

[distracted].

GDa: Don't think we should be talking about accuracy of this story but is it not clear that changes were made to the dossier. Do we know that is not true?

MD: Not sure it is absolutely true. What Alastair Campbell says in response to Labour members, he saw raw JIC assessments before they were inserted into drafts. Closest we get is Guardian.

GDy: We do know that wording of JIC assessment was changed.

CT: Peter Ricketts from FCO, evidence. First draft included 45 minutes on 11 September it was two weeks.

SH: But key point is we do not know when the wording around the 45 minutes claim was changed.

GDa: We note that PNJ does not think intelligence denials were given enough prominence.

PNJ: Agree. I do criticise the balance of our reporting.

RSa: We could do a trawl of JIC denials and analyse them.

MD: We will go back through everything including Radio Five.

PNJ: We could say we are looking at balance of our reporting.

RR/RD: Not sure I agree.

GDy: You [PNJ] need to be careful because of your own background.

GDa: There is not a majority view that we should express doubt about the coverage of denial. There is a view that we might have put it to Number 10. The former would be interpreted as a climb down.

RD: Just takes Number 10. . . .

PNJ: Quality of our reporting.

DG: We have agreed to look at JIC coverage carefully. Do not think we should be saying anything of that nature.

MJ: Are you comfortable that our reporting retained level of reporting the allegation?

RSa: Think Andrew Gillian is very clear about it being a single source. But some of the phrases used by John Humphrys were not what we would have wanted.

RR: This is an area that we need to examine in the future.

BBC/14/0031

960