

# CONFIDENTIAL

## EXTRACT FROM THE EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY SIR DAVID OMAND TO THE ISC ON WEDNESDAY 16 JULY

### Approved by Sir David Omand

**ALAN HOWARTH:** Can I ask you one further thing surrounding the reputation of the Agencies? Mr Gilligan said that he has a number of sources from within the Agencies – not just Dr Kelly, he has suggested that he has four, whom he can regularly call – so to speak – in order to draw from. This would appear to be extremely unfortunate and damaging – and I wondered what you, in your present office think about it and are doing about it – ie the question of leaks from the Agencies?

**DAVID OMAND:** I think I should choose my words carefully, in fairness to Dr Kelly. As you know the Ministry of Defence did not name Dr Kelly. And it was our suggestion that he might appear before this Committee in confidence ...

**MICHAEL MATES:** He's going to...

**DAVID OMAND:** ... We did not suggest that he appeared before the FAC, and certainly not in front of the television cameras. So I just want to make that point – that any suggestion that he has been mistreated or paraded in front of the TV cameras – the responsibility for that does not rest with them (the MOD). The assessment we have made – and again I want to choose my words carefully, I do not want to be unfair to him – is that in evidential terms, we will remain with the judgement which was put out by the Ministry of Defence in their press release. We can't be certain whether Dr Kelly was the sole source that Mr Gilligan said that he was reliant on. That's in evidential terms. Seen and read in counter-intelligence terms, in terms of the balance of probabilities I have to say that you will all form your own views and perhaps I shouldn't be saying this to anybody, but I have to say that the case does deserve some very close scrutiny. On the balance of probabilities, I think probably

CONFIDENTIAL

ISC/1 / 0048

## CONFIDENTIAL

we have uncovered the main source that Mr Gilligan was referring to. What appears equally true, but doesn't seem to have come out in his cross-examination, is that Mr Gilligan may not have been entirely straightforward, for very good honourable reasons as a journalist, in how he described his source. That would be entirely to be expected – that a good journalist will not reveal information which will identify his source. So simply going by the description of his single source my own counter-intelligence hunch, as it were, is that we have uncovered the main explanation for much of what was said and that other elements have been added in, so the story of the single source as described has in itself to be taken with a pinch of salt. That said, we remain concerned that there may be separate unauthorised leaks of information and we have various investigations in hand. If I can tell the Committee in confidence, so this must not be repeated outside, those investigations do include the police, so it is not true to say that we are not following these matters up. But since there is an investigation in progress, I cannot say much more than that. But I did not wish to leave the Committee with the impression that we are not – or have not been actively investigating this with the assistance of the police and Security Service. But we think in relation to the Gilligan story ..

**MICHAEL MATES:** Sorry – can I just ask – this is in relation to the Official Secrets Act?

**DAVID OMAND:** Yes. But in relation to the story of the 45 minutes and the Gilligan story – I think we have got as close to an explanation as we are ever going to get unless the BBC decide to tell us more.

**ALAN BEITH:** Does that mean that you do not accept Gilligan's allegation that he was shown a document in an office ...

**DAVID OMAND:** No, we do accept that .

**ALAN BEITH:** Or is it still under investigation.

## CONFIDENTIAL

ISC/1/0049

## CONFIDENTIAL

**DAVID OMAND:** . it is still under investigation. But that is not related – as he made clear at the FAC – that is a different matter from the story to which there has been so much fuss – the false allegation that the dossier had been sexed up, with the 45 minutes put in at Alastair Campbell’s request, or whatever, all of which I think has now been pretty convincingly found to be false. Given that was a false story I think the chances that he had a real mole who would have fed him such a false story – when we know in the period in question he did in fact meet Dr Kelly in the circumstances that Dr Kelly had described – I think it stretches credibility. So I think we have got as close as we’re going to get of an explanation of that particular story. What we haven’t got to the bottom of is whether a classified document was shown to him and we are actively exploring that – but that is a separate inquiry.

CONFIDENTIAL

15C/1/0050