

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## APPENDIX A

[REDACTED]

(U) We provide specific comments below, in the form of a scorecard. We flag the draft's strengths as well as weaknesses. This scorecard is pegged to analytic merit, not persuasive power. On a range from one to five stars (asterisks), five denotes a smoking gun in terms of UNSCR 687-prohibited weapon systems. One star denotes a claim we do not consider strong, but which is plausible. A bifurcated score (e.g., "\*/WEAK") indicates that parts of the discussion are strong, other parts weak.

### Introduction

-- Page 1-2. \*\*\*\* Discussion of historical, outstanding issues and Iraq's track record of noncompliance, deception, and denial. There is further discussion at the beginning of the biological, chemical, nuclear, and missile sections. These discussions might be expanded.

### Iraq Deception and Denial

-- 4-5. \*/WEAK. Intercepted conversation of [REDACTED] re hiding vehicle from inspectors. Weak re [REDACTED]. Virtually conclusive re hiding prohibited vehicle, presumably involving OFF violation. But it demonstrates Iraq's continuing proclivity to hide proscribed equipment from inspectors--reinforcing our concerns about hidden WMD.

[REDACTED]

-- 6-7. \* Information on Higher Committee: Generally valid, even though we don't take the source's every claim as Gospel, and the insider's information is very general.

-- 7, last bullet. \* Information from senior official in [REDACTED] Okay.

-- 8, first bullet. \*\*\* Orders to hide correspondence with OMI: Highly compelling, even though the high-level orders apparently cover sensitive materials not exclusive to WMD.

-- 8, second bullet. WEAK. Qusay order to remove prohibited items from palaces.

-- 8, third bullet. \*\*\* Multiple humint reports of hiding prohibited items in various homes. Compelling, even though some reports appear based on rumor and/or circular reporting, and the hidden items presumably include sensitive non-WMD documents as well as WMD items.

-- 8, last bullet. WEAK. Sensitive files being driven around in cars, in apparent shell game. Plausibility open to question.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-- 9, first bullet. \* Computer hard drives reportedly removed from "weapons facilities." Such claims are highly credible, even though they apparently extend to non-WMD sensitive files as well. (Note: Draft states claim as fact.)

-- 9, second bullet. WEAK. Plans to hide WMD in [REDACTED] We cannot rule this out, but virtually all of the many reports come from questionable sources. Also, inspectors may have already investigated one or more such reports and found nothing.

-- 9, last bullet. WEAK. Missiles with biological warheads reportedly dispersed. This would be somewhat true in terms of short-range missiles with conventional warheads, but is questionable in terms of longer-range missiles or biological warheads.

-- 10, first bullet. \* Missiles hidden [REDACTED] Authenticity of information is questionable, but claim is not implausible.

#### Chemical Weapons

-- 10-11. \*\*\*/WEAK. We support much of this discussion, but we note that decontamination vehicles--cited several times in the text--are water trucks that can have legitimate uses. A safer characterization is, "a vehicle used for chemical weapon decontamination."

-- 11. \*\*WEAK We agree there has been suspicious activity [REDACTED], including presence of a decontamination vehicle. We caution, however, that Iraq has given UNMOVIC what may be a plausible account for this activity--that this was an exercise involving the movement of conventional explosives; presence of a fire safety truck (water truck, which could also be used as a decontamination vehicle) is common in such an event.

-- 12, top. \*\*/WEAK. Much of discussion is valid, but it is unlikely the Iraqis [REDACTED] This paragraph really should describe [REDACTED]

-- [REDACTED] Authenticity of information is questionable, though some of the claims are plausible. Nuclear claims are WEAK, and open to IAEA criticism. (Note: Draft states it as fact.)

#### Thwarting Interviews

-- 13-14. \*\*\* Discussion is good and valid.

-- 14, last bullet. \*\*/WEAK. Iraqi intelligence officials posing as WMD scientists. Such claims are not credible and are open to criticism, particularly by the UN inspectorates. (Interviews typically involve such topics as nuclear physics, microbiology, rocket science, and the like; and inspectors tend to be leading scientific or technical experts.) Better to state that some Iraqi intelligence officials have been part of WMD programs for

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

years, filling scientific positions [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-- 15, first half. \* Saddam reportedly warned scientists of serious consequences if they revealed sensitive information to inspectors. Not clear the information is authentic, but it is generally credible. (Note: Draft states it as fact.)

-- 15, penultimate bullet. \* WMD scientists reportedly attended pre-inspection training. Unsubstantiated but credible. (Note: Draft states it as fact.)

-- 15, last bullet. WEAK. Claim of intelligence officials posing as WMD experts. Aside from the question of plausibility, note that such claims arguably are at odds with the above-cited report of pre-inspection training by WMD personnel.

-- 16, first bullet. \* Claim that intelligence agents posed [REDACTED] Unsubstantiated, but plausible. (Note: Draft states it as fact.)

-- 16, second bullet. WEAK. Alleged false death certificate for scientist. Not implausible, but UN inspectors might question it. (Note: Draft states it as fact.)

-- 16, third bullet. \* Iraqi regime prepared to execute key scientists to prevent disclosure of sensitive information. Unsubstantiated, but plausible--at least to the point where a suspiciously high number of scientists start dropping off.

-- 16, bullets four and five. WEAK. WMD personnel leaving Iraq under various circumstances to avoid interviews. Some details are highly questionable, and this reporting is arguably at odds with other claims in the draft.

-- 16-17. WEAK. Experts at one facility being substituted by workers from other facilities. Plausibility open to question.

-- 17, first full bullet. \* Some [REDACTED] officials reportedly [REDACTED] We question report's authenticity, but it is not implausible.

-- 17, second bullet. WEAK. 12 experts reportedly under house arrest, 70 others in prison, to prevent contact with inspectors. Highly questionable.

-- 17, third bullet. \* Unidentified scientist reportedly held by authorities to prevent contact with inspectors; family threatened. We question report's authenticity, but it is plausible.

Illegal Procurement of WMD-Related Goods

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the prevailing IC view, with which INR (and many DOE experts in private) disagree.

[REDACTED]

### Biological Weapons

22-23. \*\*\*\*\* We endorse the discussion of outstanding, historical issues. We suggest adding that "UNSCOM reported in 1997 that a panel of 13 experts from member states unanimously found that 'the outstanding problems' in Iraq's BW declarations were 'numerous and grave.'" (Quoted from recent CIA product.)

-- 25, first full para. \*\*\* Discussion of MIG-21 and BW delivery. We share the strong concern about Iraqi intentions for recently refurbished MIG-21s for BW purposes. However, the claim that experts agree UAVs fitted with spray tanks are "an ideal method for launching a terrorist attack using biological weapons" is WEAK.

-- 26 - The date of the accident asked for in the text is 1998.

-- 29, end of middle para. \*\*\*\*/WEAK. Smallpox indeed is a great concern: We believe there is an even chance smallpox is part of Iraq's offensive BW inventory. But there is no solid evidence Iraq has researched smallpox for weaponization purposes.

-- 31, third bullet. \*\*\*/WEAK. This is a legitimately serious issue, but "marks on his arm" is not compelling and should be deleted; or the text should read, "UN inspectors acquired a photograph of one of the prisoners that showed biological experimentation."

-- Page 32, last para. \*\*/WEAK. Most of the discussion is valid, but the reference to "central" as part of Iraq's battlefield strategy should be deleted. The use of CW was small, but not inconsequential, in comparison to the many strictly conventional attacks that claimed thousands more lives.

-- Page 34, second bullet. \*\*\*/WEAK. The text in fact should be strengthened, by deleting the word "laboratory" from the first bullet. This will strengthen our concerns about equipment being used for production.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-- Page 38, second bullet. \*\*\*/WEAK The castor oil issue is serious, but the discussion should be modified.

[REDACTED]

Nuclear Weapons

-- 39-40. \*\*\*\* We support the focus on Saddam's continued intent/ambition to acquire nuclear weapons; track record of deception, denial. We would add that the nuclear-weapon program has always been the jewel in the crown for Saddam.

[REDACTED]

-- 40. \*\*\*\*\*/WEAK. We support the focus on Iraq's record in the early-to-mid 1990s of deceiving the IAEA. But most of the discussion is overstated, in our opinion, especially the suggestion that only a single defector stood in the way of an IAEA clean bill of health for Iraq.

[REDACTED]

-- 41. \*\*\*/WEAK. We concur with some of the discussion of Iraq's nuclear-weapon status.

[REDACTED]

-- 41-42. \*\*\*/WEAK. On the tubes, in addition to our general remarks above, we suggest not playing the cited intercept, as it is taken out of context and is highly misleading. Meantime, we will work with our IC colleagues to fix some more egregious errors in the tubes discussion.

-- 43-44. \*\*\*/WEAK. While the discussion of magnet procurements is largely valid.

[REDACTED]  
Nonetheless, this discussion tracks with the majority IC view.

-- 44. \*\*\*/WEAK. We support the focus on the fact that Saddam's cadre of nuclear experts remains largely intact. However, some specific claims are WEAK, namely that many key scientists and equipment were "often hidden" and the suggestion that Iraq moved and renamed teams of personnel

[REDACTED]

-- 45, last para. \*/WEAK. While we too are concerned about Saddam's periodic meetings with nuclear personnel, we have a more mixed interpretation as to motive.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Delivery Systems

- 47, first full para. WEAK. Linkage of specialty trucks to Scuds is unsubstantiated.
- 47, middle of page. WEAK. Reports of missiles being transported on trucks, or moved into southern Iraq at night, come from questionable sources, in our view.
- 48. \*\*/WEAK. We support much of the discussion of al-Samouds. For the record, however, we question the claim that Iraq has developed an al-Samoud with a 300 km range. We believe it might be a garbled reference to the wider-diameter, al-Samoud II variant.
- 49, top of page. \*\*/WEAK. We agree the reporting on clandestine work on the Scud-type engine is compelling, though it is unproven and, in our view, at odds with other compelling humint. (Note: The draft states it as fact.)

[REDACTED]

- 49, bottom. \*\*/WEAK. While we agree that Iraqi contacts with North Korea are worrisome, we believe the discussion overstates the evidence of any missile link.
- 50, first full para. \*\*\*\*/WEAK. We agree that the evidence suggests work on large-diameter motor cases, though we do not believe the evidence is necessarily conclusive, contrary to what the draft suggests. (The intercepts are hardly straightforward.)
- Page 55, bottom. \*\*/WEAK. While we agree with much of the discussion, we are unconvinced that "...all the bad actors and terrorists who could come through Baghdad and pick-up biological weapons..." is a likely scenario unless Saddam's regime is about to fall.

---

<sup>ii</sup> [State | WashDC 022561 | 199802071709 | (U)]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**APPENDIX B**

[REDACTED]

(Passed to INR Front Office, February 3, 2003;  
a final version was delivered to S staff.)

( [REDACTED] ) The draft we saw today at CIA is vastly improved over Friday's draft, and many or most of the incorrect or dubious claims have been removed. Earlier today, we flagged for the drafters some remaining problems that were relatively important; the drafters subsequently fixed most, but not all, of these.

( [REDACTED] ) What follows are the remaining points (in order of appearance) we find most problematic:

-- Numerous references to humint as fact. (E.g., "We know that...") We have been told that some are being adjusted, but we gather some others--such as information involving multiple-corroboration--will stay (e.g., page 7, third full para). In the Iraq context, "multiple corroboration" hardly guarantees authenticity of information.

-- Page 2, missile intercept transcript: We learned that for source/methods reasons, the officials associated with the hidden, "modified vehicle" are no longer identified as [REDACTED] personnel, and are [REDACTED] linked to the elite Republican Guard. [REDACTED]

We are somewhat uncomfortable because this new, redacted text leans further toward longer-range missile equipment, whereas the actual evidence points more toward SAM equipment--even though the al-Kindi establishment, to which the vehicle is linked, has at least historically been engaged in longer-range missile work.

-- Page 4, last bullet, re key files being driven around in cars to avoid inspectors. This claim is highly questionable and promises to be targeted by critics and possibly UN inspection officials as well.

-- Page 5, first para, claim re missile brigade dispersing rocket launchers and BW warheads. This claim too is highly questionable and might be subjected to criticism by UN inspection officials.

-- Page 15, top, re nuclear acquisition timeline. We understand that the first sentence--about a UN assessment that Iraq "could have produced a nuclear bomb by 1993" had the Gulf War not intervened--is being changed to reflect that this was a US, not UN assessment. We do not object to the proposed new version, as long as it is understood that this involved a "Crash Program" scenario in which Iraq diverted IAEA-safeguarded, foreign-supplied highly enriched uranium, or HEU. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

understands that the 1993 timeline involves diverted, foreign-supplied HEU. After all, the USG's own assessed Iraqi timeline for *indigenous* bomb development was "five to seven years," and that the Crash Program scenario is no longer viable, as all highly enriched uranium has been removed from Iraq.

-- Page 6, aluminum-tube discussion. The good news is we believe the text is far better than the "Friday version." Our key remaining concern is the claim that the tubes are manufactured to a tolerance that "far exceeds US requirements for comparable rockets." In fact, the most comparable US system is a tactical rocket--the US Mark 66 air-launched 70mm rocket--that uses the same, high-grade (7075-T6) aluminum, and that has specifications with similar tolerances. Note that the Mk 66 specifications are unclassified, and the Department is planning to share them with the IAEA.

We understand CIA now argues that a comparable US system is an Astros multiple-launcher rocket, said to have much looser tolerances. We believe this system is less comparable, for at least two reasons: 1) The Astros does not involve high-strength aluminum; and 2) the *Iraqi* rocket in question, the Nasser 81 MLR, was reverse-engineered from an Italian *air-launched* rocket, not an MLR system.

That said, it would not be inaccurate to suggest that the Nasser 81's tolerances are *suspiciously tight*.

-- Page 17, bottom: "We know that Iraq has produced large-diameter [REDACTED]." We have sigint information that is highly suggestive, but not necessarily conclusive. (Even a key WINPAC missile analyst agrees.) INR could live with something along the lines of, "We are quite certain that..."

Finally, one unsolicited suggestion for your consideration: After the description of Blix's remarks, one could transition into the discussion of recent activities by saying something like: "We *know* Iraq is still lying on these outstanding issues, so why should we trust Iraq's claims about lack of recent prohibited activity?"