

RSm. It is important to me that someone other than Andrew Gilligan knew who source was.

SW: Absolutely. Programme editor.

GDa: And since then Richard [Sambrook] and Greg became aware of source.

DG: Source?

RSa: Don't know for sure but Newsnight piece looks like same source.

SW: Anonymity. We agree to this when someone on fringes of the law or requires protection in relation to allegations. Guidelines are more relevant to people who put voices or body.

GDa: Does not seem to be in Guidelines that apply to anonymity in this case

MD: Very hard to have a guideline that applies to off-the-record sourcing because of the need to weigh up information.

GDy: Also have to put information provided by source into a wider context. In this circumstance already knew that information had been adapted.

PNJ: Dangerous line of argument to say that because Government did something previously. Seems to be reasonable action by journalists.

SH: Think "context" is a woolly reason. Less convincing than argument about credibility. I am therefore comfortable.

DG: Context outlined by Greg created obligation not justification.

MD: In judging sources one considers if person is credible, sufficiently well known, proven and plausible. If you add dodgy dossier and the issues that have gone on before. Pattern is much wider than dodgy dossier.

GDa: On single source Board is happy

#### Consultations/Warnings

SW: More difficult because don't have as full a note as we would have liked to have had.

[Outlines sequence of events – see SW speaking note/crib sheet]

Difficulty is Andrew Gilligan knew nothing about cluster bomb story so why would he have done this

RSm: Why are we contacting MOD?

SW: Because we already have MOD on air re cluster bombs. They were recording this story as a "chatter in the air" and not the sort of scoop it was. If you look at running

BBC/14/0028

957