaction would be
 15 reassured by that. In terms of his aunt's presence,
 16 I had kind of -- I have always rather gone with his
 17 fundamental logic, which is that why on earth would he
 18 be trying to cover for his aunt, when he was the first
 19 person in history to actually try and nail this story in
 20 the first place, by exposing the home that his aunt used
 21 to run.
 22 I can tell you more about that going on. But I have
 23 to say I have always been slightly overwhelmed by that
 24 logic. The idea that he would be protecting his aunt by
 25 launching an investigation into his aunt's -- into
 Page 22

1 Duncroft, I find extraordinary, and if it did worry them
 2 at the point, then why on earth didn't they raise that
 3 as a conflict of interest issue and deal with it at the
 4 time? That strikes me as a piece of post-hoc
 5 justification par excellence.
 6 MR POLLARD: In fact he does put it in the first line.
 7 MR GILES: He put it in his first line to me. I took that
 8 as therefore what he's saying is, I know this. I know
 9 something odd was going on, because I was there.
 10 I think that was his way of sort of saying -- I took it
 11 as he had a better handle on this than he would
 12 otherwise have. I didn't immediately think, because as
 13 I have said, I barely thought this about it in that way,
 14 but I didn't immediately think, "Gosh, that's a conflict
 15 of interest".
 16 Obviously, when he then subsequently joined Panorama
 17 we discussed his aunt.
 18 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 19 MR GILES: In far more detail. In fact we attempted to get
 20 her to do an interview and we went and spoke to her.
 21 Which I think you will find is more than anyone on other
 22 programmes have on the BBC.
 23 MR POLLARD: I would like to come back to that if I may when
 24 we get to it.
 25 MR GILES: I feel pretty well briefed on the subject of his
 Page 23

1 aunt.
 2 MR POLLARD: Okay. After 1 October, when you are in touch
 3 with him again, there are potentially two strands
 4 emerging. One is presumably he's telling you chapter
 5 and verse about how the Newsnight investigation
 6 progressed to the point that it was dropped, how and why
 7 all that happened and at the same time you are
 8 presumably thinking about a possible Panorama?
 9 MR GILES: Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: Can you sort of fill us in on those two
 11 strands, as it were?
 12 MR GILES: Of course. I can't remember -- as you will see
 13 when you get this, which is my copy not for you -- you
 14 will see that emails start pretty much on the 2nd, from
 15 Meirion. I think the crucial thing for me, in terms of
 16 the story, was that Meirion clearly immediately had
 17 a head start in terms of any attempt to pursue it.
 18 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 19 MR GILES: Meirion had already spoken to these women, it
 20 became very clear. Obviously the fact that it was
 21 dropped did, you know, alert me to the fact that there
 22 may be a problem convincing them to talk to the BBC
 23 again, but I knew that if I was going to do this story
 24 at all, to have a chance in embracing not just, you
 25 know, the whole history of Savile's abuse -- at this
 Page 24

1 point I was not clear in my mind that it was going to be
 2 anything that would also incorporate Newsnight's
 3 dropping of it, then I was going to need Meirion.
 4 One of the things I found absolutely
 5 extraordinary -- and I'm happy to say this on the
 6 record -- was that Meirion was doing nothing.
 7 Here was this story that he had originally
 8 uncovered. That people knew he had originally uncovered
 9 after how many decades of rumour, he was the person who
 10 had basically gone out, found these witnesses, not being
 11 able -- got one of them on camera. Not been able to
 12 broadcast it. [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED] When he started telling me
 15 that some of the people on the exposure on camera were
 16 sources that they had originally spoken to, that made it
 17 even more striking.
 18 Yet here he was with a story that everyone was
 19 talking about, it was the front of all these national
 20 newspapers and he was sat in the Newsnight office doing
 21 nothing, because no one wanted him to pick this story
 22 up --
 23 MR POLLARD: Doing nothing on that story or just doing
 24 nothing full stop?
 25 MR GILES: Doing nothing, doing nothing, doing nothing full
 Page 25

1 stop. The impression he gave me was that that was an
 2 act of will by his editor. There appeared to have been
 3 already, at an early point -- and I can't remember if
 4 this was stated, you know, on 1 October or in subsequent
 5 conversations just -- just as the Exposure was broadcast
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 The impression I got from him was that he was
 12 genuinely worried about his position. And again, that
 13 seemed very strange. I said, I think probably in any
 14 first conversation -- at least that's a recollection as
 15 well in my timeline -- why didn't you -- are you going
 16 to be doing something, are you doing a spoiler, are you
 17 going to resurrect this interview that you haven't run?
 18 Why don't you get it out on Monday, 1st or Tuesday, 2nd,
 19 they are not going out until the 3rd, you could run it
 20 before they do. They are not going out until
 21 11 o'clock.
 22 He said, "No, no, I have been told that's out of
 23 question, Peter doesn't want to in any way be seen to
 24 following ITV's agenda", I think the expression used
 25 was, "Jump on ITV's bandwagon." I remember being
 Page 26

1 slightly surprised by that, so it immediately told me
 2 there was a clear issue there.
 3 The BBC had started trying to do this story. They
 4 put a package on the 10 o'clock News I think on the
 5 Sunday. Which was very kind of -- they interviewed
 6 someone from the family saying it was outrageous that he
 7 was being libelled in this way, that he couldn't answer
 8 back, and someone from the charity, so it was quite
 9 a careful piece.
 10 He made it clear, in fact he told me at that point
 11 that [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 So I immediately had a pretty quick sense that
 15 something was -- something was going wrong here. Now,
 16 look, Meirion is a -- you know, he's a classic obsessive
 17 investigative journalist, and I work with a lot of them.
 18 They are never exactly -- they are not perfect people,
 19 none of us are, but they are certainly not perfect
 20 people, and Meirion is, you know, a slightly different
 21 kind of a character, but I had never thought of him as
 22 being anything other than completely sincere and having
 23 integrity and passion for what he was doing. So
 24 I perhaps, more than others, even reaching back into the
 25 mid 90s would have recalled him as someone, yeah,
 Page 27

1 a little bit different, but very well intentioned, well
 2 meaning, and, you know, a good journalistic egg, you
 3 know, a BBC person. I was surprised frankly, and pretty
 4 shocked soon after, at just how -- how out of bounds,
 5 you know, he had been put.
 6 MR POLLARD: Do you mean -- just to sort of press this -- do
 7 you mean effectively -- we can ask him and we will of
 8 course ask him about this when we see him, that since
 9 the dropping of the Newsnight story the previous year,
 10 had he effectively, within Newsnight, been sort of put
 11 on ice, not given a lot to do.
 12 MR GILES: No, the curious thing is -- no. He had gone on
 13 to do all sorts of investigations. He did one into the
 14 Olympic, Azerbaijani Olympic wrestling team. I am sure
 15 he will list them. No I had not had any sense that he
 16 was not carrying on doing investigations and, you know,
 17 he referred the fact to me, that Peter had referred to
 18 others as him as him as the "jewel of the Crown."
 19 MR POLLARD: Yes, but as far as that story, as far as
 20 Savile --
 21 MR GILES: But as far as that story was concerned, there was
 22 something immediately -- this is my sense and actually
 23 I have to say, the more I have looked at this the more
 24 that appears to be, I think that -- the more that
 25 appears to be the case. There was something inherently
 Page 28

1 toxic about that whole story. The fact that it came
 2 back. The fact that it was back at ITV and there was
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 MR POLLARD: Do you think he -- I understand the
 7 Mark Williams-Thomas role, because he's not a BBC
 8 employee, he was a consultant --
 9 MR GILES: He was a consultant, yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: And free to do whatever he wants after that.
 11 MR GILES: Yes.
 12 MR POLLARD: Again, it is obviously something we will ask
 13 Meirion, did you get the sense that Meirion was aware,
 14 during the first half of 2012, that ITV and Mark William
 15 Thomas were working on it.
 16 MR GILES: I think you will find that he was explicitly
 17 aware, in his own mind, that Mark Williams-Thomas, was
 18 him, in his own mind, doing the right thing. When we
 19 interviewed Meirion, for example, about why hadn't you
 20 gone to the police with, you know, the allegations that
 21 were made both regarding Savile, and regarding
 22 [REDACTED] one of his own constructs -- and this is
 23 his own personal one, this isn't Liz or Peter's
 24 clearly -- was that he knew that this former Surrey
 25 detective was actually going to be carrying this on.

Page 29

1 And that that somehow made him feel better about that.
 2 Now, I don't know why he got it in his head that the
 3 BBC just wouldn't do this story. I have to say --
 4 I have to say that seems slightly far fetched. The way
 5 it was handled as an editor would certainly alarm me
 6 enough to think that there was something going on,
 7 a little bit, and I will come back to that if you want.
 8 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 9 MR GILES: He has also been explicit both to me and, I
 10 think, to others, notably Ken MacQuarrie, about the fact
 11 that he handed -- which did surprise me, I have to say,
 12 and does surprise me -- that when the Leeds producer,
 13 I think she's called Susan Thompson, contacted him in
 14 February, he handed that pretty well straight away to
 15 Mark Williams-Thomas.
 16 THE JUDGE: Yes.
 17 MR GILES: She was the first example in the Exposure, so the
 18 Exposure starts off with an example who has come to
 19 Meirion, as a result of the publicity in the press about
 20 Newsnight dropping this story, the other people in the
 21 film, [REDACTED] and I think
 22 someone called [REDACTED] all of them, all of them, Meirion
 23 was aware of and had spoken to. [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 MR POLLARD: Yes. Again, this is something we will talk to

Page 30

1 him about, but you must have discussed this with him
 2 because obviously one of the things that you -- one
 3 could do, getting that Susan Thompson email.
 4 MR GILES: Is give it to Panorama.
 5 MR POLLARD: Or go back to Peter Rippon and say, "This is
 6 the thing that kicks it forward, let's do it now."
 7 MR GILES: Quite right. Absolutely, in the normal
 8 circumstances, that's exactly what you would expect your
 9 producer to do and your reporter to do. But I can't
 10 remember a time when an editor has formally told his
 11 team to stop working on this stuff, because that's no
 12 longer the point. He wasn't interested, once he had
 13 raised his bar, the way he did.
 14 Look, I don't know Peter Rippon well. I know most
 15 of the people up and down this chain of command, if you
 16 like, and Meirion and to a lesser extent Liz, but
 17 I don't really know Peter, he's one person I don't know,
 18 other than, you know, meeting him in editors' meetings
 19 and things. But it does surprise me that he would have
 20 said, so bluntly, that he wasn't interested in them
 21 finding more people.
 22 So it may have been, um -- you know, I can -- I can
 23 kind of understand it, it is strange, but I can kind of
 24 understand why he wouldn't have gone back to his editor
 25 at that point with that -- with another victim, another

Page 31

1 example.
 2 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 3 MR GILES: And you cannot really have it both ways. You
 4 can't say, "I'm saying that the reason I'm doing this
 5 story is because, it has to be institutional failure".
 6 Although, as we have argued, there was all sorts of
 7 institutional failure, and it has to be this specific
 8 form, on the one hand make that absolutely clear that's
 9 your bar or else you just drop the whole thing. And on
 10 the other get all annoyed when he doesn't come back to
 11 you with something which goes nowhere near that bar, the
 12 CPS bar. I am afraid it does raise more questions about
 13 the BBC. But that's me, you know, I suppose with
 14 a pro-Meirion hat on.
 15 Of course it looks a bit strange. If I were his
 16 editor, I wouldn't be very impressed or happy. I have
 17 to say, as a current affairs journalist at the BBC, I'm
 18 less than thrilled, that, you know, it went over to ITV
 19 when it was a BBC story, but I can -- I can just about
 20 understand why he may just have felt this is the best
 21 way to do it.
 22 MR BLAKELY: Can I come back to something you said earlier,
 23 Tom? You said that you had heard from Meirion that
 24 Peter Rippon [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 32

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 MR BLAKELY: Just in terms of the internal management
 4 structure at the BBC, how would he go about doing that?
 5 Who would he talk to?
 6 MR GILES: He might have -- he might have gone to
 7 Stephen Mitchell [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 MR BLAKELY: Mitchell would be the right lever to pull in
 10 the circumstances?
 11 MR GILES: Stephen Mitchell has this weird job where he's
 12 director of programmes, director of News programmes,
 13 which is a huge all-encompassing job, that involves
 14 effectively running all the radio sequence programmes,
 15 that is from Today through to World Tonight, the daily
 16 news programmes like Newsnight, and the whole of
 17 television and radio current affairs.
 18 Television current affairs has an added bonus of
 19 having an executive editor, Clive Edwards, who works to
 20 Stephen, but on top of that, Stephen is also deputy
 21 director of News, and working to Helen, so he -- good
 22 luck to you in understanding the BBC hierarchies, if you
 23 need any extra help I'm happy to come back.
 24 THE JUDGE: Sure.
 25 MR GILES: But he -- he has an overarching job that controls

Page 33

1 News and News programmes. Where effectively he can call
 2 on both. So he's the first person you go to if you
 3 think there is something you need News to hear. Either
 4 he would have gone to Stephen or perhaps he would have
 5 gone directly to the News desk and said, "Look you
 6 shouldn't be giving air time to this story, it's
 7 a nonsense."
 8 I can see why that might have happened. I don't
 9 know if it did or it didn't, you will have to ask him.
 10 But Meirion certainly told me it had. I can imagine
 11 that if you are terrified -- or worried, should we
 12 say -- that this story is going to get legs. By that
 13 Sunday it wasn't -- it had done pretty well, was it a
 14 splash in the Mail on Sunday, it was slightly buried in
 15 the Sunday Times, which is where I read it. But you
 16 might be worried that you are giving a turbo charge to
 17 the last story in the world you suddenly want to rise
 18 up, so I can imagine why you might have been pretty keen
 19 that the news didn't make much of it. They didn't make
 20 much of it. It was about forth or fifth item, from
 21 memory.
 22 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 23 MR GILES: Obviously I was interested to see if they did it
 24 or not, because I'm sitting there as editor of Panorama,
 25 with my pathetic competitive hat on, wondering how much

Page 34

1 exposure it's going to get on my own 10 o'clock News.
 2 MR BLAKELY: Just while we are on that part of the chain, is
 3 there, to your knowledge, a mechanism or facility for
 4 Meirion to bypass Peter Rippon if he had wanted to, in
 5 terms of referring things up? Is there a way to do
 6 that, to go around the chain or do you have to go
 7 straight up?
 8 MR GILES: Let's talk about chains, chains are --
 9 MR BLAKELY: It may not work in practice --
 10 MR GILES: I don't know quite how you put them, but I have
 11 to say if someone went round above me as editor directly
 12 to -- even to Clive, I would be slightly concerned that
 13 they hadn't come to me first. It wouldn't -- it doesn't
 14 look good if you are -- if you are running or editing
 15 a programme and people on the programme bypass you and
 16 go to your boss. And you would know that. So it would
 17 be a pretty heavy -- it would be the ultimate --
 18 MR BLAKELY: Nuclear step.
 19 MR GILES: It's a bit of a nuclear step, yes.
 20 MR POLLARD: The point is not so much --
 21 MR GILES: This is now back in December 2011, why didn't you
 22 go to Helen and Stephen?
 23 MR POLLARD: Yes, I think it is partly practical and partly
 24 theoretical.
 25 MR GILES: Yes.

Page 35

1 MR POLLARD: You would clearly be upset if somebody went
 2 over your head without coming to you?
 3 MR GILES: Yes. Upset, unless there was a very good and
 4 clear reason.
 5 MR POLLARD: If you had spiked a story that somebody had
 6 done some work on, your just didn't think it stacked up,
 7 wasn't going to work, and somebody said: do you mind if
 8 I get a second opinion on this. You probably would not
 9 be pleased but it wouldn't be quite the same as someone
 10 bypassing you without talking to you?
 11 MR GILES: That would be -- exactly, you are right. He
 12 could have done that. Although, he knew perfectly well
 13 because Stephen had already been cc'd into the emails
 14 and given the tone of -- the interventions that Peter
 15 appears to be making, according to Liz and according to
 16 Meirion, along the lines of, "I have to refer this up".
 17 I have to say, on a story as sensitive as this it
 18 would be absolutely totally expected and anticipated
 19 that you would have referred it up. So the fact that
 20 Peter is dropping the story, you think by raising the
 21 bar to a ludicrous degree and changing the goalposts
 22 completely, you would not have automatically assumed,
 23 I know what, I will go to the bosses. You would have
 24 assumed the bosses would have had a say in that or would
 25 have had, you know, some kind of acceptance that that

Page 36

<p>1 was Peter's decision. 2 So it is slightly naive to assume that you go and 3 knock on Helen Boaden's door and then it is all fine. 4 Not only that, you risk not only annoying your editor 5 but you risk getting absolutely nowhere; it is pretty 6 double jeopardy. And, of course, Peter was probably 7 offering Meirion some pretty nice investigations for him 8 to go and work on, for all I know. That's probably 9 why -- you know, you want to go off and do something 10 else. 11 MR POLLARD: Lots more things to come to, but let me ask you 12 that directly. 13 MR GILES: Um-hm. 14 MR POLLARD: What do you think, from what you know now, 15 having spoken to Meirion about it, what do you think was 16 the true reason or the reason why that investigation was 17 dropped? 18 MR GILES: Er, I -- I suspect there's multiple reasons, but 19 I think in the end the editor, you know, loss confidence 20 in his ability to run the story for a number of reasons. 21 One, you know, he was never completely sure about 22 the nature of the characters, you know, the 23 interviewees. However, if that was the case, you know, 24 I would have done a damn lot more to sit down and make 25 sure I tested that evidence and to check it and to watch</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 the record, and I suppose by Meirion who has some handle 2 on the fact that he was there. I'm going to run this 3 story, the charities are going to come at me. The press 4 are going to come at me, because they will say, "There 5 is the BBC shitting on its own." 6 The tributes are going to be pulled and everyone is 7 going to go completely apeshit about this. What 8 a nightmare. So unless someone at that point comes to 9 you from above -- this is where I think the real 10 important things has been slightly missed and says, 11 "Don't worry about any of that. Just keep going and see 12 what you get, if you can't run it now, let's look at the 13 evidence and see if you think it's worth -- worth 14 pursuing." 15 Now, I can see why that might happen, but why it was 16 dropped absolutely completely stone cold, never to be 17 touched again, don't go anywhere near it, I -- I find 18 much harder to understand. I suspect it was because -- 19 and in fact Meirion seems to hint at this himself -- 20 that they were worried that whatever they did, if they 21 then came back to it after -- after Christmas, people 22 would say, there you go, you had all this stuff, you 23 deliberately didn't run it ahead of Christmas, because 24 of your tributes. Somehow they may have got in their 25 mind that they couldn't win any other way. One of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 it. To make sure that, you know, I was across all the 2 information. He doesn't seem, from what I can gather 3 both in the emails and in the testimony -- I mean from 4 his blog, to have been as across that material as he 5 should have been, if that was what he was solely worried 6 about. 7 On top of that, he would have been slightly alarmed 8 that when the impact report came back from Jo Mathys, 9 saying this is going to run big, all domestic outlets. 10 Plus in the back of his mind, and I say no more than 11 that, would have been the sense that this would mean 12 that the BBC would inevitably have to pull the tributes 13 that he would have been aware of. I'm not saying that 14 anyone -- I think it is slightly ludicrous to assume, 15 unless you can find otherwise, that there will be an 16 email saying, "Don't run this, we have all these 17 tributes coming up." 18 To be honest, I find it slightly extraordinary that 19 anyone would even think it, but what you might think is 20 hang on a minute, what do I do if -- this guy has just 21 died, people were ten deep in the street applauding his 22 coffin as it goes through the streets of Leeds. I'm 23 going to basically say, on the say so of someone who by 24 her own admittance is damaged, was on lithium at various 25 points, and by a whole lot of other people who are off</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 things that Meirion has always referred to, and again 2 I have no evidence for that, so it was not in the 3 programme, was this sense that Peter was saying to him 4 at one point, "If only you hadn't actually got that 5 woman on camera". In other words: how, do we not run 6 this and it not come back? 7 But I can see why, as I have just explained, why all 8 those factors might cut across you. I can also see why 9 you might regard the institutional story as somehow more 10 important, but apologies to Kevin Marsh and others, that 11 strikes me -- the fact that they had five cases of abuse 12 themselves and the CPS say we dropped one case. I mean, 13 they already had four more, potentially than the CPS 14 were even telling them about. So what happened to them? 15 They assume that some of them have gone to the police, 16 there is still evidence of potential institutional 17 failure there anyway, why not keep going or put it and 18 come back to it? Say, look, do this, but keep an ear 19 out. 20 To be honest this is what I would have naturally 21 done, but I think something bothered them about carrying 22 on with it. I suspect it is because they were worried 23 that once the tributes went out, it would look like they 24 had deliberately sat on it, until -- 25 MR POLLARD: Until it was too late.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

1 MR GILES: That is -- that's my best guess, I'm not helped
 2 by the fact that none of these people, Peter Rippon or
 3 above, ever gave us a sort of proper briefing or went on
 4 the record, for their own reasons I'm sure.
 5 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 6 MR GILES: So I have to try to piece it together in my own
 7 mind.
 8 MR POLLARD: I think we will ask them.
 9 MR GILES: Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: Each of those people, with the aid of
 11 documents, about their decision-making process all the
 12 way through and the meetings they had.
 13 MR GILES: In the brief time that I did speak to
 14 Peter Rippon about this, and that literally was him
 15 coming up to me after a meeting in the corridor, one of
 16 the things he kept stressing -- and I think
 17 Steve Mitchell has stressed this to other programme
 18 editors -- was the fact that he was worried about the
 19 nature of the witnesses, the fact that they were
 20 damaged. He talks about the fact that: did she have
 21 [REDACTED] was there some kind of --
 22 He will probably talk to you about how the chat
 23 rooms meant that their evidence could have been
 24 cross-meshed, and all the rest of it.
 25 All of that is absolutely true, but I would have
 Page 41

1 been far more impressed by that if I had had any sense
 2 that he had actually got down and looked at the evidence
 3 firsthand himself, before coming to that judgment, but
 4 he doesn't appear to have even really done that. More
 5 to the point, even when all of that was happening, they
 6 had had [REDACTED] and they had all the stuff through
 7 the chat rooms and all the rest of it, he's the one
 8 saying excellent, prepare for TX.
 9 Once they know -- this is the killer for me -- once
 10 they know that they have confirmed the fact that
 11 Surrey Police interrogated Jimmy Savile under caution in
 12 2007. No one had any idea about that. What is really
 13 impressive is that Mark Williams-Thomas doesn't even
 14 know about it, and he worked for Surrey Police up until,
 15 whatever is was, 2001/2002. He doesn't even know
 16 about it, and yet there is the management of the
 17 BBC News, telling everybody that they set out to
 18 investigate an investigation that no one had any idea
 19 even existed.
 20 MR POLLARD: Until the very end of the process?
 21 MR GILES: Yes.
 22 So I find it odd that even finding that out, you
 23 wouldn't have thought, blimey, yes. Obviously,
 24 initially his instinct was, yes, go for it. So I'm very
 25 struck by that change.
 Page 42

1 I would also say something quickly as an editor on
 2 that. I think that if you run your team up the flagpole
 3 like that, tell them to prepare for TX and then suddenly
 4 turn around and say, "Stop what you are doing, pull it
 5 from the edit", you know that they are going to go.
 6 They will be extremely angry and concerned, and want to
 7 know what on earth is going on. It is just obvious that
 8 that is going to be a problem handling your journalists.
 9 If I did that, you know, on Panorama, I would expect
 10 to have quite a lot of trouble. You better be clear in
 11 your own mind. Now obviously he's fallen back on the
 12 CPS thing, but what you would absolutely do, as a sort
 13 of releasing the gasket was just, "But keep looking at
 14 it". That's what you do. That's how you -- that's how
 15 you manage people, especially investigative journalists.
 16 You give them a sense that they keep doing it. I don't
 17 mean to be sitting here sounding as though I'm
 18 condemning, with 20/20 hindsight, Peter Rippon for that.
 19 I'm just saying, as an editor at the BBC, who has to deal
 20 with all kinds of highly strung, high powered obsessive
 21 journalists -- wonderful though they all are -- you have
 22 to, you have to think about how you would manage that.
 23 MR POLLARD: Would it be fair to say, from what you have
 24 said, that if you were to put yourself in the position
 25 of the editor of Newsnight --
 Page 43

1 MR GILES: Yes.
 2 MR POLLARD: -- on whatever the date was, about December 5,
 3 last year, given precisely that material that had then
 4 been gathered, you might not have run a piece then --
 5 MR GILES: Yes.
 6 MR POLLARD: -- but you would certainly not have stood it
 7 down?
 8 MR GILES: Let's be absolutely clear about this. I'm not in
 9 the business of condemning -- and clearly nor are others
 10 in the BBC the idea that someone doesn't run a story, at
 11 any one time, potentially quicker than they would like
 12 anyway. In a programme like Newsnight you are going to
 13 have a constant ability to come back, and look at
 14 stories and put them out, kind of when you want. It's
 15 not like Panorama where I have a slot to fill and I have
 16 invested a lot of time and effort, and that puts a lot
 17 more pressure on you to really decide whether you are
 18 going to run it then or not. On a programme like
 19 Newsnight, you know you can come back to things. So I'm
 20 not condemning the decision not to broadcast it when he
 21 broadcasted it in any sense, I myself would probably
 22 have taken a different decision, what I just find
 23 absolutely baffling is the sense that you kill the whole
 24 thing, you kill the entire investigation and worse, you
 25 tell your journalists the worst thing you can tell any
 Page 44

1 investigative journalists, which is just stop doing it,
 2 don't think about it, do something else, preferably go
 3 to Azerbaijan, please, whatever you can do, please don't
 4 look at this.
 5 You know how journalists are sort of slightly
 6 conspiratorial anyway, you are just creating, apart from
 7 anything else, you are creating a notion in their head
 8 that there must be more to this, this doesn't make any
 9 sense. This man has completely changed.
 10 MR POLLARD: Just looking at that incident, as it were --
 11 I hope this doesn't call for a sort of conclusion that's
 12 not fair or you can't give.
 13 MR GILES: Yes.
 14 MR POLLARD: There has obviously been talk about whether the
 15 decision to drop that story was the result of pressure?
 16 MR GILES: Um-hm.
 17 MR POLLARD: And more to the point, unfair pressure or
 18 improper pressure. Do you think there was pressure from
 19 above to drop that story? If so, do you think it was
 20 more than just a conventional editorial process? In
 21 other words, one's boss saying, I don't think from what
 22 you have told me, the evidence really stacks up?
 23 MR GILES: Look, as the programme said explicitly, we find
 24 no evidence of -- of pressure, bar, I suppose, the
 25 hearsay -- the hearsay by Liz MacKean in her emails to

Page 45

1 colleagues that Peter was saying I'm at the end of
 2 a long political chain and, you know, I can't go to the
 3 wall on this one.
 4 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 5 MR GILES: All I know is that Stephen Mitchell was handling
 6 the process -- I imagine pretty regularly, because
 7 that's the way these things work -- with Peter.
 8 I have -- we have what we call routines, mine in current
 9 affairs is with Clive Edwards. I see him every week
 10 about everything. I talk to him constantly about
 11 everything. I imagine, because Peter was quite close to
 12 Stephen and to Helen -- this hasn't been picked up, but
 13 you might as well know, that his arrival as editor of
 14 Newsnight, having never really worked in television, let
 15 alone Newsnight was very much an act of Stephen Mitchell
 16 and Helen wanting to say, "We think radio sequence
 17 editors can just come and do Newsnight". So for that
 18 reason he's always been pretty close -- certainly to
 19 Stephen, very close. So I would have thought he
 20 discussed this sort of stuff all the time with him.
 21 So was there pressure from above? It depends what
 22 you call pressure, and there is no rule about this. It
 23 depends entirely on what you are like as an editor.
 24 You know, some editors will probably be far more
 25 attuned to the sorts of things they are told in a subtle

Page 46

1 way. No one's going to come in with great jackboots and
 2 say, "You are not going to run it". Well, not to me
 3 they haven't so far. Although, you know, you go further
 4 up the chain and sometimes programmes do just get put on
 5 hold for a bit. I have one at the moment. But if -- if
 6 someone like Helen comes in and says, as it is my
 7 understanding she did and you would be well -- you would
 8 be very advisable to find out exactly when she did
 9 that -- you know, this Savile story, we have to be
 10 careful, we can't just put -- you have to be sure in
 11 your own mind that it's true. On the one hand that's
 12 a completely fair reasonable and legitimate thing to
 13 say. Absolutely.
 14 But on the other it's how you say it. It's your
 15 relationship with her, isn't it. Now I can't --
 16 Helen -- Helen is -- I have a lot of respect for all
 17 these people, but, you know, sometimes pressure shows,
 18 reveals itself in all sorts of different ways. [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 I refer a hell of a lot of stuff that ends up with

Page 47

1 Helen, and often beyond. This idea that an editor just
 2 sits there, a BBC editor of a programme like Panorama or
 3 Newsnight just says, "Stuff this, I'm putting this out."
 4 Fine, but if it is legally contentious or in the case of
 5 Jimmy Savile blatantly sensitive, that's just
 6 ridiculous. That's just playing Russian Roulette with
 7 your programme. You, as a matter of reasonableness,
 8 talk to people about it, refer it up and kick it around.
 9 So Helen would have been aware of lots of these
 10 issues. Now, how Helen expresses that is a different
 11 matter. But I would return to the unusual nature of the
 12 way in which this programme was disposed of, which
 13 strikes me as, you know exceptional.
 14 It seems strange for a man who is, you know,
 15 vacillating from day to day about whether it is right to
 16 do or not, to suddenly be so sure that it should never
 17 be returned to. That seems an unusual thing for
 18 an editor -- an editor to be suddenly very clear about,
 19 having not previously been as clear.
 20 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 21 MR GILES: I suppose what I'm saying is someone -- they must
 22 have sat down and sort of war gamed it, if you like, at
 23 some point. Certainly Stephen and Peter would have
 24 done. Helen, I think you will find, says that she had
 25 very little to do and didn't know, and all the rest of

Page 48

1 it. You know, that's for you to decide whether it's
 2 plausible or proper that the Director of News wouldn't
 3 really know what evidence there was gathered by
 4 Newsnight on a subject as sensitive as Jimmy Savile
 5 having been a paedophile when you know that your
 6 corporation is about to run tribute programmes to him.
 7 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 8 MR BLAKELY: On this topic of the sensitivity, what's the
 9 role of the MPRL in all of this?
 10 MR GILES: Right. I'm glad you asked me about the MPRL.
 11 The MRPL, the Managed Programme Risk List is important
 12 in as much as it was something which has been introduced
 13 under Mark Thompson, and I don't know if it predates
 14 Queengate, but it is actually in answer to all of the
 15 stuff you have been reading about and hearing about,
 16 which is Chinese walls, silos and all the rest of it.
 17 The MPRL was a way of making sure that people across the
 18 BBC -- and there are a couple of things in the BBC that
 19 are set up to cross these divisions, can be discussed
 20 across the divisions. It goes up to something called
 21 the News board and then from thence it will go on --
 22 "thence", did I say that? I sound very pompous -- from
 23 then on it will go to Vision and elsewhere across the
 24 BBC, as far as I understand it, under the management of
 25 the head of editorial standards, which would have been

Page 49

1 David Jordan.
 2 So every week -- I don't know if it is in here, when
 3 you get my wretched bundle you will see I have actually
 4 put in there an example of the MPRL. Of course it's not
 5 my in my copied version.
 6 MR POLLARD: I have --
 7 MR GILES: Have you got one? I redacted some of those,
 8 because I didn't want them published, just in case this
 9 all gets published, but normally you wouldn't do that.
 10 Normally it would be there.
 11 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 12 MR GILES: So the MPRL is your way of signalling higher up
 13 the chain that you are doing something difficult.
 14 Frankly it is important inasmuch as if it is not in the
 15 MPRL and something terrible happens, you know that
 16 that's a bit of a problem. The worst thing you can do
 17 at the BBC, frankly, the cardinal sin -- you can do all
 18 sorts of terrible things and just about get away
 19 with it, but the worst thing you can do as an editor is
 20 fail to communicate. Fail to communicate things that
 21 are happening, both with your immediate boss or, if you
 22 think it's really important, your senior bosses.
 23 The MPRL is a way of ensuring that you are
 24 communicating. I'm asked, every week, to update my MPRL
 25 by Sarah Beck, who sits in Stephen Mitchell's office.

Page 50

1 Stephen Mitchell's office runs the MPRL for all of News
 2 programmes, and that includes television current affairs
 3 and it would include Newsnight.
 4 Do you want to know the significant fact about the
 5 MPRL -- I couldn't work out, once it goes to News board,
 6 a copy of that document is not only pushed across
 7 David Jordan's office, but it actually goes to a woman
 8 in the Director of Vision's office. I can't remember
 9 what her name is, but she would have worked with
 10 George Entwistle, and she's still there, I think. Now,
 11 whether anyone bothers to read it or not, that's that
 12 question for the higher-ups.
 13 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 14 MR GILES: I'm not always sure they do, but I have to say
 15 investigating Jimmy Savile as a paedophile would
 16 probably have echoed fairly loudly across any senior
 17 office.
 18 MR POLLARD: The list gets added to at various stages?
 19 MR GILES: Yes.
 20 MR POLLARD: News programmes do it and then presumably
 21 general news bulletins, the sort of main news
 22 gathering --
 23 MR GILES: I assume so. I don't really know about news
 24 gathering and news bulletins, I assume, because I work
 25 directly to News programmes, that Newsnight do pretty

Page 51

1 well what Panorama does, and that all goes up to
 2 Sarah Beck, and then she compiles it and then that is
 3 handed up to News group, or News board, who sit across
 4 the pan-news. Once it gets to up to that kind of level,
 5 once it gets to David Jordan then it is circulated as
 6 well, across and into Vision.
 7 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 8 MR GILES: So it is significant in terms of this case,
 9 clearly, about warning Vision that this might have been
 10 on the cards.
 11 MR POLLARD: Yes. We're following the trail of those --
 12 MR GILES: Let me save you a bit of time and tell you what
 13 I was told. This is one of these moments where I will
 14 probably have to say this is a [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 they say early on in this investigative process,
 21 although I have my suspicions when that might be.
 22 I think it is something like 21 to 28 November, and
 23 discovering it is no longer on the MPRL, and emailing up
 24 to Stephen Mitchell's office to ask why that is. And
 25 then being told, "It's been taken off".

Page 52

1 Now I was told by this person -- [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 but I will keep it that way for the moment -- that it
 4 had been mentioned to them that this was because
 5 Stephen Mitchell, and I assume Peter, did not want
 6 Vision to know about it.
 7 Now, can I first of all say that is a pretty
 8 exceptional step. I have never done that. If I'm
 9 worried about something in the MPRL, I give it some
 10 ludicrous name, "Project Winter" I have at the moment.
 11 Which is, you know -- but even, that being said, that
 12 particular project, which I'm due to put out before
 13 Christmas, I have already discussed with the director of
 14 programmes in Northern Ireland and the controller of
 15 BBC1, anyway. So, you know, we do talk.
 16 But to take it off the MPRL because you are worried
 17 about Vision getting it, is unusual and I suspect that
 18 that's -- I will have to conjecture, if that is the
 19 case, and if there is an email saying that, well, you
 20 will find it, so you will show that's odd when you are
 21 in the middle of an investigation, unless you have
 22 already decided that there is going to be no further
 23 investigation, but crucially I think it says, they don't
 24 want this story to get out.
 25 MR POLLARD: Yes.

Page 53

1 MR GILES: They don't want anyone to know. I could put
 2 a pretty benign spin on it and say this was
 3 Stephen Mitchell protecting Peter Rippon from other
 4 people finding out about it and putting pressure on him
 5 within the BBC, and that could happen. But at the same
 6 time it's a slightly odd thing. It's an odd thing not
 7 to let anyone know in Vision. And to me, I am afraid,
 8 that speaks of a slightly paranoid and from my
 9 perspective as someone who as I have said in my sheet
 10 works across Vision and News, as we all do in current
 11 affairs television, as opposed to -- this is where it
 12 gets complicated -- daily news programmes like
 13 Newsnight.
 14 That's odd, that's what I would say.
 15 THE JUDGE: Just so I'm a bit clearer --
 16 MR GILES: Yes.
 17 THE JUDGE: -- what you mention we're pretty much across.
 18 MR GILES: Good.
 19 THE JUDGE: [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 MR GILES: [REDACTED]
 22 MR POLLARD: Okay, yes.
 23 MR GILES: [REDACTED]
 24 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 25 MR GILES: [REDACTED]

Page 54

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 MR POLLARD: It would be fair assumption, would it, that
 7 Sarah Beck would not take that off, on her own back?
 8 She is effectively an assistant to Stephen Mitchell?
 9 MR GILES: Effectively she is -- she is a bit more senior
 10 than an assistant, she is a proper journalist in her own
 11 right. But she has got a sort of editorial role and she
 12 will check with me what I want and want off the MPRL. I
 13 update it, I give it to her, she will ring up and say,
 14 "What are you going to do, do you want me to keep that
 15 on?"
 16 When she asks questions like that, it's usually
 17 because something has already been broadcast, so I don't
 18 need it to go on, particularly. Sometimes I keep it on
 19 a bit longer if in case there is going to be fallout --
 20 THE JUDGE: Have you ever withheld anything from that list,
 21 anything that you thought was very contentious?
 22 MR GILES: Not consciously, no. When I have put something
 23 on it I think is contentious -- to be honest there are
 24 times when every other Panorama should be on the MPRL,
 25 and that is kind of job of Panorama to do things that

Page 55

1 are likely to be slightly risky, but if it is
 2 particularly contentious, that's when I make sure it is
 3 on the MPRL. And if I think there's a problem with it,
 4 you know, transmitting everywhere, like I say, I give it
 5 some daft -- you don't need to say -- you can say very
 6 little. It doesn't need to say very much, but to take
 7 it off is quite a -- quite a step.
 8 MR POLLARD: Of course.
 9 MR GILES: Certainly before you have killed the
 10 investigation, yes.
 11 MR POLLARD: One of the purposes of that MPRL is, to some
 12 extent, I imagine, to stop precisely the sort of
 13 blowback on the Savile thing --
 14 MR GILES: Exactly.
 15 MR POLLARD: -- that did happen. You have made the point,
 16 I think, in your note about effectively this being
 17 a counter argument to this idea that the BBC lives in
 18 silos and it is right that nobody speaks to each
 19 other --
 20 MR GILES: Yes, it is wrong, they shouldn't.
 21 MR POLLARD: The point of that is to have a corporation-wide
 22 alert about something that one part of the organisation
 23 is doing that another part needs to know about?
 24 MR GILES: That was exactly the point of it. Whether it
 25 really works like that in practice you would have to ask

Page 56

<p>1 people at different divisions higher up. Can I also say 2 that I have monthly routines and a constant dialogue 3 myself anyway with the controller of BBC1. And this is 4 one of the things I really wanted to highlight about 5 this whole Chinese walls concept. For a programme like 6 Panorama, being part of current affairs television, my 7 staff are News and they are paid for by the News 8 directorate, where they are staff. 9 The programmes themselves -- you might find this 10 slightly bizarre, but the programmes themselves are paid 11 for by BBC Vision. My budget for Panorama comes out of 12 BBC Vision. On top of that BBC Vision are -- because 13 News decided to cut it -- overwhelmingly paying for my 14 investigations fund as well. This was because 15 Mark Thompson stepped in after News slashed that budget 16 to insist that everyone else picked up the slack, so 17 Vision did that. 18 I think now it's paid for by Corporate, Corporate 19 Centre. I don't know how much longer that will go on 20 for. But Vision paid for Panoramas. On top of that, 21 for the specials, the 60-minute ones, which are often 22 the biggest impact ones, the ones like the 23 Winterbourne Home undercover film, I have to go to 24 Danny Cohen at an early stage and say, "Look, will you 25 commission this as an hour?" Page 57</p>	<p>1 impact on Sport's ability, potentially, to broadcast the 2 FIFA World Cup. On top of which there were plenty of 3 people inside Sport who were very keen that England won 4 the World Cup bid, and they made that very clear 5 publicly. 6 Now, when that film was being billed, before it had 7 even been billed -- this is where I do differ from 8 Newsnight, I have to put a billing in the Radio Times to 9 explain what my programme is, sometimes I can get all 10 mysterious and say it is a weekly programme -- 11 THE JUDGE: Special investigation. 12 MR GILES: Special investigation. But with FIFA I had to go 13 to Helen Boaden and to Danny Cohen and basically write 14 out the entire story, as much as I could, in terms of 15 proposing what the investigation was saying before Helen 16 would -- would clear it and Danny would bill it. 17 On top of that, Helen, at that point, went to 18 Barbara Slater and said, "We're doing this programme" 19 and Barbara of course said "fine". The idea that at 20 this point Barbara would say, "I'm sorry, you can't, 21 that's just terrible it will destroy ..." To be honest, 22 it is kind of unthinkable and if they did start doing 23 that it would only rebound and not get anywhere. People 24 accept within the BBC that journalism does these things. 25 So that went all the way up there on that one story. Page 59</p>
<p>1 MR POLLARD: And effectively pay the whole cost of it? 2 MR GILES: Yes. 3 The idea that I wouldn't tell Vision that I have 4 this sensitive investigation, as Panorama editor is -- 5 you know, it's daft. It would be unusual for -- 6 I suppose it is slightly harder for Newsnight, because 7 they are all -- they are all paid for by News and there 8 I think Stephen and Helen obviously -- this was what the 9 MPRL story would indicate -- jealously guard how much 10 News tells Vision. That to me is very much part of the 11 way they see Vision. It's not the way I see Vision, but 12 it's the way they see Vision. 13 MR POLLARD: Is that just to do with money? 14 MR GILES: No, no. It's not to do with -- it's not to do 15 with money. I suppose it means that they don't have to, 16 because there's no money, because Vision don't pay for 17 it, they don't have to talk to Vision, whereas I have to 18 all the time. 19 MR POLLARD: Sure. 20 MR GILES: Just to be clear about this, I have an incredibly 21 good relationship with people in Vision like 22 Danny Cohen, who are completely fine about the sorts of 23 films I do, even in -- as have other directorates been. 24 For example, FIFA, that programme that Panorama did at 25 the end of 2010, was of course going to have a massive Page 58</p>	<p>1 Winterbourne View, again, Danny Cohen. There are other 2 stories where you just talk constantly not just to the 3 Director of News, but to the controller of BBC1, 4 sometimes the Director of Vision, director of Sport, 5 a couple of times. 6 The only time I have ever come under any pressure 7 was -- silly really -- was doorstepping 8 Englebert Humperdink. Because though I had told Danny 9 I was doing something on Eurovision, so just, you know, 10 watch it -- and fine, great, it was -- he was 11 doorstepped outside of -- or on Radio 2 property or 12 something, and they got very sensitive about all this 13 and I can understand. People rang up and Danny rang up 14 and said "are you sure?" The problem is I feel bad 15 because I asked him to do this. And I said, "Look, 16 Danny, that's fine." 17 He said, "Look, that's totally your decision, 18 absolutely your decision. I'm just saying make sure 19 you -- just think about it a bit." 20 I ran it anyway. 21 MR POLLARD: Yes. 22 MR GILES: A part of me actually deep down probably ran it 23 partly because of people telling me, "Don't run it." 24 MR POLLARD: Yes. 25 MR GILES: But literally it is like that. It's a very Page 60</p>

<p>1 healthy reasonable mature understanding -- you know, 2 reasonable way of looking at what the BBC's core purpose 3 is. Now that could vary from controller to controller, 4 but I've never had any trouble like that. 5 MR POLLARD: Would that suggest to you that the logical 6 thing to do, if there was a Jimmy Savile interview 7 running, would be actually to let it be known -- at 8 whatever appropriate level it was -- up that chain, just 9 so people could be aware of it? 10 MR GILES: Yes. Yes. That would -- because you are 11 sensitive about it getting out, then you would probably 12 reserve that for the Director of Vision or potentially, 13 I suppose -- you see this is where I don't know, 14 Peter Rippon may or may not have a relationship with the 15 controller of BBC2, who does take an interest in 16 Newsnight. Maybe he didn't have a particular 17 relationship with Janice Hadlow, who is the controller. 18 But he may have spoken to her, because obviously he 19 would have been aware that one of the programmes coming 20 up, was coming up on BBC2. What you would say is pretty 21 well what Helen Boaden ended up saying, but probably a 22 bit longer. Something along the lines of, "We're 23 looking at Savile, it is quite serious stuff it involves 24 potentially child abuse, we have not got anywhere near 25 there yet. Just so you should know, if we do I will</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 David Jordan, I assume, to the likes of -- at that time 2 Caroline Thomson, possibly Mark Thompson at some point. 3 I think probably the Vision and the controllers were 4 probably made aware. So Danny Cohen and Janice Hadlow 5 would probably have been made aware by the director of 6 Vision, and then that would all trickle down as much as 7 they want it. You can see to some extent why that might 8 be a slightly difficult thing -- if you are attempting 9 to do an investigation that you still are extremely wary 10 of actually putting out, and you are conscious of the 11 damage limitation that you have to do just making sure 12 that if people got wind of this, and this does happen to 13 me on Panorama occasionally, people get wind of the fact 14 that you are planning a Panorama and immediately it's, 15 "If you don't broadcast it on Monday, then, you know, 16 there's clearly a conspiracy". 17 I had a bit of that with the Savile one, where there 18 was a bit of: is Panorama going to broadcast this on 19 Monday or not? And the Mail put out some story saying 20 there were fears that we were going to shelve it because 21 we didn't want to put George on the hook, or something. 22 That's sometimes what can happen once word spreads 23 that there's a film. The moment that had got out, there 24 would have been potentially a story in the press about: 25 what are you going to do about your tributes? Are you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 give you a heads up, because clearly that is going to 2 affect your schedule." 3 She sort of said all of that, apparently, without 4 mentioning the word "child abuse". She also said that 5 pretty late in the day, I have to say. I would have 6 assumed that that kind of conversation would have 7 happened earlier. 8 MR POLLARD: That is the 10-second? 9 MR GILES: Hilton, busy lunch conversation within film and 10 television. The 10 seconds, by the way, is something 11 that George has not confirmed; that appears to come from 12 the other side. 13 MR POLLARD: We will get the accounts of that conversation. 14 MR GILES: I am sure you will. 15 That, to me, seemed pretty late in the process and 16 pretty damn short, and that's the sort of thing the MPRL 17 should have engineered a lot earlier. 18 MR BLAKELY: Who picks up on the entries in the MPRL? Whose 19 job is it to spot, "Hang on, we need to have 20 a conversation about this"? 21 MR GILES: Sarah Beck would hand it to News group, so News 22 board would know, so that would be Helen, Stephen, 23 David Jordan, others, and at that point, as well, 24 I think a copy then goes to Vision. Now that goes to 25 the Director of Vision's office, it would go via</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 going to run the tributes? You can't run these tributes 2 if you are investigating him for -- or they might have 3 said it is outrageous, how dare they do this? And all 4 the rest of it. 5 So I can see why they would be nervous, but having 6 said that, there is still a way of handling that that is 7 sensible, I would have thought. I have to say I get the 8 sense that people at the top of Vision now -- I haven't 9 spoken to George, but obviously I have a fairly -- you 10 know, are a bit, a bit put out that they had no idea 11 about this. 12 MR POLLARD: Yes. 13 MR GILES: And are responsible for putting out tributes. 14 You know, they are not -- it's not very nice for 15 them, frankly. I know that sounds pretty -- a slightly 16 strange concept given that these are powerful players in 17 television, but it must make you quite angry to think 18 that this stuff was sitting in the can in a BBC News 19 programme, and no one told you about it and you put out 20 "Shane Ritchie's Jim'll Fix It". 21 MR POLLARD: Okay, back to early October this year. You are 22 having conversations with Meirion and you are receiving 23 a lot of background about the whole dropping of the 24 thing. You know that the Exposure programme is 25 imminent.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

1 At what stage do you decided to the Panorama and
 2 what is, sort of briefly, the process by which you
 3 greenlight it?
 4 MR GILES: Okay, well to be honest in initial stages you
 5 tend to slightly stumble into these things. It was not
 6 clear to me, initially, that Meirion would come over to
 7 Panorama in any capacity or that I immediately would do
 8 the story.
 9 I think if you look at the timeline I gave you,
 10 having gone through emails and things like that, I would
 11 say that it sort of crystallises around the Thursday and
 12 the Friday, and it certainly is clear by the Friday,
 13 because then I'm actively asking permission to bring
 14 Meirion over to Panorama. At that point I'm thinking
 15 primarily about it being a film about Jimmy Savile's
 16 abuses. I'm not thinking primarily about it being
 17 a film about Newsnight's failure to run that story.
 18 MR POLLARD: The danger, presumably if it is principally
 19 a film about Jimmy Savile's abuses, is that it will
 20 really just look like a rather stale version of what ITV
 21 have done?
 22 MR GILES: Yes, but remember at that point there was just
 23 a huge welter of stuff coming out.
 24 MR POLLARD: True.
 25 MR GILES: There is Stoke Mandeville, there was Broadmoor,

Page 65

1 these were pretty shocking stories by themselves. Just
 2 one of them would have been pretty shocking, but there
 3 was so much happening that what I really wanted to do
 4 was get a handle, a handle on what was becoming
 5 a firestorm of stories that were coming out.
 6 Also, you know, speculation about other people
 7 within the BBC and also what the BBC knew. And one of
 8 the points of it, I thought in the end of the
 9 Panorama -- I know it got obviously waylaid by the
 10 Newsnight revelations, which were obviously
 11 fundamentally the main revelations and were the news on
 12 the day, on that Monday the 22nd, but the vast majority
 13 of the 40 minutes of that film was about -- and I was
 14 fascinated by this, how on earth did this happen? How
 15 did we get to this point -- there were clearly stories
 16 of people inside the BBC discussing this and I felt
 17 I wanted to get to the bottom of that anyway.
 18 So initially -- Meirion's initial reason for joining
 19 Panorama in my mind was to get back to some of these
 20 victims, get back to Duncroft, try and talk to his aunt,
 21 that is one of the early things that we tried to do,
 22 find out if there has been institutional failure at
 23 Duncroft, if there had been institutional failure in the
 24 BBC, if there had been institutional failure across
 25 a wide range.

Page 66

1 I actually had to ring -- I was asked to ring
 2 Peter Rippon that afternoon, that Friday, I think just
 3 before George's email came out to ask, you know, if
 4 I could take Meirion and he said "fine".
 5 I can't remember exactly how I put it to him, but
 6 I do remember saying, completely inaccurately as it
 7 turned out, that I didn't think I would be putting this
 8 programme out for quite a while. That was my thinking
 9 then, I wanted to do a proper long term look at this
 10 story. Events, you know, overtook that.
 11 He did say, at this point, "I would like to be able
 12 to brief you about what happened and about Meirion, and
 13 why I had problem the with the story", and I said "fine,
 14 absolutely terrific, of course you can do that, I want
 15 you to do that." Which made me think that at some point
 16 I probably hinted at the idea of -- or was reasonably
 17 explicit about the idea that I might be doing the
 18 Newsnight side of it, as part of that.
 19 And that crystallised pretty quickly and I remember
 20 seeing George's email that night and thinking -- by this
 21 stage I had a pretty clear handle, I think, a reasonably
 22 clear handle on problems with the blog, on why Meirion
 23 was especially concerned that this was not an
 24 investigation into a police investigation. Yet there
 25 was George's email that afternoon -- I think at about 5

Page 67

1 or so.
 2 MR POLLARD: 5.42.
 3 MR GILES: Yes, after I had spoken to Peter Rippon, saying
 4 that was what this was. And I remember being pretty --
 5 pretty shocked about that. So I think at some point
 6 over the weekend as well, I think Miles Goslett wrote
 7 a very long piece in The Sunday Times Review. I could
 8 feel that we were edging back -- back, edging more, as
 9 well, towards the Newsnight story.
 10 By now Meirion had come over with information. He
 11 brought over the transcripts of [REDACTED] interview,
 12 [REDACTED] interview, you know, he started showing, as
 13 you can see -- as you will see in my bundle -- he gave
 14 me a timeline fairly early on. I think the 3rd or the
 15 4th of events and immediately you could see that there
 16 was a switch. Something had happened, Peter Rippon had
 17 changed position between 25 November and the 29th. And
 18 then again on the 3rd, further, hardened, and that was
 19 interesting.
 20 I was also aware, as any reasonable albeit utterly
 21 conflicted and confused and slightly worried journalist,
 22 would be, that I was sitting on a story that everyone
 23 else in the press was speculating on, talking about,
 24 demanding to know and there was I sitting there looking
 25 at what was essentially crucial evidence. And at the

Page 68

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1 same time, becoming increasingly aware of the fact that
 2 the BBC public statements were inaccurate.
 3 You know, fairly soon after that, the following
 4 week, it became clear that we were going to move more
 5 and more in towards the Newsnight story as well.
 6 MR POLLARD: You obviously discussed it with Clive?
 7 MR GILES: Yes.
 8 MR POLLARD: Is that as far up the chain as it went?
 9 MR GILES: No, not immediately -- because it went higher
 10 actually, because Clive discussed with Stephen Mitchell
 11 the idea of us using Meirion, on the Friday.
 12 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 13 MR GILES: And Stephen said fine. They were all, "Jolly
 14 good, we think Panorama should be doing this."
 15 MR POLLARD: But not at that stage necessarily --
 16 MR GILES: Newsnight, I'm not sure the penny had completely
 17 dropped that that is where we might go.
 18 At this stage, remember, the BBC was fairly
 19 relaxed -- not relaxed, but it had been quite slow to
 20 respond generally to the speed with which this story was
 21 developing, and it may not have crystallised in their
 22 minds exactly what could or would happen, or that
 23 Panorama may end up doing a critique of what they are
 24 saying; it didn't immediately occur to me that is where
 25 it might get to. It didn't take that long to work that

Page 69

1 out. I think that took them longer.
 2 As I said, we had discussed with Stephen Mitchell
 3 doing a Savile Panorama. In fact I remember, I can't
 4 remember if it was the Friday, but Helen Boaden came
 5 running around, in fact it might have been that Friday
 6 that Stephen rang me and they were suggesting names for
 7 people I could chase up who were in the heart of
 8 Radio 1, around the time of Jimmy Savile. His
 9 producer's name came up, this was obviously something
 10 that News had been investigating. And Stephen mentioned
 11 this to me on the phone.
 12 Then I think on the Friday or the Monday,
 13 Helen Boaden came running around to our office, which
 14 she doesn't really do very often, this is a new office,
 15 we are all on the same floor, so that has been
 16 interesting and said, "Have you heard about this
 17 character"? Have you been chasing him up?" We said,
 18 no, absolutely fantastic, great. Meirion was there,
 19 Karen Wightman was there and I was there and she was
 20 very -- she can be very friendly, "Good, good for you."
 21 THE JUDGE: At this stage the thrust of Panorama is
 22 obviously about Savile's abuse?
 23 MR GILES: Yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: And if you like the historic connection with
 25 the BBC?

Page 70

1 MR GILES: And other institutions, while at the same time
 2 probably even then I'm feeling a bit awkward, because
 3 I'm thinking at the back of my mind anyway, that we are
 4 probably going to have focus on, as well, on the BBC's
 5 decision on this currently, over the dropping of the
 6 Newsnight.
 7 So it is a slightly awkward moment, I remember.
 8 I think everyone there would probably have said that.
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 MR POLLARD: I hope I'm not sort of skipping a stage in
 14 this, but there is a serious issue for you, which
 15 I think you make clear in your notes, that you are
 16 trying to get the official BBC description of what
 17 happened?
 18 MR GILES: Yes.
 19 MR POLLARD: To include it in the programme. At the same
 20 time the BBC via the blog and various public statements
 21 are trying to make public various versions of the
 22 sequence of events.
 23 How do you cope with that, or are you just focusing
 24 on the content of programme?
 25 MR GILES: Sorry, how do I cope with the fact their comments

Page 71

1 appear to not necessarily -- not match what I know to
 2 be the truth?
 3 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 4 MR GILES: Well I will tell you. I point that out where
 5 possible, I would say. I know now, more than I realised
 6 then, that clearly others, including Meirion, were doing
 7 the same. I hadn't necessarily twigged -- I certainly
 8 had not twigged that he had spoken to David Jordan on
 9 Thursday the 4th, that's pretty surprising to me,
 10 especially given David Jordan's evidence in the Select
 11 Committee, [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED] Well, actually we did put a little thing up
 16 saying, "Recorded on the Friday".
 17 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 18 MR GILES: But why would he make such a point of that?
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 72

<p>1 [REDACTED]</p> <p>2 I have to say I had no idea, that I now know now,</p> <p>3 that Meirion had also emailed Stephen Mitchell on the</p> <p>4 Monday, October 8. On top of that, as you have also</p> <p>5 seen, him and Liz emailed Peter Rippon and</p> <p>6 Stephen Mitchell on Wednesday the 3rd, making it</p> <p>7 absolutely clear this was inaccurate. Peter Rippon even</p> <p>8 emailed Stephen to say, "Yes, it is inaccurate. So</p> <p>9 let's just keep our press line to this", and</p> <p>10 Stephen Mitchell does nothing. Not only that, he sends</p> <p>11 me an email the following Tuesday or Wednesday to say:</p> <p>12 "Now that I understand Meirion has expressed to the</p> <p>13 Director General that his position is, you know, that he</p> <p>14 disagrees with some of context of his email. This means</p> <p>15 that Meirion and Liz are in a difficult position</p> <p>16 vis-a-vis your programme ..."</p> <p>17 He doesn't make any mention of the fact that Meirion</p> <p>18 and Liz have been telling him the same thing, virtually</p> <p>19 from the moment the blog starts. Anyway I didn't know</p> <p>20 that then. Obviously around that time, as I say in the</p> <p>21 timeline, there is becoming a bigger and bigger issue</p> <p>22 about: how on earth are we going to use Meirion?</p> <p>23 I have to, say right from the start, I mean this is</p> <p>24 obviously very much in the mind of the editor -- when</p> <p>25 things start getting difficult and legal, that will not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 Stephen Mitchell's email to me and Clive Edwards about</p> <p>2 the use of Liz MacKean and Meirion Jones, and his</p> <p>3 concerns given Meirion's letter to the DG.</p> <p>4 I should also add that on the Tuesday morning I met</p> <p>5 Liz MacKean, as I said in my timeline, and chatted to</p> <p>6 her for quite a long time.</p> <p>7 THE JUDGE: At whose request?</p> <p>8 MR GILES: Her request. She emailed me and said</p> <p>9 I understand you are talking to Meirion, or Meirion is</p> <p>10 involved, I don't expect to be involved, I'm still on</p> <p>11 Newsnight, but I would very much like to talk to you.</p> <p>12 And I said, "Absolutely, please." And, yes, Tuesday</p> <p>13 morning, I think, 10.30 which would have been -- sorry,</p> <p>14 I have lost -- what does it say in any timeline. Yes,</p> <p>15 the 9th.</p> <p>16 MR POLLARD: Tuesday the 9th.</p> <p>17 MR GILES: I met her at Television Centre foyer, slightly</p> <p>18 awkwardly Peter Rippon walked past while we were</p> <p>19 talking, so I knew that was going to come back, and it</p> <p>20 did.</p> <p>21 Talking to her, the thing I really wanted to</p> <p>22 establish with her, who I didn't know in the same way</p> <p>23 that I knew Meirion from the past, because I hadn't</p> <p>24 worked with her, was whether or not she broadly</p> <p>25 substantiated or backed up what Meirion was saying.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 necessarily be enough, so we did have to move on that.</p> <p>2 I was always aware that he would have no editorial</p> <p>3 control of the film, inasmuch as he was working to two</p> <p>4 very senior producers, and Karen Wightman, who is an</p> <p>5 absolutely doggedly, rigorously independent deputy</p> <p>6 editor. There was not any way in which he was going to</p> <p>7 control what we did in the edit. He never came into the</p> <p>8 edit, he was never shown the film.</p> <p>9 MR POLLARD: His status was effectively as a super</p> <p>10 researcher?</p> <p>11 MR GILES: Given that he was a producer on Newsnight, we</p> <p>12 probably at this point had been thinking of him as</p> <p>13 a sort of "associate producer". That's a kind of</p> <p>14 catch-all title that people get sometimes when they come</p> <p>15 in, they are quite senior, but they are not quite part</p> <p>16 of the chain or the process -- I hesitate to use the</p> <p>17 word "chain" -- but they are quite senior in terms of</p> <p>18 the nature of what you are going. That was initially</p> <p>19 where I saw him being.</p> <p>20 After Steve's email, I then --are we pausing?</p> <p>21 MR POLLARD: Okay, just for the transcribers.</p> <p>22 (4.38 pm)</p> <p>23 (A short break)</p> <p>24 (4.48 pm)</p> <p>25 MR GILES: We got as far as I had mentioned</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 Because Meirion seemed to be saying some fairly --</p> <p>2 obviously backed up to some extent by his emails, but</p> <p>3 Meirion's general sense of this sudden about turn, this</p> <p>4 sudden desire to bury this story, all these things that</p> <p>5 seemed pretty surprising and shocking in their way,</p> <p>6 whether she backed that. And it just struck me straight</p> <p>7 away that she did, pretty well word for word.</p> <p>8 I have to say this is one of things I have always</p> <p>9 found slightly surprising about the BBC management, News</p> <p>10 management and to some extent above centre, Corporate,</p> <p>11 their responses to all this has been very, very focused</p> <p>12 on Meirion, almost to the extent that Liz just somehow</p> <p>13 does not really exist, or isn't really there saying the</p> <p>14 same thing. Because she has been saying the same thing</p> <p>15 all the way along.</p> <p>16 And that's one of the things that really disturbed</p> <p>17 me about all this that you had the reporter and the</p> <p>18 producer both of them absolutely singing from the same</p> <p>19 hymn sheet about a story as sensitive as this, about the</p> <p>20 way they feel it has been handled or mishandled, both in</p> <p>21 November/December 2011 and then more recently once the</p> <p>22 Exposure comes out.</p> <p>23 One of the things that Meirion said to me when</p> <p>24 I rang him that Monday the 1st and then subsequently</p> <p>25 I was the first senior manager -- or manager if you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

1 like, I don't know how senior I am -- to actually talk
 2 to him about this properly, to sit down. Not just sort
 3 of exchange emails as Stephen and him did fairly --
 4 THE JUDGE: First, since when?
 5 MR GILES: I assume since the whole Exposure thing blew up
 6 I'm assuming that they must have discussed this all in
 7 the past at some point. Certainly discussed it with
 8 Peter. I think it was more that Peter Rippon was not
 9 really talking to Meirion at this point. There was
 10 a strong sense, as you can see from the exchange between
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 When I first contacted him, he was worried about, you
 15 know, his position, his job. He genuinely felt under
 16 threat. So I was surprised by that.
 17 And I think, after me, the next sort of senior
 18 person I suppose would have been Ken MacQuarrie, but he
 19 was very much a kind of gofer or go between and there
 20 was Peter Horrocks. And it was interesting that Meirion
 21 again felt incredibly reassured to be able to sit down
 22 with Peter Horrocks when he was given overall, sort of,
 23 executive top of line management authority over the
 24 Panorama.
 25 That this was again one of the first times he had

Page 77

1 had a chance to talk. And that's one of the things
 2 I find surprising, is how no one appears to have sought
 3 Liz or Meirion out properly or got them all in a room or
 4 at any point in order to make sure that the whole
 5 thing -- that everyone could agree properly on what had
 6 happened and what, you know, the line should be or what
 7 the BBC's position should be or even what the BBC should
 8 do going forward.
 9 MR POLLARD: Does it appear that the Ken MacQuarrie
 10 intervention, as it were, which was pretty limited in
 11 sort of scope and purpose, I suppose --
 12 MR GILES: Yes.
 13 MR POLLARD: -- that didn't really succeed in getting --
 14 MR GILES: No.
 15 MR POLLARD: -- an agreed version of events, did it?
 16 MR GILES: Let's address the agreed version of events.
 17 Let's address this, because what happened on the
 18 Thursday morning [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED] because, following Steve's emails, it
 20 was becoming increasingly clear that I had to work out
 21 how I'm going to use Meirion. At that point I was still
 22 thinking that I could try him as an associate producer,
 23 but I was becoming aware that we were probably going to
 24 have to interview him, and probably Liz as well. Liz
 25 had agreed to do one, as had Meirion. And that could

Page 78

1 create all sorts of problems.
 2 There has been some precedent for this. Years ago
 3 I strangely managed to interview myself for my own film,
 4 which is unusual, but it has happened, which is the
 5 Panorama I said before on the friendly fire incident in
 6 Iraq. Where actually my assistant producer interviewed
 7 me. So there had been some precedent for that.
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 MR POLLARD: [REDACTED]
 14 MR GILES: [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED] (1).
 24 (2). [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 79

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]

Page 80

1 [REDACTED]
 2 I was trying to make my point about matters that
 3 I was already aware were wrong with the blog. I think
 4 I was specific about the police, about all the women not
 5 having been gone to the police and frankly I think
 6 I said something along the lines of, "You know perfectly
 7 well that cannot be right because of [REDACTED] in her
 8 interview on ITV News, there was talk afterwards both
 9 then and in the papers, I believe, about going to the
 10 police. Now she was going to go to the police." She
 11 was actually taken there the next day by
 12 Mark Williams-Thomas. How on earth can we say that
 13 she'd already been to the police?
 14 I didn't know at that point that these emails had
 15 already been exchanged. [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED] he had already discussed
 17 this with Stephen Mitchell, as had Liz. I didn't know
 18 that he had raised this point, repeatedly and that he
 19 had already told this to Ken MacQuarrie, on the Tuesday.
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 And the same with the position on the Surrey Police
 Page 81

1 investigation. If people had known about the
 2 Surrey Police investigation, why on earth do you think
 3 that when the exposure first came to light, 1, 2,
 4 3 October was the fact that he had been interviewed
 5 under caution by Surrey Police front page news? No one
 6 knew about the Surrey Police investigation, so how on
 7 earth can you say this was an investigation into an
 8 investigation no one knew anything about? It's just
 9 logically wrong and it can't just be a difference of
 10 opinion.
 11 MR BLAKELY: You may have said, I think I missed it. This
 12 conversation you were just recounting, what date was it
 13 on?
 14 MR GILES: Thursday morning. 4th. Not the 4th, the 11th,
 15 silly me, circa 10.45.
 16 MR BLAKELY: Could I just ask you very quickly.
 17 Stephen Mitchell says in an email on 9 October that he's
 18 had a long conversation with you. I don't know if you
 19 recall that?
 20 MR GILES: To who.
 21 MR BLAKELY: He says to Peter Rippon that he had this
 22 conversation with you.
 23 MR GILES: Okay, about what?
 24 MR BLAKELY: That's all it says, it's not something that's
 25 mention on your timeline, I just wondered if you knew
 Page 82

1 what that might be a reference to?
 2 MR GILES: Let me think. I will tell you what that might
 3 have been. I think I know what that might have been.
 4 That was the Guardian getting wind -- 8 October we got a
 5 call from the Guardian, the press officer took a call
 6 from Dan Sabbagh wanting to know: is Panorama doing this
 7 story? At that point I was trying to dead bat all of
 8 that. I had a long discussion with Helen Deller, if you
 9 look at the email chain it is kind of comical, they come
 10 up with a fantastic line along the lines of, "Panorama
 11 never discusses investigations ..." and, of course, the
 12 next day it is reported in the Guardian anyway that we
 13 are doing it.
 14 I can't remember if it was the Monday night. It
 15 might have been Monday evening, where Stephen was
 16 talking to me and saying, "What's going on generally?"
 17 I'm saying, "Look I've not confirmed that I'm doing this
 18 yet." That was my position pretty well -- because I did
 19 not want to confirm, I did not want it to be clear that
 20 I was to actually doing this film formally --
 21 MR POLLARD: Either at all or about Newsnight?
 22 MR GILES: I think at all.
 23 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 24 MR GILES: At all. I knew it was sensitive. I certainly
 25 did not want it out there that Panorama was doing this,
 Page 83

1 because I knew that would create its own instant
 2 pressures. Of course it appeared that was
 3 overoptimistic of me. I think it appeared in the
 4 Dan Sabbagh piece -- I can dig it up for you, it's in
 5 here -- I think it is either the Tuesday or the
 6 Wednesday, pretty well saying Panorama are doing it.
 7 They talk interestingly in that piece about us doing
 8 a thing on abuse, the history of abuse. There is no
 9 real mention of Newsnight.
 10 Steve rang me one of those nights, it might have
 11 been the Monday night or the Tuesday night, I can't
 12 remember, and discussed, you know, all of this. And
 13 I was saying:
 14 "Look, I'm not confirming this Stephen, I don't know
 15 I'm doing it yet, I'm doing it going back ages looking
 16 at abuse. Yes, we might do a bit on the Newsnight
 17 story, but I will come and let your know and yes I will
 18 talk to Peter, he has already told me he wants
 19 a briefing and I understand."
 20 He also mentioned in passing, you know, Meirion is
 21 a bit leaky and all the rest of it, so I was being
 22 pretty well informed that Meirion was a leaky ship and
 23 to be handled with care by Stephen at that point. That
 24 is probably what he is referring to, does that make
 25 sense?
 Page 84

1 MR BLAKELY: Yes, given the timing of the email is 10 to 8
 2 on the 9th, which is the Tuesday.
 3 MR GILES: 10 to 8 in the morning or the evening?
 4 MR BLAKELY: In the evening, sorry.
 5 MR GILES: That would probably mean that it was Tuesday
 6 evening that I was discussing it.
 7 MR POLLARD: How did you decide, for the Panorama programme,
 8 the balance between concentrating on the Savile abuse
 9 and the Newsnight element?
 10 MR GILES: I have to say, I was always very stubbornly
 11 clear, partly because as I say later we decided to move
 12 very quickly after, I think from the Monday the 15th,
 13 because there was a report in The Times -- it was after
 14 George essentially said, "I'm going to appear at the
 15 Select Committee". Whittingdale was quoted in The Times
 16 saying, "Yes, he's coming, we will take him up on that
 17 offer it will be next Tuesday and we are going to take
 18 up all of the material for the Newsnight, so we can look
 19 at it and discuss it."
 20 At that point I remember thinking: blimey, okay, we
 21 better get ready before then, because otherwise all
 22 these things that I know that we have that we are
 23 interested in investigating are all going to come out
 24 anyway, because that Select Committee will inevitably
 25 leak like a sieve. So I crystallised quite clearly that

Page 85

1 it would be the Monday. At that point everyone said,
 2 "My God, that will be really hard, that should be a half
 3 hour. It is only got to be the Newsnight. I was very,
 4 very, clear, no way, no way am I just doing this film
 5 about Newsnight. Because I do not think, in the grand
 6 scheme of things, given the sort of information we were
 7 already getting, the sort of story, that is what matters
 8 here. In the grand historical sweep it's an important
 9 story, but we need to be seen to be looking at all of
 10 this, not just the BBC. We need to be seen to be having
 11 cases elsewhere, if we are to do this story justice, it
 12 has to be a balance of the two.
 13 For that reason I gravitated quite quickly towards
 14 the fact that I was going to need an hour. Fairly soon
 15 around that point I must have begun talking to
 16 Danny Cohen, and then there was a sort of discussion all
 17 the way through that week about whether that could be at
 18 9 o'clock or at 10.35.
 19 So yes it was always really, really clear to the
 20 point where people thought you are making it much harder
 21 for yourself, but I didn't mind that I needed --
 22 I really wanted to be seen to look at this story in the
 23 whole and in the round.
 24 MR POLLARD: Did Danny Cohen agree immediately that it was
 25 worth an hour --

Page 86

1 MR GILES: Yes.
 2 MR POLLARD: -- and with your proposal to do it in that way?
 3 MR GILES: Yes. From memory, yes. He never challenged it.
 4 He was always extremely supportive privately. I think
 5 he instinctively felt there was a huge public appetite
 6 for it anyway.
 7 Where we scheduled it was a problem. I think when
 8 I said Monday -- I mean, there were a number of options
 9 that we played around with. At one point it was could
 10 it be 9 o'clock on Monday, if not, could it be 9 o'clock
 11 on Wednesday? I think towards the end of that week
 12 I realised that Wednesday was going to be too late.
 13 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 14 MR GILES: The Mail had already decided that if we didn't
 15 put it out on the Monday we were letting
 16 George Entwistle off the hook. Actually, for the
 17 record, that's the wrong way round. It would probably
 18 have been more damaging -- and I didn't want to cause
 19 unnecessary damage anyway -- it might have been more
 20 damaging, should I say, if it had gone out on the
 21 Wednesday and he'd gone to the Select Committee and said
 22 certain things and then the Panorama had gone out on the
 23 Wednesday showing that those were not necessarily right.
 24 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 25 MR GILES: I think that could have been worse. That was not

Page 87

1 really what drove me. I knew there would be a huge
 2 topicality and interest on the Monday night.
 3 So, we gravitated towards, I think, 10.35, but
 4 that's just to underline that it was always going to be
 5 both. There were already things we had found out, the
 6 Nationwide stuff for example where there was a camera
 7 man who we all knew who had actually been filming one
 8 leg of that round Britain run who told us, and then he
 9 put us on to Bob Langley and Mark -- sorry, what's his
 10 name? The reporter from Nationwide, Martin Young. So
 11 I knew there were some good interesting stories that
 12 I thought were important.
 13 I also thought it was actually really important
 14 historically to mark something that had happened over
 15 all this time to such a high profile figure. That was
 16 an important balance in the film. I was always
 17 resistant to it just being Newsnight. We got criticised
 18 anyway for it being Newsnight from -- one of my
 19 favourite old editors, Mark Damazer, said that it was
 20 navel gazing which I thought was a bit unfair because I
 21 was wary of that.
 22 MR POLLARD: Yes. You'd get a range of reactions.
 23 MR GILES: You get a range of reaction, yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: Did you automatically assume, and was it the
 25 case, that you were able to get all the Newsnight

Page 88

1 material, rushes and all.
 2 MR GILES: Did I what, sorry?
 3 MR POLLARD: Did you assume that you would get all the
 4 original materials or did effectively Meirion bring it
 5 over in a box?
 6 MR GILES: Well, Meirion pretty well brought it over a box.
 7 What was extraordinary -- you have to remember this was
 8 against the rising background of my surprise that
 9 Newsnight was just declining to do the story at all.
 10 Newsnight were doing nothing. It wasn't until Thursday
 11 the 11th -- and actually that's another thing I said to
 12 this [REDACTED] -- well, two things.
 13 One, it is pretty ridiculous. Of course Panorama is
 14 going to be doing this because no one else is, least of
 15 all Newsnight that has spent the last however long it
 16 was, five, six, seven days while this story was playing
 17 everywhere not talking -- not even talking about it.
 18 That's how far the editor had set himself against the
 19 story and I suppose the tide of popular and news
 20 interest on it. And I remember mentioning that.
 21 So that was one of the things that made it easier.
 22 Peter Rippon refused to run the [REDACTED] interview
 23 even when, you know, it was already out there. I think
 24 he felt a sort of pride, which I suppose I can
 25 understand to some extent, that meant that he didn't

Page 89

1 want to run the story that he thought -- he knew he had
 2 dropped and it would look like he was admitting he was
 3 wrong.
 4 The same with the [REDACTED] interview. They
 5 only ran that on the Thursday after Meirion or someone
 6 else in the team, possibly Liz, says "We have this other
 7 interview actually that no one's run. Do you want to
 8 put that out?"
 9 So it was made a lot easier, this notion of them all
 10 coming to Panorama, by the rather remarkable fact that
 11 Newsnight was doing absolutely nothing on it. I assumed
 12 right up to the wire that they would try to run the
 13 [REDACTED] interview. I even checked on the Friday
 14 before transmission have they -- double checked, and had
 15 to get a statement from the press office to the effect
 16 that the [REDACTED] interview had never run anywhere.
 17 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 18 MR GILES: That made it a lot easier because Meirion was
 19 basically being given absolutely no outlet for all the
 20 information he had from the original investigation.
 21 Panorama was the only place. I didn't even have to --
 22 you know, I think there was a brief attempt by Newsnight
 23 to say they were going to investigate the Newsnight and
 24 that was quickly stopped. Not by me but by, I think
 25 Fran Unsworth, who felt that it was just too --

Page 90

1 Newsnight was just way too conflicted --
 2 MR POLLARD: Too surreal.
 3 MR GILES: Too surreal. Yes, it was already getting pretty
 4 surreal but that was obviously regarded as a step too
 5 far.
 6 MR POLLARD: The [REDACTED] interview has been a bit
 7 of a mystery in many ways because it was clearly done in
 8 either late November or early December of last year.
 9 MR GILES: Yes.
 10 MR POLLARD: And appears only to have become known to
 11 Newsnight, and possibly Peter Rippon, just about on the
 12 day that they were putting together their story on
 13 the 11th.
 14 MR GILES: Well, that's absolutely untrue.
 15 MR POLLARD: Right.
 16 MR GILES: It was not -- Meirion tells Peter -- and this
 17 again is a facet of Peter not being interested at this
 18 crucial moment in the evidence that they are getting.
 19 Meirion told Peter in an email when he says in response
 20 to "This is going to ..." you know, "prepare for TX" or
 21 whatever he says, he actually writes -- and you can
 22 check the emails -- "We're doing an interview with
 23 a second victim hopefully next Monday." Right? A TV
 24 interview with a second victim.
 25 If he was half interested in the story that should

Page 91

1 have got the bells ringing. In fact it wasn't a victim
 2 and I think they had been disappointed by the interview
 3 because it became fairly clear that this wasn't --
 4 that's not what she was. On top of which you will see
 5 in the draft scripts they were pushing around it says
 6 "Interview with second victim to follow".
 7 MR POLLARD: I think --
 8 MR GILES: So this idea that -- the fact that Peter Rippon
 9 was unaware of that interview is not -- is not
 10 a testament to Meirion hiding it. It's a testament to
 11 the fact that he was not paying attention.
 12 MR POLLARD: I was not suggesting it had been hidden and
 13 I've seen those emails.
 14 MR GILES: Yes.
 15 MR POLLARD: I think what seems to be missing from the
 16 account -- and of course we will ask Meirion and Peter
 17 about this -- is that you are right that the plans for
 18 that second interview are flagged up --
 19 MR GILES: Yes.
 20 MR POLLARD: -- but then there is no mention of it once it's
 21 done.
 22 MR GILES: Well, of course, he's told them to stop looking.
 23 By that stage, if you look at it, he's told them by the
 24 29th, whenever it is done -- I think it is done --
 25 I will have to check when it's done --

Page 92

1 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 2 MR GILES: -- but there is also a succession of emails
 3 saying "Stop what you are doing. I'm not interested in
 4 this", or words to that effect, "All you have are this,
 5 that or the other. I need to know this." You know,
 6 he's pushed bar along.
 7 She was done on, I think, the Wednesday following
 8 the 25th so whenever that would have been. I haven't
 9 got it to hand. I can find out.
 10 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 11 MR GILES: I think to be fair to them they weren't -- they
 12 thought it was of secondary importance because it didn't
 13 add to, you know, what they knew they were in the game
 14 of doing. It was just further corroboration. It
 15 happened to be on the record. And both Meirion and Liz
 16 had been absolutely clear that they had told Peter about
 17 this interview, and certainly given it's foregrounded
 18 right at the top of -- I know they don't call it
 19 a script but I have worked at Newsnight, I have worked
 20 at Panorama, as far as I'm concerned that's a draft
 21 script -- and, you know, that is foreground there.
 22 The fact that he tells Peter "We are going to do
 23 a second victim on camera", the fact that it was not
 24 a victim -- how could, if he was paying attention to
 25 what they were gathering, especially if he's talking

Page 93

1 about prepare for TX, how could that not have
 2 permeated -- permeated through?
 3 This became the source of "We never knew anything
 4 about this", and "Why you have been hiding this?" And
 5 "Here is a line from [redacted] saying I have always had
 6 my suspicions about the aunt, there was a subconscious
 7 sense that, et cetera, et cetera". I mean, I'm sorry,
 8 I just find that -- I find that whole story and that
 9 [redacted] a disgraceful
 10 episode in terms of -- I am sure other people have
 11 leaked left right and centre; I certainly haven't for
 12 what it's worth -- but that frankly was a disgraceful
 13 episode [redacted]
 14 [redacted]
 15 Really, really, really, ridiculous. As I said
 16 before, why would he attempt to suppress his aunt's role
 17 given that he was the one who had basically set about
 18 investigating her home?
 19 MR POLLARD: Do you have your own views about where various
 20 leaks came from? Any that you could share with us?
 21 MR GILES: That one, I'm fairly sure, came from inside --
 22 that one felt like it had been carefully engineered by
 23 [redacted]
 24 [redacted]
 25 [redacted]

Page 94

1 [redacted]
 2 [redacted]
 3 [redacted]
 4 [redacted]
 5 [redacted]
 6 [redacted]
 7 [redacted]
 8 [redacted]
 9 I think Newsnight had become an absolute hotbed of
 10 leaks by the time this happened, partly because the
 11 programme was so obviously in open conflict.
 12 MR POLLARD: Just to pick up on the timeline of that,
 13 because obviously stories about the dropping of the
 14 Newsnight piece start -- I think they started appearing
 15 in early January but I think there were enquiries
 16 about it just before the --
 17 MR GILES: December 21.
 18 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 19 MR GILES: Miles Goslett. Again -- again they say "It's not
 20 us."
 21 Look, frankly there is a whole nexus around
 22 Newsnight and former Newsnight people. [redacted] is
 23 pretty crucial in that.
 24 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 25 MR GILES: [redacted] and

Page 95

1 [redacted] would have kept his ear to the ground. [redacted]
 2 [redacted]
 3 MR POLLARD: That's right.
 4 MR GILES: And he didn't like Peter Rippon.
 5 MR POLLARD: Because they were [redacted]
 6 [redacted] weren't they, during that period?
 7 MR GILES: That's right. [redacted]
 8 as well so I'm saying all this --
 9 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 10 MR GILES: -- and you can use it if you want, but there are
 11 all sorts of people in and around Newsnight who had
 12 their motivation for, you know, having a go at
 13 Peter Rippon perhaps or having a go at Meirion as well.
 14 I have to say, everyone sort of said, Panorama, you
 15 know, investigating Newsnight. I did nothing but enjoy
 16 my time on Newsnight. I have no interest in, in any
 17 way, taking on Newsnight. Broadly, as a general rule,
 18 on Newsnight they pursue a completely different agenda
 19 from the agenda we pursue. We are prime time mainstream
 20 BBC1, they are late night BBC2, so normally there is not
 21 an issue at all. All Panorama was doing was reflecting
 22 an open civil war conflict, a complete breakdown in
 23 trust on Newsnight. It was Newsnight versus Newsnight.
 24 It had nothing to do with Panorama in that regard.
 25 In terms of all the leaks, well, what I would say

Page 96

1 about the leaks, as I was trying to say before, is you
 2 have to set that against essentially what, if they are
 3 blaming the journalists concerned, essentially what they
 4 had asked of these journalists.
 5 They had asked them to set off and find and stand up
 6 a story. They had gone a long way. They got the first
 7 person ever on camera in an interview that turned out to
 8 be, from everyone that I have known that has seen it, to
 9 be extraordinarily powerful. They got the first person
 10 on camera. They got 8 to 9 corroborative witnesses or
 11 up to five cases of abuse, people who said first hand
 12 they had been abused. They have the first confirmation
 13 that Jimmy Savile has been interviewed under caution by
 14 Surrey Police in 2007. They have another case
 15 potentially from Stoke Mandeville with a sister of one
 16 of the women from Duncroft, which we now know Surrey
 17 Police also looked at. They had all this information.
 18 They had a catalogue of different names, all of whom to
 19 a certain extent were pointing towards a direction.
 20 They were told once they confirmed to a certain
 21 point this was ready to go for TX. Then they
 22 suddenly -- without, in my view, proper clear
 23 explanation -- are told to stop. Not just to stop, but
 24 completely stop what they are doing. "Don't go back.
 25 Stop talking to these women", as he puts it, "Stop what
 Page 97

1 you are doing", and try to find this extraordinary angle
 2 in which the CPS write a letter in the current climate
 3 of, you know, British media journalism saying "We're
 4 awfully sorry, we won't prosecute Jimmy Savile, he's
 5 just a bit old", or words to that effect. That would be
 6 a fairly extraordinary thing for the CPS to have done,
 7 even if they thought it.
 8 MR POLLARD: Why do you think so many of those women appear
 9 to have remembered that?
 10 MR GILES: I don't know how many did or didn't. This is
 11 a mystery. [redacted] obviously did, and [redacted] came
 12 a-cropper with the Mail on Sunday by attempting to come
 13 up with a fairly clear forgery on that. But, you know,
 14 I don't know how many other women did --
 15 MR POLLARD: I think there is reference to --
 16 MR GILES: There is a reference to Meirion --
 17 MR POLLARD: -- to three, who had --
 18 MR GILES: Attempted to say that's what had happened.
 19 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 20 MR GILES: Maybe they had been told that, or maybe they had
 21 heard that. Again this is the issue of contamination
 22 which Peter Rippon obviously had a concern with through
 23 the -- basically through the chat room or the website.
 24 [redacted] for what it was worth, never said that
 25 and never hinted at it and had never even gone to the
 Page 98

1 police --
 2 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 3 MR GILES: -- and she was the key witness. That's the
 4 thing. That's why that blog is still wrong.
 5 The blog still says, uncorrected by my Corporation
 6 or my News Directorate, that the key witness spoke of
 7 having been told by the CPS that it had been dropped
 8 because he was too old. The key witness is [redacted]
 9 and she never, ever heard anything --
 10 MR POLLARD: That is, if you like, the remaining mistake in
 11 there.
 12 MR GILES: Yes, that hasn't been corrected.
 13 What I was trying to say about the leaks: put them
 14 in the context of what these journalists were asked to
 15 do. They were asked to bury a story they knew was of
 16 national significance at a time when they knew the BBC
 17 was running tributes. They were asked to stay schtum
 18 about that and not to pass this on, not to carry on
 19 their investigation, to stop their investigation all
 20 together. On top of that they were then asked to
 21 subscribe broadly to a line that they probably -- they
 22 knew fundamentally was pretty untrue, which is that this
 23 had not been an investigation into what they knew it was
 24 an investigation in, but into something else.
 25 Then when the blog arrives they were also asked to
 Page 99

1 subscribe to the line that all the women had been to the
 2 police even though they make it absolutely clear they
 3 hadn't been to the police, and they are also asked to
 4 subscribe to this whole idea that they had no evidence
 5 to give to the police anyway, which they seem to have
 6 been to their -- you know, probably to their fault --
 7 more willing to attach themselves too.
 8 All of these things. They are asked to do all this
 9 and sit back and watch the story go out on all channels
 10 and all outlets, and to say absolutely nothing while
 11 their own editor refuses to even look at this story.
 12 Now put this those leaks, if they are responsible
 13 for them, in the context of being asked to sign up as an
 14 investigative journalist to inaccurate statements by
 15 your corporation.
 16 In the end, what is the greater issue here? The
 17 issue here is that for whatever reason the BBC News, or
 18 Peter Rippon, or -- appear to have been relatively
 19 willing to put forward lines that they were told again
 20 and again repeatedly couldn't be right and weren't
 21 right, and if they had bothered to do some fundamental
 22 pretty basic checking they would have seen couldn't have
 23 been as a matter of record right, and rather than change
 24 those they turn around and [redacted]
 25 [redacted]
 Page 100

1 [REDACTED] Right?
 2 What I'm saying is not going to help my career.
 3 It's not going to help me one bit in the BBC. But I'm
 4 sorry, these are journalists who have gone out there and
 5 they have discovered something, and they have discovered
 6 something significant. Now you can play a long game
 7 with that, you can play it all sorts of ways, but if you
 8 bury it and then you tell them to be, you know, less
 9 than 100 per cent truthful about it, then you are being
 10 naive about -- about whether or not that is going to
 11 stay put. That's not going to change. That's not
 12 a situation you are going to shift.
 13 And I just think time and time again they were given
 14 the chance -- the BBC was given the chance to get this
 15 right and they didn't. And they seem, whether it's
 16 Stephen Mitchell, [REDACTED] whether
 17 it's Ken MacQuarrie, Stephen Mitchell again, senior
 18 person I can't name, all of them were given a clear
 19 sight of the fact that this blog was wrong. Why did
 20 they wait until October 22nd to change it?
 21 And, you know, I'm sorry, as someone who has worked
 22 at the BBC for as long as I have, I am not a little
 23 worried about that.
 24 MR POLLARD: It's a very difficult sort of big question to
 25 ask, but obviously this is, and will be, a painful
 Page 101

1 period for the BBC.
 2 MR GILES: Yes.
 3 MR POLLARD: It is possible to list a lot of things that
 4 have gone wrong throughout this whole period. What
 5 should the BBC fundamentally do differently going
 6 forward?
 7 MR GILES: Talk to its journalists. Listen to your
 8 journalists.
 9 You know, I am now an editor and a manager, but
 10 obviously I have been a journalist in the BBC for nearly
 11 20 years -- in fact maybe -- Christ, it probably is
 12 20 years. I just don't understand why this should -- it
 13 should have been the first thing they did, whether it
 14 was at Peter Rippon's level, but the moment they knew
 15 that there was a disagreement between Peter and Liz and
 16 Meirion, they should have talked to all of them.
 17 They should have talked to Meirion, they should have
 18 talked to Liz. That is not just at the point at which
 19 the blog became an issue; they should have probably
 20 discussed it all probably much more openly back when
 21 this was first put aside, the investigation was first
 22 put aside.
 23 Now you may be right: Meirion should and could have
 24 spoken to Stephen and Helen, but why didn't Helen and
 25 Stephen think that they may -- or at least Stephen who
 Page 102

1 was probably far more abreast of this than I suspect
 2 Helen was at least consider talking to them.
 3 It seems strange when we send people out to do these
 4 sorts of stories and they dig things up and they -- it
 5 seems strange not to have gone firsthand to the people
 6 who knew the most to uncover what was really -- what was
 7 really happening on what was, by any stretch of the
 8 imagination, a bloody sensitive story for the BBC.
 9 MR POLLARD: Yes. One of the things which is quite
 10 difficult to get to the bottom of through this period,
 11 if you like, from in fact almost the point that ITV
 12 approach the BBC pre-transmission of Exposure all the
 13 way through --
 14 MR GILES: No one spoke to them though.
 15 MR POLLARD: -- through the blog --
 16 MR GILES: In the September the 7th letter.
 17 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 18 MR GILES: Yes.
 19 MR POLLARD: Almost if you were taking that as the start
 20 point for the BBC requiring a response --
 21 MR GILES: Yes. I have seen the Stuart Purvis timeline on
 22 that.
 23 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 24 MR GILES: Of course --
 25 MR POLLARD: But my question is: do you have a clear picture
 Page 103

1 of how, shall we say, the BBC's line or lines evolved?
 2 Who was the driving force behind it?
 3 MR GILES: Yes. I don't know entirely --
 4 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask you --
 5 MR GILES: I know that there is this issue about who was
 6 pushing the line -- because Peter didn't say it directly
 7 in his blog, who was pushing the line that this was just
 8 an investigation into a police investigation.
 9 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 10 MR GILES: And why that seemed to harden as it went higher
 11 up the chain.
 12 I'm not sure that is necessarily directly relevant
 13 because however Peter might have put it in his blog --
 14 and he left a sort of question unanswered, didn't he; he
 15 said "the nature of the allegations" is how he put it,
 16 but otherwise he mentioned the CPS straight after --
 17 I think there were people around at Corporate Centre,
 18 and obviously within News, who felt for some reason that
 19 that -- that that line, that blog, for a start had to
 20 stand. It would have been deeply, deeply difficult --
 21 which they seem to admit between themselves, ie Peter,
 22 Stephen -- to have changed it.
 23 In terms of the line, clearly that was picked up
 24 early by David Jordan on the Today Programme and The
 25 Media Show. It was then perpetuated by George and it
 Page 104

1 appears to have been still briefed to Lord Patten the
 2 following week. In fact -- and this is where I think
 3 Peter Rippon is not quite off as scot-free as some
 4 people are suggesting -- Kevin Marsh on the first
 5 Thursday when Newsnight ran the story, when we know
 6 [REDACTED] which would
 7 have been on October 11th, maintained exactly the same
 8 line when there was no BBC spokesman.
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 16 MR GILES: As I said, if they weren't interested in talking
 17 to Meirion about it, they might have watched
 18 [REDACTED] interviews on ITV News or [REDACTED]
 19 interviews in a variety of other newspapers subsequently
 20 where she said she was now going to the police, on that
 21 one anyway.
 22 In terms of the wider line, again, did anyone really
 23 know about the Surrey Police investigation in 2007? No,
 24 it hadn't been confirmed. That's why it was a big story
 25 at the time.

Page 105

1 So I don't know who was pushing it. [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED] I can't
 4 speak for Stephen Mitchell and Helen Boaden, but in
 5 addition to them advising there would have been
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 MR POLLARD: Roger Mosey not involved in this?
 8 MR GILES: This I don't know. I don't know. I don't know
 9 Roger Mosey, I know of him.
 10 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 11 MR GILES: I know he's been running what is called "Gold
 12 Command".
 13 MR POLLARD: That is precisely the phrase I was going to ask
 14 you about.
 15 MR GILES: I don't know how that works.
 16 MR POLLARD: No. I had heard this phrase, you know, in if
 17 you like the Scotland Yard usage of that.
 18 MR GILES: So have I.
 19 MR POLLARD: It is senior point person on crisis or big
 20 story management.
 21 MR GILES: I don't know anything about --
 22 MR POLLARD: So if you think it is that sort of inner
 23 circle --
 24 MR GILES: I think Roger -- if Roger was running Gold
 25 Command then obviously he's part of that.

Page 106

1 Clearly remember [REDACTED]s the one who seems to
 2 perpetuate that story more than most, even though -- the
 3 crucial thing about the other figures as opposed to
 4 Roger is that Roger, from what I can gather, hasn't had
 5 any direct briefing or direct contact either with, you
 6 know -- whether it is myself or whether it is someone
 7 like Meirion or Liz, he hasn't had a direct email so
 8 he's hearing this slightly secondhand.
 9 [REDACTED] was clearly the person who appears to
 10 have been briefing from the start that this was just,
 11 you know, "We shouldn't feed this. This was just the
 12 press getting in a tizzy as a revenge on Leveson. We
 13 shouldn't play to it." He was pretty uncompromising on
 14 those issues and I think he may have been a leader in
 15 the pretty slow response to the notion that the BBC
 16 should apologise, that the BBC should set up an
 17 independent look at what happened, both in the past and
 18 in the present, and crucially in this whole approach
 19 towards the journalists at the heart of it.
 20 It seems strange to me now that part of
 21 Peter Rippon's argument for example is that Meirion --
 22 "Meirion said this to me, now he's saying that.
 23 Therefore, you know, it's a difference of opinion."
 24 Well, it's not actually, because Peter Rippon doesn't
 25 appear to know anything other than what he's told by

Page 107

1 Meirion and Liz.
 2 So if Meirion and Liz are telling him that's wrong,
 3 what validity does Peter Rippon's opinion have? It
 4 seems to me a fairly logical, clear problem that it is
 5 not just a difference of opinion. You have the people
 6 who know saying something is wrong. The person who
 7 doesn't know and is relying on them to tell him
 8 shouldn't therefore be the person -- it is not therefore
 9 a difference of opinion. Certainly in terms of the
 10 police, the police issue.
 11 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 12 MR GILES: In terms of what the investigation was, well,
 13 I suppose that is more of a difference of opinion.
 14 There I think that Peter Rippon must be -- must, in the
 15 background at least, have been briefing that that was
 16 his position.
 17 There also appears to have been a sense right from
 18 the start that the CPS line, the police investigation
 19 line, was where they needed to get to in order to
 20 explain why they didn't run the story. I think --
 21 I suspect when Exposure came around again, they knew
 22 they couldn't shift from the sort of positions that they
 23 had already set up in January and in December.
 24 I gather that on 22 December Helen Deller responded
 25 to Miles Goslett. You might want to look at that

Page 108

1 because Jim'll Fix It is recorded on the 19th. On the
 2 20th, my understanding is Caroline Hawley tells
 3 Mark Thompson what is going on with Newsnight, and on
 4 the 21st Miles Goslett rings the press office and says
 5 "I know that you have an interview. I know you are
 6 going to run these tributes. Would you care to
 7 comment?"
 8 It's not until the 22nd that he gets a formal
 9 comment. There must have been some kind of meetings
 10 going on on 21 December which no-one -- obviously we
 11 know now around about that time there is this discussion
 12 between Helen and Mark Thompson --
 13 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 14 MR GILES: -- which wasn't originally admitted to.
 15 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 16 MR GILES: As I understand it, he said quite clearly he had
 17 not spoken to the director of Vision or News. And then
 18 he did. So that's another issue.
 19 In terms of the line that you are pursuing, I can't
 20 honestly hand on heart say who would really have driven
 21 that line. All I know is that certain key people in
 22 this who have gone public would have known that there
 23 was a problem with that line. They certainly failed to
 24 tell Lord Patten; they certainly failed to tell the
 25 Director General. I also don't understand how

Page 109

1 Ken MacQuarrie could go and talk to all these people and
 2 come back and the Director General could still say that
 3 he stood by all the BBC lines and had full confidence in
 4 Peter Rippon and these questions were for your inquiry
 5 and not for the BBC to resolve quickly and instantly in
 6 its own blog.
 7 That I don't understand. I don't understand,
 8 frankly, what changed between that Friday, which would
 9 have been, what, October the 12th? Yes, October 12th,
 10 and ten days later, Monday 22nd in terms of what they
 11 knew. What actually changed?
 12 So in other words, for some reason they weren't
 13 terribly urgently looking to correct -- make sure that
 14 blog was correct.
 15 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 16 MR GILES: That's the impression I get at least. And, you
 17 know, that's a matter of some regret and I don't know
 18 who's responsible for that. And I don't know why --
 19 I don't in the end know how or why these positions come.
 20 I am assuming that the BBC is under a lot of pressure;
 21 I'm assuming that, you know, people -- there may not be
 22 some leading conspiracy to that. I just know that
 23 repeatedly people are told this and they are not
 24 listened to. And, you know --
 25 MR POLLARD: Yes.

Page 110

1 MR GILES: -- instead they are told the opposite.
 2 So, um, I would be interested to find out what your
 3 feeling is about that. Okay.
 4 Anyway, it certainly allowed a Panorama to go out --
 5 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 6 MR GILES: -- where it might otherwise not have done.
 7 MR POLLARD: Were you pleased with the programme in the end?
 8 MR GILES: I don't want to say anything on the record about
 9 that, really. It was a difficult and painful process
 10 and, you know, I think -- I think broadly it did the
 11 right thing.
 12 MR POLLARD: Do you think in the extraordinary circumstances
 13 the editorial management of it worked?
 14 MR GILES: Yes, I think it did. Partly because I have
 15 worked for Peter Horrocks before and -- both at Panorama
 16 and at Newsnight -- and he's a very, very, powerful
 17 clear thinking journalist.
 18 I think he came on board very late and, funnily
 19 enough, I think it was probably his own discussions with
 20 Meirion and with Liz that sort of gave him the
 21 confidence of where -- what the programme was doing.
 22 And also he was clearly instrumental, I think anyway, in
 23 terms of the letter that he forwarded on to the Trust,
 24 in ensuring that the right thing was done before we went
 25 to air.

Page 111

1 There seemed to have been a hesitation over that
 2 weekend. So I think that command structure just about
 3 worked. It was very bumpy. It was difficult when it
 4 first started getting tested and we were told that there
 5 was a lot of unhappiness that we were doing what we were
 6 doing. There probably is still a lot of unhappiness
 7 that we did what we did. What I would argue is --
 8 MR POLLARD: Unhappiness in which quarter?
 9 MR GILES: I think unhappiness probably in some parts of
 10 News, those that would certainly see it as being unfair
 11 on Peter Rippon, and maybe some mystification in parts
 12 of Vision and parts of the rest of the BBC as to why on
 13 earth the BBC can do this.
 14 For what it's worth, I would say the opposite. I
 15 would say how does Panorama not do this when it
 16 becomes -- when it becomes clear to Panorama and it has
 17 evidence to the effect that the BBC's public statements
 18 are not right on a subject as sensitive as that at that
 19 time, and given that no one -- there hadn't been a clear
 20 programme really from the BBC about what had happened,
 21 really could Panorama afford not to do it?
 22 I mean, that was very much my starting point with
 23 this: if we don't do it, it will look like Panorama is
 24 asleep at the wheel, or Panorama has something to hide,
 25 or it is not willing to take on big difficult stories.

Page 112

1 If I had that sort of information about any other
 2 corporation I would go for it. To have it for my own
 3 corporation and hold back on it, I think would just add
 4 to the BBC's difficulties and would have been wrong.
 5 MR POLLARD: This might be an unfair question, so apologies
 6 if it is: do you think Meirion has a future at the BBC
 7 now after all this?
 8 MR GILES: I certainly hope he does.
 9 MR POLLARD: Will he stay on Panorama do you think?
 10 MR GILES: That I don't know. You know, he's currently on
 11 attachment pursuing a wide range of projects.
 12 Obviously it will depend a great deal on how this
 13 all pans out. Because clearly there are people -- he
 14 has burnt his bridges with quite a few senior people.
 15 All I would say to anyone about him is, whatever your
 16 judgment, none of this would have happened -- none of
 17 this story would have come out -- I suppose it may have
 18 done but it would have taken a lot longer, but none of
 19 what's happened on the issue of abuse, none of these
 20 inquiries, none of these investigations would have
 21 started if it wasn't for the fact that Meirion pursued
 22 a story that he knew in his heart and in his gut was
 23 right. You can make all sorts of judgments about how he
 24 did that and how he behaved subsequently, and lots of
 25 people have been very swift to do that, but in the end

Page 113

1 he made this -- he brought this story to light.
 2 MR POLLARD: True.
 3 MR GILES: It worries me that I think the BBC at times has
 4 simply forgotten that and not taken it into account at
 5 all. But there you go.
 6 MR POLLARD: Tom, thank you very much.
 7 Any questions or anything that we should have asked
 8 that we didn't?
 9 MR GILES: I can't remember now.
 10 MR POLLARD: I think we have covered a lot.
 11 MR GILES: We have covered a lot. Was there anything that
 12 you thought --
 13 MR BLAKELY: Can I just confirm so I'm certain: point 2 on
 14 your email where you say, "Regarding outside normal BBC
 15 investigations protocol ..."
 16 MR GILES: That is the MPRL.
 17 MR POLLARD: That is the MPRL. I just wanted to double
 18 check.
 19 MR GILES: Absolutely. As I say that is extremely -- that
 20 is outside what we would normally expect of protocol.
 21 You don't normally take active, sensitive investigations
 22 off the MPRL.
 23 MR BLAKELY: We just want to double check with Bob on that
 24 point.
 25 MR POLLARD: We're well on the case of that.

Page 114

1 MR GILES: Good. Okay, excellent.
 2 MR POLLARD: You have to be somewhere.
 3 Tom, I'm very, very grateful.
 4 MR GILES: Thank you.
 5 MR POLLARD: Thank you for the way you have given your
 6 evidence.
 7 MR SPAFFORD: Thank you, we're done.
 8 (5.37 pm)
 9 (The interview concluded)
 10 I N D E X
 11 P R O C E E D I N G S2
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 115

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25