### Annex 3

#### Documents referred to in Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Copies of fake bank statements referred to at 1 and 2</td>
<td>16 March 1994</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 June 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Handwritten telephone message by Carol Sprigg dated 24 August 1995 (2.30 pm) and transcript</td>
<td>24 August 1995</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Earl Spencer's Handwritten note of meeting with Martin Bashir on 31 August 1995 and transcript</td>
<td>31 August 1995</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Undated post-it note for Martin Bashir regarding a call from &quot;Charles&quot;</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Note purportedly from Earl Spencer to Martin Bashir dated 2 September 1995 and enclosing unsigned affidavit of Paul Gammon</td>
<td>2 September 1995</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>BBC Press Office Log dated 6 April 1996</td>
<td>6 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Extract of Note from Tom Mangold to Anne Sloman dated 11 April 1996</td>
<td>11 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Note from Harry Dean to Anne Sloman dated 12 April 1996</td>
<td>12 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Minutes of BBC Board of Management meeting on 15 April 1996</td>
<td>15 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Note of a meeting between Martin Bashir, Tony Hall and Anne Sloman dated 17 April 1996</td>
<td>17 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Briefing note from Tony Hall to John Birt regarding Martin Bashir and the Mail on Sunday allegations</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Summary note prepared by Anne Sloman dated 22 April 1996 (including timeline)</td>
<td>22 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Minutes of BBC Board of Management meeting on 29 April 1996</td>
<td>29 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Westminster Bank

**Account:** Current Account

**155 North Street, Brighton BN1 1DN**

**Date:** 8 Mar 1994

**Statement Date:** 5 - 6 Mar 1994

**Account Number:** 00413901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Balance (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 Mar</td>
<td>Balance from Sheet No. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>8,094.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mar</td>
<td>Balance to Sheet No. 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,094.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- SO: Standing Order
- EC: Electronic Credit
- TR: Transfer
- CC: Cash Credit
- CP: Card Purchase
- DD: Direct Debit
- PF: Period End

---

**Information:**

1. **Overdrawn Borrowing Rate:** 35.5% pa.
2. **Credit Limit:** £10,000.

---

**Notes:**

- If the account is overdrawn, you will be charged an overdraft fee.

---

**Confidential**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>WITHDRAWALS</th>
<th>DEPOSITS</th>
<th>BALANCE (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 JUN</td>
<td>PENFOLS CONSULTANTS (JERSEY)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>4,894.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 JUN</td>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,694.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AS AT 15 JUN 1994**

**SHOULD YOU OVERDRAW WITHOUT ARRANGEMENT YOU WILL BE CHARGED OUR UNARRANGED OVERDRAFT RATE WHICH IS CURRENTLY 28.5% PA.**

**15 JUN**

BALANCE TO SHEET NO. 113

0.00

### National Westminster Bank

**155 NORTH STREET**  
**BRIGHTON**  
**BN1 10N**  

**ACCOUNT CURRENT ACCOUNT**  
**MR ROBERT DAVID HARPER &**  
**MR ALAN JAMES WALLER**  
**TRADING AS**  
**WEIDER HEALTH & FITNESS**  

**STATEMENT DATE 16 MAR 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Balance (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 MAR</td>
<td>BALANCE FROM SHEET NO. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>994.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEWS INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****AS AT 16 MAR 1994**  
**SHOULD YOU OVERDRAW WITHOUT ARRANGEMENT YOU WILL BE CHARGED**

### National Westminster Bank

**155 NORTH STREET**  
**BRIGHTON**  
**BN1 10N**  

**ACCOUNT CURRENT ACCOUNT**  
**MR ROBERT DAVID HARPER &**  
**MR ALAN JAMES WALLER**  
**TRADING AS**  
**WEIDER HEALTH & FITNESS**  

**STATEMENT DATE 15 JUN 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Deposits</th>
<th>Balance (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 JUN</td>
<td>BALANCE FROM SHEET NO. 111</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
<td>4,994.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PENFOLDOS CONSULTANTS (JERSEY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 JUN</td>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>4,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,694.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****AS AT 15 JUN 1994**
TELEPHONE MESSAGE

To:

Date:  

Time:  

Subject:  

MESSAGE:  

[Handwritten content is not legible]
The Right Hon The Earl Spencer

Independent investigation led by Lord Dyson

Transcript of handwritten notes

[Handwritten telephone message for Lord Spencer – 24.08.1995]

TELEPHONE MESSAGE

To:

Date:  
Time:  

Subject:

MESSAGE:

24.8.95 2.30pm

BBC – Martin Bashir

Panorama – not seeking interview or info.

15 mins of time to talk.

Legal letter from BBC to confirm confidentiality.

W: [Redacted]

H: [Redacted] (strictest confidence)

No filming or interview – just talk.
Carol Brigg
Althorp House
Northampton
NN7 4HQ

24 August 1995

Dear Carol,

Thanks for your helpfulness during our telephone conversation earlier today. It was much appreciated.

I have spent the past three months investigating certain aspects of press behaviour. At present I am simply drawing material together. As I said it is not my intention to record or publish any discussion with Earl Spencer but simply to share some information which, I believe, may be of interest.

The BBC is more than happy to provide a letter of comfort confirming that a meeting would be strictly confidential. I do hope that this will allay any natural anxieties that may arise.

Thanks again and I do look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]

Reporter, Panorama
After my BBC interview, I was under surveillance by MI-5, and my leadership actividades were closely monitored. My family was targeted.

While I was leading my family, I was under constant surveillance. My family was regularly checked by MI-5 agents.

I was disappeared in 1981. My family was also disappeared. My family was disappeared in 1981.
[Lord Spencer’s handwritten notes of first meeting with Martin Bashir on 31 August 1995]

8/3/94 £4k News International – £4k quarterly since

4/6/94 £6.5k Penfolds – 4 payments, all less

  1st payment (transfer) Draught?

  = wholly-owned subsid. in Houston, Texas.

  2 directors investigated for fraud by FBI.


  s forwarding address.

  with Waller,+

M.: Been working on this for 9 months.

Action by BBC – against

Aylard at Wheeler’s. Didn’t eat. *No receipt

From D.: access to her suite.

2 friends inform.

List of staff at my party.

Aylard to Jonathan Dimbleby, last week: “We are in the end game. Shit or bust.”

Prince Philip doesn’t like D. at all.

‘HOLIDAY OF A LIFETIME’. Shoot it later.

JOB OF A LIFETIME’
Charles rang to say
you can expect the
call he’s arranged on
Wednesday.
2nd September, 1995.

Dear [Name],

Enclosed is the piece of evidence I think might be of interest.

Do you know:

1) [Redacted]?
2) About the ISDN digital secure system?

Good luck!

Yours,
Paul Gammon, of Village Investigations of St. Andrews House, Upper Ham Road, Richmond in the County of Surrey, acting under instructions received from Flaggate Fielder Solicitors of Heron Place, George Street, London W1H, make Oath and say:—

1. That I have made extensive enquiries into a man known as Alan Waller in order to locate a home address for him.

2. That I was supplied with a mobile telephone number being [redacted] I made various enquiries as to ascertain the owner of the phone and the billing address. The results of which are the phone is owned by Mr A Waller of [redacted] and

3. That I did then make further enquiries into [redacted] and found that this is a shop called [redacted] with offices above. That the shop keeper did know of Mr Allan Waller and had seen him entering the office above recently. The office above is occupied by a company called [redacted] All attempts to contact this company have failed as they do not have a normal telephone line or number to contact them on and when my colleague Mark Wingrove tried to get a response from the door he found that the entry phone was not answered. The telephone number listed for [redacted] is [redacted] it is an ISDN digital secure line and can only be accessed by similar lines. These types of lines are very unusual and we are informed that they are most often used by the Stock Exchange and Government Departments.

4. That after making enquiries with numerous official bodies and all the normal agencies I can find no home address for Mr Allan Waller.

5. That after reporting this to Mr Simon Ekins of Flaggate Fielder's he did ask me to make further enquiries, which all came up blank and that the local shop keepers had been told that Mr Waller no longer worked for [redacted] and that a man they know as working for [redacted] had made a special point of telling them such.

6. That the telephone number of [redacted] is still operational and is still in Mr A Waller's name.

7. In my experience this man is trying to avoid being found and that the address of [redacted] is the only place of contact that I can find.

SWORN:

at

This __ day of __, 1994}

Before me, ____________

Solicitor empowered to administer Oaths.
1. 4 months ago, 3 men met him - MI6.
   Applied orchestrate everything, commissioned a man (SMM) - escort girls in London.
   Plus one more.

2. Aylard put by Joanna Drukeby. 2 yrs ago, decided to remarry P.O.L. 1 yr ago, decided to attack Diana (+ family).

3. MI6 taped C + Aylard: "in one line". I told Aylard she thought of him, and she didn't divorce.

4. Source: Family to be destroyed. I to go to States (+ me).

5. Casual thing led by Julia C.

6. Jephson used to do flying lessons in Jersey. Used to go to Jersey for weekends - hasn't been this year.

7. Difficult relationship with Martin for D, because of Tiggy. C's in love with her.

8. D: for past 6 months, had letters delivered by BT at tax inspectors' doors. 9-10 letters - lives being taped. Steve Daniels (chauffeur) feeds TODAY newspaper: "Change your chauffeur.

9. Bugs on car. Senior police officers make money. 3 lives at K.P. bugged; mail read; disinformation down line; line on car bugged.

10. Casual publicly broke a day C +
Tiggy went away for 2 weeks.

11 Junes Goldsmith — Martin Williams told him "She's had it".

12 2 B.L. staff on manpower returns.

13 Richard Kay & Aykroyd had dinner in Riverdale Ran of Savoy, 3 weeks ago.

14 D's stepped up engagements. Off to Chicago. Aykroyd suffered through Pavarotti and pictures.

15 V.J. Day. D. asked. P.C. stopped it tried to stop it, + failed.

16 'Notiz' obsessed with me. Carey to go for Victoria again. 'Notiz' egged on by Aykroyd.

17 Camilla: depressed, but quiet for the being.

18 Longing for Diana to initiate divorce & go to U.S.

19 Cathy's father went to see Aykroyd.

20 I finished with Sonja in March. She is trying to reconcile with Nicholas S. Depson dangerous money left offshore a/c in March '94.

21 One leak splices to Arbusker every day.

22 Copy deadline in Cathy's diary. Today: Express Prince Philip.
17. Prince Philip: v. unpleasant character. "Rage's war to be a Princess of London, a boy in love." Philip was under to Ferguson - Ferguson b the Edmire M. of the 1990s.

18. Possible leaks: Julia Samuel out of way since June; Mervyn out from April - fell out severely; Catherine has not heard - debriefed. Catherine knew everything.

19. Ferguson goes to U.S. for huge deal today; Andrew locks up after her.

20. Edward has AIDS? Royal Free Hospital; Queen ill: heart: eats for comfort.

21. Simon Slept with Kay?

22. Nicholas S. = court jester & chief flatterer.

23. Aykroyd & PC have strategy - special present for William 3 weeks ago - sleeping swatch.

24. 3 days to get him into William, after he goes back to D.


26. Michael Thorpe: valet. Pissed Ken Stagg into doing 'NotW' story. MF v. well-off; Barry: looks part-five in Turnbull & Asser, nowhere to MF had overdraft paid off by PC.
via Ayland.

(27) When Ayland was in, huge bill sent - went to D. by mistake - C. May Ayland (Stated D. for seeing bill. All D.'s bills, including Access bill, go through Richard.

(28) Next May, false accusation that D. has spent £20k on clothes. (Fergie told)

(29) Ayland plied £250k story in papers last year.

(30) D. phoned twice in car recently.

Bharia - no action but number of inquiries with BBC.
Tried to get job on 'Public Eye' - 1/2 hr current affairs - editor said
[Lord Spencer’s handwritten notes of meeting with Martin Bashir and Her Royal Highness Princess Diana – 19.09.1995]

Martin: 19/9/95

At Samantha’s flat

1. 4 months ago, 3 men met him – MI6. Aylard orchestrating everything: commissioned Wharf (scum) – escort girls in Langham Hilton; plus one other.

2. Aylard pd by Jonathan Dimbleby. 2yrs ago, decided to reinvest P.O.W. 1 yr ago, decided to attack Diana (+family).

3. MI6 taped C + Aylard: “in end game” – D told Aylard what she thought of him, + that she wdn’t divorce.

4. Spencer family to be destroyed. D to go to States (+me).

5. Carling thing fed by Julia C.

[page 2]

6. Jephson used to do flying lessons in Jersey. Was in Used to go to Jersey for weekends – hasn’t been this year.


8. D: for past 6 months, had letters delivered by BT at therapists’ doors, 9-10 lett pages – lines being tapped; Steve Davies (chauffeur) feeds TODAY newspaper; “change your chauffeur”.

9. Bugs on car. Senior police officers making money. 3 lines at K.P. bugged; mail read; disinformation down line; line on car bugged.

10. Carling publicity broke on day C + [page 3] Tiggy went away for 2 weeks.

11. James Goldsmith – Jonathan Dimbleby told him “she’s had it”.

12. 2 B.P. staff on moneyed retainers.

13. Richard Kay + Aylard had dinner in Riverside Room of Savoy, 3 weeks ago. Kay entirely untrustworthy.


15. V.J.Day: D. asked. P.C. stopped it tried to stop it, + failed.

16. ‘NotW’ obsessed with me. Going to go for Victoria again. ‘NotW’ egged on by Aylard.

[page 4]

17. Camilla: depressed, but quiet for time being.

Aylard terrified of Tiggy – she’s v. powerful.
18. Longing for Diana to initiate divorce + go to U.S.

19. Carling’s father went to see Aylard.

20. D finished with Soames in March. She trying to reconvene with Nicolas S.
    
    Jephson dangerous – money: left offshore a/c in March ’94.

21. One leak speaks to Arbiter every day. Aylard + Arbiter ran it.
    
    11.30, not 7pm

22. Copy of deadline on Carling day, Today; Express; Sun; Mirror. Prince Philip.

23. Soames slept with Kay?

24. 3 days to get thru ice with William, after he goes back to D.


27. When Aylard moving in, huge bill sent – went to D. by mistake – C. rang Aylard. C. Slated D. for seeing bill. All D’s bills, including Access bill, go through Richard.

28. Next thing, false accusation that D. has spent £20k on clothes. Fergie told D.

29. Aylard planted £250k story in papers last year.

30. D. followed twice in car recently.
Bhatia – no action – but number of interactions with BBC.

Tried to get job on ‘Public Eye’ – 1/2 hr current affairs – editor said [page 8] corrupt.

Legal dept. search. Will take 1 yr.

31. Hoare: out. Telephone conversations in August. SOL Boy from Stowe, Nick Turner, sacked from Stowe because of Oliver H. going to JGLN.

32. Graham Harding, Fergi’s contact, has swept Ken. Palace recently. Cdn’t do telephone lines. Didn’t do it thoroughly.

33.
Charles,

A brief note to say how grateful I am for all your efforts on my behalf. I believe, sincerely, that we can do this and do it extremely well.

With sincere thanks,

[Name Redacted]
December 22nd 1995.

Martin Bashir did not show me any documents, nor give me any information that I was not previously aware of.

I consented to the interview on Panama without any undue pressure and have no regrets.
concerning the matter.

Diana
Statement by M. Bashir concerning documents
produced for the purposes of research. 28th March 1996

1. In the course of pursuing a story about the
future of the monarchy, and other constitutional
questions, I met Earl Spencer and HRH
The Prince of Wales.

2. Earl Spencer was in the process of suing a
national newspaper and was also pursuing a former
employee of Althorp House, Mr. Alan Waller. Waller
was hired by Earl Spencer when it was discovered
that he had stolen private documentation from
the House. Waller subsequently provided information to
'The Sun', newspaper, which published a story.

3. Following Waller's sacking, private mail for him,
continued to arrive at Althorp House. Earl Spencer
opened a particular letter which was a bank
statement. Earl Spencer gave me a copy of that
bank statement and also another photostat which
referred to a security company. It was believed Waller
may have worked for that company or had some
financial interest in it.

4. By now I had developed a close relationship with
HRH The Prince of Wales. She mentioned that she
had some important information about Alan
Waller. She suggested that a Jersey-based Trust
fund had paid him money. She believed that this
Trust fund may have been set-up and run by
Richard Ayland, HRH The Prince of Wales' private

Secretary. She also said that she knew of the
exact amounts of money that were paid and
also the precise amounts which had been paid by
News International for their help in the story
subsequently published by 'The Sun.' I took these
details down.

5. HRH The Prince of Wales continued to press for
information and also documentation. I had no idea that she
might yet have any confidence in a request for intention
and I therefore never mentioned the matter at this
stage. It was important that I maintained a
warm relationship with all my sources.

6. As part of the process of collecting material I
began to put a file together. This file contained
photocopies of private correspondence between HRH The
Prince of Wales and other members of the Royal Family.
private notes from theAttached Department at
Buckingham Palace, etc. I decided to add the two
bank statements, which HRH The Prince of Wales had
mentioned concerning HRH, to this file. I
asked Mr. Weisler to reconstruct them on the basis
of the photocopy which Earl Spencer had given me. Matt
reorganized this as a normal practice we having read
graphic reconstruction for their programme, i.e. Wembley
T.I.T. At this stage there was no plan to publish any documents but merely to
organize a research file, in the normal way.
7. I visited Earl Spencer in the last time, at Althorp House. We chatted about a number of his concerns—particularly his desire to see a national newspaper. He repeatedly asked if I knew an 'Express' reporter by the name of [Name redacted]. I explained that I did not. I then showed him the two falsified banking statements. I did not explain where the information had come from, nor did I explain that neither were originals or photoreplicas of originals. It did seem obvious that they were not bank statements because both were printed on A4 sheets—much larger than standard size bank statements. He asked to keep them.

I agreed. We then continued to discuss his plans for using a number of papers. He asked if he had ever been sued by the BBC and I said that I did not know. We then discussed his TV series on famous houses for the BBC and we also discussed a possible light-hearted look at celebrities' favourite vacations. He then explained that he would be very busy in the next few months but that I should keep in touch. I rang a few times but received no answer.

8. On seeing HRH The Princess of Wales, she said in passing that the information concerning Owen Wafer had not been true. She said that a source of hers had made a mistake. Since I did not regard these as of any great importance I thanked her and we continued discussing other matters.

9. It was two weeks after transmission of the interview that the issue of these documents re-emerged when
Tom Mangold, Harry Dean and Mark Kittick demanded a meeting. I did not meet them but asked them to see the Palace. I felt it was a matter of importance.

10. In speaking to HRH The Princess of Wales yesterday evening (2300hrs 27th March 1996) she said that after her brother had introduced her to me she had never spoken to him about Panorama or anything to do with our relationship. They never discussed the idea of an interview, and she never sought his counsel on any matters related to Panorama. She did not trust him and felt that he might leak information about the interview before she had informed Buckingham Palace.

11. The question has been asked of me - why did I show these documents to Paul Spencer? Since I had already established a warm relationship with HRH The Prince of Wales, and since no mention had been made of an interview, I maintain that I was not seeking to impress or manipulate her. This has been confirmed by her statement since transmission. I believe that I was in the course of developing a relationship with Paul Spencer, keen on fostering my contact with him. They were drawn in forcing and although I did not need to impress him (because he has been asking me about his action against the paper) I suppose that I wanted to encourage the relationship. In the event they made no impression whatever, but I acknowledge that, with hindsight, I should either have a) explained what they were and where the information had come from or b) not shown them to anyone.
This was a serious error and one for which I must take full responsibility. But there was no intent to deceive and if I had known they were inaccurate, they would have been destroyed.
1. In the course of pursuing a story about the future of the monarchy, and other constitutional questions, I met Earl Spencer and HRH The Princess of Wales.

2. Earl Spencer was in the process of suing a national newspaper and was also pursuing a former employee of Althorp House, Mr Alan Waller. Waller was sacked by Earl Spencer when it was discovered that he had stolen private documentation from the House. Waller subsequently provided information for 'The Sun' newspaper, which published a story.

3. Following Waller's sacking private mail, for him, continued to arrive at Althorp House. Earl Spencer opened a particular letter which was a bank statement. Earl Spencer gave me a copy of that bank statement and also another photocopy which referred to a security company. It was believed Waller may have worked for that company or had some financial interest in it.

4. By now I had developed a close relationship with HRH The Princess of Wales. She mentioned that she had some important information about Alan Waller. She suggested that a Jersey based Trust fund had paid him money. She believed that this Trust fund may have been set up and run by Richard Aylard, HRH The Prince of Wales' private secretary. She also said that she knew of the exact amounts of money that were paid and also the precise amount which had been paid by News International for Alan Waller's help in the story subsequently published by 'The Sun'. I took these details down.

5. HRH The Princess of Wales continued to pass on information and also documentation. I had no idea that she might, at some point, consider a request for interview and I therefore never mentioned the matter at this stage. It was important that I maintained a warm relationship with all my sources.

6. As part of the process of collating material I began to put a file together. This file contained photocopies of private correspondence between HRH The Princess of Wales and other members of the Royal Family, private notes from the Accounts Departments at Buckingham Palace, etc. I decided to add the two bank statements, which HRH The Princess of Wales had mentioned concerning Alan Waller, to this file. I asked Matt Weissler to reconstruct them on the basis of the photocopy which Earl Spencer had given me. Matt regarded this as a normal practice we having used graphic reconstructions for other programmes, i.e. Venable I & II. At this stage there was no plan to publish any documents but merely to organise a research file, in the normal way.

7. I visited Earl Spencer, for the last time, at Althorp House. We chatted about a number of his concerns – particularly his desire to sue a national newspaper. He repeatedly asked if I knew an 'Express' Reporter by the name of [name redacted]. I explained that I did not. I then showed him the two graphicised (?) bank statements. I did not explain where the information had come from, nor did I explain that neither were originals, or photocopies of originals. It did seem obvious that they were not bank statements because both were printed on A4 sheets – much larger than standard size bank statements. He asked to keep them. I refused. We then continued to discuss his plans for suing a number of papers. He asked if [name redacted] had ever been sued by the BBC and I said that I did not know. We then discussed his TV series on famous houses for NBC and we
also discussed a possible light-hearted look at celebrities' favourite vacations. He then explained that he would be very busy with work, in the next few months but that I should keep in touch. I rang a few times but received no answer.

8. On seeing HRH The Princess of Wales, she said in passing that the information concerning Alan Waller had not been true. She said that a source of hers had made a mistake. Since I did not regard these of any great importance I thanked her and we continued discussing other matters.

9. It was two weeks after transmission of the interview that the issue of these documents re-emerged when Tom Mangold, Harry Dean and Mark Killick demanded a meeting. I did not meet them but asked them to see the Editor, if it was a matter of importance.

10. In speaking to HRH The Princess of Wales yesterday evening (2330 hrs 27th March '96) she said that after her brother had introduced her to me – she had never spoken to him about Panorama, or anything to do with our relationship. They never discussed the idea of an interview, and she never sought his counsel on any matters related to Panorama. She did not trust him and felt that he might leak information about the interview before she had informed Buckingham Palace.

11. The question has been asked of me – why did I show those documents to Earl Spencer.

   Since I had already established a warm relationship with HRH The Princess of Wales, and since no mention had been made of an interview, I maintain that I was not seeking to impress or manipulate her. This has been confirmed by her statements since transmission.

   I believe that I was, in the course of a developing relationship with Earl Spencer, keen on fostering my contact with him. They were shown in passing and although I did not need to impress him (because he was keen on asking me about his action against the paper) I suppose that I wanted to encourage the relationship. In the event they made no difference whatsoever but I acknowledge that, with hindsight, I should either have a) explained what they were and where the information had come from or b) not shown them to anyone.

   This was a serious error and one for which I must take full responsibility. But there was no intent to deceive and if I had known they were inaccurate, then they would have been destroyed.
I am recording my recollection of the allegations surrounding Nourin Rashid's obtaining of the Revenue with the Price of Wisdom.

On December 21st, around mid-morning, Tim Sutter, Managing Editor of Weekend Programme, came into my office to tell me of a conversation he had been approached by a freelance graphic designer, noisy the BBC designer of Panorama, named Matthew Weissler. Weissler had been advised to come to see me by Peter Delany, a long-serving Panorama producer, whom he had approached for advice. The subject concerned the interview with the Prime of Wales. I agreed to see Weissler immediately with Delany present.

Weissler told me that sometime in September, late August, he had been approached in a hurry by Rashid who wanted an immediate graphic job done. It involved making up three long statement graphics based on information which Rashid had given. There was one section which should have detailed a quote of the credit to the account. Into this section of the statement, Rashid entered a dummy name, so he did not know the original. He then left with the idea asking for a copy of the document to be sent to him so he could collect the at Heathrow, to board a flight. I think he said to Scottish.

I have not taken notes of this meeting at the time, I subsequently destroyed them, because I believe the accusations are directed against Basil's to be groundless. Some current account is based on my recollection three months distant.

Weissler then told me that after the interview he was insistently approached by the Panorama producer, Nick Killick, who claimed he had been working with Rashid and Weissler told Killick of the graphics of the documents. Killick then persuaded Weissler to give him copies.
Killick, who said, told him that he believed that Bashir had used the documents to persuade the Prince of Wales to give him an interview, thereby harm to her.

Kirsten then told me that he understood that Killick, who had been approached by Steve Hearst of Panorama, after hearing the talk to Bashir, who said that Bashir showed the document to Hearst, but did not give it to him. He rejected the allegations of the use to which he claimed documents had been put. Hearst refused to be drawn into discussion with them, but immediately said Bashir had admitted having made up the documents, a graphic representation, from information he had been told, but had not made them for any other purpose than to prove the story. He then told me this after I told him to see him on behalf of the Prince of Wales. Steve apologised to me for not having been present at the meeting, having happened some weeks previously, but had been aware that the allegations were false. It was motivated by Killick's jealousy of Bashir's success.

Hearst told the Prince that he had made the programme. He also believed Killick had been used to make the Prince's case more difficult.
We expressed some surprise at why Bashiri had needed to turn the manuscript into a graphic at this stage. He also told us that on the same day the fragment into the secret room as an envelope, he had submitted a manuscript which had occurred to him, knowing it to be false, but in order to complete the graphic. Again, we find this action difficult to comprehend.

Bashiri repeated his claim that following the making of these documents, they had been deposited in a box along with other research material and two we were not to see them. Again, he explained that the information had come backwards from the Panza Island and could not have been the document to mislead her.

We suggested that Bashiri was telling a lie, though we stated that the decision to make a graphic representation of the document was unusual, and, given the fact that the program was in a research stage, wholly unnecessary. Therefore, we asked him in addition, to provide independent evidence from the Prince that he had not been shown any documents. This she was, I was told, happy to do.

I was able to reassure Mr. Winter by telephone that I had had him remain to understand why the Prince could not have been shown any of the documents he had made but thanked him for coming to see me.

He had also told me that the disc on which he had made the mistake had disappeared. He feared it had been stolen. However, given the explanation by Bashiri, there seemed little to be gained by pursuing it.

The following day, we received a letter from the Prince which stated she had never been shown any documents or told anything of which they had not already known. She remained happy with the way the interview had been conducted and had no regrets. We believed this ended the matter.

However, the Friday evening of 17th April 22nd that I was contacted by Ed Stenson through the Director of Emergency Office. I understand the Chief on Sunday had come to him with a story about Bashiri's documents being shown to him in order to secure the interview with his sister. I spoke to Steve Howlett who offered to ring him as he had spoken to him at the time of Bashiri's release. He had confirmed he worked for Panzarman. Howlett was reading a statement.
that Earl Spencer proposed to read to the press. It said that Bashir had indeed come to him with certain allegations about specific journalists. As a result, Spencer had introduced him to the Prince.

At no time was an interview mentioned. This confirmed our knowledge of the story. Earl Spencer let Steve Hewlett know he was somewhat resentful of the fact that Bashir had not got back in touch after their meeting.

I asked Hewlett to ask Bashir. Bashir confirmed again to Hewlett that he had shown the so-called documents to no one, and he specifically named Earl Spencer. Indeed Richard Peel had believed there was no foundation in the Mail’s story.

The next day, Saturday, I was telephoned at home by 3 Mail on Sunday journalists including the Editor. I was not sent to my home. I refused to talk to them but asked New Press Office to get back to the Mail on Sunday to ascertain their story. The first conversation with John Dowling, Executive Editor, was quite general and suggested documents had been shown to the Prince and the Earl, that Management had known of this before the interview and subsequently tried to keep it quiet. I contacted Bashir who again reassured me. Steve Hewlett, in separate conversations, felt nothing had been shown to either the Prince or the Earl.

I then telephoned Matt Worsner who was being compulsed by the BBC and told him that my conversation with him on 21st December still stood. There was no truth in the allegation that these documents had been shown to anyone, in particular the Prince, to obtain junketively an interview.

Later that afternoon, the BBC Press Officer spoke directly to the Editor, who gave a clear account of the Mail story. This suggested that the specific allegation was that Earl Spencer had been shown a so-called document - which had persuaded him to recommend to his sister that Martin Bashir should be given an interview.

I then went to Bashir again, but failed to get hold of him. However,
he rang me and told me for the first time that he had shamed, despite his specific denial on December 21st, and that morning, the graphicised document, to Earl Spencer.

I told Bashir that this overruled every assurance the BBC had been given: the BBC would have to come in at a position. Bashir insisted that this had not been in the context of requesting an interview. The agreement by the Prince to an interview was at a later date, and he did not talk to Bashir about the facts, or discuss it with him. Earl Spencer's statement, as read to Steve Hewlett, confirmed that he never spoke of an interview with Bashir.

After talking legal advice from Roger Law, the BBC drafted a statement, prior to the best of our belief, that it was utterly untrue to state that forged documents, any documents, had been used as a means of coercing the Prince to an interview. It was understood that there was no allegation that the BBC had known of this, and handed it up.

However, the same day, I agreed with the F.D. of NCA, Tony Hall, that the BBC needed to find out the entire truth behind Bashir's activities given he had misled us when asked, specifically about the graphicised documents. On the Monday, there was a meeting where it was agreed that a full enquiry would be made and action decided upon when the full facts were known. Given that I was leaving the BBC three days later, this would be conducted by the Managing Editor of News and Current Affairs, to ensure continuity in the Management's handling of this event.

I believe I told the BBC, upon hearing with polling throughout, when the allegation was brought to my attention, we pursued it and demanded independent corroboration from the Prince, that she had seen no documents, no content. We were consistently told by Bashir that the documents had been shown to no-one, and that the producers and graphic designer who had approached me that I was content that there was no truth to the allegation. When I left, Bashir admitted he had not told the truth.
Annex 2

I am recording my recollection of the allegations surrounding Martin Bashir’s obtaining of the interview with the Princess of Wales.

On December 21st, around mid-morning, Tim Suter, Managing Editor of Weekly Programmes, came into my office to tell me of a conversation. He had been approached by a freelance graphics designer, formerly the BBC designer on Panorama, named Matthew Weissler. Weissler had been advised to come to see me by Peter Molloy, a long serving panorama producer, whom he had approached for advice. The subject concerned the interview with the Princess of Wales. I agreed to see Weissler immediately with Tim Suter present.

Weissler told us that sometime in September/late August, he had been approached in a hurry by Bashir who wanted an immediate graphics job done. It involved making up two bank statement graphics based on information which Bashir had been given. There was one section which should have detailed a source of the credit to the account. Into this section of the statement, Bashir entered a dummy name, as he did not know the original. He then left, asking for the documents to be sent to him so he could collect them at Heathrow, to board a flight, I think, he said to Scotland.

(Though I took notes of this meeting at the time, I subsequently destroyed them, because I believed the accusations against Bashir to be groundless. Hence my current account is based on my recollection three months distant).

Weissler then told me after the interview he was insistently approached by the Panorama producer, Mark Killick who claimed he had been working with Bashir and Weissler told Killick of the graphic of the documents. Killick then persuaded Weissler to give him copies.
Killick, Weissler said, told him that he believed Bashir
had used the documents to persuade the Princess of Wales to
give him an interview, by showing them to her.

Weissler then told me that he understood that Killick, [?] and
Harry Dean Panorama journalists, approached Steve Hewlett [Editor]
of Panorama, after being asked to talk to Bashir who [refused?]
Killick showed the document to Hewlitt but did not give it [to him].
He repeated his allegation of the use to which he claimed [the]
documents had been put. Hewlett refused to be drawn [into]
discussion with them, but immediately saw Bashir [separately].
Bashir admitted having made up the documents a [as a?]
graphic representation, from information he had been told, but
he had not used them for any other purpose + had shown the [m to no-one?].

Steve Hewlett told me this after I + Tim Suter asked to see him and
heard Weissler's story. Steve apologised to me for not having [told me]
before, the meeting having happened some weeks previously. [?]
he had been assured that the allegation was groundless. [   ]
It was being motivated by Killick's jealousy of not having been part [of the]
team that made the programme. He also believed Killick was [the]
source of leaks to the press from the Panorama office.

Tim Suter, I, and Hewlett then saw Martin Bashir [and]
asked for a full account of what had happened. Bashir [said]
that the documents in question were based on information from the Princess of [Wales. He]
had been given information by her concerning a man called [Weller whom]
she believed was being paid via a Trust Fund to [leak stories on]
her. It was possible he was in the employ of not merely [News]
International but some official surveillance, [possibly even]
the Security Services. He had one original document, [a Weller?]
bank account, and information regarding two [more.]
He had made up graphics of the other two in order to [record the]
information. However, he had shown these to no-one. [He] therefore could not have used the documents to [secure the] interview as the information on them came from the [Princess of Wales herself].

We expressed some surprise at why Bashir had needed to turn the information into a graphic at this stage. He also told us that, as the source of the payment into the account was unknown, he had substituted a [name] which had occurred to him, knowing it to be false, but in order to complete the graphic. Again, we found this action difficult to comprehend.

Bashir reiterated his claim that following the making of these documents, they had been deposited securely along with other research material and no one else had seen them. Again, he explained that, as the information had come from the Princess, he could not have used the documents to mislead her.

We accepted that Bashir was telling the truth, though we stated that the decision to make up a graphic representation of the document was unwise, and, given the fact that the programme was in a research stage, wholly unnecessary. I therefore asked him in addition to provide independent evidence from the Princess that she had not been shown any documents. This she was, I told, happy to do.

I was able to reassure Weissler by telephone that I now had firm reason to believe why the Princess could not have been shown any of the documents he had made, but thanked him for coming to see me. He had also told me that the disc on which he had made the artwork had disappeared. He feared it had been stolen. However, given the explanation by Bashir, there seemed little to be gained by pursuing this.

The following day, we received a letter from the Princess which stated she had never been shown any documents or told anything of which she was not already aware. She remained happy with the way the interview had been conducted and had no regrets. We believed this ended the matter.
It was on the Friday evening of March 22nd that I was contacted by Earl Spencer through the Director General’s office. I understood the Mail on Sunday had come to him with a story about forged documents being shown to him in order to secure the interview with his sister. I spoke to Steve Hewlett who offered to ring him as he had spoken to him at the beginning of Bashir’s enquiries and had confirmed he worked for Panorama. Hewlett was read a statement that Earl Spencer proposed to issue to the press. It said that Bashir had indeed come to him with certain allegations about specific journalists. As a result, Spencer had introduced him to the Princess. At no time was an interview mentioned. This confirmed our knowledge of the story. Earl Spencer let Steve Hewlett know he was somewhat resentful of the fact that Bashir had not got back in touch, after their meetings.

I asked Hewlett to ring Bashir. Bashir confirmed again to Hewlett that he had shown the graphicised document to no one, and he specifically mentioned Earl Spencer. I informed Richard Peel, but believed there was no foundation in the Mail’s story.

The next day, Saturday, I was telephoned at home by 3 Mail on Sunday journalists including the Editor. 2 more were sent to my home. I refused to talk to them but asked NCA press office to get back to the Mail on Sunday to ascertain their story. The first conversation with John Dobbie, Executive Editor, was quite general + suggested documents had been shown to the Princess + the Earl, that Management had known of this before the interview + subsequently tried to keep it quiet. I contacted Bashir who again reassured me + Steve Hewlett, in separate conversations, that nothing had been shown to either the Princess or the Earl.

I then telephoned Matt Weissler who was being pursued by the press, and told him that my conversation with him on 21st December still stood. There was no truth in the allegation that these documents
had been shown to anyone, in particular the Princess, to obtain fraudulently an interview.

Later that afternoon, the BBC Press officer spoke directly to the Editor who gave a clear account of the Mail story. This suggested that the specific allegation was that Earl Spencer had been shown coddled documents which had persuaded him to recommend to his sister that Martin Bashir should be given an interview.

I then rang Bashir again, but failed to get hold of him. However he rung me and told me for the first time that he had shown, despite his specific denials on December 21st, and that morning, the graphicised documents to Earl Spencer.

I told Bashir that this overturned every assurance the BBC had been given + the BBC would have to consider its position. Bashir insisted that this had not been in the context of requesting an interview. The agreement by the Princess to an interview was at a later date and she did not tell her brother of the fact, or discuss it with him. Earl Spencer’s statement, as read to Steve Hewlett, confirmed that he never spoke of an interview with Bashir.

After taking legal advice from Roger Law, the BBC drafted a statement, true to the best of our belief, that it was utterly untrue to state that forged documents, or any documents, had been used as a means of coercing the Princess to an interview nor was there any truth in the allegation that the BBC had known of this, and hushed it up.

However, the same day I agreed with the MD of NCA, Tony Hall, that the BBC needed to find out the entire truth behind Bashir’s activities, given he had misled us when asked specifically about the graphicised documents and appeared to have acted unethically and in breach of the Guidelines. On the Monday, there was a meeting
where it was agreed that a full enquiry would be undertaken
+ action decided upon when the full facts were known. Given
that I was leaving the BBC 3 days later, this would be
conducted by the Managing Editor of Weekly Programmes, to
ensure continuity in the management's handling of this event.

I believe that I, and the BBC, have behaved with probity throughout.
When the allegation was brought to our attention, we pursued it
and obtained independent corroboration from the Princess that she
had seen no documents + was content. We were consistently told by
Bashir that the documents had been shown to no-one. I assured
the producer (Peter Molloy) and graphics designer who had approached me that I
was content there was no truth in the allegation. When last week
Bashir admitted he had not told the truth, we took immediate action
to obtain all the facts.

At time of writing, Tony Hall, MD NCA, has not determined
what action he will take but will do so once he has had time to
study carefully what has occurred.

Tim Gardam
28/3/1996
Martin Bashir esq

4.04.96

Dear Martin,

Thank you for giving me the detailed account of your preparations for the interview with the Princess of Wales.

I have consulted Tony Hall and others within the senior management of News and Current Affairs, and it is clear to us, from the account you have given and from the corroboration we have received, that your dealings with the Princess in securing the interview were absolutely straight and fair. We are completely satisfied that the interview was freely given; that the Princess was placed under no pressure by you or anybody else; and that she was neither shown any documents nor told anything she did not already know.

However, it is also clear to us that the creation and use of some material in the early preparation for the programme was in breach of the BBC’s guidelines on straight dealing. This breach was compounded by your failure to inform the then Head of Department of the use made of this material when directly questioned by him.

You should be in no doubt of the seriousness with which we view this, nor of the reprimand that this letter represents. I will be consulting Tony Hall on his return to the office to discuss any next steps.

We believe that no purpose is served by making this a matter of public record. However, we retain the right, if future events require it, to make this letter public and to justify the action we have taken.

Your sincerely

Tim Suter
(Managing Editor, Weekly Programmes, News and Current Affairs)
NCA/PANORAMA/MARTIN BASHIR/MAIL ON SUNDAY

From Richard Peel, C.CINCA. John Ryan (Asst Ed, MoS) said the MoS was conducting an investigation into a series of documents, designed to resemble bank statements, which were commissioned by ‘Panorama’ reporter Martin Bashir. Ryan said the statements purported to show details of a joint bank account held by Mr Robert Harper & Mr Alan Waller, trading as Weider Health and Fitness. He said the statements had been created by a BBC graphics artist. Ryan asked a series of questions about the documents: who had commissioned them, had their authenticity been called into question, and were any senior BBC staff informed about concerns over their veracity? After consulting Tony Hall, MD NCA, Editor ‘Panorama’ Steve Hewlett, and DCA, gave MoS the following statement: "The draft graphic reconstructions on which this story are based have no validity and have never been published. They were set up in the early part of an investigation and were discarded when some of the information could not be substantiated. They were never in any way connected to the ‘Panorama’ on Princess Diana, and there was never any intention to publish them in the form in which they have been leaked. Their use would never have been sanctioned at a higher editorial level, and if they had been transmitted it would have been a clear breach of our editorial guidelines." HCPR aware.

From Kevan McClair, Press O. Follow-up calls received from Clive Goodman (NoW), Steve Ball (S.Times), Helen Johnstone (S.Tel), and Vikram Dodd (Obs). After consulting C.CINCA, responded with above statement.
PRESS OFFICE LOG

Sunday, 7 April 1996

NCA/PANORAMA/MARTIN BASHIR
From Richard Peel, C.CINCA. See yesterday's log. John Hamshire (D.Mail) and Chris Blackhurst (Independent) both asked if the documents referred to in today's MoS story had played any part in the Princess Diana interview. Replied: When the documents came to light and it was suggested they might have been used in relation to this interview, we launched a thorough investigation. No connection was drawn. Asked whether Princess Diana had confirmed there was no connection said that she had, and referred them to her press office. Blackhurst also asked if the documents had been used as part of another investigation involving Earl Spencer and MI5. Replied we would not talk about any 'Panorama' investigation either ongoing or abandoned. Blackhurst called again and asked: Had the statements been shown to Earl Spencer? Had they been produced in conjunction with an earlier investigation? Had Earl Spencer been questioned by the BBC? Responded by reiterating our position from statement; confirmed the graphics had been put together for a wider investigation, and said we had nothing further to add. Jon Ungeod-Thomas (D.Mail) asked for BBC view on the creation of the documents. Replied it was obviously not something we condoned and referred him back to final paragraph of original statement. When asked if Martin Bashir had been officially disciplined, replied that he had not. John Mulholland and Edward Pilkinson (Guardian), Christian Dyerson (D.Mirr), Oliver August (Times) and Malcolm Brown (London News Radio) briefed as above.

From Simon Rahamim, Press O. Daniel James (UK News) asked if there had been any investigation into the use of the documents. Replied as above. C.CINCA aware.
Strictly Confidential
April 11 1996
No file copies.

From: Tom Mangold.
To: Anne Sloman.

You have asked me for a factual note on my involvement in Les Evenements.

Mark Killick approached me around November 22nd. He was distraught and very anxious. He told me he needed my help in something he had discovered on Panorama. I told him, as a friend, I would be happy to do my best to help him.

Mark then decanted his knowledge about Martin and the documents to me. I was less than happy even to possess the knowledge let alone give guidance on what to do next. Mark felt this was an extremely serious matter which, not to put too fine a point upon it, involved the faking of a document by the BBC for pecuniary gain. Venables case.

My immediate reaction then, and for the following months was that whatever the truth, this was a story that HAD to be kept away from the press; and that the circle of knowledge remain as tight as possible. I had no other agenda then, or now.

A few nights later, at about 11.15pm I received a call at home from Chris Blackhurst of the Independent newspaper. He wanted to talk to me about Bashir and faked documents. I said I knew nothing. Why should receive a call from him at that time remains totally unexplained.

In the light of this call, and for other reasons I decided to bring Harry Dean into the loop. Harry is a friend of mine, of Mark’s and of Martin’s. He is a BBC manager and a man whose judgement I trust.

Harry’s view, and mine, was that we should meet and discuss the implications of the allegations. This we did and spoke for several hours. This was not a meeting where value judgements were offered nor was it a meeting of vigilantes. It was a meeting of three mature men who, at that stage were agreed on one key item on the agenda, namely, to make sure this matter was kept away from the press.

A feeling evolved from our meeting that Martin should now be told of Mark’s fears. We were clearly agreed that this was NOT a matter to raise with management, particularly because there was no evidence that the documents had been used as a deception to help obtain the interview.

Harry called Martin and in a series of conversations, I believe Martin took the view that if anything were to be raised with him about the film, it should be raised through the editor. Martin was adamant about this and in a call I made to him, I was unable to shake that view.
TO: ANNE SLOMAN  
FROM: HARRY DEAN  
12TH APRIL 1996  

After our meeting earlier this week you asked for a written statement from me concerning what I know about the genesis of the current row over “Diana”.  

I have confined myself to factual statements and I have tried to be accurate about dates (if the exact dates are important I would need to check with my last year’s diary which is currently in one of dozens of packing cases).  

On the 22nd November I attended a BCC with Tom Mangold. After the hearing was over Tom asked me whether I would be prepared in principle to give advice on a difficult issue that had been brought to him by another member of the “Panorama” team. He said he hoped the problem would go away but, if it did not, he would value my advice on how to proceed.  

Tom later telephoned me (I think it was on 1st December) to say the problem had not gone away and would I meet with Mark Killick and him. We met on the afternoon of Monday 4th December and the three of us talked for several hours.  

At that meeting Mark outlined his concerns that broadcast quality graphic representations of bank statements had been commissioned by Martin Bashir from Matt Wiesler and that the information in those graphics may have been false. His concerns covered both the Diana programme and Venables.  

Tom and Mark asked what I thought should be done. I said I thought the matter needed to be brought to the attention of the Editor of “Panorama” as soon as possible but agreed that an attempt should be made first of all to contact Martin. I agreed to telephone him and, without outlining the detail, explained that something had come up. He agreed to meet later that day.  

A short while later Martin called me back and said he had decided a meeting would not be a good idea. Anything that needed to be raised should be raised with Steve Hewlett as he knew everything that had happened in the making of the programme. I tried unsuccessfully to ask if an informal chat with him might not be the best way forward.
I then arranged for Mark to explain his concerns to Steve later that evening in the Editor’s office. I accompanied Mark and Tom and briefly explained why we were there. The meeting began rather acrimoniously but Mark explained his concerns, Steve said he could not remember whether he knew about the bank statements, there were some questions from Steve, he expressed thanks that the issue had been brought to his attention and the meeting ended.

Later that evening I was telephoned by Steve and asked to return to his office alone which I did. He said he wanted to talk without Mark and Tom being there; he was particularly concerned that Mark had been leaking information about the programme as he was jealous that he had not been Producer. Steve stressed to me that the information in the bank statements was true

Terry Venables. He also said the statements had not been shown to Lady Di.

I stressed to Steve that, although I would do anything that he thought would help to reduce any fallout, that was the end of the matter as far as I was concerned.

I did not discuss any of this with anyone else until a few weeks ago. Tom Mangold telephoned me to say he had been contacted by the Editor of the Mail on Sunday. I was concerned that the story was, after all, not going to go away and decided to described my limited knowledge of what had happened to Helen Boaden.

I have not spoken to any journalist about this although Tim Kelsey of the Sunday Times was trying to contact me yesterday.

If you require a more detailed statement I will of course be happy to provide one next week.

Harry Dean
**BOARD OF MANAGEMENT**

Minutes of a meeting held at 10.00 am  
on Monday 15 April 1996  
in the Board Room, Broadcasting House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Birt</td>
<td>Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Phillis</td>
<td>Deputy Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Wyatt</td>
<td>Managing Director, Network Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hall</td>
<td>Managing Director, News &amp; Current Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Younger</td>
<td>Managing Director, World Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Green</td>
<td>Acting Managing Director, Network Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Salmon</td>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hodgson</td>
<td>Director of Policy &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Baker-Bates</td>
<td>Director of Finance and Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Browne</td>
<td>Director of Corporate Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Byford</td>
<td>Deputy Managing Director, Regional Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In attendance:</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Stevenson</td>
<td>The Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Graham</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Mayhew</td>
<td>Director of Strategy and New Media Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for minute 103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Foster</td>
<td>Controller, Corporate Strategy (for minute 104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies:</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Neil</td>
<td>Managing Director, Regional Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Drabble</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Lynch</td>
<td>Managing Director, Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tony Hall said he had asked Ann Sloman, acting Head of Weekly and Special Programmes, NCA, to report to him on the background to allegations in the press of unethical conduct in connection with the *Panorama* interview with the Princess of Wales. He said it was already clear that, while mistakes had been made, the BBC's position was more robust than might appear from the press.
Martin Bashir had been undertaking a wider investigation when the opportunity of interviewing the Princess arose. Information which had been received from a reliable source had been put into graphic form. The graphics had been discarded when Bashir had concluded that the information could not be substantiated. The Princess of Wales had confirmed that the ‘documents’ had played no part in her decision to give an interview.
Notes from Meeting between Martin Bashir, Tony Hall and Anne Sloman at 6pm on April 17th in Room 425, BH

Martin gave a lucid and detailed account of the events leading up to his interview with the Princess of Wales, the headlines of which were:

1. A conversation in the canteen at the beginning of 1995 with Mark Killick speculating about the big stories which might emerge in the coming year, at which Martin had first floated the idea that the Royal family's use of not only the media - which everyone knew about - but of their agendas as a weapon in their private battles. It was this conversation, Martin believes, which gave Killick the feeling later on that he had some sort of stake in the interview, even though the idea had come from Martin and not him.

2. A contact/friend of Martin's who was introduced him to a man called who Martin believes worked for the Security Services. Over a period of time fed him with information which led Martin to believe the Security Services were involved in a campaign against the Princess of Wales. Martin gave two specific instances.

3. At this point Martin left the investigation to make another programme.

4. After the summer break Martin resumed his investigation and made contact with the Princess of Wales' former flatmate Other contacts included someone called in Both encouraged him to "keep going".

5. He then approached Spencer who eventually agreed to meet him at the NBC office in London. Spencer was obsessed about an article in the Standard by suggesting that he had been involved in a deal with He
thought the BBC might have been involved in litigation with

He was “full of rage and hoping I might be able to help him”.

6. In a second meeting with Spencer, Alan Waller’s name came up. Spencer said “I want to show you something” and produced a Bank Statement of Waller’s. Waller, who Spencer suspected of being planted in his home by the Security Services, had left his employment by this time, but his mail was still arriving there. Spencer said “There’s a big story here”. Spencer gives the bank statement to Martin.

7. By the end of August, the investigation has run into the sand. Steve Hewlett encourages Martin “to go for her”.

8. A third meeting with Spencer takes place. Martin asks to meet his sister. Spencer says he hasn't seen her for two years (they had fallen out when he had refused to let her come and live at Althorp) but he rang her and arranged a meeting.

9. This took place in a Knightsbridge flat belonging to one of Spencer’s girlfriends.

10. That evening the Princess of Wales bleeps Martin and says thank you. The relationship is established.

11. A number of subsequent meetings take place, at one of which she gives him copies of a correspondence between her and the Duke of Edinburgh and at another that Waller had received payments from News International and a Jersey Trust Fund, the name of which she didn’t know. She doesn’t reveal what her sources are.

12. Martin had lost touch with Spencer but now rang him to arrange another meeting. He had collected a substantial pile of documents by this time and at this point he asked Matt Wiessler to make up the false bank statement. When he showed it to Spencer he said “I've got some information”. He did not explain they were reproductions but drew attention to the fact that the information on the Jersey-based off-shore
fund "may not be accurate". That was his last meeting with Spencer.

13. Subsequently Steve pressed him to ask the Princess for an interview. He did. She agreed. She never saw the false bank statement. It had nothing whatever to do with her decision to give the interview. When pressed by Tony about the circumstances of the forged document, Martin said:

• It was done in a rush because he didn't want to leave it in Wiessler's hands longer than necessary. Wiessler had been unable to do it that day but had recently gone freelance and wanted the work so had done it overnight. Martin was flying to Scotland to talk to a former policeman. That's why he suggested the Sock Shop drop.

• "On previous occasions when Mark Killick and I needed a document and couldn't take it away, we would record a description of it and draw it" to make a graphic representation afterwards. We did it on Venables and [blank] Mark did it on [blank]. In those instances the mocked-up graphics were based on hard-factual evidence. This one clearly wasn't.

• Why? "At the time it was just one of those things". "I didn't think it was a big deal".

• On previous programmes with Killick "I did people and he did paper". He'd always compile a brilliant folder of research. I was trying to get together a pile of evidence as an addendum to my research brief to present to Steve. I was trying to something I wasn't very good at".

• Why use Penfold's name? [blank] Venables. [blank] I just put it down. It was stupid".

• He was already locked in a relationship with Diana. He had no need to persuade Spencer of anything.
FOR THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

MARTIN BASHIR AND THE MAIL ON SUNDAY ALLEGATIONS

1. Martin Bashir had a conversation with Mark Killick at the beginning of 1995, speculating about the ‘big’ stories which might emerge in the coming year. Martin floated the idea that the Royal Family’s use of the media and maybe other agencies, as a weapon in their private battles, would be a major issue. It was this conversation, Martin believes, which gave Mark Killick the feeling that he had some sort of stake in the interview, even though the idea had come from Martin not from him.

2. Martin spoke to a friend of his who is [REDACTED]. He in turn introduced him to a man called [REDACTED] who Martin said worked for the security services. Over a period of time [REDACTED] encouraged by [REDACTED] fed him with information which led Martin to believe certain ‘officers of the Crown’ were involved in a campaign against the Princess of Wales. Apparently they were receiving instructions from the Prince of Wales and his Private Secretary.

3. Some speculative information was provided, including, a drawing of the Princess of Wales’ house, with information about where bugs had been placed.
4. The motive of [redacted] and [redacted] at this stage, was apparently to represent the views of members of the security services who were concerned about what was going on.

5. The other piece of evidence involved the broadcast of the ‘Squidgy’ conversation involving the Princess of Wales.

6. At this point, in the spring, Martin left the investigation to make another programme. In the summer Martin returned to the story and was told by [redacted] to talk to [redacted]. After winning her confidence, Martin was taken on a car ride to show junction boxes where tampering with telephone lines to the Princess of Wales was taking place. She refused to help Martin meet Diana.

7. Martin was also introduced by [redacted] to someone called [redacted] who worked at GCHQ in Cheltenham. His main message was to keep going with the investigation.

8. Martin then approached Spencer who eventually agreed to meet him at the NBC office in London. Spencer was obsessed by an article in the Evening Standard by [redacted] which suggested that he had been involved in a deal with [redacted]. He thought the BBC might have been involved in litigation with [redacted]. He was “full of rage and hoping I might be able to help him”.

9. In a second meeting with Martin, Spencer mentioned the name Alan Waller. Waller had been sacked by Spencer when it was discovered that he had stolen private documentation from the house. Spencer suspected Waller had been employed by the Security Services because there was a possibility that the Princess might move to Althorp House. Mail for Waller was still arriving at Althorp including a bank statement which Spencer gave to Martin saying “There’s a big story here”. One of the documents referred to a security
company.

10. By the end of August, the investigation had run into the sand. **Steve Hewlett** encouraged **Martin** “to go for her”.

11. A third meeting with **Spencer** took place. **Martin** asked to meet his sister. **Spencer** said he hadn’t seen her for two years (they had fallen out when he had refused to let her come and live at Althorp) but he rang her and arranged a meeting.

12. This took place in a Knightsbridge flat belonging to one of **Spencer’s** girlfriends.

13. That evening the Princess of Wales bleeped Martin and said thank you. The relationship was established.

14. A number of subsequent meetings took place, at one of which she gave him copies of correspondence between her and the Duke Of Edinburgh and in another said that Waller had received payments from News International and a Jersey Trust Fund, the name of which she didn’t know. She didn’t reveal what her sources are.

15. **Martin** had lost touch with **Spencer** but now rang him to arrange another meeting. He had collected a substantial pile of documents by this time and at this point he asked **Matt Wiessler** to make up the false bank statement. When he showed it to **Spencer** he said “I’ve got some information”. He did not explain they were reproductions but drew attention to the fact that the information on the Jersey-based off-shore fund “may not be accurate”. That was his last meeting with **Spencer**.

16. Subsequently **Steve** pressed him to ask the Princess for an interview. He did. She agreed. She never saw the false
bank statement. It had nothing whatever to do with her
decision to give the interview. When pressed by Tony about
the circumstances of the forged document, Martin said:

- It was done in a rush because he didn’t want to leave
it in Wiessler’s hands longer than necessary. Wiessler
had been unable to do it that day but had recently gone
freelance and wanted the work so had done it overnight.
Martin was flying to Scotland to talk to a former
policeman. That’s why he suggested the Sock Shop
drop.

- “On previous occasions when Mark Killick and I
needed a document and couldn’t take it away, we
would record a description of it and draw it” to make a
graphic representation afterwards. We did it on
Enables and [redacted] Mark did it on [redacted] In
those instances the mocked-up graphics were based on
hard factual evidence. This one clearly wasn’t.

- Why? “At the time it was just one of those things”. “
I didn’t think it was a big deal”

- On previous programmes with Killick “I did people
and he did paper”. He’d always compile a brilliant
folder of research. I was trying to get together a pile of
evidence as an addendum to my research brief to
present to Steve. I was trying to do something I wasn’t
very good at”

- Why use Penfold’s name? [redacted]
Venables [redacted] I just put it down. It was stupid”

- He was already locked in a relationship with Diana.
He had no need to persuade Spencer of anything.
To sum up on the **Spencer** issue:

- I have talked to **Martin**, and others involved, and I am satisfied of the following points:
  - the graphic had no part whatsoever in gaining the interview with the **Princess of Wales**. We also have her word in writing for that.
  - the graphic was not intended for transmission; in fact the information soon turned out to be false.
  - nonetheless, to produce such a graphic was unwise. He shouldn’t have done it.

- I have talked to **Martin** at length about his reasons for compiling the graphic:
  - he has none, other than he wasn’t thinking.
  - I believe he is, even with his lapse, honest and an honourable man. He is contrite.

- As I said, this had no impact on the investigation or the interview. It was unwise. I am writing to him requesting that his action was incautious and unwise, and that he should be a great deal more careful in the future.

- I have suggested to **Venables** programme.
- Richard Ayre will draw up 2 guidelines to cover:

(a) the use of reconstructed material
(b) the payment of people who supply information to investigative programmes

- Further, because TRUST is the most vital quality necessary in our journalism, we will also carry out a
review of all aspects of our investigative journalism to ensure those issues of trust and straight dealing - are paramount

- The final point concerns the actions of those who leaked material to the press:

  - We are taking steps to ensure that the graphic designer involved - Matthew Wiessler - will not work for the BBC again (when a current contract expires in the next few weeks)

  - In addition, between now and the summer, we will work to deal with leakers and remove persistent troublemakers from the programme
PHASE 1

1. Wiessler to Killick - Late October

Matt Wiessler contacted Mark Killick and talked of programme for the Venables programme: Killick said... Killick said...

Source: Killick

2. Associated Newspapers to Killick - Late November

A journalist from an Associated Press title phoned Killick asking about the Panorama "MIS" file on the Princess of Wales. Killick said he knew nothing of it but reported the call to Steve Hewlett.

Source: Killick

3. Killick to Wiessler - Late November

Killick phoned Wiessler to enquire further into the documents that Wiessler had first phoned him about. Wiessler told him the story of how the documents had been created overnight and biked to Bashir at Heathrow. Wiessler faxed copies of the documents to Killick.

Source: Killick

4. Killick to Law - Late November

On receiving the copies Killick consulted Roger law. Law suggested that Killick refer the matter to management.

Source: Killick, Law

5. Killick, Mangold/Dean - November 22 - December 24

On November 22 Killick consulted Mangold first who asked Dean for advice. The three met on December 4th. At this meeting Killick distributed copies of the two documents to Mangold and Dean.

Source: Killick, Dean, Mangold
6. Killick, Dean/Mangold to Martin Bashir, December 4

Following their meeting, Killick, Mangold and Dean phoned Bashir asking to talk to him, but he refused to see them. Instead, he suggested that they talk to Steve Hewlett.

Source: Killick, Mangold, Dean, Bashir

7. Killick, Dean, Mangold to Hewlett - December 4

Killick, Dean and Mangold arranged a meeting with Steve Hewlett. They explained their concern that the Princess had been mislead. Steve Hewlett told them that he did not believe that there was anything irregular, but that he would investigate.

Source: Killick, Mangold, Dean, Hewlett

Later, Hewlett spoke to Dean alone on the phone to say that Killick was motivated by jealousy, and that no documents had been shown to the Princess. Hewlett also made Killick and Mangold aware of his view that the Princess had not been in any way mislead and was shown the documents.

Source: Dean

8. Wiessler to Killick - Mid December

During December, Wiessler contacted Killick to tell him that the disc on which the documents were created had been stolen from his house.

Source: Killick

9. Wiessler to Molloy, December

Wiessler was increasingly concerned about the implications of the theft, and asked Molloy for advice. Molloy advised him to speak to Tim Gardam.

Source: Wiessler

10. Wiessler to Suter, Gardam December 21

Wiessler saw Tim Suter who immediately involved Tim Gardam. Together they heard Wiessler's story of the creation of the documents, the theft of the disc and his concern that the documents had been used for irregular purposes and that he was himself likely to take the blame.

Source: Suter, Gardam
11. Hewlett, Bashir to Suter/Gardam, December 21

Gardam and Suter interviewed Hewlett and Bashir separately. This investigation confirmed that the documents had been created; that a false name had been used for the Jersey trust fund; but that the documents had not been shown to anybody. The information contained within the documents had originated with the princess herself, so could not have been used to persuade her to give the interview.

Source: Suter, Gardam, Hewlett

12. HRH to Bashir, Hewlett, Gardam December 22/4

Bashir asked to Princess to confirm that she had been shown no documents and that she had not told anything she did not already know by Bashir at any point. She confirmed this in a hand-written letter.

At this point the first investigation closed having proved that there was no substance in the allegation that the Princess of Wales had been coerced into giving the interview.

Source: Suter, Gardam, Hewlett

PHASE 2

13. Mail on Sunday to Wiessler, Hewlett, Bashir, Gardam - March 22 - 24

The story re-emerged to the management of the Programme, the department and the directorate. The Mail on Sunday knew that documents had been created, but they were unclear what they were or to what use they could have been put.

14. Bashir to Gardam, March 23

In the course of conversations on the Saturday before the possible printing of the Mail on Sunday piece, Bashir confirmed to Gardam that the documents had been shown to Earl Spencer. This was the first time anybody knew that the documents had been used.

Source: Gardam, Bashir

However, the Mail on Sunday did not print the story following the statement put out by the BBC that the interview had not played any part in securing the interview.

Mangold called Hewlett at about 19.00hrs saying he had been telephoned by the Editor of the Mail on Sunday asking him to confirm elements of it they were trying to run. He said he had declined to comment but was unclear as to what he had actually said.
15. Gardam, Suter Hewlett to Tony Hall, March 25

Gardam, Suter and Hewlett went to see Tony Hall to discuss what to do next. It was agreed that we should ask Martin Bashir to give a full account of the story. We would then decide what action to take.

Source: Gardam, Suter, Hewlett

16. Bashir to Suter, Richard Peel, March 26

Bashir met Suter and Peel in Anne Sloman’s office. He told them the full story of how the interview was obtained, and how the documents were brought into being and what use they were put to. Bashir agreed to get the Princess’ permission to extend her statement to cover the fact that she had not been influenced by anybody in giving the interview and seek permission to use the contents of her note in dealing with the Press.

Source: Suter, Peel

17. Suter to Tony Hall, Richard Peel, 26 - 28 March

Suter agreed a letter with Tony Hall which would confirm that the interview was properly arrived at, but that there were questions about the creation and use of the documents. This was a holding letter against possible further press interest. A copy of it was left with Richard Peel to be sent if needed. It was never sent.

Source: Suter

18. Bashir to Suter, March 28

Bashir met Suter to write down his version of the events. The master copy - hand written, - was given to Tony Hall. Bashir kept a copy. No other copy was made.

Source: Suter

PHASE 3

19. Wiessler to Bashir, Early March

Wiessler sought a meeting with Bashir to settle their differences. This meeting was unsuccessful. A few days later the story re-emerged.
Source: Wiessler/Killick

Bashir also tells of the meeting, but reports that it was cordial and that a further social meeting was organised to follow it the next weekend.

20. Mail on Sunday to Press Office, April 4

The Mail on Sunday fax through a list of questions about a document (bank statement) they claim to have in their possession. Peel, Sloman, Hewlett discuss tactics.

Source: Sloman, Peel

21. Saturday, April 6

BBC statement issued to Mail on Sunday who admit they have been speaking to a number of BBC sources.

22. Sunday, April 7

Mail on Sunday run front page lead; feature spread and opinion piece. The spread has much detail relating to Matthew Wiessler including the make of his computer and a ‘sop’ quote at the end of the article referring the Mail to Panorama. The Mirror claim Wiessler was paid for the leaked document, Independent follow-up the story with background information that can only have come from an internal source.

23. Monday April 8

Guardian, Mail, Mirror and Independent run stories.

24. Dean, Mangold to Sloman, April 9-11

During the week following the publication of the story, both Dean and Mangold came to see Sloman to tell their version of events. They were then asked to write them down and give them to Sloman. References to sources are taken from these documents.

Source: Sloman, Mangold, Dean

25. Thursday, April 11

Sunday Times begin contacting Panorama staff/management. Tim Kelsey (fromer Indepedendent) says a BBC source has confirmed that Tim Suter/Richard Peel have launched a new inquiry. This is denied by Alison Jackson, Publicity Officer.
26. Killick to Suter, Sloman, April 12

Killick came to see Suter and told him that he believed he was himself the victim of a smear campaign. He subsequently saw Sloman and Suter together and told his version of the story. He said that he had not been the instigator of the story, and that he had not leaked the documents. He too was invited to write his version and give it to Sloman. Within half an hour of his leaving, the Press Office is rung by the Sunday Times asking to confirm the meeting between Suter and Killick.

Source: Sloman, Suter, Killick

27. Friday, April 12

Nick Fielding, Mail on Sunday, asks a series of questions which take the story no further and Venables, Mangold and Dean are both contacted by the Sunday Times. They notify Sloman of the calls.

28. Saturday, April 13

Richard Brooks, Observer, says Princess of Wales confirmed at a private lunch on Thursday that she had not seen the ‘documents’. Brooks says that Will Hutton had talked to Panorama journalists who were ‘hurt’ by the Guardian piece on Monday. Brooks says it is plain that there is jealousy involved.

29. Venables to BBC, April 12

Source: Suter, Sloman

30. Sunday, April 14

Source: Sloman
31. Monday, April 15

Source: Phillips

32. Monday, April 15

Hewlett called Team meeting and advised them of the damage being done to Panorama by the stories in the press.
SUMMARY

1. The Diana story is probably now dead, unless Spencer talks. There’s no indication that he will.

2. [Blank]

3. Management will have to decide what action if any to take privately or publicly about Bashir, what to do about his contract and how long he should stay on Panorama.

4. Management will have to decide what to do about the other participants in this sordid saga in order to enable Panorama to settle down as a team without a) constant leaks to the press, b) staff running their own agendas.

5. The guidelines on commissioning graphics may have to be looked at. There is nothing specific in the Producer’s Guidelines at the moment.
NCA/PANORAMA/MARTIN BASHIR
From Justin Everard, Pub O NCA. Paul Donovan (S Times) asked why the BBC had not reported the allegations made about Martin Bashir by MoS on 7.4.96 in its news summaries and newspaper reviews. Consulted Stephen Mitchell, ED Radio News & C.CINCA and replied: "The BBC is proud of its track record on reporting issues about the Corporation objectively, when it is appropriate. Sometimes judgements are difficult. On this occasion allegations of a potentially defamatory nature, to which the BBC responded, were made by a newspaper. After careful consideration we decided the story was not sufficiently newsworthy." Pub O Panorama aware.
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BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Minutes of a meeting held at 10.30 am
on Monday 29 April 1996
in Room 323 CB, Bush House
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Birt</td>
<td>Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Phillips</td>
<td>Deputy Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Neil</td>
<td>Managing Director, Regional Broadcasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Wyatt</td>
<td>Managing Director, Network Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hall</td>
<td>Managing Director, News &amp; Current Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Younger</td>
<td>Managing Director, World Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Green</td>
<td>Acting Managing Director, Network Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Drabble</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Salmon</td>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hodgson</td>
<td>Director of Policy &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Baker-Bates</td>
<td>Director of Finance and Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Browne</td>
<td>Director of Corporate Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Thomas</td>
<td>Managing Director, Worldwide Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Chapman</td>
<td>Managing Director, Worldwide Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Lumley</td>
<td>Controller, London Production Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Stevenson</td>
<td>The Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Graham</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Foster</td>
<td>Controller, Corporate Strategy (for minute 118-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lancaster</td>
<td>Head of Rights Negotiation, Rights Archive (for minute 118-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Meredith</td>
<td>Licence Fee Business Manager (for minute 120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies:

<table>
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<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Lynch</td>
<td>Managing Director, Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Emery</td>
<td>Managing Director, Worldwide Television</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tony Hall said he had concluded a personal investigation into allegations made against Martin Bashir over his conduct in the course of two "Panorama" investigations.

In connection with inquiries into events surrounding the Royal Family, Bashir had been working on a story concerning allegations of serious impropriety. These had been allegations: there had been evidence but no proof. In the course of this investigation Bashir had come across some financial information from a high level source. Bashir had commissioned graphic representations of the information. He intended to show these "graphics" to his editor at a later date to illustrate his thesis. He had put a false name on the graphic, and that had been foolish. He had not revealed the information to anyone outside the close circle his informant. Tony Hall was certain that there had been no question of Bashir trying to mislead or do anything improper with the document and that it had played no part in the Princess of Wales' decision to give an interview to "Panorama." Tony Hall had concluded that Bashir was an honest man who was deeply remorseful about an action which had been incautious.

The Terry Venables programmes were reviewing the guidelines in this area.

Tony Hall was consulting with the editor of "Panorama," Steve Hewlett, to find out how the allegations against Bashir had reached the newspapers.
From the Director-General

10 June 1996

Mr John Garrett MP
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

Dear Mr Garrett

Thank you for your letter of 21 May, previously acknowledged, enclosing a letter and newspaper cutting from your constituent

As Paul Donovan's article says, at the end of last year, specific allegations were brought to the attention of the senior management of BBC News and Current Affairs that documents created in the course of a Panorama investigation had been used to persuade the Princess of Wales to agreed to an interview for the programme.

These allegations were immediately and thoroughly investigated by the BBC and colleagues in News and Current Affairs were satisfied that the documents had played no part either in securing an introduction to the Princess, or in the subsequent granting of the interview.

We are aware that there has also been press speculation that these documents were shown to people other than the Princess in the course of the investigation.

Contd/...
I am assured that these allegations have also been promptly and thoroughly looked into, and the BBC has been able independently to verify that the documents were put to no use which had any bearing, direct or indirect, on the Panorama interview with the Princess of Wales.

I hope my letter will enable you to respond to [REDACTED]. I am enclosing a copy for you to forward to her, should you wish to do so, and am returning her original correspondence to you herewith.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

JOHN BIRT
CHARLES SPENCER
[interview with Sally Bedell Smith summer 1998]

I have heard that you played a role. That Martin Bashir had been investigating a story that Diana and her close family were victims of a dirty tricks campaign. It was rumored that some of your former employees were being paid to leak information to the newspapers and in response you had obtained an injunction against Allan Waller, the former head of Suecreity, to prevent him from revealing anything concerning the private lives of the Spencer family. That at this point Bashir faked evidence, bank statements purporting to show payoffs from a newspaper to Waller and that he gave these to you and you then urged Diana to speak to him?

That is all true, until the last part. When Bashir presented me with the statements I rang up the editor of Panorama, Steve Hewlett and said is this true. He said it is all true. How could he not have? Said to Diana this is what they presented, I don't know the first thing about it but you ought to know about it. So I arranged a meeting with Bashir, Diana and me in a friend's flat and he told the story. I thought that was it.

But she took it on her own, and I didn't know the interview had taken place until I read about it.

He had made her so paranoid about her phone lines and her channels of communication that he destroyed several of her friendships—including with —— and ———-—by convincing her they were plotting against her.

I did buy into it to start with. I remember when he was telling Diana, it didn't add up with what he had said to me. I took notes both times, and some of the specific details were wrong.

He had forged bank statements of Patrick Jephson and Richard Aylard as well.

Diana believed him.

I never heard from him after the meeting with Diana, where he played the card——— he used to write her speeches. ———

He used to write her speeches.

How did he keep a hold on her?

He made her worry that no one else could be trusted.

It was to be a book of her speeches about her causes, speeches he had written, .

He wrote speeches for her after Panorama.

I don't think anyone else urged her to do the interview. She was off on her own bat having had her various insecurities fed by Bashir very cleverly. I even heard from members of her staff, that he would go in with his anti-bugging team and go into a radio and produce a bug that he had of course planted.
this is why you havent heard about him again at the bbc. at first he was talked about as an anchor, but i told robert fellowes about him, and robert had a word with the bbc and that was the end.

duke hussey? dont know who

bashir said only three people in the bbc knew about the interview—he, hewlett, and john bert, the director general. i dont know if he did know

so he got the interview under false pretenses? yes. she didnt need to give an interview

heard he rehearsed her and let her do takeovers? from watching it i didnt get that impression. it was very much her speaking. that impression got established by RORY BREMNER..tv comedian.

i am sure she had time to think, but i dont think it was anything more than that

why on earth did she use him as a speechwriter?

bashir presented himself to me as a prefect christian with a very solid marriage and he was a complete fraud

a lot of american interviewers came through me becasue i had workdd for nbc. i didnt even present her with the requests. i would never even have suggested to her that she do an interview. i thought she was bigger than that and didnt need it

afterwards i said what were you doing, you could have talked to me. she said i didnt want to get you involvled