

- 2 -

simply untrue. The JIC provides regular intelligence assessments to the Prime Minister, other ministers and senior officials on a wide range of foreign policy and international security issues.

Andrew Gilligan said: "...there's absolutely no doubt that there was rather a major row in that Committee". This is false, whatever his "source" tells him. As the Prime Minister has made clear, all the intelligence in the September dossier was there with the complete authority of the JIC. There was no row.

Do you accept that what Gilligan said this morning about the composition and role of the JIC is inaccurate? What, if anything, do you intend to do about it?

The BBC's reporting on the WMD issue has been driven for days now by the false claim of a single uncorroborated source that Gilligan claims to be reliable. The Prime Minister, after consulting the Chairman of the JIC who was able to speak on behalf of the Agencies represented on it, has emphatically denied the claims made by this single uncorroborated source, yet your reporting continues to be driven by it, not just on the Today programme, but across the BBC. At no point has the reliability of Gilligan's source been questioned or discussed by the BBC.

Strategic intelligence assessments are presented to the government by the JIC who receive intelligence information on a continual basis. The JIC draw on a wide range of experience and expertise to assess the information for its reliability and strength. As the Prime Minister said in a speech on the subject, some of the raw intelligence is reliable; some of it may be misinformation; some of it will be gossip; other material will be based on technical intelligence gathering. Following a rigorous process of assessment and analysis this information is presented to the Prime Minister and other Ministers.

I would like to ask about the rigour of the process which the BBC applies to its reporting. Do you have a process to filter out potential misinformation, gossip, unreliable or uncorroborated information? What is that process?

In particular I would like to know what checks and balances have been applied to some of Mr Gilligan's reporting of information from 'anonymous intelligence sources' or indeed how the BBC's own Guidelines are applied. You cannot have missed the irony that one of the central (albeit false) charges against us (namely that the 45 minutes claim in the dossier was based on a single

BBC/5/0061 338