

- 2 -

The questions are these:

- Does the BBC still stand by the allegation it made on 29<sup>th</sup> May that Number Ten added in the 45 minute claim to the dossier? Yes or no?
- Does it still stand by the allegation made on the same day that we did so against the wishes of the intelligence agencies? Yes or no?
- Does it still stand by the allegation made on that day that both we and the intelligence agencies knew the 45 minute claim to be wrong and inserted it despite knowing that? Yes or no?
- Does it still stand by the allegation, again on the same day, that we ordered the September dossier to be "sexed up" in the period leading up to its publication - and that Gilligan had found what Humphreys called "evidence" that it was "cobbled together at the last minute with some unconfirmed material that had not been approved by the security services"? Yes or no?
- Does it still stand by the statement made on 6<sup>th</sup> June by Gilligan that the JIC is not part of the intelligence community, but a Number 10 Committee which exists to arbitrate between government and the intelligence agencies?
- Does it stand by the claim on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of June that the chairman of the JIC only "kind of bureaucratically signed off his report"? Yes or no?

Could I also ask:

- How many sources was the original "45 minute" allegation being added in based on? Was it one source or more than one source? You will be aware of the BBC Guidelines on this.
- Is that source on the JIC, and do you agree that any source not on the JIC did not have the full picture?
- Was the source, as Gilligan has said, "a senior official involved in drawing up the dossier", or is he, as you said today, a source, "in the intelligence services"? I'm sure you at least understand the significance of the difference to which I am alluding.
- Is it now normal BBC practice not to seek to corroborate single source stories?
- Finally do you believe that Gilligan's statement to the FAC that all he had ever alleged was that we gave "undue prominence" to the 45 minute point, or do you share my views that this is utterly inconsistent with what he and others or the BBC have said and what Gilligan has said, writing as a BBC journalist in the Mail on Sunday, the Sunday Telegraph, and The Spectator.
- Finally, have you seen today's Spectator, in which Mr. Gilligan, writing not in a personal capacity but as a BBC correspondent, writes an article concluding that the Prime Minister is a "push over" in his relations with President Putin. Is that

BBC/15/0095 <sup>372</sup>