

CONFIDENTIAL

possible to include something in the statement that would set the record straight and provide an olive branch in this respect.

- Whether an investigation into any other matters of concern should be instigated. For example, the rules under which BBC journalists were allowed to publish newspaper articles; the nature of the Producers' Guidelines on the use of single-source and anonymous-source material; and the training of BBC journalists, especially in matters relating to regulation, accuracy and impartiality.

Gavyn Davies confirmed that the Board's public statement would not necessarily comment on all issues discussed at the meeting. During discussion, the following points were made:

a Coverage of the War in Iraq

- Most Governors did not support reopening their assessment the BBC's coverage of war in Iraq, remaining convinced that it was impartial
- There was a suggestion that Governors should not offer immediate support to the management, however. Although there was no reason to doubt the BBC's coverage of the war, the Board could request the Director-General to undertake a review with external experts. This would demonstrate that the BBC was not arrogant and avoid accusations of a whitewash by the Governors; providing an opportunity to raise questions with management in light of the review's conclusions. Indeed, the report by Cardiff University into broadcast coverage of the war only served to reassure the BBC that an external review was not something to worry about.

Gavyn Davies noted the intention of such a review was to verify Governors' judgement, rather than reopen the debate. But the majority of the Board did not support this proposal. However, in line with the new arrangements for monitoring impartiality, the Board could, for example, request that coverage of the war in Iraq be the next subject for external review by experts when the next quarterly report on impartiality came forward to the Board in October. However, this should not be referred to publicly at this time.

b Producers' Guidelines

- It was clear that the Board was being asked to consider whether it was right to broadcast the allegation as an allegation and not decide whether that allegation was true
- Governors' initial view was that the Producers' Guidelines on single sources were clear and there was sufficient evidence that due consideration had been applied before the report was broadcast.
- Some Governors were less sure about whether the BBC had acted in line with the Guidelines in relation to consulting Number 10 prior to and following broadcast of the story. Indeed, there was a view that the BBC had been naive to broadcast this allegation without expecting a powerful reaction and therefore should have been more careful in his consultations with Government
- On the Guidelines more generally, the Board might consider commenting publicly that these were being reexamined in light of this episode, not least because the Intelligence Services now operated in a more open fashion. Also, there had been