

minute claim had been derived from only one intelligence source - whereas most of the other claims in the dossier had at least two. Gilligan's source also believed this single Iraqi source had probably got the information wrong.

- *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 found what Humphreys (sic) called "evidence" that it was "cobbled together at the last minute with some unconfirmed material that had not been approved by the security services?"*

We stand by our reporting of the source as saying that the dossier was "sexed up" and that had happened at a late stage in its preparation – and that the "sexing up" relied on uncorroborated material not approved of by all in the intelligence agencies.

I note today that Mr Peter Ricketts, Director General of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office has told the Foreign Affairs Committee that the "45 minute" claim was not in the first draft of the dossier.

- *Does it still stand by the statement made on 6<sup>th</sup> June that the JIC is not part of the intelligence community, but a Number 10 committee which exists to arbitrate between government and the intelligence services?*

We never said that the JIC was not part of the intelligence community. What we actually said was the JIC is not the same thing as the intelligence services.

- *Does it still stand by the claim on 3<sup>rd</sup> June that the chairman of the JIC only kind of "bureaucratically signed off his report?"*

It would have been better if Andrew Gilligan had attributed this answer to his source and that was a slip on the day. However he had frequently reminded the audience that claims were derived from the source. What Andrew Gilligan did in this section of the report was to acknowledge that the JIC chairman had indeed 'signed off'