

- 8 -

on the dossier - but that did not of itself mean that all members of the intelligence services were happy with its contents. Further we know from other sources that some senior members of the intelligence community were reluctant to use intelligence material in this way.

- *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.*

I have repeatedly made it clear that the particular allegations made in Andrew Gilligan's report of the 29th May came from one source and I have outlined why we felt it appropriate to broadcast the information. The audience was told time and again on the 29th May that the criticism of the dossier's compilation was being made by one source. The source was credible and what he chose to tell Andrew Gilligan was highly plausible given what we knew by then about the preparation of the February "dodgy dossier". Other journalists, including some within the BBC, had been told of concerns held in the intelligence community about the way intelligence was used in the run-up to war in Iraq - and they had been told this by sources other than the one who spoke to Andrew Gilligan. In the light of this it would have been wrong for the BBC to decide not to put into the public domain the information provided to Andrew Gilligan by his source - and we did so with transparent attribution to a single source.

As for your point about the BBC Guidelines let me quote:

"Programmes should be reluctant to rely on only one source."

That is true. The BBC would have preferred it if the source had been on the record. But you well know that in this field sources very rarely - if ever -- choose to speak on the record. I do not accept your inference that means we cannot publish information on intelligence matters if only derived from one source - particularly in light of what we knew about the February dossier.

...../9
CAB | 1 | 0362