


JTF-5



- Would be more useful if good bring in all analysts (from a security viewpoint)

- Primary use: Individuals in eastern Pacific, dynamics of organization (Pakistan, Afghanistan)

Aligned by SW-Asia, SE Asia re heroin.

[Also

- Al came out at briefed (w/ Mickey), reinvigorated interest.

- Think its a legitimate alternate source of information.

- Asked each lead analyst to structure requests for RV. Then evaluate inputs.

- Dropped earlier because no feedback mechanism had existed. Believed that frequently no response was received from program. Frequent interaction both between Rums & Al helped to keep program alive.

- Tasking - re people, objects (shyis),

some kind of specific areas

Very specific targets

(2)

- PV reports fairly consistent in identifying the nature of the target, i.e., person or thing, but not always.
- After some testing, to develop confidence in process - would feed info into general intelligence.

SG1J

[ ] was aware of Soviet activities - not as skeptical as others, so needed to develop some confidence with his analysts.

- provided specifics in some instances re "associates", "activities".
- did not task field collection due to security ~~at~~ restrictions on program
- could not use info in real-time sense for operational purposes; because:
  - not timely enough
- best info when asking for historical info (in terms of accuracy), time sensitive requests not so good.
- used info to fill in blanks from other sources - try to sort out wheat from chaff in terms of re chug order with drug organizations

(3)

analysts to be ~~objective~~ told them  
about program. [ ] told them  
to evaluate info, ignore personal  
beliefs and be objective

SG1J

SG1J

- [ ] did some of evaluations but  
some about 6 people did evals -  
All evals done by a specific  
individual, not by a group.

- If got <sup>into</sup> corresponding of info to  
RV data, would ask odd questions  
of RV - but usually add info was  
not corroborated.

- Cited a case of info provided by RV  
on an individual in Pakistan was  
corroborated as very accurate.

- Use info as an "alternative" source.  
~~relied~~ relied on only when it was  
only source of info

- did not task anything <sup>as result of solo-RV info,</sup> needs much  
evidence of reliability to do these.

- all reports had some accurate info, e.g.  
but seems obvious info (knowing the  
source of the question) was  
considered accurate. [ ] seemed

SG1J

to assume that RV knew who was doing talking  
know that RV knew who was doing talking

SG1J

(4)

to provide detailed, specific data - he was satisfied with the type of info they <sup>(PR)</sup> could provide. Seem to accept any specific info as "probably accurate" - "I'd fold into the data base and as one more piece of uncertified intelligence."

- Data made contributions to "target packages" - but no real audit trail of value <sup>or contribution</sup> of the data. No attempt ever made to do a post correlation of data provided versus other
- Would like to see program continued, more formalized.
- ~~#~~ Afraid that direct involvement of PR would ~~lose~~ lose their objectivity.
- To integrate into org they would have to be legitimized <sup>in reputable</sup> in some way otherwise they ~~would~~ would be made fun of, etc.
- Would be willing to pay for PR info if had to give up source like, e.g., "Sun" - but selling up the ~~line~~ line would be difficult due to situation above.

