

PRODUCED ON DEMAND 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