We have no reason to believe - not then, not now - that our report on the Government's Iraq dossier was in any way false or contained any untrue allegation.

While it is the case today did not contact Downing Street prior to first running the story at 0507, it is the case that we set out its main aspects to Adam Ingram's assistant yesterday evening in connection with the interview with him. No specific comment was made at that time.

It is not true that there was no "balancing comment" in the programme.

Number 10 called us at about 7.15; their comments were included verbatim in John Humphreys' introduction to the main item shortly after 0730; he said that Downing Street had told us the story was "not true... not one word of the dossier was not entirely the work of the intelligence agencies." However, we had never at any time suggested the final document was not the work of the intelligence agencies - which we clarified in the following 2-way.

When the Downing Street press officer was asked specifically whether an earlier version of the dossier was sent back to the intelligence services for revision, the press officer said "we will not comment on processology (sic)" - a comment that falls some way short of a denial.

Later at about 0630, during John Humphreys' conversation with Adam Ingram, the Minister said of our report that we had claimed the dossier "had been concocted under pressure from Number 10 - that is not the case. There was no pressure from No 10."

When John Humphreys put a more accurate precis of our story to Mr Ingram he replied "No. It's not true - and you know No 10 has denied that."

I should point out, however, that Mr Ingram accepted that some parts of the dossier - in particular the reference to "45 minutes" - were attributable to a single intelligence source, and it is the burden of our story that the intelligence services, or some in those services, are unhappy that material so sourced was included - after consultation with Downing Street - in the final dossier.