

PRODUCED ON SIGNING OF T-1-1-1

Q&A

Who is the official?

We are not prepared to name the individual involved.

Why not?

We have released all the relevant details. There is nothing to gain by revealing the name of the individual who has come forward voluntarily.

Can we interview the individual?

No.

Is it a senior figure?

It is not a member of the SCS
(steer – a middle-ranking official)

Where did they meet?

The meeting was in London. I do not have details of the specific location.

Why has the official come forward now?

Only when the official read Mr Gilligan's evidence to the FAC did it occur to him that his conversation with Mr Gilligan might be relevant.

In what form did this official 'confess'?

The official approached his line manager which is standard procedure for raising concerns.

What in Mr Gilligan's evidence made the official think this conversation relevant?

As we have said, Mr Gilligan's account does not match the account given by Mr Gilligan of his 'single source.' But the official felt that some elements of the conversation with Mr Gilligan's evidence may have been linked to his conversation which was why he came forward.

If the story does get legs we will get pushed very hard on the detail of the conversation and the discrepancies.

Do you believe that your official is the 'single source'?

At this stage, we are not in a position to judge. This is a question only Mr Gilligan can answer.

Are you suggesting that Andrew Gilligan has deliberately 'sexed up' his story and twisted/exaggerated the information he received?

The MoD has drawn no conclusions and is not making any suggestions. We have simply given the facts. Only Mr Gilligan can know how he handled the information he received.

This is just spin – you're releasing this information in order to help clear the Government's name?

MoD did not break this story. We have today put out a statement in response to clarify speculation.

If/when the existence of the letter is leaked: Have you published the whole letter and if not, will you?

No. The substance of the issue is contained in our statement. We have nothing to add.

If pushed: a further consideration is that the account names of various people who have nothing to do with the story but are involved in the work of the individual including other journalists with whom the individual has had contact.

The letter was written on 30 June. Why did it take a week to deal with?

The letter was put in the in-tray (true?) of the individual's line manager which is standard procedure for raising concerns. When the line manager had read the letter he informed the Personnel Director who immediately organised an interview with the individual to establish the facts and informed the PUS.

21
CAB/20/0003

If needed:

The Personnel Director was informed on ?? PUS was informed on Thursday afternoon and the interview conducted on Friday morning.

When was SofS informed?

PUS informed SofS of the issue on Thursday evening and told him that the individual would be interviewed the following day to establish the facts.

Did SofS see the letter?

No. SofS was informed of the substance of the letter and told that an interview had been organised to check the facts. He was then briefed on the outcome of the interview.

**If pressed for detail of exactly who knew what and when:
Chronology?**

Has Alastair Campbell/No10 seen the letter?

The relevant Government departments have been informed, including No10.

When were No10 informed?

Why are you not taking disciplinary action?

??

How can you be sure that there has been no breach of the Official Secrets Act?

There is no evidence to suggest that a breach of the OSA has occurred -- the individual did come forward voluntarily.

21
CAB/20/0004