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Interview with Liz MacKean

Tuesday, 13 November 2012

QQ. So what contact did you have before you got this email about this?
A. I think only one previous to October was during the summer. Meirion talked to me about this story that he'd always wanted to do. That's my only recollection of the time we'd spoken about it. And I was sort of vaguely interested. We didn't go into much detail but it was obviously he had the bit between his teeth and it was something he'd kept an eye on over a long period of time.

So once Savile died, on 29 October, he spoke to me again. At that point I said, yes, I would be interested to work with you. Then after that he sent this document.

Q. And you had worked with Meirion Jones before, had you?
A. Yes, many times, many times over the years.

Q. So what did you -- what did you do when you got this email, apart from presumably reading it? How did it strike you?
A. Um, how did it strike me? Well I would say overall that I approached it all in quite an open-minded way. I was inclined to think that Savile, who had always growing up struck me as an odd ball, and I saw him perhaps given all the rumours that had attended him, I had seen him as someone who attracted rumours because he just seemed strange.

MR SPAFFORD: Can I make a couple of points if that is okay?

Thank you, Liz, for coming in. Obviously we have to your left over there Richard Blakeley, a barrister, Alan Maclean whom you have met, Nick Pollard and me, here, Richard Spafford.

Just so you know, the process is being transcribed and you can see on the screen in front of you that you have a real-time screen of that. At the end of the process the transcript will be made available to you and your lawyers on a confidential basis to enable you to correct any typographical errors. Thank you very much for the copies of the two agreements. Obviously we have those, which is great. Obviously confidentiality is very important part of our process.

I know that you spoke to Meirion Jones yesterday.
We talked to Meirion about that. We had concerns about that because obviously it is incredibly important that we get just your view of what went on and your account and not a sort of combined account. We wanted to make sure that you hadn't spoken to Meirion again since yesterday lunch time?

A. No, yesterday lunch time it was more sort of "how are you?" Obviously he was here on his own. It was that sort of chat rather than detail about the session.

MR SPAFFORD: Good. But you are aware of your obligation of confidence and you understand it?

A. Yes, very much.

MR SPAFFORD: We will have various breaks.

(Pause due to technical fault)

Questions by MR MACLEAN

MR MACLEAN: Can you look at bundle A1, page 170, please. It's an email from Meirion Jones to Peter Rippon and to you at 12.33, on the 31st.

A. Yes.

Q. He's sending you an extract from the web memoir from
A. Yes.
Interview with Liz MacKean

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

Q. It comes from meeting LNI, that's you at the top of the
page. So can you put a date on this, or not?
A. Not a precise date, no. It would have been early
November.
Q. So, I think it says at the top:
"Hannah, three girls, one willing to be filmed."
A. Yes. I think the one willing to be filmed initially was

Q. And there's quite a long note that gets produced,
I think by Hannah Livingston.
A. Yes.
Q. She had a discussion with and then you had a
discussion with and there's a note of that as
well?
A. Yes.
Q. So at this very early stage is the candidate to be
filmed?
A. Yes. It was always in the offering that there would be an
on-camera interview with I don't know that
it was confirmed, but that was always Meirion's
intention to get her to do an on-camera interview. He
thought she'd be willing.
Q. So who first as it were discovered?
A. That was Meirion.
Q. From the blog?

A. That's right. He had been aware of her for well over
a year.
Q. And he had been following the Friends Reunited chatter
so he knew the names that people gave for themselves on
Friends Reunited, not of course the real names or full
names. So we see that you have written down there in
the middle of the page:
"A few have letters saying not to pursue because he
was too old, 2009, Surrey Police".
Q. Where are you getting that information from, that
you are writing down?
A. This is coming from the people we have started to speak
to, including who had had contact with the police. I meet Surrey Police in big bold
letters. Some of them said Surrey, some of them of said
Sussex, and least one doesn't know. So we didn't know
exactly where this investigation had come from.
Q. So how many of these people that you had spoken to at
this stage were saying. "I got a letter". Not
necessarily I have a letter, but I got a letter at some
point?
A. Three or four. I could think of three, but there might
have been four.
Q. And they all told the same story, did they?
A. Yes.
1. a reference to... You see the penultimate paragraph?
2. A. Yes.
3. Q. "Another celebrity, whom I can only refer to as... showered those he sexually abused (on the day we met him) with expensive perfume [and so on]. He didn't touch me, although I watched in a detached fashion as he had full sex with one of the other girls in the dressing room into which we were all crammed."
4. Obviously now a huge part of this story has been allegations of misconduct, not necessarily by Jimmy Savile directly but by others in the dressing room at the BBC?
5. A. Um-hm.
6. Q. Did that bit of the story strike you at this stage or was it something that really came to the fore later?
7. A. I think it came to the fore -- I registered it, but we were so strongly focused on Savile at the time that I really registered it as something potentially important was after the on-camera interview with...
8. 20. 
9. Q. On the 14th?
10. A. Yes, when she obviously spoke in more detail about it, 21. Q. We will come to that obviously. Do you still have the handwritten note, page 257? If you turn that round on the right-hand side this looks like your note of...
11. Page 9

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

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

1. Q. Angie was another girl, was it?
2. A. No. Was it not Angela? Possibly Angela the 3. investigating officer. Possibly.
4. Q. And the note above that, ... That is... again, is it?
5. A. That was definitely... She didn't like Maggie Jones 6. all...
7. Q. It is cut off in the left-hand side. We may need to look at the original of this, but can you see here -- 10. I can't read that, but something "had a"?
11. A. couple of friends. I think that's JS, that 12. would be.
13. Q. JS?
15. Q. And then B, perhaps is broadcasting. TVC is presumably 16. Television Centre?
17. A. Yes.
18. Q. Plus...
19. A. Yes.
20. Q. So what was said about...
21. A. What she said was that the girls didn't like him. That she offered to sort of give them a safe house. If they 23. were in trouble with the police and they had run away,
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| 1 | he offered to put them up and said he wouldn’t say anything, but they entirely mistrusted his motives. |
| 2 | I mean something that did come out from talking to some of them, they felt very upset by, and they just thought that there was something dangerous about him. Savile they thought was an utter creep but there was a difference in their attitude to both men. They just felt there was something dangerous about one. |
| 3 | Q. In a sense less sinister, or how do we capture this difference? Savile less sinister. |
| 4 | A. Yes. I think they saw Savile as a creep and a dirty old man who would give them things in return for sexual favours and occasionally it was a bit sort of unpleasant and he would sort of force himself on them, but I got the feeling that some of the women I spoke to felt they could handle him and they sort of knew where they were, unlike where they wouldn’t have been in a room with him on their own. |
| 5 | Q. He was a level or two up the scale as it were? |
| 6 | A. That is what they were -- they indicated, yes. |
| 7 | Q. Right. Now at some point in the story you or Hannah Livingston managed to identify at least one of the people that assaulted at television centre, didn’t you? |
| 8 | A. On Klunk Click. That was Hannah who did the picture research. |
| 9 | Q. And that was who we never contacted. We tried but we couldn’t find her. |
| 10 | Q. But she had been identified by a combination of Hannah and your research and what had told us as to a likely candidate? |
| 11 | A. A likely candidate, not a definite candidate. What he photo which had on it and her it was from that photo that Hannah identified her as being in the footage of Klunk Click. |
| 12 | Q. The photo was at was it, yes. |
| 13 | A. Was it, yes. So gave you a photograph? |
| 14 | A. I think so. |
| 15 | Q. Then later, Hannah Livingston who spent some time looking at all these old Klunk Clicks, then found a Klunk Click with Savile and Gary Glitter as a guest on the show; is that it? |
| 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | Q. And that helps to put the -- |
| 18 | A. Yes, I mean there were two sections of footage that we got, and I don’t know that they were the same programme. One of them had Freddie Starr, and was in |
MR MACLEAN: That question arose in the context of whether you had given some promise, as it were, to somebody you had spoken to of confidentiality or --
A. Yes.
Q. -- just ordinary journalist source confidentiality?
A. More the people we had spoken to.
Q. So the upshot of the conversation with Nicola Cain was that you weren't providing any obstacle to the police?
A. That's right.
Q. So far as this review are process is concerned, you haven't had any discussion with the BBC about covering up parts of documents.
A. No, if I have, I have entirely forgotten it.
Q. Just below the word "redacted"?
A. Yes.
Q. We have a date on this now, you see 21/11?
A. Yes.
Q. So we have jumped quite far down the story. Liza Dowd, Sky. We heard, I think from Meirion Jones -- it is in the documents -- that you and he thought, or had grounds to believe that Sky were sniffing around this story as well; is that right?
A. Yes. The Sun newspaper had been.
Q. Now on the opposite page -- and I don't quite understand, maybe we should look at this, the original of this notebook, if it still exists, to work this out, but it seems to be jumping around time-wise. Monday --
A. 14 November.
Q. The day you interviewed --
A. Yes.
Q. That then says "numbers"?
A. Yes.
Q. And then --
A. MO. These are little notes of the sort of areas I want to talk to her about. So the MO would have been Savile's MO, the sort of grooming style approach --
Q. Right?
A. -- she herself, and what was her involvement with Savile.
Q. So this is your note for your interview?
A. Yes.
Q. "Her view of him, why not an obvious question. Why wait until now. Why should you be believed ... (Reading to the words) ... Gulf between public image and your reality."
And then TVC guide --
A. Yes.
Q. So the basis of those notes for was the document that Meirion Jones had sent you that came from the document had published on the web?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 21</th>
<th>Page 22</th>
<th>Page 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. But I had had the original conversation with [redacted] so obviously I had briefed Meirion ahead of the interview.</td>
<td>1. shortly before the interview with [redacted] is that right?</td>
<td>1. now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. So if we go to 263 in the same bundle --</td>
<td>2. A. Yes.</td>
<td>2. Q. Where would they be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Yes.</td>
<td>3. A. Well, originally in the office in Television Centre.</td>
<td>3. A. Well, certainly the TVC references. But I think the others were the sort of open questions to get her to tell the story that weren't based on the original note from Meirion. They were then just me about to interview this person and this is how I want to draw out her story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. -- as we know. And there was a filmed interview for 5. Q. Did you provide the whole notebook to the BBC or copied 6. Q. Right. So is this -- this is a single -- these were all done in a single notebook?</td>
<td>5. There have been various clearouts of things over the months as the office was prepared for the move to W1.</td>
<td>5. And I had more notes, I am sure, which I wasn't able to then locate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A. Yes.</td>
<td>6. A. Yes. These came from -- no, two notebooks.</td>
<td>6. Q. Right. So is this -- this is a single -- these were all done in a single notebook?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q. We have seen the rushes. We have seen all of it. So we know what was done there. There was you and Meirion 8. Q. I just photocopied the relevant pages.</td>
<td>7. A. Ok. We have jumped around -- jumped ahead a bit in the story. Can I take you back to the beginning, to Meirion Jones' email? He sent the email to you and to Peter Rippon, the programme editor?</td>
<td>7. A. No, I just photocopied the relevant pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jones and not by you?</td>
<td>8. A. Yes.</td>
<td>8. Q. And also to Hannah Livingston. If you go to page 267 of bundle 1 -- A1/267, Meirion Jones told us yesterday that shortly after sparking the story on 31 October he was actually in America --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Q. Why was that?</td>
<td>10. A. It was a practicality thing. I think I wasn't in the office. That day I was originally going to do the interview -- changed the date and I think I was filming another story and not available.</td>
<td>10. Q. And also to Hannah Livingston. If you go to page 267 of bundle 1 -- A1/267, Meirion Jones told us yesterday that shortly after sparking the story on 31 October he was actually in America --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A. Um-hm.</td>
<td>11. Q. And also to Hannah Livingston. If you go to page 267 of bundle 1 -- A1/267, Meirion Jones told us yesterday that shortly after sparking the story on 31 October he was actually in America --</td>
<td>11. A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Q. The interview with [redacted] was done by Meirion Jones and not by you?</td>
<td>12. Q. The interview with [redacted] was done by Meirion Jones and not by you?</td>
<td>12. Q. And also to Hannah Livingston. If you go to page 267 of bundle 1 -- A1/267, Meirion Jones told us yesterday that shortly after sparking the story on 31 October he was actually in America --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A. Yes.</td>
<td>13. Q. So he was away for a few days and told us he didn't really get his hands on this story again properly until</td>
<td>13. A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Q. So if we go to 263 in the same bundle --</td>
<td>14. Q. So if we go to 263 in the same bundle --</td>
<td>14. Q. So in the intervening couple of weeks it was you and Hannah Livingston who were doing the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A. Yes.</td>
<td>15. Q. So in the intervening couple of weeks it was you and Hannah Livingston who were doing the research?</td>
<td>15. A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Q. -- it looks like 17/11, 20/11, do you see that?</td>
<td>16. A. Yes.</td>
<td>16. Q. I thought I was working on it with a view to doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A. Yes.</td>
<td>17. Q. And he told us that at this stage the programme, or the piece, hadn't been commissioned. Is that right?</td>
<td>17. The reason that was -- there is an email, I think it might be 3 November from memory -- in fact I have it in my statement -- where Peter tells me -- 2 November, he replied on 3 November, top of page 2 of my statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Q. Did you provide the whole notebook to the BBC or copied 19. Q. And he told us that at this stage the programme, or the piece, hadn't been commissioned. Is that right?</td>
<td>19. A. Yes. Doing the digging.</td>
<td>19. Q. I thought I was working on it with a view to doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Q. It looks like 17/11, 20/11, do you see that?</td>
<td>20. Q. The reason that was -- there is an email, I think it might be 3 November from memory -- in fact I have it in my statement -- where Peter tells me -- 2 November, he replied on 3 November, top of page 2 of my statement.</td>
<td>20. Q. I thought I was working on it with a view to doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Q. I thought I was working on it with a view to doing it.</td>
<td>21. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Q. It looks like 17/11, 20/11, do you see that?</td>
<td>21. Q. The reason that was -- there is an email, I think it might be 3 November from memory -- in fact I have it in my statement -- where Peter tells me -- 2 November, he replied on 3 November, top of page 2 of my statement.</td>
<td>21. Q. The reason that was -- there is an email, I think it might be 3 November from memory -- in fact I have it in my statement -- where Peter tells me -- 2 November, he replied on 3 November, top of page 2 of my statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Q. Right. So you have provided to the BBC -- not directly 23. Q. When people talk about commissions it's a formal thing? You tell me, how does something get commissioned? Some importance is attached to the notion of it being commissioned?</td>
<td>23. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
<td>23. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Q. Right. So you have provided to the BBC -- not directly 24. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
<td>24. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
<td>24. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A. Um, as much as I have to get my hands on them.</td>
<td>25. I think I have made more notes that I just don't have</td>
<td>25. I think I have made more notes that I just don't have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I think I have made more notes that I just don't have</td>
<td>25. I think I have made more notes that I just don't have</td>
<td>25. I think I have made more notes that I just don't have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 a fairly typical thing where you have a word with the  
2 editor and say, 'I'm working on this story.' And they  
3 say, 'Great!', and then the broad expectation is that it  
4 is going to get on the air.  
5 I mean there were formal aspects to the Jimmy Savile  
6 story that kicked in down the line when the editing was  
7 booked and the budget was approved. That's what you  
8 might call a copper bottom commission and we were given  
9 a date for transmission. This is an informal  
10 commission, but he's telling me let's do it first. So  
11 his expectation, I took from that, to be this is a story  
12 that's going to be done.  
13 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask a detail on that. I get the  
14 point about there to be booking in the editing and you  
15 know it is up on the board and so on. Does a camera  
16 crew day affect that? Would you say if you are shooting  
17 an interview, that's a commissioned story?  
18 A. Yes. I mean, again you can quibble about the word  
19 "commission", but pretty much -- and as you well know we  
20 don't often just go round speculatively booking camera  
21 crews, that is 500 quid a day off including expenses to  
22 film interviews. It is quite a commitment in this day  
23 and age, so we definitely thought we were working  
24 towards a story that would get on air.  
25 MR POLLARD: I just, effectively for the sort of information

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

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

1 programme?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Because the editor of the whole programme obviously has  
4 the whole programme to run, is that right?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. So the fact that he was executive producer on this is  
7 rather important to understanding what his, as it were,  
8 obligations were in relation to it?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. In their opinion stronger and deeper than the  
11 obligations he had to a Newsnight story executives  
12 produced by someone else, is that right?  
13 A. Yes, he would have more involvement with the story.  
14 What it means in practice often is that he would be the  
15 person viewing the film, viewing the edited film, and  
16 either saying, "Not sure about that, change that round",  
17 or, "Fine".  
18 Q. Was there ever any doubt about the fact that  
19 Peter Rippin rather than say Shaminder Nahal or  
20 Liz Gibbons were the executive producer of this piece?  
21 A. No doubt at all. Because Liz -- she almost recoiled at  
22 the story. She just didn't want to have anything to do  
23 with it.  
24 Q. Let us look at precisely that point. A1/267. You  
25 recognise this mail. It is your email --
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A. Yes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. -- to Meirion Jones on 9 November?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Yes.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. That time of year When I'm A Celebrity was on. &quot;Had a meeting with Liz and Peter, she thinks we shouldn't do JS story on grounds of taste.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I just pause there. This was a meeting in Peter Rippon's office or something?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A. Um-hm.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q. How did she -- what did she do? Did she use the word, &quot;taste&quot;?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A. Yes, literally that. You know, she said it's taste. I don't think it's tasteful. I --</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q. What was distasteful? The fact that he had died or what?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A. The fact he had just died. And obviously within the context of the BBC already, you know, we knew there were going to be tributes at some point.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Q. You didn't know that -- quite know that now, did you?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A. No, they hadn't been commissioned, or at least they hadn't been announced but remember we have not long since had this sort of major coverage is given to his funeral so there is a sort of wider atmosphere that was one of celebrating Saville. So this &quot;taste&quot; was sort of: why are we making these claims about him when he has just died?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Q. So Liz Gibbons didn't fancy this story from the start?</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A. No. I think her reasons for not liking it changed, that's my impression, last year. But she certainly didn't like it at any point.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Q. So they changed?</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A. Yes.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Q. But they start off as being taste?</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A. The taste issue, yes.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Q. Which you interpreted as being it was distasteful --</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A. Don't speak ill of the dead.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Q. Don't speak ill of the dead. We will come to this in more detail. Just give us the overview of what the change was that you perceived?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A. In Liz?</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Q. Yes?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A. At some point a little bit further down the tracks, and again the emails show it, her concerns seemed more that</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Page 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. this was going to cause a big fuss, the story that we were trying to do. Because I approached her -- I can't remember exactly what day, but to literally -- because normally it's Liz that we talk to about films, not Peter.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. Because?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Because she's the commissioning editor.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The deputy, and Peter is sort of beyond that. I think this is the only film I have ever done where Peter was the exec producer.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maybe there was one other, but it would normally be Liz that I would talk to.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. So I approached her desk to say, you know, I will be filming this day and then I'm going to go and do another story that day. But as soon as I mentioned the Saville, she just turned away and just said, &quot;No, I want nothing to do with it. That's Peter's story, it's nothing to do with me. Talk to Peter about it&quot;. And that was the end of the conversation. So I -- well, I didn't think that was down to the feeling that the story was in bad taste. But I do think it might have been more to do with the fact that, you know, Meirion and I could see for some time that there was going to be a looming difficulty with the fact that part of the BBC was running the tributes and officially celebrating Saville, while the other little bit of the BBC was planning to run this incredibly damaging to his reputation story. If you follow me.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q. So you were going to, if I can put it like this, you could see that Newsnight was going to rain on the BBC's parade?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A. Yes, totally. And Liz said at one point to Meirion -- again a bit later, about this time, which is why I think I had taken from that exchange with her that she didn't want to go near it. She had said to Meirion, I don't want to piss off Danny Cohen, the controller of BBC1. So that clearly indicated that she was, you know, seeing which way the wind was blowing and realising there was going to be a big fuss.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q. What I don't understand is if Liz Gibbons is the commissioning editor, and if a decision is taken which Liz Gibbons doesn't approve of, but we can see from this email that in the end it's decided that it's a runner, at least at this stage, why didn't Liz Gibbons nonetheless have the responsibility as commissioning editor? Since that's what she did and it's what Peter Rippon didn't do?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A. Because --</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Q. Isn't a bit odd?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A. Because Peter occasionally does exec films. It's unusual in my experience, but that's not to say he</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. doesn't do it reasonably often. But day to day issues of where I am, when I'm available, when I am not, tend to go through Liz.
2. Q. So did you get the sense by this later time of not pissing off Danny Cohen --
3. A. Yes.
4. Q. -- that Liz Gibbons realised that Peter Rippon was holding a bit of a hospital pass here?
5. A. Yes. That's how it seemed, yes. I felt by the time we're talking about, which was obviously later than this email, I could see Peter seemed to me to be between a rock and a hard place.
6. Q. If Liz Gibbons could see that he had a hospital pass, did Peter Rippon give the impression of appreciating the pickle that was looming?
7. A. He gave the impression of being extremely uncomfortable and, you know, verging towards desperate not to run the story and looking for a lot of excuses not to run the story.
8. Q. We will come to the detail of that. Just let me ask you about the next sentence in your email: "I persuaded them [is that you?] her otherwise ... especially given police line!".
9. A. Yes.
10. Q. Can you fill that out for us?

**Page 33**

**Page 35**

1. A. Never mind that Jimmy Savile had just died, I thought there was very strong public interest for the story to run. You know, if someone is being seen and held up, especially by the BBC as one thing but actually we're getting by now, by this stage, quite a few conversations which suggest that we have got good grounds for suggesting he was something very different, I just saw a clear public interest, particularly in the BBC making that clear. You know, far better it came from within.
2. So --
3. Q. But what's the police line?
4. A. The police line now is the fact that we were hearing that there had been a police investigation, we didn't yet have confirmation. I can't remember if at this point we knew that it was definitely Surrey, but that to me added to the public interest. And it was an added thing, if you like, to help persuade him that the story was in the public interest.
5. Q. You discussed with her the fact that you had some information to suggest, did you, that there had been a police investigation which hadn't gone anywhere because of his age and infirmity?
6. A. Yes. I had said that's what we were being told.
7. Q. Obviously we didn't have any confirmation of that.
8. A. Yes. When I left the office there, I have indicated to Meirion, it's a goer, with Peter's say so.
9. Q. Right. So having got the apparent green light back on the 3rd?
10. A. Yes.
11. Q. You have now had a sticky meeting with Liz Gibbons, but it's still on track?
12. A. Yes.
13. Q. Go to 276, please --
14. MR POLLARD: You may be coming back to this, apologies if you are. You say in the 267 email; "But of course they are concerned about the women's credibility". Was that Peter and Liz? And if so, how strongly were they concerned?
Interview with Liz MacKean

Role in research was only to try to help us track down where this investigation, where was it based and what had happened to it.

Q. But the particular -- one particular reason why he was suited to this was because he had previously worked himself at Surrey Police?

A. Yes.

Q. So he was well placed, he had good contacts --

A. That is right.

Q. -- for doing a bit of digging there?

A. Yes. You see that won't have been in the original brief for him when Meirion first signed him up. But obviously as we were going along and we needed to find out about this investigation, he was an obviously good help.

Q. That neatly I think takes us to 276. Now at this stage we can see from the bottom there is some discussion about people entering the building. What was going on was they were being interviewed for the Newsnight political editor's role, weren't they?

A. Yes.

Q. We know that Allegra Stratton got that job?

A. Yes.

Q. And her predecessor was Michael Crick?

A. Yes.

Q. He had recently left Newsnight had he?

---

MR POLLARD: Did Mark Williams-Thomas talk to any of the women himself?

A. Um, certainly when our story was dropped, yes. Not at this stage, no.

MR POLLARD: Not before the story was dropped?

A. No.

MR POLLARD: Okay.

MR MACLEAN: He in fact wanted your job on this story. Did you know that?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you know that at the time?

A. Yes, Meirion told me.

Q. At the time?

A. Yes.

Q. We will come to Mark Williams-Thomas a bit later, but he had multiple roles in this story, didn't he? He was helping with the research and ultimately he was going to appear on the piece as some sort of expert witness.

Q. Did you speak to him on the quality of the work the police had done.

A. Um, opinions on the credibility of the witnesses we had spoken to. Not, from memory, particularly on the work the police had done, on the police investigation. His

---

Role in research was only to try to help us track down where this investigation, where was it based and what had happened to it.

Q. But the particular -- one particular reason why he was suited to this was because he had previously worked himself at Surrey Police?

A. Yes.

Q. So he was well placed, he had good contacts --

A. That is right.

Q. -- for doing a bit of digging there?

A. Yes. You see that won't have been in the original brief for him when Meirion first signed him up. But obviously as we were going along and we needed to find out about this investigation, he was an obviously good help.

Q. That neatly I think takes us to 276. Now at this stage we can see from the bottom there is some discussion about people entering the building. What was going on was they were being interviewed for the Newsnight political editor's role, weren't they?

A. Yes.

Q. We know that Allegra Stratton got that job?

A. Yes.

Q. And her predecessor was Michael Crick?

A. Yes.

Q. He had recently left Newsnight had he?

---

MR POLLARD: Did Mark Williams-Thomas talk to any of the women himself?

A. Um, certainly when our story was dropped, yes. Not at this stage, no.

MR POLLARD: Not before the story was dropped?

A. No.

MR POLLARD: Okay.

MR MACLEAN: He in fact wanted your job on this story. Did you know that?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you know that at the time?

A. Yes, Meirion told me.

Q. At the time?

A. Yes.

Q. We will come to Mark Williams-Thomas a bit later, but he had multiple roles in this story, didn't he? He was helping with the research and ultimately he was going to appear on the piece as some sort of expert witness.

Q. Did you speak to him on the quality of the work the police had done.

A. Um, opinions on the credibility of the witnesses we had spoken to. Not, from memory, particularly on the work the police had done, on the police investigation. His
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Interview with Liz MacKean

If you just go over to 278, keeping a finger in 276, those are the briefing notes, right:
"Here are the notes from the conversations I have had".
Do you see?
"The best is probably [redacted], do you see that? 278?"
MR SPAFFORD: We have some redactions in the top of this.
A. Yes, they are, with the different phone calls.
MR MACLEAN: Different people's names. Can you read the words, "Best is probably [redacted]?"
A. Yes.
Q. "Don't get in touch without ..."
A. Talking to me please.
Q. "I said ...(Reading to the words)... phone numbers et cetera."
If you go to 280, we can see what you were being given at this stage. There is a note, do you see --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that Hannah has made with one of the girls, as she was. Then 282, that's Hannah's note?
A. Yes.
Q. It's a long one about [redacted]
So back to 276, you are anticipating with Meirion Jones being sent those from Hannah Livingston. Then you say, "Shall I contact Surrey Police or wait?" And he says:
"Wait on Surrey Police. [redacted]."
What did that mean?
A. Well, I was asking him, you know: shall I approach Surrey Police to see if perhaps the investigation had come from them? Because at this stage we still didn't know. [redacted]
I think Meirion's caution, from memory, was that, you know, he didn't want it getting back to The Sun that we were looking at the story in case they escalated their efforts and got there before us.
Q. Did you know about Sky at this stage sniffing around, or not?
A. I can't remember. I knew about that from when I had spoken to [redacted] that first time, which I think was after this.
Q. Then we can go to 289, please? Still the same day, the 29th.
A. Yes.
Q. From Hannah Livingston to you and Meirion Jones:
"Here's all the notes I have on JS and Duncroft. So
Interview with Liz MacKean
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<th>Page 49</th>
<th>Page 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. I'm not sure I know. I mean, I certainly remember  
1. I spoke to some people who had not been in touch, had  
2. not had any direct contact with any of the people for  
3. years.  
4. Q. These girls, as they were at the time, had presumably by  
5. this stage in time scattered all over the place?  
6. A. And married, so names changed and so on. I do remember  
7. that [redacted] -- not [redacted] [redacted] online book that  
8. Melron originally sent the extract from it was resent  
9. by [redacted] as I recall.  
10. Q. Right.  
11. A. So she thought that maybe [redacted] was trying to --  
12. Q. Big herself up?  
13. A. Yes.  
14. Q. And that would be reflected in that [redacted] isn't overly  
15. keen on [redacted] being their spokesperson.  
16. Then she's adamant that it was somebody's sister who  
17. sparked the police investigation?  
18. A. Yes.  
19. Q. Now that sister had also been at Duncroft, is that  
20. right?  
21. A. Right, the sister is [redacted] who was at Duncroft.  
22. Q. Hang on. She isn't overly keen on [redacted] either. She's  
23. adamant that it was [redacted] sister who sparked the  
24. investigation.  
25. A. Yes, visiting Stoke Mandeville.  
26. Q. Right. So the police investigation had derived from, is  
27. this right, a complaint made by somebody against  
28. Jimmy Savile not at Duncroft at all but at Stoke  
29. Mandeville Hospital?  
30. A. Yes. We suspected that it was that way round. And that  
31. then in the course of that the police had then heard  
32. further complaints from Duncroft.  
33. Q. Did that, in the end, stack up? Did you ever  
34. understand -- did you ever find out what the spark for  
35. the Surrey Police investigation actually was?  
36. A. I think it was -- we now know from a statement the CPS  
37. gave ahead of the Panorama that there had also been  
38. a separate complaint in Sussex.  
39. Q. At times we can see in these documents there is  
40. reference to the girls contacting the police. But in  
41. fact the position is, isn't it, that obviously somebody  
42. contacted the police at some point, but what happened  
43. then was that the police contacted a number of the  |  
|  
| elements of, for example, grandiosity and so on?  
|  
| A. Very possibly. I mean I couldn't -- talking to her,  
|  
| there wasn't a point where I thought, "Well, that sounds  
|  
| crap", but she just seemed to really enjoy it. I don't  
|  
| know if it was just she enjoyed being phoned up and  
|  
| having a conversation but, you know, I didn't think she  
|  
| was sorted. I just thought "she sounds articulate and  
|  
| clever".  
|  
| Q. Although she didn't sound sorted, did she sound the most  
|  
| sorted?  
|  
| A. No.  
|  
| Q. There were others more sorted?  
|  
| A. To be honest [redacted] was the most sorted.  
|  
| Q. Leave her to one side. In the end she does a film  
|  
| interview and you can judge for yourself --  
|  
| A. You can judge for yourself.  
|  
| Q. But none of the other, except for [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]  
|  
| fall into that category?  
|  
| A. [redacted] certainly was sorted. I had phone  
|  
| conversations -- I didn't have one conversation where  
|  
| I thought somebody sounded shrill. Some of them were  
|  
| a -- some of them were a little vague in their  
|  
| recollections, not surprising really. You know, I felt  
|  
| I was speaking to perfectly reasonable people, albeit  
<p>|<br />
| people who had had a hard life. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. How many times had you met Hannah?</td>
<td>A. Twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. In which city did you first meet Hannah?</td>
<td>A. London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What was your first impression of Hannah?</td>
<td>A. She was warm and friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Describe the first conversation you had with Hannah.</td>
<td>A. It was brief but pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Did you have any concerns about Hannah's reputation for being manipulative?</td>
<td>A. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. How did you feel when you found out that Hannah had made a statement about your relationship?</td>
<td>A. Frustrated and upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What did you do when you heard about the situation?</td>
<td>A. I talked to Hannah and tried to sort things out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What was the outcome of the situation?</td>
<td>A. We resolved our differences and continued our relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotionally damaged with a criminal background**, he is,</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Q. Was that something discussed back at the ranch in Newsnight? You and Peter Rippon for example, did that ever come up in conversation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think, drawing from his experiences as a young person going there and knowing about the school. It was for emotionally disturbed people, some of whom had been in trouble with the police but some of whom were just a bit too hard for their parents to handle.</td>
<td>A. No, absolutely not.</td>
<td>A. We have seen that. I don't want to go into what she said, because we've seen it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But--</td>
<td>Q. The 14th was the interview with --</td>
<td>If you go to page 85, please, bundle 2, it's an email from you to Hannah Livingston on the 15th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Suspicious? Yes. Certainly that they were, as I say, very concerned, most of them, about having their identities kept out of it.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Suspicious of you, of the BBC --</td>
<td>Q. We have seen that. I don't want to go into what she said, because we've seen it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes --</td>
<td>Q. We have seen that. I don't want to go into what she said, because we've seen it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- or journalists?</td>
<td>Q. We have seen that. I don't want to go into what she said, because we've seen it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. There was a degree of being suspicious about journalists: what's the point of talking to you, it will never come out. And obviously suspicious that their identities would be protected if that's what they wanted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extremely manipulative, I genuinely don't know. I -- apart from and the letter, I did not find anyone I spoke to manipulate in the least.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. It's not your email, it's his email, but you see how that last sentence follows on from the sentence before, which is not talking about Duncroft girls in general, still less Duncroft girls in the 1970s or any particular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time in general, or Duncroft girls when I was a boy, it follows on from a sentence about &quot;five we have talked to&quot;. I think &quot;we've talked to five&quot;, and then it says &quot;it goes without saying that most of these girls ...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes. I think Meirion is generalising using some of his, you know, impressions of Duncroft growing up.</td>
<td>A. Liz Gibbons. I would have definitely told her, especially knowing how generally hostile she was to the story, but obviously Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My account to him at the time would not have led him to suggest they were extremely manipulative. He would have known that they were suspicious. And trust and gaining their confidence was obviously a big hurdle in our conversations with them.</td>
<td>Q. So Peter's enthusiasm has been bucked up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. You know that the interview --</td>
<td>A. Yes. You know, just it felt great, this is more of a goer now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can I add one thing there? The other striking thing, they didn't want anything. Even herself didn't ask for money or even a fee for doing the interview. They seemed, all of them, just very driven to put the record straight about Jimmy Savile.</td>
<td>Q. But the very next thought is about the letter?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Just on that, we might come to this letter, but one of the points that has been mentioned</td>
<td>Q. Yes.</td>
<td>Q. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**That's true, she was,</td>
<td>Q. So that's still an important part of the jigsaw?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. **</td>
<td>A. Yes, as I said for me it was. It was, you know, what the hell -- what's going on with that part of the story, I wanted to know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
<td>Q. If you go to 112 then, do you have mostly a blank page --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. I take it -- we had this discussion earlier, I'm not going to do this every time -- you didn't blank that out?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (Pages 57 to 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q. Do you remember what might have been there, when you say "see this"?
A. Is it a photo? Yes, I had sent something -- it was a link for something online involving Jimmy Savile.
I can't remember much more than that, but I had sent it to Meirion and Hannah.
The bit at the bottom of the page is something that you put on Friends Reunited?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. So the "story to have made you grinace", that is obviously a reference to the paragraph above, no doubt some unpleasant photograph of Jimmy Savile?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's a different topic. Then from "we have been approached", that's the text you put on Friends Reunited?
A. Yes.
Q. And the purpose of it was to ask the people on Friends Reunited to fill in any gaps, and in particular chasing up the point about the letter?
A. Um-hm.
Q. Yes. And what was the response to that?
A. From She was a former Duncroft girl?

A. Yes, I am sure she responded but I don't remember.
Q. If you go to page 117, that's your email to yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at 116, that's an email to you from --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in response. Then at the top of 116 you to -- "grim picture" et cetera, but is that as far as this went, this little trail?
A. Yes.
Q. It didn't get you any further forward? Is that right?
A. Um-hm.

MR SPAFFORD: We need to take a break for the shorthand writer.

(11.30 am)
(A short break)

(11.45 am)

MR POLLARD: Liz, could I just resume, just with a couple of questions. We had reached the point where we were talking about the interview and coming back to the office, and that went well and so on.
Having seen all the rushes of that, there were just a couple of questions about it. She's obviously -- she makes quite a big impact when you see it all. How did you judge her overall credibility when you saw that?
A. Very high. She just seemed believable. She didn't pretend to remember things she couldn't remember. And I think that was why she was doing it.
You know, she wanted to set the record straight and, you know, she had clearly had a hard life.

MR POLLARD: Did you have any qualms about a couple of things she mentioned, one that she was clearly on medication at the time, she talked about Lithium, whether that was Librium or somebody else said it was Largactil and a different thing. She and probably several of the other girls were on some sort of medication and she also talked about being in a sort of dream-like state for part of that period, and as you say there were several things where she said, "I just don't remember the incident." Did that give you any sort of pause for thought?
A. Well, no. I mean, yes, in that I registered her saying it, and of course I wondered what effect would that have on her recollection. The question is would she have been hallucinating, did she imagine things that had happened to her and in fact didn't happen and Savile was blameless. But that again is where we were relying on wider accounts and having spoken to more people.

MR MACLEAN: But Savile was dead. Some people have suggested to us that it shouldn't -- not, I hasten to add BBC management -- that it shouldn't make any difference to the substance of the story, the bar that you set, whether somebody that you are accusing of being a paedophile is alive or dead. Do you agree with that?
A. Well, yes, I agree with the spirit of it. But maybe not the practice. The key difference is that this story would not have run, I'm pretty sure, had he been alive.
I don't think any of those people we talked to would have talked to us, for fear of being sued. You know, it is a practical fact.

Q. There are two different elements there, aren't there?
A. One element is whether the women would have talked to you in the first place for fear of being sued. That's one thing, I can see that. But then there's another question, isn't there, which is: if they did talk to you and said all the things that they said, whether any sentient broadcaster would have broadcast that piece.
So there are two different stages at which things would have run.
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1. might well have been different had Savile still been
alive, is that right?
2. A. Yes.
3. Q. So let's go back to this interesting and perhaps
important question about the spirit and the practice.
4. I cut you off, you were in the middle of your answer.
5. I said:
6. "It shouldn't make any difference if you are
accusing somebody of being a paedophile whether they are
alive or dead, do you agree?
7. You said: yes, I agree with the spirit and not
necessarily the practice. Then you said the key
difference --
8. A. I'm there again. The practice is the women were willing
to talk to us and they would not have been. But I think
there is something in the spirit. I mean I wasn't sort
of champing at the bit to rubbish Jimmy Savile now that
he was dead. I didn't come into the story, as I said to
you at the beginning, with any baggage in relation to
Savile, beyond the thought that he seemed a bit of
a weirdo.
9. That is why for me it was always very important that
we had what I would consider a credible number of
complementary accounts to justify, because I could see
the clear public interest in this story if it were
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justifiable, and to make it justifiable I felt we needed
2. to speak to more people. Because you had to take
3. account of the fact that, you know they were, as I said
4. before, women who had been compromised. They had
5. difficult backgrounds, obviously a lot of mental health
6. issues along the way. They were clearly disturbed --
7. some of them very disturbed teenagers.
8. MR POLLARD: Were you reconciled and happy with the idea of
9. putting a case to air that couldn't have been put while
10. he was alive?
11. A. Well, I didn't try -- I didn't come to it when he was
12. alive. So I was only looking at it in that context.
13. I haven't really asked myself that question. I mean, if
14. he had been alive, with what I had, if those women had
15. spoken to me -- and as I say I don't think they would
16. have done -- I think I would have still reached the
17. conclusion that it was worth -- you know, it was
18. important and worth running. We might have wanted even
19. more, I don't know.
20. MR POLLARD: Because there is a point, we may be coming
to it later, where you are talking to a friend about the
21. bar being put impossibly high. This, I think, has been
22. construed as a reference to the idea that just because
23. Jimmy Savile is dead you shouldn't drop the level of
24. proof required to put a story out.
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1. have a view about an answer they want to hear again.
2. MR POLLARD: If, if you like an outsider or
3. a non-journalistic person was looking at that, they
4. could construe that as going again to get the account
5. right, rather than it being a spontaneous offering.
6. A. Did you form that impression when you looked at it?
7. MR MACLEAN: We will ruminate about that.
8. A. Yes. I mean, I know why we go over things again. It's
9. for, you know, reasons of practicality, that the chance
10. may be I haven't asked something that Meirion thinks
11. I should have asked. You know, it's almost like
12. a safety net. It gives you more than just one chance to
13. get at particular things in the interview.
15. MR MACLEAN: There was one element in the rushes where, for
16. example, she simply lost her train of
17. thought and at one point she confused two words,
18. I think. I forget what they were, but I don't know if
19. you remember that. She used the wrong word and then it
20. stopped and there was a kind of a chuckle and you said,
21. "You confused one word with another word", and you went
22. back over it again.
23. A. Yes.
24. Q. It has been suggested to us that Peter Rippon took the
25. view that it simply wasn't a good idea to have
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1. interviews done on film at the stage that you got them, because it was necessary to establish the full strength of the story before doing any interviews that you might not be able to use. All right?
2. First of all, do you recognise that as a part of --
3. topic of discussion that you had at the time?
4. A. Absolutely not. No discussion about that at all.
5. Q. Then secondly, let's assume for example that the broadcast had been made in respect of somebody who was still alive, who then the brought a legal action --
6. A. Yes.

Reed Smith Meeting

1. telling -- a colleague of the same rank for example, leave aside whether it is an inappropriate thing to be saying to you, as a matter of principle?
2. A. I think I would say, as a matter of principle, no.
3. Because if you are trying to make these -- bring these allegations against someone who is alive, obviously you are thinking about the libel court and the credibility of your witness in those extremely difficult situations.
4. But where I meant before about the spirit being the reasonable consideration, you've got to bring, if the person is dead, you've got to bring claims that you are as sure as you can be, are true. That's where the rigour comes in. That you, you know, make -- you are as certain as you can, you talk to as many people as possible, you subject what they tell you to scrutiny, to cross reference.
5. What I absolutely think is just because the guy is dead it's not a great free for all, he can't sue us, let's dig up a salacious story. That is absolutely the last approach I would ever take.

1. Q. In the end you had two filmed interviews, one with [redacted] and one with [redacted]
2. A. Yes.
3. Q. [redacted] didn't claim to be a victim of Jimmy Savile?

Merrill Corporation
(+44) 207 404 1400
www.merrillcorp/mls.com
8th Floor 165 Fleet Street
London EC4A 2DY

Page 69

1. being a paedophile --
2. A. I don’t think I said that.
3. Q. Well --
4. A. I didn’t quite mean that.
5. Q. Well, that was what I was trying to get at earlier.
6. A. Right. Self-evidently it's not the same standard.
7. Because the standard of accusing someone who’s alive, is that, yes, you have to stand up there in the libel court with the people you have used as witnesses to be tested.
8. As we know, it’s very easy to knock holes in what people are saying, particularly people with these sorts of backgrounds.
9. Q. Let's assume that a hypothetical BBC manager had come to you at some point --
10. A. Yes.
11. Q. -- and said, "Liz, you are applying the same standards of whether you call it rigour or whatever that you would apply if you were accusing a live person of being a paedophile, aren't you?"
12. A. Your response would have been --
13. A. No, I think I would have --
14. Q. -- no, I'm not.
15. A. -- thought that unwarranted.
16. Q. Leave aside the question of whether it would be unwarranted interference by somebody. Somebody you are Page 70
| Page 73 | Q. Can we go to 194, please? It’s an email from somebody called Helen Weaver to Meirion Jones.  
1 A. Yes.  
2 Q. You know who Helen Weaver is?  
3 A. She’s from the Impact team.  
4 Q. There are a number of emails from her, which I am sure you have seen. But at the time did you have any email contact, first of all, with Helen Weaver?  
5 A. No. No.  
6 Q. Did you have any telephone or face-to-face contact with Helen Weaver?  
7 A. I may have seen her in the office and had a word, but, no, Meirion was looking after that side of it. But obviously he was keeping me in the loop because it was going to greatly affect what — you know, the amount of extra work I would need to do on different versions.  
8 Q. Yes, because the idea was you would be all over the place —  
9 A. Yes, they anticipated that would be the case.  
10 Q. So, unless you want to say anything to us about Helen Weaver and Impact, it doesn’t sound like a very fruitful way of spending our time to go through those emails, does it?  
11 A. No, not particularly. The significance of it in terms of the timeline is that this was showing that the word was getting out that we were looking at a story about Jimmy Savile being a sexual abuser, and the response was, you know, immediate and very enthusiastic as in: this is going to be a huge story and everyone will want to run it.  
12 So in terms of the other background that I was talking about earlier, you know, gearing up to tributes in this general atmosphere of celebration of Jimmy Savile, this was, if you like, another sign that there was going to be — you know, a collision was looming.  
13 Q. Is that quite fair? A general atmosphere of celebration? Is that really what was going on at the time or is that —  
14 A. I think so. You know, you had had the elaborate funeral, the huge coverage on the BBC and the body lying in state.  
15 Q. The elaborate funeral and the body lying in state, they were not the BBC’s doing.  
16 A. But the BBC gave it massive coverage at the time.  
17 Q. There were a lot of people there. It was a big public event in that sense.  
18 A. It was an atmosphere of celebration.  
19 Q. Well, among the people lining the streets of Leeds.  
20 A. Sure, but the amount of attention it got, particularly  |
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1 A. No, it doesn’t.  
2 Q. -- but you had reached the position where you were satisfied in your own mind -- and I think Hannah was as well -- I suggest, but tell me if this is wrong, that you probably had identified the likely victim of  
3  
4 A. The possible victim rather than the likely victim.  
5 I mean, thought she was the victim. But she wasn’t certain about it. So I thought we’d tracked -- we’d identified someone who, if we could find her, would help shed light on that.  
6 Q. How many times had been to Television Centre for a Jimmy Savile programme?  
7 A. Certainly more than once, but I don’t remember.  
8 Q. And how many times had she been to TV centre to a programme that was on?  
9 A. I think once.  
10 Q. And how many girls had gone to that programme --  
11 A. A number.  
12 Q. -- from Duncroft?  
13 A. A number, she was not specific.  
14 Q. And they went in, was it Theo’s minibus or something?  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. Theo being a woman?  
17 A. Being a teacher.  |
| Page 75 |  
1 Q. We can see that Hannah Livingston thinks it would be ideal to track her down because thought that was the girl she had seen having sex with?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Obviously that would have been a big help if you had been able to do that. You say in your reply:  
4 "Brilliant you registered that about I was thinking we could do with corroborating about that incident".  
5 But it never got any further, that particular aspect?  
6 A. No, we couldn’t find her.  
7 Q. So the position that you got to was that was the girl she had seen having sex with. You had a photograph of and which is how she had identified her, and then Hannah finds the Klunk Click which puts those two girls, as they were, at the TV centre with the perpetrator, which obviously gives legs to the suggestion that she was the victim.  
8 A. Yes. I mean it certainly takes you further to that conclusion than without the footage.  
9 Q. It doesn’t in itself prove anything --  
10 A. No, it doesn’t.  
11 Q. -- but you had reached the position where you were satisfied in your own mind -- and I think Hannah was as well -- I suggest, but tell me if this is wrong, that you probably had identified the likely victim of  
12  
13 A. The possible victim rather than the likely victim.  
14 I mean, thought she was the victim. But she wasn’t certain about it. So I thought we’d tracked -- we’d identified someone who, if we could find her, would help shed light on that.  
15 Q. How many times had been to Television Centre for a Jimmy Savile programme?  
16 A. Certainly more than once, but I don’t remember.  
17 Q. And how many times had she been to TV centre to a programme that was on?  
18 A. I think once.  
19 Q. And how many girls had gone to that programme --  
20 A. A number.  
21 Q. -- from Duncroft?  
22 A. A number, she was not specific.  
23 Q. And they went in, was it Theo’s minibus or something?  
24 A. Yes.  
25 Q. Theo being a woman?  
26 A. Being a teacher.  |
| Page 76 |  
1 Q. We can see that Hannah Livingston thinks it would be ideal to track her down because thought that was the girl she had seen having sex with?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Obviously that would have been a big help if you had been able to do that. You say in your reply:  
4 "Brilliant you registered that about I was thinking we could do with corroborating about that incident".  
5 But it never got any further, that particular aspect?  
6 A. No, we couldn’t find her.  
7 Q. So the position that you got to was that was the girl she had seen having sex with. You had a photograph of and which is how she had identified her, and then Hannah finds the Klunk Click which puts those two girls, as they were, at the TV centre with the perpetrator, which obviously gives legs to the suggestion that she was the victim.  
8 A. Yes. I mean it certainly takes you further to that conclusion than without the footage.  
9 Q. It doesn’t in itself prove anything --  
10 A. No, it doesn’t.  
11 Q. -- but you had reached the position where you were satisfied in your own mind -- and I think Hannah was as well -- I suggest, but tell me if this is wrong, that you probably had identified the likely victim of  
12  
13 A. The possible victim rather than the likely victim.  
14 I mean, thought she was the victim. But she wasn’t certain about it. So I thought we’d tracked -- we’d identified someone who, if we could find her, would help shed light on that.  
15 Q. How many times had been to Television Centre for a Jimmy Savile programme?  
16 A. Certainly more than once, but I don’t remember.  
17 Q. And how many times had she been to TV centre to a programme that was on?  
18 A. I think once.  
19 Q. And how many girls had gone to that programme --  
20 A. A number.  
21 Q. -- from Duncroft?  
22 A. A number, she was not specific.  
23 Q. And they went in, was it Theo’s minibus or something?  
24 A. Yes.  
25 Q. Theo being a woman?  
26 A. Being a teacher.  |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- with Shane Ritchie.</td>
<td>1 story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's look at 324, please. I asked you about</td>
<td>2 A. I think it would have done in the mind of Peter Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact. Jo Mathys, she is in Impact, is she --</td>
<td>from things that he's said. But I really question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. She is.</td>
<td>what's behind what you are asking me, in that a tabloid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. And she's emailing Liz Gibbons on 23 November.</td>
<td>story is to sort of dismiss it and make it sound, in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>way I that Peter characterised it this year, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Why is she -- that's part of some regular process,</td>
<td>celebrity exposé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is it?</td>
<td>I mean, these were such serious claims about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>a public figure involving the BBC -- I mean that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Why Liz Gibbons, why not Shaminder Nahal or</td>
<td>clearly a huge thing, not just that he had been a BBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Rippon?</td>
<td>employee but he had actually operated on BBC premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Because Liz Gibbons is the commissioning editor.</td>
<td>But you know a school with vulnerable teenage girls --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That goes back to the point we discussed earlier?</td>
<td>vulnerable but tricky teenage girls who were being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, exactly.</td>
<td>looked after variously by the Home Office or the local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But this wasn't Liz Gibbons' baby, this particular one?</td>
<td>authority, and we had had this suggestion or account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. It was not her --</td>
<td>from Stoke Mandeville, the hospital, and it was very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. This was not Liz Gibbons' piece?</td>
<td>vague but I think we were going to try to shoehorn it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No, very much not.</td>
<td>in. We had seen that he had been at Haute de la Garenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Just jumping around a bit, we see if we go to 266 you</td>
<td>and there had been some hint of a complaint which we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentioned earlier, you made the point just after we</td>
<td>didn't get anywhere with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumed, that you didn't come to this with any baggage.</td>
<td>All I'm trying to say is without doubt we had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
<td>a story that took in -- it was more than just some sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. There is a distinction, isn't there, between your</td>
<td>of tabloid silly little-tattle, it took in important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position which is coming to this, if I may say so, as an</td>
<td>institutions, but it suggested a pattern of behaviour of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent but, in a sense ignorant, journalist on the</td>
<td>wilful targeting of the sort of people who probably</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Wouldn't be believed if they complained and who were very vulnerable.

Q. I understand that. My function is -- this is a inquisitorial process, I am sure you understand this --
A. Sure.
Q. One of my functions is to test what you are saying and whoever comes tomorrow we will test what they say.
A. If I seem fired up it is because I believe very strongly that this story, and what we were trying to do has been totally deranged for quite suspect reasons.
Q. Let's just unpick some of this. I think you accepted that in principle the police inquiry running into the sand because he was old and infirm would help to convert this into more of a Newsnight story?
A. Certainly the police investigation, the police inquiry.
Q. Your next answer focused on Jimmy Savile and Stoke Mandeville and the various places that he worked, and I understand that. But if you can leave out of account the fact for the moment that Jimmy Savile had been a BBC personality -- let's assume he had been a pop singer or a footballer or whatever -- pop singer is probably a good enough example for the moment, who had done all these things, some aged rock star. Without the police element this would have been a story about aged pop star
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1 is a paedophile; a predatory, nasty paedophile in a range of places a long time ago. That is not the bread and butter of Newsnight is it?
A. No, but don't forget the charity aspect. Savile -- setting aside, as you have asked, that he was a BBC person --
Q. Yes.
A. -- he was also a huge charitable figure who was, you know, knighted twice for his services to charity. So I think that elevated him as a target of public interest over and above the fact -- you know, he wasn't just in your rock star category that you are making. I think the charitable side of it, the fact that he was held in such great esteem all around the country, that he had raised so much money for good causes and was therefore identified with them added to the public interest in testing whether there was more to know about him. I don't think he was -- I don't think your example is the best one.
MR POLLARD: Could I just ask, while we're on this subject of, if you like, the strength of the story, just to be a bit more specific about the issue of the supposed letter and the CPS dropping the case for the reason that was given; old and infirm and so on. It may be the case that -- and we will see this obviously when we talk to
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1 Peter Rippon -- was that, if you like, the final barrier. If that had been proven to be the case, if the letter had arrived, it may well be that he would have been happy to have run the story.
So can you just explain what in your mind the story was without that element, and what the story would have been with that element, in the sense that logically if we got the extra element that would have meant that the case against Jimmy Savile had been investigated and proven to have substance and dropped for a reason that wasn't to do with the facts, as it were?
A. I mean, in my mind at the time I never expected to be told that the reason the prosecution was dropped was because of his age and infirmity. It just seemed a totally unlikely thing that the CPS would have admitted.

MR POLLARD: So did you think that the letter didn't exist?
A. No, I think enough people had said they had seen it and had remembered that being a part of it, which is why I really wanted to see it. Because I thought that might be our only way to see if his age and infirmity had been a consideration in the decision.
But, you know, the fact of the police investigation definitely added weight to the story in my mind.

MR POLLARD: Does the fact that several of the women
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1 remembered seeing this letter and the terms of the letter which, it would appear, in the end wasn't written in those terms, or didn't exist in those terms, did that give you some concern about a sort of collective false memory, to use a slightly quasi-scientific term?
A. No. I mean it is possible, if I'm honest -- you know, it is entirely possible. But -- and I can't say this with utter certainty, actually, so I don't know if my answer is going to be helpful. But I don't think they necessarily all got together on the letter. I'm not certain that people we'd spoken to about the letter were all in touch. Certainly both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were in touch and both talked about the letter. So therefore I would have to say yes, it's possible it was some collective memory.
But we do know now of course that there was an investigation that was dropped for lack of evidence.

MR POLLARD: Yes.
A. So, you know, they knew about -- I think they were right in their memory of a letter.

MR POLLARD: Yes, okay.
MR MACLEAN: We can put bundle 2 away, I think, and take bundle 3 and go to page 11. Now we go to 25 November.
A. Yes.
Q. You are not actually sent this email, but you presumably
Interview with Liz MacKean
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1. discovered this pretty much instantaneously; that off
2. the record Surrey Police has confirmed that they did
3. investigate Savile about sexual abuse and they
4. interviewed girls from Duncroft.

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

Q. Then if you go over the page again, Meirion replies
saying Peter Rippon that:
"We are hoping to interview a second victim on
Monday afternoon, but we won't be sure until midday''.
There was a bit of shuffling around with dates.
I can't remember the details, I am afraid, and it
doesn't matter, I think, but the second victim that's
a reference -- an inaccurate reference, actually -- to

A. Yes.

Q. Now it was obviously of some importance, isn't it,
whether that second person is herself a victim or
merely -- well, you could be a victim, you could be
a spectator in the murder in the dressing room
sense, or you could simply be a girl at the school who
had heard other girls talking. But if you are in the
first of those category, that obviously gives the most
corroborative weight.

A. Yes.

Q. You know that there is some suggestion that Peter Rippon
either didn't know or hadn't registered about there
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1. decided in query 2009 that he was too old and infirm to
2. face a trial. So that was going to be the immediate
3. fronting up of the story?
4. A. Um-hm.
5. Q. Then there is reference to some of the abuse having
6. taken place after BBC recordings. Hannah Livingston
7. makes a rather interesting correction, doesn't she, if
8. we go back a page? She quite rightly suggests that it
9. would be more accurate to say that they even claim that
10. some of the abuse took place at the BBC, not merely
11. after. After was correct, as a matter of time, but at
12. was more precise?
13. A. Um-hm.
14. Q. Did that draft Q ever find its way into Peter Rippon's
15. hands, other than as part of the ROUGHSAVILE --
16. A. Not that I'm aware of.
17. Q. So what was Peter Rippon furnished with?
18. A. Um, well, I don't know if he'd have seen this Q.
19. I mean, you know as you say it's a draft Q, as Meirion
20. says, it's a first attempt.
21. Q. Yes.
22. A. What he had was the knowledge of the ROUGHSAVILE
23. interview is. I think two days later we sent him the
24. ROUGHSAVILE 2 script which had clips transcribed from
25. interview and quotes transcribed from the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview with Liz MacKean</th>
<th>Reed Smith Meeting</th>
<th>13 November 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>anonymous interviews, along with what we were pretty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Liz Gibbons on the 28th --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sure Mark Williams-Thomas would say given that Meirion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>had been in close touch with him and knew what he</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q. -- copied to Meirion Jones, subject JS. Was this talked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>thought about what we were -- how the thing was shaping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>about in some sort of code, was this deliberate code?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>up and the detail that we were getting a second</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>interview on camera with a Duncroft pupil.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q. Why not just write Savile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q. So where were the rushes? Where did they reside?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. Shorthand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A. With Meirion. With Meirion.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q. So we should not read anything into that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q. In his office in the BBC?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A. No, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Yes, in his open office. He has an area in the office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q. TX, that is transmission, is Wed 7th. So that is just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>and his normal practice is to put stuff in his files, in</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>over a week, nine days later?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a drawer.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q. Would you expect not the editor of the programme, going</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q. &quot;We will do a day's filming this Weds&quot;, and that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>back to our earlier discussion --</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>with -- what was that, what is that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A. That would have been with -- but she put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q. -- but the executive producer of a piece to view the</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>it back to the following day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>rushes from start to finish?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q. Finishing off on Monday 5th. That was your piece to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A. No.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>camera?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Q. So the information that you would expect to furnish to</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A. And the Mark Williams-Thomas interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>the executive producer of a piece in a typical story</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Q. The location of your pieces to camera had not yet been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>would comprise what?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>decided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A. Well, the verbal account and then a script of how the</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A. No, no, we knew it would be at Duncroft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>story was looking. I would expect the exec producer to</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Q. Not at Television Centre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>say, &quot;Hang on, let's go back to the source material!&quot;, if</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A. Maybe one of them would have been done at Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>they had a problem or they wanted to make sure of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | things. |
| 1 | Q. And the source material here would be -- |
| 2 | A. The rushes and the notes. |
| 3 | Q. Would be the rushes, your handwritten notes, the |
| 4 | typed-up notes from Hannah Livingston -- |
| 5 | A. The typed-up notes, yes, I wouldn't have treated Peter |
| 6 | to my handwriting. But, yes, everything had been typed |
| 7 | up. |
| 8 | Q. Is this right then -- forget about stories that don't |
| 9 | run -- stories that do run are okayed, given the green |
| 10 | light, whatever expression you want to use, on the basis |
| 11 | of the reporter or the producer or in collaboration, |
| 12 | providing the executive producer with a draft script |
| 13 | saying: this is what we are proposing to say, as they |
| 14 | say in Private Eye, "Will this do Ed?"
| 15 | Is that how it works? |
| 16 | So there must be occasions when the executive |
| 17 | producer comes back and says, "This won't do. I don't |
| 18 | think this is good enough", for whatever reason. Strong |
| 19 | enough. So what would typically happen then? |
| 20 | A. Well in this case I would then expect a conversation |
| 21 | where a lot more is asked of us in terms of the way |
| 22 | we're presenting the material in that draft script. |
| 23 | Q. Just before we get to the draft script, if you go to |
| 24 | page 121, bundle 3, there is an email from you to |
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|   | Q. That's why I asked. |
| 1 | A. Yes. |
| 2 | Q. You were doing something else, a day's filming with |
| 3 | Poppy. Who is Poppy? |
| 4 | A. She's another producer who I was working on a story |
| 5 | about academies with. |
| 6 | Q. Is she Poppy Sebag Montefiore? |
| 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | Q. You have some email traffic with her about the Jimmy |
| 9 | Saville story as well. |
| 10 | A. Do I? |
| 11 | Q. Yes. |
| 12 | A. That's how you know her name. Maybe I do, I can't |
| 13 | remember, it was all going on at the time. |
| 14 | Q. Did she work for the BBC? |
| 15 | A. She is a freelance, yes. |
| 16 | Q. So this was something about the education policy? |
| 17 | A. Yes, yes. |
| 18 | Q. So why does this go to Liz Gibbons and not Peter Rippon? |
| 19 | A. Because that's logistics, you know. That is saying this |
| 20 | is going out that day, when we are going to be filming, |
| 21 | when we are going to be finished. I'm just keeping her |
| 22 | in the loop because now it is much more of a matter for |
| 23 | her. |
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23 (Pages 89 to 92)
MR POLLARD: Can I just ask one factual thing, where did the
  definite date of Wednesday 7th, TX come from?
A. Well it's in the budget, in the budget called Jimmy that
  was identified as the date.
Q. But who would have set that? Is that --
A. Meirion and Peter set it in conversation.
MR POLLARD: Between them.
A. So when there was basically space to run it, giving us
  enough time to turn it round.
MR POLLARD: So it would have been set some time in the
  previous couple of days, do you think?
A. Exactly, it would have been set after 25 November.
MR POLLARD: Okay, thanks.
MR MACLEAN: Did you know that by this stage -- in fact I
  think the day before but it doesn't matter precisely,
  I am sure it is the day before -- that Meirion Jones had
  been in contact with Roger Law?
A. I think he'd had a telephone call with him. I mean we
  didn't think that the story would be legally that
  difficult, but Meirion had had a phone call with him.
  I don't know how much detail he had given him and I know
  he copied him into the script ROUGHSAVEILE 2.
Q. So far as you are aware, did the BBC's lawyers -- Mr Law
  or any of his colleagues -- ever suggest that there was
  any difficulty with the script that you were developing?
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A. Not that I am aware of.
Q. So whatever sensitivity there might be for the BBC, it
  wasn't driven by those considerations? Legal defamation
  type considerations?
A. No.
Q. We can also see at 118, just a little bit before where
  we were, that by this time Meirion Jones had done what
  he calls a sync pull. Then if you just keep a finger
  there, please, and go to 123. If I have this right, you
  then take the sync pull he sent you at a 14.53 and you
  are working, we can see this from your handwritten notes
  on the script -- if we go to 126 there is a early draft
  of the script which is dropping in these gobbets, to use
  a legal term, of pieces from the interview?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't think -- we went through this with Meirion Jones
  in some detail, I don't think it is particularly
  fruitful to go through these, this draft script, unless
  you want to. Because we can see what it says.
A. Yes.
Q. Now both you and Meirion then worked on the script a bit
  further, didn't you, in that couple of days, the 27th,
  28th --
A. Yes, the 29th and 30th, there were two further drafts.
Q. I want to come to and pause at the 29th. If we go to
  page 143, this is the 29th, in the morning. What has
  happened is, as we have just seen, he, Meirion, gets the
  sync pull, you do a draft. You and he work it up a bit.
  It doesn't -- the details of that doesn't matter for
  present purposes. He then sent an email to you, Hannah,
  Roger Law, Peter Rippon and Liz Gibbons:
  "And that is a very rough script to give you an idea
  of what we're saying. Could put a defence in there or
  leave it as a prosecution case and have a defender off
  the back in the disco, very '70s."
  I find that slightly opaque. What's that
  a reference to?
A. That we would either -- we would obviously need to give
  right of replies particularly in relation to Duncroft
  school and the BBC. Then we would either put them into
  the body of the film or leave it as a prosecution case,
  have the film setting out the allegations with a chance
  for the people, you know, in the dock if you like to
  appear in the studio as a right of reply.
Q. So the people in the dock, as you put it, would be the
  Duncroft School? It had been closed down, hadn't it?
A. Well, it was Home Office, but it's a -- it's sort of
  changed. I think it was local authority control. It
  was sort of -- both had been in charge during the time
  period that we were dealing with.
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**Interview with Liz MacKean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fix it, charity work, Stoke Mandeville, Prince Charles and so on. Then you do a piece to camera, then we have Mark Williams-Thomas. Then you and Meirion are anticipating that Mark Williams-Thomas will then deal with the Surrey Police investigation and with the fact that the CPS had decided that he was too old and infirm and that that was unacceptable and was an unacceptable hushing up of Jimmy Savile’s criminal activity. That’s the direction of travel for the script?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. If you jump to the end at 165 the piece is going to end you with saying to the camera – piece to camera – that’s why I asked you a moment ago if it wasn’t certain where, Duncroft or Television Centre: “Not sure yet, with any statement from police or CPS and line about girls not believing it just happened at Duncroft. Others will now come to tell what happened to them.” So in the dock, to use your word, are the police or the CPS, with the addition of the suggestion from you at the end of the piece that what might well happen as a result of this is that other people will, as it were, appear from other aspects of Jimmy Savile’s life and say something nasty happened to me at X or Y or Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is that a fair summary?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, in a way where we felt we were going with this whole story was towards a picture where Savile had insinuated himself into all sorts of institutions, with his sort of charitable hat on, around the country. And it seemed to us if we’d had this account at Stoke Mandeville, Duncroft obviously, and Television Centre, it just seemed very likely that what we might be looking at -- and we had a whisper about Haute de la Garenne -- is the idea that he, you know, deliberately worked his way into places where he could access vulnerable people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But there is no mention in the script -- it is true it mentions the [censored] episode at Television Centre, but by no stretch of the imagination does this script focus on what has in recent weeks been focused on, which is that the BBC has got a, so it is said, a real problem because it, as it were, allowed these things to happen on its premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That wasn’t -- that wasn’t the focus of this. The focus of this was the police investigation and the CPS and the fact that Savile may have done this in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, but not the BBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Is that fair?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I think that’s completely fair based on the script.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reed Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 November 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. But, you see, we had been a bit, um, hesitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I suppose -- well, we had been weighing up when do we approach the BBC because also in our minds we were afraid the BBC might somehow stop us running the story, given that we were implicating -- by the testimony about the dressing room and the recordings, the Klunk Clicks, we were implicating the BBC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. And we were alive to the possibility that it might make it harder for the piece to get on air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. So we needed to contact the BBC and get some comment, but at this point that was still quite undeveloped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So what was the embryonic thought? Who was going to be the recipient of the right to reply letter at the BBC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. We would have gone through the press office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. The press office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. Yes, which is the way that -- you know, like in the recent fuss since the beginning of October, BBC journalists had to direct all their inquiries through the press office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That is common, isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. That is standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. One of the BBC’s rules is you are not allowed to short circuit things. If you are doing a piece about my programme you have to go through the same channels as if you were working for ITV, The Times or The Telegraph --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. An outside journalist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- or The Guardian, whatever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Exactly. So people were expressly told not to contact me and Meirion directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So you said that you thought the BBC might stop you doing it. Let me see exactly what you said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. We were alive to the possibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Can I just ask you to look, while Richard is finding that, at page 171? We have heard a bit about something called editorial policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Meirion told us yesterday that he spoke to the person you see named in the middle of the page called Phil Abrahams and he also spoke to somebody called Roger Mahony. What contact did you have in 2011 with editorial policy, if any, about this story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So when you said a moment ago, “In our minds we were afraid the BBC might somehow stop us running this story.” Which entity, which part of the BBC or which individual did you have in mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I think just it was a corporate thing. I just imagined that, you know possibly because of the tribute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. Is the CPS?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Is that right?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Is that the one?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. It's the one on 214. It's actually not sent to you, but I'm pretty sure it came to your attention pretty quickly.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That one, yes?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Concerned it was only on 30 November that it became apparent Peter Rippon was having pretty cold feet?</td>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. And until then, we've seen the earlier emails and in particular the one of the 25th where he says, you know, next step is transmission date. Had anything happened between then, the 25th and the end of the 29th, to lead you to think that he was changing his mind?</td>
<td>A. I honestly don't remember if there had been conversations, but I don’t recall. But I do remember this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Email of course and I think it was the first time it was clear in black and white that the CPS line, which I’d never thought it likely we would get verbatim, had become the test for the story going ahead.</td>
<td>A. None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What contact had you had with Helen Boaden by the end of the 29th September about this story?</td>
<td>A. None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What contact had you had with Stephen Mitchell about this story?</td>
<td>A. None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Had you discussed with Peter Rippon whether he'd had any contact about this story with either of those two?</td>
<td>A. I remember a conversation that would have been about this time, yes, when I asked him directly if he'd spoken to Helen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. After this email? After you -- I can see why you would have reasoned, once you saw this, to go to Peter Rippon and say, &quot;Well, what does X say, what does Y say, have you spoken to Z?&quot; But before this email can you remember if there was any such discussion?</td>
<td>A. No. I can’t -- I just can't remember the precise timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. The same day, we're on the 29th still, if you just jump back to 174, this is not to you but it is about you. This is about all the places that Jo Mathys had you covering these bases when the story goes out?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So it is an indication of about how widespread an impact Jo Mathys was expecting the story to have. I assume that none of this, of course, happened because the plug gets pulled?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Before any of this comes to fruition. Because in order to do this, you would have to have finalised your own piece. When you nod --</td>
<td>A. I beg your pardon, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. How would you characterise 214 then? Would that come as a surprise, or not a surprise; something you had feared and half expected?</td>
<td>A. I think from memory I had known that Peter was -- the tone had changed from the excellent email of the 25th, but I remember seeing this email as a kind of a new thing, a new test that seemed to be changing the requirement from the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What happened when you learned about this at 9.37 or presumably shortly thereafter?</td>
<td>A. As I recall on that day we were having a lot of conversations with Peter to try to keep the thing on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. As a result of the email?</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 105</th>
<th>Page 106</th>
<th>Page 107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A. Yes.</td>
<td>1 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask a question on the specific subject of Peter Rippon's view of the CPS line. I think you are suggesting that his suddenly throwing in of this as a factor to decide whether the story could run or not, was very unexpected. But is clear that through the previously sort of two or three weeks he had been asking about that letter and whether you or Meirion had been saying effectively, &quot;Yes, we're on the case. We know that the letter says the case was dropped because he was old and infirm&quot;. So it is not merely on the 30th, something that he just produces out of a hat; it had been a constant subject between the two of you and he had let it be known he was pretty keen to get this element and he considered it important. A. Sure. I considered it important, but not -- not the thing that would stop the story going ahead. Particularly given the fact that on the other hand we had more evidence than the CPS had to consider. Q. And you and Meirion made it clear to him, &quot;Okay, we get this about the CPS, but now it's new, fresh evidence which effectively, shall we say, negates the overriding value of that CPS&quot;? A. Yes, it reduces its importance. But you see, I have obviously now, after the weekend, I have seen emails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Q. How would you characterise those conversations?</td>
<td>2 Q. And that becomes -- and we can see from the blog -- an important element of all of this going ahead, doesn't it?</td>
<td>3 A. Well, it does become very significant and I can't account for it, because I just know at the time that I came to see the fact that we'd spoken to women who the police hadn't spoken to -- as far as I was concerned that torpedoed this editorial requirement to have the CPS saying that they dropped it because of age and infirmity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A. Well, um, I mean firm. They were firm, but they weren't sort of argumentative or antagonistic. But we felt strongly what we felt and we communicated that.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Q. Just on the email, on the language. You are aware obviously there has been some talk in the press about the expression that Peter Rippon uses here, &quot;Just the women&quot;. But you didn't understand him to be, as it were, belittling the women in that sense, did you? He was simply making the factual point that your sources were in fact the Duncroft women and the secondhand briefing which is a reference to Mark Williams-Thomas and what he's got from the Surrey Police?</td>
<td>6 A. Well --</td>
<td>7 A. Well, it does become very significant and I can't account for it, because I just know at the time that I came to see the fact that we'd spoken to women who the police hadn't spoken to -- as far as I was concerned that torpedoed this editorial requirement to have the CPS saying that they dropped it because of age and infirmity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A. Well --</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Q. As a matter of fact that was correct. You might form a different view as to whether it was enough for a story --</td>
<td>10 A. Yes.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A. Yes.</td>
<td>12 Q. -- but as a matter of fact your sources were -- leave out the word &quot;just&quot; -- the women and the secondhand briefing. That was true, wasn't it?</td>
<td>13 A. Yes. But that's great. I mean, the secondhand briefing obviously we were due to have that formally confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Q. -- then why that investigation got dropped so far as her story is concerned is neither here nor there, in a sense.</td>
<td>14 A. Well, yes.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Q. Right?</td>
<td>16 A. Right.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A. Yes.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Q. So there's a -- if one had properly understood what had been saying, and that she hadn't been to the police, it's a bit harder to make the suggestion that the CPS, &quot;Dropping the case for the reasons the women say&quot;, it's a bit harder for that because wasn't, for these purposes, one of those women with that case at all, right?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Q. And you and Meirion made it clear to him, &quot;Okay, we get this about the CPS, but new, fresh evidence which effectively, shall we say, negates the overriding value of that CPS&quot;? A. Yes, it reduces its importance. But you see, I have obviously now, after the weekend, I have seen emails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 109</td>
<td>Page 110</td>
<td>Page 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview with Liz MacKean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reed Smith Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 November 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 where it's -- Peter doesn't appear to have hoisted that in and I can only say I am astonished.</td>
<td>1 breathing down his neck, necessarily, but just that he wasn't going to be challenging them if they had concerns.</td>
<td>1 Mitchell?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MR MACLEAN: After this weekend?</td>
<td>4 Q. When he said, &quot;If the bosses aren't happy&quot;, that might be thought to suggest that he hadn't yet approached them?</td>
<td>2 A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A. Yes, I got them on Friday night.</td>
<td>5 MR MACLEAN: As a result of seeing the stuff from us?</td>
<td>2 Q. So what was your understanding of the extent to which if at all Peter Rippon had, by this stage, approached the bosses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A. Yes. I really can't account for that because it was such a consideration in my mind, and it gave us so much more weight that I don't know how he couldn't have hoisted that in.</td>
<td>7 Q. When we asked you the last question, I said let's assume, for the purposes of discussion, that it was a good point that the CPS angle was undermined by the fact that hadn't been to the police.</td>
<td>7 A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Q. When we asked you the last question, I said let's assume, for the purposes of discussion, that it was a good point that the CPS angle was undermined by the fact that hadn't been to the police.</td>
<td>11 A. Um, I -- I suppose I thought -- I assumed he would have done because that would be standard practice. I didn't take from this that he had spoken to them and they were breathing down his neck. I took from this that he wasn't willing to really push it. That he didn't want to cross them full stop.</td>
<td>8 Q. So just let me explore with you your reference to standard practice, because is quite important this. To understand on a run of the mill Newsnight story -- not one that is going to lead to particular great press coverage, still less what has happened with this story -- what would be the norm in terms of relationship, discussion, interaction between the editor of the programme on the one hand and his immediate superior, who in this case happens to be Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Q. When we asked you the last question, I said let's assume, for the purposes of discussion, that it was a good point that the CPS angle was undermined by the fact that hadn't been to the police.</td>
<td>15 A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Q. And I said surely that's a point you and Meliron would have emphasised to Peter Rippon on 30th November, all along we would have said we had more than the police.</td>
<td>16 Q. Just let me explore with you your reference to standard practice, because is quite important this. To understand on a run of the mill Newsnight story -- not one that is going to lead to particular great press coverage, still less what has happened with this story -- what would be the norm in terms of relationship, discussion, interaction between the editor of the programme on the one hand and his immediate superior, who in this case happens to be Stephen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Did you say it? Is it conditional or --</td>
<td>17 A. No, I'm --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Q. -- you did in fact say it?</td>
<td>21 A. I'm positive. Definitely.</td>
<td>8 Q. And there is nothing sinister about that, because their job, the manager's job, is to manage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Q. If you go to page 215, please, Jackie Long is a friend of yours who used to work for the BBC and now works for ITN?</td>
<td>23 Q. So what he said was, &quot;If the bosses aren't happy, I can't go to the wall on this one&quot;?</td>
<td>11 A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 A. Yes.</td>
<td>25 A. Yes.</td>
<td>12 Q. So that would not lead the journalists and the troops on the front line to, as it were, revolt. It would be perfectly normal for the editor of the programme to be speaking to Steve Mitchell?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 A. Yes, Channel 4.</td>
<td>27 Q. So that would not lead the journalists and the troops on the front line to, as it were, revolt. It would be perfectly normal for the editor of the programme to be speaking to Steve Mitchell?</td>
<td>17 Q. So from a journalist's point of view work on this programme, where would the line be, if you like, in terms of that interaction? There is a discussion: this is what we're doing, I have decided not to run this story, that's presumably perfectly normal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Q. So you, by 30 November, simply didn't know whether there had been any contact between Mr Rippon and Mr Mitchell, or what the content of it might have been?</td>
<td>29 Q. So what he said was, &quot;If the bosses aren't happy, I can't go to the wall on this one&quot;?</td>
<td>23 Q. So you, by 30 November, simply didn't know whether there had been any contact between Mr Rippon and Mr Mitchell, or what the content of it might have been?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 113</td>
<td>Page 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No. I absolutely didn't know. But I also assumed there would have been contact.</td>
<td>1. a story, a very delicate interview in Northern Ireland and Peter was completely like: if my boss is saying no, I can't say yes, is what he said. And we did end up both of us going up to have a meeting with Stephen Mitchell who said, &quot;Yes, go for it if you can do it.&quot; So my experience on that occasion was that Steve Mitchell is the ranking person who can say yea or nay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. When we get Peter Rippon essentially going cold on this story, you and Meirion Jones could have gone to Steve Mitchell or Helen Bouden and said, &quot;Peter's about to make, or has made, the most ghastly error&quot;, couldn't you?</td>
<td>Q. Is that something to do with Mr Rippon and his relationship with Steve Mitchell or is that something laid down in the rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. We could have done. But it's not surprising we didn't. Q. You could have done, but you didn't. So why? Why not.</td>
<td>A. I don't know about the rules but in that example Peter was immediately concerned because it would have been a risky project for a lot of reasons and he needed the say-so of his superior to even consider going ahead with it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Because that would have been highly unusual.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Could I just check that, because I misheard. It wasn't that you went over Peter's head to Steve Mitchell?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my day to day world, have almost no contact with either of those people. I think I have only ever had one conversation with Helen, and three or four with Steve.</td>
<td>A. No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Over a period of?</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: You know that Peter, with you --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Years and years.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That doesn't sound like particularly interventionist management then?</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: You both went up to see Steve Mitchell?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No, they are detached. They are -- you know, they sit in a completely different bit of the building and at my level I never encounter them, because obviously I'm not an editorial figure, I don't go to these meetings where you would interact with them. To sort of go over Peter's head, which is what you are suggesting, at this point it wasn't something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: That in a way seems a model of how it might work, but that for some reason wasn't possible on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 115</th>
<th>Page 116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I seriously considered doing because I assumed that they were of one mind because I did assume that Peter would have been involving them and discussing with them, privately or wrongly, and --</td>
<td>1. Savile story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That's what I'm trying to get at. What if they were not of one mind? What if they disagreed?</td>
<td>A. No. And the Savile story predated the example I'm giving you, I think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Obviously then.</td>
<td>MR MACLEAN: But it also predated the current fuss, as you put it earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What happens then?</td>
<td>A. Yes, definitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I would have missed a trick. But I assume they would be. To go over Peter's head would have undermined and risked antagonising him at a time when I was trying to keep him on side because I was still trying to persuade him of the merits of this story.</td>
<td>Q. Fuss being an interesting word in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What would have happened if they had disagreed, Mitchell and Rippon -- you don't know anything about it. I'm not suggesting that they did or didn't disagree. Let's take a hypothetical theory.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sure.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: To put it bluntly, it does seem that both you and Meirion consistently -- to be fair, consistently say that you were keen not to go over Peter's head, that you thought that would be counter-productive and that he had already perhaps taken the views of his superiors into account. But at no stage did you say, &quot;Look, could we just have a chat with Steve or Helen about this?&quot; We think it's incredibly important and there is the possibility of the BBC making the most colossal mistake by dropping this story and running tributes, it will be a disaster&quot;, as we know Meirion was writing in his notes. You didn't push Peter to do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What would happen if there is disagreement between editors of the programme and someone in Steve Mitchell's position, Helen Bouden's position, about whether to run a story? How would that clash, as it were, get resolved? It must be somebody's decision in the end.</td>
<td>A. No. I did ask him if he had spoken to Helen and he said firmly, &quot;Yes, I have&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes. I don't know. I mean I know during the course of the last year -- for a while I have been trying to get</td>
<td>Q. Okay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29 (Pages 113 to 116) | A. I just thought they were all consulted and all of one
MR POLLARD: When was that that he said he had spoken to Helen?
A. I asked him -- I think it was on the 30th. It was a conversation in his office, just him and me and I was trying to establish the point, basically was it worth going around him so I had asked about Helen.
Q. You mention that specifically in your statement, I can see that, paragraph 24:
   "I remember asking if he had spoken to the head of news Helen Boaden about the story, and he said he had."
   Okay, thank you.
MR MACLEAN: Another of your emails I think we read about in the press in recent weeks. I think it is at page 220.
Another email from you to Jackie Long. We are still on the 30th:
   "PR's latest panic attack. Liz, internally this is a very long political chain".
A. Um-hm.
Q. Just picking up on the next point earlier: why was the chain any longer -- leave aside the word "political" for a moment, he obviously means BBC. We could substitute BBC could we? Or even managerial? Would that be another synonym?
A. Not as neutral as that. To me that suggested that there were politics involved.

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

Q. Those drinks were, I think, the 20th December. It was very close to Christmas, and by that stage your story was dead as a Dodo.
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Can I just show you one more and then we should break for lunch.
A. 222, please. I don't know whether you seen this one before. I don't know -- we're not entirely sure what you have seen from us already. Liz Gibbons on the 30th.
Jo Mathys, we know who she is. Hannah MacInnes, Meirion explained yesterday who she was and I am afraid I have forgotten.
A. She sits on the planning desk in Newsnight.
Q. And Jennifer we see in the first line?
A. Yes, yes, sorry. I'm not sure I know who Jennifer is.
Q. Do you understand the reference to, "Next week's prospects"? What would Liz Gibbons be --
A. I mean I'm --
Q. What's this about, basically?
A. I'm the wrong person to ask. A guess would be that it's a sort of regular channel to make sure other bits of the BBC know what Newsnight is up to.
Q. Did you understand that your story was legally complicated?
A. No, as I said to you before, I don't think it was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q. What about the reference to it being, &quot;V. sensitive&quot;?</td>
<td>A. Well it was certainly sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. For?</td>
<td>A. Well, definitely for Liz --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. For Jimmy Savile's family for a start.</td>
<td>A. -- and for the public. You know, who genuinely -- you know, who had been celebrating Savile. I mean overall it was a sensitive subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So you can't help us -- it's not a criticism, it's just an observation -- with what the meeting is that's referred to in the second line?</td>
<td>A. No, it reads like a regular thing, though, doesn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. You can't help us with whether it is noteworthy or how noteworthy that she should be saying, &quot;Can we not mention it at the meeting&quot;?</td>
<td>A. No, I mean that jumps out at me of course because it -- you know, it was clear that the story became inconvenient in the extreme. It wasn't -- you know, from the time it was dropped it wasn't treated like a normal dropped story. It came to be treated in an entirely different way, so I'm just mentioning it because seeing that sentence -- bearing in mind this is out of the context in which it was written, but it jumps out at me as: here we go, this could be the start of the special treatment given to this story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Leave aside the question of the running or the not running of the story --</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- let's assume for the moment that the non-running of the Newsnight story has happened. But the information that would have been in it is still there, so, as it were, the risk, from the BBC's point of view, of running tributes to someone who might very soon be discovered to be a paedophile, is still there, isn't it, even though the Newsnight story has not run? Not at least because Sky and everyone else were sniffing around. So did you impress upon Peter Rippon, Helen Boaden, Steve Mitchell or anyone else -- go to them and say, &quot;My story is not running, but you really do need to understand that there's a problem for the BBC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Not Steven, not Helen Boaden. Certainly in conversation with Peter Rippon. It -- you know, I mentioned at some point and I know Meirion did it more forcefully than me but I also did it, to say, you know it's going to look terrible. MR MACLEAN: That's 30th November, probably a place to pause, I think.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. All right. I mean I'm guessing we will come back to that, won't we? You see when I talk about special treatment for this story, unlike other dropped stories, I felt that this story came to be presented publicly as a different story.</td>
<td>A. Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. We will come to that.</td>
<td>A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"... and interviewed, and a year or so later had
received another letter saying that the case was not
going ahead three specifically remembered that the
letter said he was too old and infirm to prosecute."
And then the reference to Sky.
I think he made one slight correction in the
numbers, but is that paragraph essentially right?
A. Yes, in terms of the numbers, I don't remember seven
saying they had been contacted by the police. That's
the only thing I would have a question mark about.
Certainly a number, a good few.
Q. I think he explained there were 10 plus one, in a sense.
There was ten Duncroft girls, and then the sister of one
of them, who we discussed earlier had herself been
disabled, a Duncroft girl, but was, as we said, the source of the
Stoke Mandeville allegation.
A. Yes.
Q. Now if you go to page 231, on 2 December there was
something called the Women in Film and Television
Awards. I think it was at lunch time, no, it was in the
evening. Did you attend that function?
A. No.
Q. We see from seating plan that Mr Entwistle, Mr Mitchell,
Ms Bofaden and Mr Rippon all did. I think they all did
in fact attend. This is the seating plan but they did
not attend.
A. Not at the time.
Q. And not at any time until in the last few weeks?
A. Sadly.
Q. So far as George Entwistle is concerned, he just didn't
feature in this story at all?
A. No.
Q. Is that right?
A. No.
Q. And so far as you were concerned, nobody from Vision
featured in any active way in the story at all?
A. Exactly, not as far as I was aware.
Q. When I say, "Actively", by which I mean you had at the
back of your mind that there might have been issues with
the controller of BBC1 and BBC2, as we discussed
earlier, but they didn't feature on your radar, if I can
put it like that?
A. That's right.
Q. And the same goes for, as we discussed earlier,
Mark Thompson?
A. Um-hm.
Q. And David Jordan?
A. Yes. I had no contact with him about this story.
Q. So far as you were concerned, this whole event up to and
including the definitive ending of the story, the
decision not to run the story, was entirely within the
news part of the BBC?
A. Um-hm, as far as I was aware, yes.
Q. And the only people you had actually yourself interacted
with -- apart from, as it were, down the chain to the
source or sources, the women, and
Mark Williams-Thomas -- the only person you had only
actually entered acted with or people you had interacted
to were other Newnight colleagues up to Peter Rippon's
level?
A. Yes.
Q. On the 30th -- the same day -- page 232, you emailed
ROUGHSAVILE 5 to yourself and to Meirion Jones?
A. Um-hm.
Q. Why did you email it to yourself? Were you working from
home or remotely or something?
A. Um, no, I would have been in the office. I would have
done it as a Word document and by emailing it to myself
I would have access to it at home if I wanted to, for
reference.
Q. Those are two different emails addresses?
A. No, it's my BBC email address but the script was written
on a Word document on my BBC computer. So by sending it
to myself I would be able to download it at home --
Q. But it would be in your sent box anyway. You could
still have found it.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. You are clogging up the BBC server there, I think.
A. Point taken.
Q. So you emailed the ROUGHSAVILE 5. We have seen the
previous drafts. What had really changed, if any, by
this stage?
A. I had simply fleshed it out, that was the main thing.
I was just trying to make it fuller, to visualise it
further and to work towards the edit.
Q. So in other words a bit more prose, rather than notes
and so on?
A. Yes.
Q. So how close to a final -- it is obviously not a final
script, but if it were to be suggested to us that this
was really not a script at all, this isn't a script,
would that be right or not right?
A. No. I mean I can see -- the Mark Williams-Thomas -- we
have written down things that Meirion was certain he
would say based on conversations with him, more or less.
But obviously we hadn't done that interview, so in that
sense it was not a final script.
Q. There were two things you hadn't done. You hadn't got Williams-Thomas on film and you hadn't got the other girl either, who is --
A. [redacted] interview? No, that was done the following day. And we hadn't recorded my pieces to camera. So I would have fiddled with those when it came to filming them. But in terms of it's not a script,
I mean, you know, you can go into an edit with all sorts of stuff that, you know doesn't necessarily pass as a full script. This is relatively a full script --
Q. So if I was --
A. -- ahead of an edit.
Q. If I was the executive producer of all of your pieces over a 2-year period, would this be typical or atypical of the sort of thing I would get at the pretty much final decision to go ahead stage?
A. Yes. Pretty much. It is obviously not always the same because we turn around things at different speeds,
Sometimes I might go into an edit with a very complete script but without doubt you know the thing gets made --
we have a two day edit process. I think three days had been set aside for this. The first day would have been ingesting, feeding all the rushes into edit machines, and you polish it up in the script and you also find things don't work as you had intended.

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

Q. It would always seen by the executive producer. So, as we have discussed earlier, it is really the executive producer who is de facto the critical person from the editing point of view --
A. Yes.
Q. -- above the reporter and the producer?
MR POLLARD: Not the editor of the day?
A. Sometimes they would, sometimes they are really too busy. It just depends. Quite typically a film would not be made ready until sometimes even during the evening it is due to go out and in those circumstances it might not be possible.
MR MACLEAN: This script does not actually get developed in the end beyond ROUGHSAVILLE 5, does it?
A. No.
Q. So this is pretty much where it rests. Did ROUGHSAVILLE 5 go to Mr Rippon?
A. I didn't send it to him, no.
Q. You didn't send it to him. Do you understand that anybody else did or not?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know. Then if you go to 274, this is the next day. Help me, which day of the week is this?
A. This is Thursday.
Q. This is Thursday. Still no word. That's obviously a reference back to the --
A. The CPS.
Q. -- the one the day before:
"I think we should stop work on other elements until we know for sure".
Q. What were the other elements?
A. Well, all other parts of the story. I mean there was the interview with [redacted] but looking at the time of this email that might already have been --
Q. That has been done that day?
A. -- in the can. And the Mark Williams-Thomas interview and --
Q. Somebody has hired the Rolls Royce to go driving around?
A. And Meirion has hired the Rolls Royce, yes.
Q. When was that to be filmed?
A. I think on the 2nd, the Friday, the day after.
Q. The Rolls Royce had been booked, I think?
A. Yes.
Q. We have something somewhere. And the driver did go and some shots were filmed around Duncroft.
A. Yes, that is right.
Q. Mr Rippon says:
"I think we should stop working on other elements until we know for sure what we are like to get from them because we don't really have a strong enough story
1 without it.
2 So at this stage Mr Rippon is putting, as it were,
3 the decisive emphasis on the CPS and that's the --
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. -- the deal breaker, as it were, for him?
6 A. Yes. I mean, I know that we interpreted this email as
7 a pretty negative event, in that it seemed that Peter
8 was being more assertive now about it was that or bust.
9 And certainly it seemed that we had gone some way away
10 from the original commission and the evidence that we'd
11 collated about Savile himself.
12 Q. If you look over the page, we can see that Mr Jones
13 dissented from this and wanted to have a chat --
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. -- and he told us yesterday that there was a chat. Were
16 you around that day on the 1st?
17 A. No, I wasn't.
18 Q. You don't work on Thursday, do you?
19 A. I don't typically work on Thursday and Friday because
20 I'm part time. In reality I work any day of the week if
21 I'm needed on a story, so this week I will work to
22 Thursday because there is something I need to do, but, yes,
23 routinely I wouldn't be in.
24 Q. You would be at home or whatever --
25 A. Exactly.

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

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

1 to stop, as it were, and wanted to keep it going. But
2 I'm intrigued by it being back on by the Monday. Was
3 that something that Peter Rippon knew about?
4 A. I just don't know.
5 Q. Or was this, as it were --
6 A. A freelance.
7 Q. -- a freelance operation?
8 A. I mean, it might have been. But that would be
9 unprecedented. You never -- we have no authority over
10 the edit suites. They are booked by Liz and obviously
11 it looks from this like she had unbooked them. And
12 I don't know how it would have come about that the stuff
13 was getting ingested.
14 Q. In the end, on the Monday, were you actually in the edit
15 suite working on the Jimmy Savile story?
16 A. No, because we didn't get that far. I think it stopped
17 at lunch time, ie before the point at which I would have
18 gone in to begin editing. The rushes would have still
19 being fed in.
20 Q. It is booked, possibly unbooked --
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. -- but you are not dealing with that. So far as you are
23 aware, when you came in on Monday morning it was on
24 again, but it didn't happen?
25 A. That's right.
Q. Right. Then I think we can put 3 away. If we go to 4.
Look at page 24, is Mr Rippon's diary, I think, of the 5th. Meirion Jones explained to us that these investigation routine meetings quite often did not happen. The Liz there is not you?
A. No.
Q. That is Liz Gibbons. But do you remember what happened on that Monday morning when you went in to work?
A. Yes. I know that I was in early, which in Newsnight terms is 9ish or earlier. At some point shortly afterwards I saw Peter and we had a conversation in the production office.
Q. To what effect?
A. Well, I argued again to run our story. And I went again to what I thought were key points in its favour, particularly the fact that we had stuff the police didn't have.
Q. So if you look in what I call your statement --
A. My statement, yes.
Q. -- at paragraph 26, page 5 you refer to many conversations. You don't distinguish them. That's perhaps not surprising:
"Many conversations between Meirion and myself and Peter Rippon, some together and some separate, when we tried to persuade him to keep our story on track."

A. I don't remember doing that, no.
MR POLLARD: Would that have been a key card to play, or was there some reason not to say that? You have nothing to lose at that stage, because the story is clearly going to be dropped by the looks of it.
A. No, we didn't. I mean we'd given sort of verbally a very glowing account of it. We'd put details from it in the script.

MR POLLARD: But you have one interviewee and only one, and you presumably needed -- it's academic now, it is clearly not going to happen -- you needed to convince him this is only one interviewee on camera but she is very credible when you see her. That would be what you would presumably want to say. You must have said that to him?
A. Well we certainly said that to him, but I don't recall ever suggesting he sit down and view it.
MR MACLEAN: You had discussed she was not herself a victim.
A. Yes.
Q. If you have 28 of your statement you say:
"By now a lot of our colleagues in the wider
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Q. You already knew, exactly.

Then on the next day, the 6th, if you go to page 19?

Who is Michael Hughes?

1. **A. He's a very good friend who used to work on Newsnight.**

Q. Where was he working at this stage?

A. At this stage at RTE in Dublin.

Q. So this isn't, as it were, an official email? Is this a friend to friend email?

A. Yes.

Q. I'm not sure we have the start of this. Did you just kick this off or are you responding to something from him or what? It sounds as if you are starting it by saying, "How is Hughes?"

A. Yes, I can't exactly remember.

So I was just sort of jogging him, you know, saying hi.

Q. And then you say:

"My story with Meirion that Jimmy Savile was investigated for sexual offences is terrifying the bosses."

A. Um-hm.

Q. We saw the word "bosses" before. Who are bosses here?

A. Well, I think I'm not thinking of individuals beyond just the general hierarchy of the BBC. Because in my

mind I thought this wasn't just down to Peter.

Q. Is it a synonym for management or not really?

A. Yes, yes it is.

Q. Management would include Peter Rippon --

A. Stephen and Helen.

Q. In a sense was he your manager?

A. Yes.

Q. He was your line manager?

A. Um-hm.

Q. "Basically BBC1 is preparing a Jim'll Fix It special for Christmas. Having commissioned the story, Peter Rippon keeps saying he's lukewarm about it and is trying to kill it by making impossible editorial demands. When we rebuff his points he resorts to saying, well it was 40 years ago, the girls were teenagers, not too young, they weren't the worst kind of sexual offences et cetera."

I will come to the rest of it in a minute which is also important. I think Nick asked you this earlier, but just so I can be clear, the "Impossible editorial demands", were nothing to do with the setting the bar at the same level you would for a paedophile who was still alive, but were instead the CPS aspect, is that right?

A. Yes, specifically the CPS confirming that they hadn't prosecuted because he was too old.

---
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1 is only reflecting something that you and Meirion had
2 mentioned to him as a probable element quite a long way
3 through this process.
4 A. I think what I meant was that it -- it had no place as
5 being the reason not to run the story.
6 MR POLLARD: Yes, I see, yes.
7 MR MACLEAN: Look at the next bit, please:
8 "He hasn't warned BBC1 about the story, so they are
9 beavering away on the special oblivious."
10 Just pause there. I think you say, correct me if
11 I'm wrong, you had asked Peter Rippon at some point if
12 he had -- yes, paragraph 31 of your statement:
13 "During the day I asked Peter if he had contacted
14 the controller of BBC1 about the possible conflict
15 between our programme and Savile tributes and he said he
16 hadn't."
17 A. Um-hm.
18 Q. You had especially raised that with Rippon. Hence you
19 did that on the 5th and so it's not surprising you
20 should be referring to that in an email the following
21 day.
22 Did you understand that it was, as it were,
23 Peter Rippon's business to warn BBC1 about the story?
24 A. Yes. I thought it was a -- you know, a duty. Surely
25 that he should flag up -- because Meirion and I, you
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1 know, we didn't just want to run the story for our own
2 sake, but you know, we were very aware of this
3 uncomfortable juxtaposition of the tributes versus what
4 we are trying to get on air.
5 Q. Yes.
6 A. We thought, you know, there comes a point where it has
7 to be raised and surely that would be Peter's job, just
8 out of consideration. Because we had thought -- I can't
9 remember if I still thought it by this stage but
10 certainly earlier -- well, there's no way these tributes
11 can run.
12 Q. Right look at the next sentence:
13 "Liz G has said to Meirion, I want nothing to do
14 with this. I don't want to piss off Danny Cohen, it is
15 down to Peter."
16 On its own that reads like a rather different reason
17 for not running the story than the question of taste.
18 Maybe that is what you were referring to earlier about
19 your perception that Liz Gibbons had come to another
20 reason for not advancing the story, is that right?
21 A. That was my impression.
22 Q. Because not pissing of Danny Cohen is not a fantastic
23 reason for not running a story on Newsnight, is it?
24 A. Not at all. That's why at the time we had the feeling
25 that there were other considerations, non-journalistic
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1 considerations, that were making this story sensitive.
2 Q. So you are sure that Liz Gibbons had said, "I don't want
3 to piss off Danny Cohen", or words to that effect?
4 A. As Meirion told it to me. To me directly there had been
5 a conversation a little while earlier, which I think we
6 may have touched on earlier, where she just said, you
7 know, "This is not my story, if you want to talk
8 about it, it is Peter's story".
9 Q. We talked about the hospital pass earlier.
10 A. Yes, it was part of that conversation. This is more
11 overt.
12 Q. And a slight elaboration at that point, that it is not
13 just a hospital pass, in the sense that something awful
14 might happen here if the problem is not identified, but
15 specifically Danny Cohen being mentioned.
16 A. Um-hm.
17 Q. We come back again to the point that you had not had any
18 contact with Danny Cohen and you didn't know -- perhaps
19 no reason why you should have known -- whether Danny
20 Cohen knew what Newsnight was up to at all?
21 A. No, except I had at some point asked Peter.
22 Q. And he had said he hadn't mentioned it --
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. -- to the controller of BBC1. So far as you were
25 concerned Danny Cohen was in ignorance of all of this?
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1 A. Yes.
2 Q. And you were concerned about that?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Right. If you go on a couple of pages, you will see --
5 I don't know whether you have seen this before, just as
6 we are passing it anyway -- if you go to page 21, this
7 is BBC1 getting its publicity in order for Christmas.
8 If you go to 22, you see that Jim'll Fix It with
9 Shane Kitchin and there was outstanding interest in the
10 one off special and there were oodles of Fix It requests
11 and massive -- I assume that is quite a large number --
12 12K of ticket applications and they were getting ready
13 with this production.
14 You presumably didn't know those details?
15 A. No.
16 Q. If we go on to page 26, if you go over the page there
17 should be one numbered 26.001, is there?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Keep going, please, to 004. That's the end of an email
20 chain. So then turn back to 3 and that is the email we
21 just looked at, at the top of the page, do you see,
22 "Terrifying the bosses*"
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. So this is the same email chain. Then go back to
25 page 2. We see at the bottom of 002 that's the email we
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 149</th>
<th>Page 151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. just looked at, &quot;How is Hughes?&quot; And here is Mr Hughes' reply. We got this from the BBC just the other day, I don't think we got this from you. How is it that we got from you the one at page 19 -- maybe we didn't, we got that from Mr Jones actually. The one we just looked at we got from Meirion Jones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. he will be sure to be referring up all the time. At this rate [you say rather presciently] someone higher up might get taken out. I'll keep you posted. Naturally I'm expecting things to backfire at any time.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. You don't address the, &quot;Can you appeal above him?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exactly, you don't answer that query.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A. No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. I think I had already formed the view, as I said earlier, that it wouldn't make any difference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Q. But you had formed the view -- as you say to Mr Hughes, you were expecting anyway things to backfire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A. Yes, that's a reference to the fact that they were pressing ahead with the tributes regardless and that struck me as a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Q. That's the point I put to you a bit earlier. Even although your story has been canned, is or is about to be canned or whatever, there is still the problem of the expectation of the backfire for the BBC. You and Meirion Jones think that you can see that problem coming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. Um-hm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q. So surely you would have wanted to draw to the attention of whoever you could your real concerns about this backfire in order to avert it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A. Well, we had expected Peter to take our views elsewhere, that this would be a potential problem. Meirion wrote his red flag memo that in the end he didn't send, so he obviously had thought about going over Peter's head. But I mean, I think by now we just felt sort of slightly squashed and that it didn't matter what we thought and it won't make any difference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Q. So the backfire -- just to be clear about the backfire, by this stage your assumption was that your story was not going to air?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A. I think it was on the 6th. Yes, it looked bad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Q. So the backfire wasn't going to be, as it were, a clash between Newsnight doing a story and the BBC's tribute, because Newsnight wasn't going to do the story anymore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A. Well potentially we had thought, um, that this story would come out. Because we knew other journalists had spoken to the women.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Q. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A. We expected them to be pretty unhappy that we hadn't got their story on air. At some point we knew that Mark Williams-Thomas was going to try to do the story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Q. I can't remember at what point we knew that. I don't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A cracker of a story there sir Jimmy. For some reason I would have expected his victims to be male. Rippon for the high jump surely. Can you appeal above him or can you flounce?...
think this early. And so it's possible then that I'm -- 

1 Q. And Peter Rippon's background was in radio?
2 A. Yes.

2 you know, I thought it would come out that we'd had
3 Q. And I think Helen Boaden's background is in radio?
4 A. Yes.

allegations that obviously by now I didn't think would
5 Q. Did that fact have any impact on Newsnight?
6 A. Do you mean from the radio point of view or from the
7 fact their friendships would go back a long way?
8 Q. Not so much the friendships, but did the fact that this
9 chain of command was radio --
10 A. Yes.

be strong enough for us even to run it and he wasn't
11 Q. -- in background, did that have any adverse implications
12 satisfied that it was. So he's telling her to hold her
13 for Newsnight. Did that make it more difficult for
14 horses, if I can continue the analogy?
15 television journalists? Was there something they didn't understand or --
16 A. Um-hmm.

be strong enough for us even to run it and he wasn't
17 Q. Did you notice that he had copied his reply to Steven
18 satisfied that it was. So he's telling her to hold her
19 Mitchell?
20 A. Yes.

horses, if I can continue the analogy?
21 Q. What did you draw from that?
22 A. Yes.

horses, if I can continue the analogy?
23 Q. What did you draw from that?
24 A. Well, it confirmed that the decision had gone higher
25 than Peter. Which, as I say, I had assumed, but that
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was just significant to me in that it was the first time
I'd seen Stephen's name.

Q. But you didn't think that was -- I mean you disagreed
with the decision, of course, but the fact that it had
been referred up to Stephen Mitchell wasn't in itself,
as it were, a sinister part of the story?
A. Not necessarily. It didn't mean that Stephen had said
to Peter.

Q. Done something outrageous --
A. No.

Q. -- done something inappropriate or broken the rules?
A. No, just that Peter was involving higher layers.

Q. As you would expect.
A. Um-hmm.

MR POLLARD: Did you know Stephen Mitchell pretty well?
A. No. Not at all.

MR MACLEAN: You said you had only had three or four

1 Q. Rolls Royce, and so on, your story could have aired on
2 the radio just as easily?
3 A. Yes, I don't think it was a particularly fair view.

11 Q. -- done something inappropriate or broken the rules?
12 A. No, just that Peter was involving higher layers.
13 Q. As you would expect.
14 A. Um-hmm.
15 MR POLLARD: Did you know Stephen Mitchell pretty well?
16 A. No. Not at all.
17 MR MACLEAN: You said you had only had three or four
18 conversations.
19 A. Yes, and I think all but one postdate that.
20 MR POLLARD: Okay.
21 MR MACLEAN: So he was -- was he himself a journalist
22 originally?
23 A. Yes. And, you know, a very experienced editor on the
24 radio side and at this point in charge of all radio and
25 television news programmes.

19 A. No, not particularly. I mean, Meirion, you know, would
20 have -- I would have said was supportive to Peter
21 generally.
22 Q. I'm trying to get away from the personal about -- I'm
23 not suggesting that this is any personal antipathy
24 towards Peter Rippon,
Q. Somebody has told us that they think, Newsnight must be led, "At all times with panache, determination and mental toughness". Do you agree with that?

A. Yes.

Q. I see.

A. ...and compared to radio television is much better resourced so there is often a tension between the radio and telly side.

Q. I think you said earlier -- we can check -- that Peter Rippon didn't very often perform the executive producer role, may not have ever done so in a film with you?

A. I can think of one that he did, actually, but only one.

Q. Was he, in your opinion, as it were, up to the job of performing that role, the executive producer role? Not the editor of Newsnight, but the executive producer role in a film like that; did he have the skills for it?

A. Yes, I think so. I wouldn't have expected him -- say we had made the film, he had come in to look at it as the executive producer, I would not have expected him to have much of a role in the way we put the film together because I have sat in that viewing with him before where, you know, the thing is playing on the screens and he's reading the script, which suggests the sort of -- the craft, if you like, of the pictures isn't as much of a priority to him. But, you know, journalistically, yes, he absolutely could have sat there as the exec and said it was okay.

Q. He's very aware of the management above him. Whereas for instance, to compare and contrast, the previous editor --

A. Yes, he positively relished the programme being a bit apart and slightly maverick.

Q. His talents have been extolled to us.

A. He would have panache. When you say panache, Peter Barren had flair and he had self-confidence.

Q. By November 2011 did he look like -- often you can tell, sometimes you can't tell, but often you can tell that people you work are under pressure because they start to...
behave differently.

A. I'm not really sure. You know, I was so narrowly focused on trying to get the story.

Q. Okay. Let's move on to page 34, where Mr Rippon sends Meirion Jones an email:

"What is the latest, did the CPS get back? There is a limit to how much time it is sensible to continue chasing this."

Then Meirion replied at page 42, and in this email he does -- it's not the red flag email by any stretch of the imagination, but he does say:

"As you know, I already think the story not strong enough and danger of not running it is substantial damage to BBC reputation. But at no point having that discussion until I have final word from CPS."

You had been party to -- it's one of the points you had been making, isn't it, to Peter Rippon? One of the ones in your statement?

A. Yes.

Q. One of the six points. If you go to page 38 we have your rather pithy response to the cart before the horse email?

A. Yes.

Q. You sent an email, which I am afraid I can't put my finger on just at the moment, but we will dig out to you. You sent an email to Poppy Sebag Montefiore.

Which is why I mentioned her earlier.

A. Yes, you did, yes.

Q. Which I cannot put my finger on, but I'm pretty sure it said that PK was, "Trying everything to kill it."

A. Yes.

Q. It's not in itself different to the other things that we have been seeing. But I assume that was the attitude you had, that he was trying everything to kill it?

A. When I had had the conversation with him on Monday the 5th and he talked about, you know, it was 40 years ago, they weren't the youngest victims; that conversation, I really thought, yes, he's desperate to kill this. And if you like it doesn't matter how, it's almost like a scatter gun approach editorially.

Q. Clutching at any many threads?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes. I am afraid I can't -- I promise you there is one to Poppy Sebag-Montefiore somewhere.

A. Yes.

Q. So if you go to page 77, he has: "The very enticing prospect of a spicy beef..."
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1 A. Yes, and would deal with reporters on stories.
2 Q. So we should not read anything into the invisibility of
3 Shaminde Nahal one way or the other?
4 A. No.
5 Q. Right. Now Hannah Livingston is still ploughing her way
6 through Klunk Clicks in the background?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. If you go to page 86, on the 13th, it think it is, you
9 see she emails Merton Jones.
10 "It is them, isn't it, in Klunk Click I mean? In
11 the photo, on the left and standing on the
12 right and in the video on the left and on
13 the right."
14 And that's a reference to and
15 yes.
16 A. With yes.
17 MR POLLARD: I was a bit puzzled by that. Hasn't that been
18 seen and discovered some time earlier?
19 A. I think the earlier one was and that
20 one relates to
21 MR MACLEAN: So both and both of them, attended
22 A. Yes.
24 Q. The Jimmy Savile show with and both of
25 them also attended the one with
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A. A Spectator article that in fact enquiries were being
made before Christmas.
3 Q. Is this the one you had in mind?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. James Hardy, he is head of press?
6 A. He's in the comms, I don't know --
7 Q. A senior comms person. Sarah Beck works closely with
8 Stephen Mitchell, I think; is that right?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. And Karin Rosune's is a press officer, I think. So you
11 didn't know about this December stuff?
12 A. No.
13 Q. And you weren't involved in developing the line which we
14 can -- it gets developed but we can see it here in the
15 statement:
16 "The BBC gathers information on hundreds of stories,
17 not all make it to air. In this case the angle we were
18 pursuing could not be substantiated."
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. That was not something you had anything to do with?
21 A. Absolutely nothing, no.
22 Q. If you go to 137, you see at the bottom it is the same
23 email, the Helen Deller one, do you see?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And Karin Rosune said, "I'm happy if others are." And
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then Peter Rippon adds:
1. "That was not quite right. There was a police CPS investigation recently, in 2007 it was into an historic
2. indecent assault. However it was not pursued for lack of evidence. We were trying to establish if it was
3. true, as the women alleged, that it was dropped because of Savile's age, celebrity status. We could not
4. establish that that was the case.
5. "PS the main allegation she made about herself did not take place at the BBC. She alleged some other
6. incidents did involving others."
7. Now there is a confusion. There is an elision,
8. between the first woman, in the second line, who is probably [redacted] and the, "She made about herself", in
9. the penultimate line, who is [redacted] isn't there?
10. A. I hadn't thought [redacted] was being referenced here.
11. Q. It may not be [redacted]. Just read it carefully.
12. A. Yes.

Q. Start in the middle of the second line:
13. "We were trying to establish if it was true, as the
14. woman alleged that it was dropped because of Savile's age and celebrity status."
15. [redacted] certainly never alleged that.
16. A. No.

Q. Somebody else did. It may have been [redacted] or someone
17. else, it doesn't matter really who else it was.
18. A. Could it have been women, plural?
19. Q. Well, maybe. But it says, "The woman".
20. A. Yes.
21. Q. But then the PS:
22. "The main allegation she [so I don't think it can be
23. women. She, ie the singular, woman] made about herself
24. did not take place at the BBC."
25. That looks to me like a reference to [redacted]

A. Um-hm.

Q. Yes, you would agree?
26. A. Yes.
27. Q. So there is a confusion, isn't there, in this email?
28. A. Yes, definitely because, as we know, [redacted] didn't talk
to the police.
29. Q. And there is an elision, consciously or unconsciously,
an elision between the accounts between two different
women --
30. A. Yes.

Q. -- which Peter Rippon is feeding into the proposed
31. response of the BBC and that leads to errors appearing.
32. A. Yes.
33. Q. Obviously if this is the wrong end of the stick, he has
34. it by 21 December.
35. A. Yes.

Q. At that stage, after the story being -- after the CPS on
36. the 9th I think, after that what contact or discussion
37. did you have with Peter Rippon about the Savile story?
38. A. I don't remember any contact at all.
39. Q. The next time you discussed the Savile story with anyone
40. other than Meirion Jones --
41. A. Yes.
42. Q. -- were you talking to Williams-Thompson?
43. A. I didn't talk to Williams-Thompson, no.
44. Q. So after 9 December?
45. A. Yes.
46. Q. Is that it for you on Jimmy Savile?
47. A. No, I mean I spoke to Caroline Hawley later on in
48. December.
49. Q. Right.
50. A. Certainly I do not remember talking to Peter again
51. about it until the New Year when reports began appearing
52. in newspapers.
53. Q. And you didn't have any input at any stage, I don't
54. think, into the BBC's press operation responding to
55. this?
56. A. No, none.
57. Q. Did you think that was -- did you get the impression
58. that you had been -- you were being treated with
59. suspicion by the BBC press office? You were seen as not

A. Um-hm.

Q. There was a piece in The Mirror in January, I think, the
60. Sunday Mirror?
61. A. On the 8th.
62. Q. On the 8th. If you go to page 265, you saw The Mirror
63. piece. Meirion Jones emailed Peter Rippon, we see at
64. the bottom of the page -- I am sure you have seen
65. this -- and he replied:
66. "There has been some internal briefing too, which is
67. unsurprising but disappointing."
68. A. Um-hm.

Q. Do you recognise the description of internal briefing?
69. A. Well you mean from inside the BBC? I mean that's
70. obviously what that relates to.
71. Q. Internal at the BBC, so somebody at the BBC is briefing
72. The Mirror, that is what Peter Rippon is complaining
73. about?
74. A. Yes, I can't remember the detail of the story but

Q. being inside or whatever? Or not really?
75. A. Iformed no view about the press office. I mean, you
76. know, I had had the contact with Helen Deller on
77. 7 December, but, you know, we didn't know that this
78. version of our story was being discussed and, if you
79. like, fed into the system. So all I knew was when I saw
80. it coming out the other end in newspaper reports and
81. I was very concerned about it.

Q. There was a piece in The Mirror in January, I think, the
82. Sunday Mirror?
83. A. On the 8th.
84. Q. On the 8th. If you go to page 265, you saw The Mirror
85. piece. Meirion Jones emailed Peter Rippon, we see at
86. the bottom of the page -- I am sure you have seen
87. this -- and he replied:
88. "There has been some internal briefing too, which is
89. unsurprising but disappointing."
90. A. Um-hm.

Q. Do you recognise the description of internal briefing?
91. A. Well you mean from inside the BBC? I mean that's
92. obviously what that relates to.
93. Q. Internal at the BBC, so somebody at the BBC is briefing
94. The Mirror, that is what Peter Rippon is complaining
95. about?
96. A. Yes, I can't remember the detail of the story but
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>obviously someone knew something and it was coming out.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think there had been a phone call to the office to one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>of my colleagues from The Mirror, which I think would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>have been in the new year, so we knew that questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>were being asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q. You see Meirion Jones' response to Peter Rippon at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>top of the page. You have seen that before, I imagine?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q. &quot;Sounds like someone who thought we shouldn't have done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>it in the first place, probably not someone from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Newsnight&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What view did you have about who was helping The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mirror to write these pieces?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A. I don't know. I mean -- I mean obviously someone had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>been talking. You know, they'd had information, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I can't remember if I thought it had to have come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>within the BBC or whether it could have come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>possible other routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Q. The Oldie piece, which appeared a few weeks later, was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>not completely accurate but it was very well sourced,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>wasn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A. Yes, from what I remember. But when you say, &quot;Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sourced&quot;, he'd spoken to women, hadn't he? Some of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>them; had he spoken to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Q. It was pretty detailed in terms of what Newsnight was up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>something I have never done.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>to as well, wasn't it? We will come to it. Let's not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>take it out of sync.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If you go over the page to 267, look at the one at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.09. Have you seen that before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. No. I haven't seen that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q. You have never seen that before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q. It mentions Meirion's suspected role. The inference is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>that some people in comme or the press office thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>that Meirion Jones was leaking this stuff, or providing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>this material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q. And they were happy to drip poison about him, given half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a chance. Do you know or suspect if you were suspected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>of --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A. I don't know. No one ever said anything to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Q. No one challenged you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A. No one challenged me openly. I mean I have never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>leaked -- I should say until the recent period, I have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>never discussed the BBC with journalists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Q. You discussed your story with Jackie Long and that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mr Hughes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A. Yes, I discuss them with friends. Obviously they didn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>go further. But in terms of, you know, journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>looking to run stories about the BBC, it's just</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>December 2011 and 30 September this year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>So what I get from that is that you had very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>to do with the background chatter, if I can put it like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>that, about the Jimmy Savile story through the early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>part of 2012, is that right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. That is right. I mean I -- you know, I did go and see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter because as far as I was concerned the story was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>being misdescribed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q. By the BBC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A. Yes, by the BBC, and a false impression was being given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>about the nature of what we had been doing, and of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>course I wondered why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Were you still working alongside Meirion most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>of the time, were you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A. No. We have worked on projects since then, but, no, at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>that time I was working on other things, as was he.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Both still working for Newsnight but just doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>separate things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Did he mention to you the Susan Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Which seems quite dramatic when you see the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>story that she was telling. I wonder whether that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>hadn't been worth, if you like, a last gasp attempt to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. revive the story or breathe life into it, because it was
2. an eye witness account by a BBC person, admitted
3. a long time ago, but it -- I think it was judged by
4. Meirion, perhaps you as well, that it wouldn't change
5. Peter's mind. I think it -- did it not, get passed on
6. to Mark Williams-Thomas?
7. A. Yes, it did.
8. MR POLLARD: Do you agree with that approach?
9. A. Passing it on to Mark Williams-Thomas?
10. MR POLLARD: Well that it wouldn't -- an assumption that it
11. wouldn't revive the story within the BBC.
12. A. Yes. I mean we both thought that once those tributes
13. ran, it was over for good. Because it would only then
14. come out that we'd known this stuff ahead of them.
15. MR MACLEAN: Yes. I think you can put bundle 4 away,
16. please, and take 5. The Susan Thompson approach that
17. Nick has just referred to is at page 168. It came into
18. Newsnight. It came in as a Newsnight email and it gets
19. passed on by Anna Bolton to Meirion Jones. Then he
20. replied to Susan Thompson, we see over the page at 169,
21. and then there's a bit of follow-up over the next few
22. pages and then it goes to Mark Williams-Thomas?
23. A. Right. We had always thought that once some allegations
24. were put out there, other people would come forward.
25. That just seemed the nature of it. We thought we were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>building up an impression where he was, as I said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before, going around different institutions working his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way in there, and accessing vulnerable people and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abusing them. So when that -- when the Thompson email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came in, there was another one that came in alleging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rape in Sussex, I think in his camper van or caravan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We thought that that was part of that process of what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What about the police in all of this? What was your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude about the police investigating Jimmy Savile,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which as I understand it -- well in the last few weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we have seen in the press that that was a suggestion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that there was something for the police to investigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis-a-vis Jimmy Savile, who was of course dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was your attitude to that? Did you think about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Not really, no. I mean, in terms of the claims that we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were hearing, I thought we'd hoped to put them on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air and then the police would have known about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But because Savile was dead there didn't seem any way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But in terms of the individual women, I did think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well, it would be up to them to go to the police, not to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Did you give any -- going to the police to say that one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was assaulted by somebody who is dead sounds like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably a waste of shoe leather, doesn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, I didn't seriously think about it. But in relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to an account of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. I'm coming to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That's why I dealt with Savile first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But as far as you're concerned, right from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very beginning you had credibly sourced -- because you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obviously thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because otherwise you couldn't possibly have ever been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitching this or taking this story forward, she was a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if not the, fulcrum of it, all right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Right from the very beginning you had a credible account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q had committed a very sexual assault on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somebody whom you believed to be an underage girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and had at least a lead as to the name of that person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That was, surely, information that the police would or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least might have been very interested in, wasn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, and I didn't give it any consideration at all,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rightly or wrongly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>building up an impression where he was, as I said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before, going around different institutions working his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way in there, and accessing vulnerable people and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abusing them. So when that -- when the Thompson email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came in, there was another one that came in alleging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rape in Sussex, I think in his camper van or caravan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We thought that that was part of that process of what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But later on, I think one of the few things that Meirion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones and Peter Rippon agreed about when the questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>started to be asked, was that you didn't have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information that could have been of any use to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just take it in stages. First of all they did agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that, didn't they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. That was in that conversation after the blog, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But it wasn't right, was it? It wasn't correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No, I think it was a slight evasion -- you know, if you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are going to be strict about it, it was a slight evasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of responsibility. We didn't know who the person was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for sure, we didn't know for sure that it was someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under age --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But knowing for sure --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. -- but the chances were that it was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Knowing for sure, of course, that's not even the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or the CPS's job, all they have to do -- it is about all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they have to do -- is have an investigation. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police, as you know, send it to the CPS, they then have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to apply certain tests as to whether there is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a realistic prospect of conviction. The only people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that have to be sure is the jury, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. It was not Meirion Jones' business or Peter Rippon's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business or anybody else's business in the BBC to be applying that test, was it; in terms of providing information to the police?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No. I mean, I think we should have considered it. I can see why we should have considered it, but we didn't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Did you -- you are not a lawyer, so I'm not asking you whether you know the law, but did you consider yourself to be under a legal obligation to supply information to the police?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What did you -- what do you understand, if you do have any understanding of it at all, the legal obligation to be about furnishing information to the police?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. My understanding of it, based on other stories, is that if they want stuff we have they have to apply for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. We see, in our documents, that the BBC's traditional line is precisely that. It is one of essentially reactive --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That if the police come knocking at the door, the BBC then considers whether they have information that they are willing to furnish to the police?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, but remember this information had come from who we had badly let down, by not running her story.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>story. I just didn't consider taking her story to the police and then the police knocking on her door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Right. But is this fair. Leave aside what the legal obligation may or may not have been, which is not a matter which it were fair to tax you with, but is it fair to say that, at least looking back on it, you felt a little uncomfortable about the way in which the information had been dealt with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. By?.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. By you and Meirion Jones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes. I did feel a little uncomfortable, I thought -- I thought we were evading a responsibility and if we were being, you know, good citizens we -- we clearly had an account which we believed of a crime having taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. That takes me rather neatly, if I may say so, to the next point. Which is leave aside legal obligations: do you accept that as a matter of either journalistic ethics, or just simple good citizenship, the information that had been obtained right at the beginning probably ought to have been taken to the police rather earlier than it was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes. I mean I see that. I mean, I -- as I say I didn't think of it in those terms, but, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. You -- I think it was you, but tell me if I'm wrong --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had actually done a bit of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Why? What did that -- what was the use that you put -- what did you make of the information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um, well it -- it had been -- I'd seen it in the paper and obviously he was in our minds because of this story. I didn't think, therefore, we should go to the police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. When Meirion and Peter Rippon agreed with each other that they didn't have anything that was of evidential value to the police, did you dissent from that? Say, &quot;Hang on --&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Not openly. Meirion and I had a conversation about it after. In that conversation -- it was sort of trying for all concerned, in that, you know, I was very unhappy about the blog, which I regarded as a completely false account of events and total misleading of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Right. So?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. So I sort of let them decide that. I think collectively we evaded our responsibility, and you know I hold my hands up for that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR SPAFFORD: Can we have a short five minute break?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR MACLEAN: 5 minutes, then we will come back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Which is 3.07 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. (A short break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.15 pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: After the interview on 14 November, did you have any further contact with her? Either you or Meirion, until the story was stood down? Did you sort of tell her how things were going or ask any follow-up questions at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. She was sort of out of the loop. And I don't think there was contact until afterwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR POLLARD: Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR MACLEAN: In the end, I think she got a text from Meirion Jones, didn't she, to say it was a non-runner --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- which she was less than impressed with. But that was the only other contact with her?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. I mean I have been in contact with her in recent weeks and spoken to her. But, yes, that was the only --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. Q. Right.
2. Were you aware of a Freedom of Information request made by Mr Goslett in April of this year --
3. A. No.
4. Q. -- made to the BBC?
5. A. No.
6. Q. If you take bundle 5 and go to 218, that is Mr Goslett's FOI request. You will see that there are three bits of it. The first is asking questions about Mark Thomson, Helen Bosden, Peter Rippon and Danny Cohen.
7. The next one is a list of meetings about the unscreened Newsnight piece and then thirdly concerns the BBC's contact with police. You have never seen that before?
8. A. No.
9. Q. Nobody asked you for any input into the rather long and slightly tortuous process by which the BBC responded to that?
10. A. No.
11. Q. Have you had any contact with -- if you go to 237, which is on the 18th May, more than a month later. This is the eventual response by the BBC, which might, uncharitably perhaps, be described as telling Mr Goslett politely to get lost. And it comes from somebody called Stephanie Harris, who is head of accountability.
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1. I have not come across her.
2. Q. She's not somebody you had any contact with?
3. A. No.
4. Q. Did you know that towards the end of August the Sunday Times started raising questions with Helen Deller?
5. A. No, I think I have known that subsequently.
6. Q. Yes. But at the --
8. Q. Right.
9. A. Because what I'm thinking of is -- or am I confusing it with ITN, the request to the BBC informing them of the programme --
10. Q. If you go -- let's see if my reference is right -- to A4 again, page 133. Do you know who Mark Edmunds is?
11. A. No.
12. Q. No. You are not familiar with him?
13. A. No.
14. Q. Look in the middle of the page, you see there is an email from him to Helen Deller on 22 August.
15. A. I think this was in what I was sent over the weekend.
16. Q. I am afraid I don't know.
17. A. Yes, it is this one, that is why I am remembering the Sunday Times.
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1. Q. If you look at 133 you'll see Mr Edmunds' email to Helen Deller and he's talking about a piece that is going to be published in The Sunday Times magazine, and he also mentions in the next paragraph, "You may also know that ITV ..."
2. So he flags that as well.
3. A. Yes.
4. Q. I think later there is a letter from ITV to the BBC, saying that we, ITV, are going to do this story.
5. A. Um-hm.
6. Q. But you were unaware of Edmunds' existence and him writing this piece and unaware of the ITV story as well?
7. A. No, I knew the ITV story was happening. I knew it was in production.
8. Q. Because of Mark Williams-Thomas?
9. A. Yes. I knew it was in production and due to come out in the autumn.
10. Q. Right. So when did you know that -- and from whom did you know -- that ITV were going to broadcast on 3 October?
11. A. Meirion and I would have been discussing the fact it was coming out. I know he'd had a conversation with Steve Mitchell about it, because he'd told me at the time and that he had spoken to Peter. I didn't speak to Peter at all. As for 3 October, I think I would have known when everyone else knew --
12. Q. You didn't hear from Mark Williams-Thomas?
13. A. No, I haven't directly spoken to Mark Williams-Thomas.
14. Everything I know about him is through Meirion.
15. Q. So in that weekend before that, it must have been Sunday 30th --
16. A. Yes.
17. Q. It is all pretty much trailed in the Sunday papers, and I think even perhaps the end of the week before, that this ITV documentary is coming.
18. You say in your statement at paragraph 38:
19. "It was widely reported that ITV were to broadcast an exposure documentary into Jimmy Savile."
20. You say:
21. "The main BBC News outlets were also reporting the allegations ...."
22. By which you mean the ordinary news, News at Ten or whatever?
23. A. Yes.
24. Q. "... But they were not given access to material we had on Newsnight. Meirion told me that this was decided by Peter Rippon."
25. A. Are you sure about that? Are you sure you were told by Meirion?
26. A. To the best, yes to the best of my recollection. But
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1. I was subsequently told by David Sillitoe.
2. Q. Who is?
3. A. He is arts correspondent on the main network news.
4. Q. He was trying to do his job?
5. A. And get on with -- he knew we had material.
6. Q. And he told you that he was blocked by Peter Rippon?
7. A. I'm pretty sure he said by Peter. But he definitely said that he was blocked and not allowed to be in touch with us directly.
8. Q. What is wrong or odd about Peter Rippon taking that view, if anything?
9. A. Well, when I was told that -- I think I'm right that I was told it -- I would have seen it as Peter's attitude to the story again, blocking it, not wanting it out there. So that would be what's wrong with it. It might be that in terms of BBC process he's perfectly entitled to say to other bits of the BBC: go through the press office in the normal way.
10. Q. That point, about go to the press office in the normal way, those are the rules, aren't they?
11. A. They are the rules, yes.
12. Q. So Peter Rippon was simply obeying the rules. Perhaps to the frustration of somebody in Mr Sillitoe's position, I can understand that.
13. A. Sure.
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1. set out. So I think he had a duty to make it as accurate as possible and he didn't consult -- well, I don't think he consulted Meirion, although I think there was one account suggesting he did. He certainly didn't consult me and I would never have agreed that he should say what he said because it was so far from correct.
2. So in other words, if it was in good faith, which as you say is a possibility, at the very least he's guilty of gross carelessness, especially given how that then, you know, caused all sorts of other senior BBC people to mislead the public.
3. Q. Tell me this is wrong: the facts that you know are that Mr Rippon published the blog?
4. A. Um-hm.
5. Q. You -- tell me if this is wrong, but my understanding is you don't have any direct knowledge yourself as to exactly how that blog came about, is that right?
6. Although when you saw it you immediately could spot that there were any number of problems with it, which you have set out. Let's assume for the moment you are right about that and, as I say, the BBC did make some corrections eventually.
7. A. Um-hm.
8. Q. What direct knowledge do you have about what happened with Peter Rippon and above after the publication of the blog. We know that it was corrected by the BBC.
9. A. It was partially corrected.
10. Q. I'm coming to that. There were corrections to it by the BBC, which Meirion Jones certainly thought didn't go far enough, and I think you thought didn't go far enough.
11. There were still mistakes and errors in it, right?
12. A. Um-hm.
13. Q. So you say that there were -- the blog was published and there were errors in it, it was inaccurate. It might be that the falsities in it, or the inaccuracies in it, which ever word you want to choose, one possibility is that they were knowingly false and the whole thing was, as it were, a deliberate pack of lies. That is one possibility.
14. Another possibility is that Mr Rippon was doing his best to recall what the facts were and in some respects got them wrong. There is no doubt any other number of possibilities in between, but what's your position if you have one about how those --
15. A. Well, I think at the very least he got things wrong and I think there's a degree of wilfulness about it, because, you know, putting something on the public record like that, it's a very serious statement. As we know, the BBC built their entire public position in some cases very aggressively around the account that Peter
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I take it you didn't have any involvement in the development of this line? Do you remember seeing this line put out at the time and if so what did you make of it?

A. Um, I don't remember precisely.

Q. It's a bit odd, isn't it? This line?

A. That criminal actions --

Q. Because, as we discussed earlier, what were the police going to do in terms of investigating criminal actions by Jimmy Savile?

A. When Mr Rippon wrote his blog, which is at page 84, he sent it -- at least a draft of it -- yes, to make sense of this you see at 86 a draft of the blog.

A. Yes.

Q. Peter Rippon, Steve Mitchell, Helen Boaden, Paddy Feeney and Paul Mylrea. Paddy Feeney, we can see from the top of the page that he is head of communications?

A. Yes, I think Paul Mylrea may work for the director general directly. He was there in the Select Committee.

Q. Yes, he was. And he was heavily involved in preparing for that appearance by the BBC.

A. You were not involved in the development of the blog and neither was Melirion Jones?

A. Um-hm.

Q. So when it gets published -- sorry, let me show you one more thing. This is the day before you go to Steven Mitchell because you speak to him on the 3rd?

A. Yes.

Q. On the 2nd, and you see at the bottom, you see the reference from Helen Deller:

"There are procedures in place regarding requests for the release of material gathered for our investigations. All requests for BBC untransmitted material are dealt with by our legal department."

That is the point we were on earlier; that the BBC line is what you thought it was, namely reactive not proactive.

But what I really want to show you here is Steve Mitchell's email:

"If we need it, that is fine Helen, and for briefing Paddy and I were discussing the fact that request for material from Newsnight is unlikely as the new rape allegation to spark the BBC offer to co-operate with the mesh only emerged today and isn't one that Newsnight were aware of when they were pursuing the Savile story."

Pausing there, I think what has happened is that ITV has not broadcast yet, but the fact of the allegation of rape, as it is put, in BBC premises had been trailed.

A. And it -- it referred to the one, refresh me, yes?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Yes. That is right. And the ITV documentary ran the allegation -- the rape allegation he's referring to is one that exposure ran which was exactly the same, wasn't it, as the one that you had known about from the beginning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. So it's not right, is it, that the new rape allegation, (a), had only emerged today --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. -- because you've it had it for merely a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. And it's certainly not one that Newsnight wasn't aware of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No. This is another uncomfortable thing. But the ITV programme was based so strongly on the planks of our investigation. It went further and it went wider, but it was completely built on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Which is why the account of it, in the way that it was portrayed by the blog and in other statements was to deny that truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. If we take this document and compare it to the very first email, from Meirion Jones to you and Peter Rippon, copying out chunks of stuff from the internet, we somehow got from that email and its Page 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information which has this allegation referred to as [redacted] and we have reached this position in 11 months and to say the least something has been lost in translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. But not, as it were, thanks to you because you weren't involved in this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No, not involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Take bundle 8 then. We see your sparkly response to the blog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. To George?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. To the blog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Do you mean the response to George Entwistle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. No, not yet. Not yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes. God, I had forgotten I said that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Just for the transcript, it is actually not the first time that we've encountered this word, I think, so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You response was that: &quot;The blog, insofar as it claimed, 'We are confident all the women we had spoken to had gone to the police', was utter bollocks.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Um-hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. You said so to Meirion Jones and of course he was of the same view. You and he were on the same page on all this, obviously?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q. Just that email at 57, do you see in the fourth line of the second paragraph the sentence, "I was of the belief..."?
A. "I am of the belief that..."

Q. Sorry, one down.
A. Yes, one down:

Q. I was of the belief [this is Meirion Jones speaking] that another woman had told the police about Gary Glitter.
A. Did you say that?

Q. I wasn't sure -- no, no, I couldn't remember it. But we did have a second account of Gary Glitter. There was obviously the [email] account, but one of the other people we had spoken to had alluded to Glitter, but I don't know if she had spoken to the police or not.
A. So you didn't share the belief that another woman had told the police about Glitter. That was not something you picked up?

Q. No.
A. It doesn't appear to be reflected in any of the notes that I have seen anyway.

Q. And it's not something you recognise either?
A. No.

Q. Then there's another one at page 61, and this is what Page 201

I was alluding to a little earlier, Meirion Jones to Stephen Mitchell:

"I did notice you didn't copy me in. Two points here to be absolutely clear, Peter is wrong to say all our witnesses spoke to the police, but more importantly, Peter is right to say we did not believe that we were withholding anything from the police that could result in a prosecution of anyone who is alive, for reasons outlined in my other email."

That was the point we were on just before we broke. I suggest to you -- and I think you more or less accept -- that that second bit is not right?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes?

A. Yes. Well, let me be clear. I think it's arguable. And I think, you know, that being good citizens we perhaps should have considered taking it to the police.

Q. So if you go to 88, then, the same day. Rippon to Mitchell, copied to you and Meirion Jones and Helen Deller. He says:

"Liz, Meirion and I have discussed this. We are agreed that we have never had any information about anyone alive that the police should have been told about."

Now, again we touched on this earlier. He is

Page 202

saying you were party to such an agreement, which I think you basically were?

A. I basically was. I was in the room. And they were agreeing it. And I was more -- my attention -- I was less concerned about that and much more concerned about other inaccuracies in the blog. So I mean I was -- I was there and part of it, but I'm not an active part.

Q. I appreciate there is a lot going on here.
A. Yes.

Q. But in retrospect, it is unfortunate, isn't it, that -- well, we see that Stephen Mitchell at page 91 just says "okay, that's fine". So he's received and as it were understood that message, which isn't actually correct. You said it was arguable, but what makes it arguable is the aspect of not being sure who the victim was?

A. And her age.

Q. That's the element of doubt?

A. I think the element of doubt is we don't know she was under age, but I think frankly we can assume that she was under age, because the girls from Duncroft were under the age of 16.

Q. If she was of age, as it were, then there is still the element, given the picture you painted earlier of the alleged perpetrator, that even if the victim was 16, it still might have been something the police might have been concerned about.

A. Yes, I mean it wouldn't have been --

Q. The question of consent and informed consent and so on?

A. It wouldn't have been statutory -- well, exactly.

Q. They would have come into play, wouldn't they?
A. Yes.

Q. Let me show you 179. The lines are getting developed for The Sun, I think. Again, I'm not -- tell me if I'm wrong, but I don't think any of this had any relation to you at all.

Peter Rippon says, "We should add that they can't speak to him ..."

This was Meirion Jones, I think:

"Also it is really odd her criticising us for not handing over our investigation to the police."

This is about its talking about?

A. Yes, this is after her ITN interview.

Q. Yes. Before it has been broadcast, I think, that evening?
A. No, no, no. Her interview went out on the lunchtime bulletins.

Q. Before the ITV exposure broadcast, but it has been trailed, yes?
A. Yes.

Q. "She was our investigation and could have gone to the
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<tr>
<td>1. police at any point in the last 40 years. I don’t know if we can gently point this out, I guess not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think one of points Merion Jones was pressing this email upon us, and I think his point is that it is hard to reconcile with the blog, which says that all the women went to the police?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. And here the point is that she could have done but didn’t. Maybe you can’t really help us with any of this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Well, it doesn’t coincide with the blog. I mean, I have always been willing to be open about the fact that the blog was mistaken -- willfully mistaken errors, I would say, because it takes some kind of carelessness not to check such basic facts when all he had to do was ask us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. But I mean that, yes, he seems to be saying she didn’t go to the police, having, in his blog, said she did along with &quot;all other women&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Q. Sorry, I didn’t mean to speak over you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A. That’s all right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Q. It is fair to say, isn’t it, that 2 October was a particularly busy day at Newsgate, is that right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A. Well, I don’t know. Newsgate didn’t cover this story, you see. So there was a lot of pressure on the programme. It was in every newspaper --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Page 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 1. that he dashed it off --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Q. Yes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A. -- I thought it was very carefully written, very carefully argued, that if you didn’t know the facts it would read like a reasonable account of events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Q. Do you know anything about efforts, perhaps even repeated efforts, by Mr Rippon to correct inaccuracies in the blog when they transpired?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A. You mean as soon as we pointed out to him the errors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Q. Yes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A. I’m not aware of that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Q. You are not aware of what he did with that information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Whether he just said, &quot;You know...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A. My impression was he appeared to shrug it off to matter in that he said, &quot;Well, I’ll tell the press office not to keep saying that line!&quot;, the line about all the women having gone to the police. Which didn’t sound like a thorough correction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Q. Yes. So to the extent that it might be suggest to us that there were repeated efforts by him to do something about the inaccuracies --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. A. Were there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Q. Well, to the extent that it might be suggested that there were, those are not matters that you could help us with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Page 207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 1. Q. But --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A. -- but it wasn’t giving any coverage to this story.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Q. There were some practical things which meant it was busy. Newsgate was in the throes of moving, wasn’t it, from Television Centre to Broadcasting House, new Broadcasting House?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Q. And you were -- you, Newsgate -- were running pilot programmes --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Q. -- as well as the real programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A. Um-hm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Q. So for the editor of Newsgate, perhaps the last thing he wanted to have to do was sit down and write an account of something that happened 11 months ago. He had a lot on his plate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. A. He had a lot on his plate, but I would have thought this was surely more important than anything. I mean the move was important, the pilot was important, but there were other people that could oversee those. And, you know, given what the headlines were like for the programme -- the programme at the time felt under siege and I would have thought -- I can’t see why that wouldn’t have been the most important thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. And in terms of -- was he under so much pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Page 206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 1. A. No, I’m not aware of efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Q. Right. Right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 3. Now, ITV broadcasts on the 3rd. You have set out in paragraph 141 what you say the inaccuracies in the blog were. I’m not going to go through them, we have read that, we understand what you say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Q. You have mentioned the inaccuracies that you -- you talk about the corrections and that you are, as it were, still not satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. A. Um-hm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Q. Then you went to see Steve Mitchell on 3 October, paragraph 45?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. A. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Q. You say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 47. "He attempted to justify the blog, talking about how, in Peter’s mind, the story had come to be about the CPS."
| 48. You say: |
| 49. "He conceded that if he and Peter had shown more imagination they might have grasped that the story was an important one. Twice he told me orally, in relation to press charges of cover-up ahead of the tribute programmes, 'Liz it is important that you are aware that corporately the BBC is all right on this.'" |
| 50. Page 208 |
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1. What did that mean?
2. A. Well, it was a striking phrase. As I say, it was said to me twice. I took it to mean there was no email that would say, you know -- Helen Boaden or someone else saying to Peter Rippon, "Kill that story."
3. Q. In other words, no smoking gun?
4. A. Yes, I didn’t take it to mean that there hadn’t been any pressure on Peter. Only that the BBC was all right on this, as he said.
5. Q. But you can be all right in the sense of, “I did it, but I’m not going to get caught”, or you can be all right in the sense of, “I didn’t do it.”
6. A. Yes, and either of those interpretations was possible.
7. Q. And you were uncomfortable with what you saw as an attempt to rewrite history. Did you explain to him that there were some pretty fundamental errors with the blog so far as you were concerned?
8. A. Yes, I said it was creating a completely false impression of our story.
9. Q. Did you say, “You have to get this fixed Steve”?
10. A. Yes, I mean I can’t remember the words I used, but it was, it’s wrong and it can’t stand and, you know, it’s misleading the public.
11. Q. What did he say or immediately do about it?
12. A. He didn’t. The conversation moved on. But I thought Page 209

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

"As Meirion knows, I'm working on identifying and collating the materials obtained during Newsnight's 2011 investigation into Savile for disclosure to the police any inquiries et cetera. Important we ensure that all materials are retained safely and not destroyed. I need to know from both of you exactly what was obtained and created during the course of your 2011 investigation will, whether you think it may be relevant or not."

Then she sets out what she is already has and asks a series of questions, essentially have you got anything else, and if so please now could you cough it up?

That was done expressly for the purpose of police and any enquiries, as she puts it. Had a similar exercise been done for the purpose of the blog or the BBC's public statements leading up to that?

A. No, we hadn't been consulted -- or I hadn't been consulted on anything.

Q. Can you think of any good reason why Peter Rippon shouldn't have consulted you when he was preparing the blog first of all?

A. Well, the only reason I can think is that he would know that we would have disagreed with his points. And that he couldn’t have put out the statement that he put out. Because from the beginning of the year -- well twice at the beginning of the year -- I had said to him, "The BBC
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| Page 213 |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. "Is not being accurate about what we were looking into". |
| 2. Q. Can you think of any good reason why once the blog was out those who were considering it shouldn't have come back to you and asked you what you thought about it? |
| 3. A. Well, no. George Entwistle's account to MPs was that that's not the done thing. He expects to rely on the editor. |
| 4. Q. As directed -- as the director general, that's what the director general would expect to do? |
| 5. A. Yes. |
| 6. Q. And we have this obviously. You prepared a note which went to George Entwistle before he went to the committee. |
| 7. A. Yes. |
| 8. Q. And Meirion Jones did the same. Was that the first direct input you'd had at that level? |
| 9. A. No, I'd sent George an email after his 5 October email where he misdescribed our investigation. |
| 10. Q. Right. So if we look -- |
| 11. A. So I mailed him on 8 October, ahead of the -- that's when he said, "Right, Ken MacQuarrie will talk to you". |
| 12. Q. I see. So his response was Ken MacQuarrie will come and see you, and then Ken MacQuarrie did indeed come and see you. |
| 13. A. The next day. |

---
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| Page 215 |
|------------------|------------------|
| Q. So until MacQuarrie and then Peter Horrocks, nobody had attempted to download from you what the -- |
| A. No, I had attempted to download to Steve Mitchell. |
| Q. Yes? |
| A. And to George, via email. |
| Q. Yes. That I think is all I want to ask you. |
| A. Right. |
| Q. I have not been through your statement paragraph by paragraph, because we have read it. |
| A. You can read it, yes. |
| Q. We can read. |
| I have not taken you to every email because we can read those too. |
| A. Yes. |
| Q. Nick may have some questions for you, but before he does, is there anything else that you want to tell us? |
| A. Well, you can stop me if you think these points have been well enough covered. |
| Q. Right. |
| A. But I mean it's something that I have, you know, I have thought throughout really, that there are two main things. |
| One that I think, you know, in the BBC we have failed in relation to the women we spoke to. I think their accounts were never properly considered by BBC. |

---

| Page 216 |
|------------------|------------------|
| Q. Management, is Peter Rippon. |
| Q. Rumour. |
| Q. Rumour. |
| MR MACLEAN: Hang on, do you have an example of that? |
| A. Yes. In the documents that I was given -- |
| Q. Give us a date? |
| A. 21 October to Paul Mylrea. |
| Q. What time? Do you have a time? |
| A. No, I'm sorry, it was in the lot I was sent. I put, "3 out of 9": Sorry, more -- a bigger one was on 1 October, to David Jordan. |
| MR POLLARD: From? |
| A. Peter. |
| MR MACLEAN: 1 October? |
| MR POLLARD: And the other one was Peter to Paul Mylrea. |
| A. Yes, on the 21st Peter to Paul Mylrea. Then again to Helen Boaden on 29 August, and Steve Mitchell, where he says the allegations are more sexual harassment than assaults; the allegations given to us. Well, (a), that is not actually true, and (b) they are still serious allegations. Sexual harassment isn't all right. And I just felt throughout that there was, |

---
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from his lack of interest in the detail of our material, that he very likely minimised their experiences by suggesting:

"Well, they weren't the youngest victims, it wasn't the worst kind of abuse".

I just think for a senior editor in the BBC that that's, you know, those attitudes struck me as being inappropriate and not something I have come across before.

MR MACLEAN: You are making a point -- there are various points one could make out of that. One is that you might say that doesn't show a firm grasp of the material you had gathered, whether it was about males or females or whoever. But you are making a slightly deeper point.

A. No, not exactly. More that this attitude, that well it was more sexual harassment than sexual assault, as to

harassment is nothing, that it was not the youngest victims, therefore it was less a of a Newsnight story, it was not the worst kind of abuse, therefore -- that was the reason for him pulling back from the story as he described it to me.

Q. Right.

A. I find that odd. But the only other point, but I am sure it is probably being made anyway, is this refusal to acknowledge publicly that we were looking into allegations that Jimmy Savile abused children on and off BBC premises. It just seems that all the public statements from the beginning of the year were designed to throw the public off the scent, and conceal that fact, and the blog then built on that.

Q. Yes. We can all speculate -- if that is right, we can all speculate as to why that might be the case. It simply might be an institution that defends itself in a particular way; it sees itself as being under attack so it hunkers down.

A. Yes, but misleading the public is effectively -- this is one thing the BBC should never knowingly do and I think it has been knowingly done in this case.

Q. I see.

A. The expectation was that, I suppose, that Meirion and I would pipe down.

Q. Okay. We will look at those -- they are on the transcript. We will look at those particular examples you have given. As I said to you earlier -- you will get this transcript at some point. These ladies have to put it together, it will come to you at some point. If you take issue with anything on it, we can have a discussion.

(4.03 pm)

Questions by MR POLLARD

MR POLLARD: Sorry, just a couple of points I wanted to raise.

Just, in a way, to go back, because we obviously will be talking to Peter Rippon pretty soon -- just to go back to what I think will probably be one of the key parts of what he says to us, without in any way prejudging that. My guess is that he is likely to concentrate to some extent on his belief, as he would see it -- and he might say to us -- that all the way through he had this idea that the CPS dropping the investigation because Savile was too old and infirm was a sort of trigger in his mind. That that would be what would move it from a, "This might or might not make", to, "Of course this is a story." And it is institutional failure, it is the acknowledgment that a case was made successfully but dropped for, if you

like, a non-legal reason.

Are you sure that that wasn't in his mind all along?

A. Well, it can't have been in his mind all along, because the story started out as per Meirion's original email.

We didn't know anything about the -- despite what the blog says, we didn't know anything about the police investigation until we began hearing from some of the women who were at Duncraft.

MR POLLARD: Just remind me. Within the Friends Reunited blog, are there not references in there to, "He was let off because he was too old!")

A. I'm not sure, Nick, I can't remember. I just remember becoming aware of this police investigation once we'd started going.

MR POLLARD: That it was triggered by the book extract, effectively.

A. Not the police aspect, no.

MR POLLARD: No, the story was.

A. Yes, exactly.

MR POLLARD: And that was what was shown to Peter.

A. Yes.

MR POLLARD: I understand.

A. Obviously he, it's clear, attached a lot of importance to that CPS aspect as time went on, but remember we had more than the CPS had and it just seemed an odd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MR POLLARD: Yes.</th>
<th>A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of our difficulties, speaking personally, is that the amount that's on the record, if you like, during that month of November about the development of the story is quite a lot, involving you and Meirion and Hannah and so on. His actual sort of response -- and the two-way process that might have taken place, there's not much of that documented.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: It was all done on the phone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumably quite a lot of that is in the conversations that you had with him about what was happening and getting, you thought, a quite positive response back.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, he reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Some of them presumably didn't want to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</td>
<td>But in such a sensitive area I guess there is potentially a difference between being able to look somebody in the eye, as you were with and obviously and make a personal judgment about their credibility and the way they told their case, told their story, and somebody talking on a phone, detached in some way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>A. Um, well I felt I heard believable accounts. And, you know, some of the conversations were short, some of them were much -- obviously but others of them were longer, and in cases they involved email exchanges as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>In other words it wasn't a sort of one hit contact, there were several exchanges, and certainly --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</td>
<td>I felt I believed the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Okay, thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes, I mean they reached a height on the 25th, with a sort of -- what read like a firm commitment to broadcast the film.</td>
<td>MR MACLEAN: I just -- I suspect -- and you will see that we have this point on board -- that's the one you had in mind, is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>Q. Is that one of the others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>Q. Do you have the third one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. Was it to David Jordan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>Q. We just can't track it down immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. 1 October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>Q. 1 October. We will find it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Thank you Liz. That is very kind. Thank you for spending top of time with us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. I don't envy you your job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>MR MACLEAN: Just before you go --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>Q. This one. That one. (Handed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Advised.</td>
<td>A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR MACLEAN: Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A. Okay, thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MR POLLARD: Thank you very much indeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A. Thank you very much indeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEX**

- MS LIZ MACKEAN (called) .......................................................... 1
- Opening remarks ................................................................. 1
- Questions by MR MACLEAN ..................................................... 2
- Questions by MR POLLARD .................................................... 219

---

**Page 225**