

Dr. Kelly attended a meeting with Andrew Gilligan at the Charing Cross Hotel. He had several telephone conversations with Susan Watts. He also talked to Gavin Hewitt from the 10 o'clock news, who reported his words along similar, if much briefer, lines to Gilligan and Watts. Dr Kelly was very experienced in talking to the press. It seems likely that he knew exactly what he was doing in talking in such similar terms to several journalists. For example, he gave permission to Andrew Gilligan to take notes. One interpretation is that, as a scrupulously honest man, he was so troubled by the circumstances surrounding the preparation of the dossier that he knowingly put his doubts into the public domain.

3. Did the BBC correctly describe the nature of their source?

Almost throughout the process, BBC reports have described the source as "one of the senior officials in charge of drawing up the dossier". That is clearly true. On a few occasions, he has been described as a "senior intelligence source", including being so-described by Andrew Gilligan, Richard Sambrook and the Governors. On the question of the Governors' statement, I can say that I wrote that description without knowing the name of the source when our statement was being prepared.

It is clear that Dr Kelly was not a member of the intelligence services himself. But it is also clear that Dr Kelly had access to some very relevant intelligence material, as he confirmed to the Select Committee last Tuesday. He said "I see the intelligence which is relevant to my expertise which is in the area of chemical and biological weapons, and I am alerted to relevant intelligence".

4. Should the BBC have carried a story of such gravity based on only one source?

This comes back to the Governors' meeting, where we decided that correct procedures had been followed by the Today programme. There is no new evidence on this matter. However, now that we know the name of the source, we can all come to a view on whether the source was in fact correctly described, and was sufficiently senior and credible to run the story without other direct corroboration. I will not attempt to pre-judge your views on this, but personally I am not particularly troubled by the criticism we are getting on this matter.

5. Should the BBC have withdrawn the allegations against Alastair Campbell when they were categorically denied by the Prime Minister and others?

Some of the precise claims made by David Kelly were

BBC/17/0098 1183