

There is a clear editorial procedure involving referral up to senior managers which was followed in this case.

We also note that Adam Ingram told us on May 29<sup>th</sup> that your "45 minute" claim is based on a single uncorroborated intelligence source.

- Is that source on the JIC and do you agree that any source not on the JIC did not have the full picture?*

I do not intend to say anything more about our source. You well know that it is a matter of principle for us not to reveal our sources. I will do nothing to help you in this regard.

- 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.*

I refer you to my previous answer.

- Is it now normal BBC practice not to seek to corroborate single source stories?*

Of course we would prefer corroboration. The fact remains that we made a judgement about whether in the particular circumstances it was appropriate to place the allegations made by our source into the public domain. I have already outlined the context which justified this decision.

- 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 it 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?*

...../10

CAB | 1 | 0363