

DECLASSIFIED

From: Tim Dowse
Sent: 10 March 2003 13:15
To: Peter Ricketts
Cc: Stephen Pattison; Charles Gray; William Ehrman; Edward UKMIS New York -Conf
Subject: Oakden (London); Edward Chaplin;
CONF: Benchmarks - No10 version
Importance: High

Peter

The No 10 benchmarks more or less overlap with my version. My main comments are:

General

- Don't set a figure on the number of scientists to be interviewed - there is no magic in 150 (UNMOVIC certainly couldn't handle 150 at once). We should just say that Iraq must provide all those individuals requested by UNMOVIC/INVO - and then work with Blix to ensure that he makes a suitably testing request;

Biological

- I think my growth media question is worth including, as well as the anthrax. This is material that Iraq admits possessing as recently as 1999. Where has it gone in the last 4 years? It is simply not credible that all documentation has disappeared in such a short space of time.

- I included the mobile bio-labs mainly because they've had so much publicity, and there is fairly firm intelligence about them. But if Iraq just refuses to admit their existence we are in a bind, because we are unlikely to be able to prove they do exist. So perhaps we should drop them;

Chemical

- I included the bombs and shells simply because they are concrete things, more easily visualised than "VX" - and there is less room for argument over whether they have been destroyed or not (as the current UNMOVIC effort at al-Azziziyah shows, there is lots of scope for Iraqi obfuscation over destruction of VX);

Missiles

- The problem with the No10 "SCUDs" benchmark - or almost any benchmark relating to SCUD-type missiles - is that we end up with a stand-off: the Iraqis claim they were destroyed (the 14 in a test programme in the 1980s) and we can't prove the contrary - we have no hard evidence either way. Better might be to demand the surrender for destruction (or provision of evidence of previous destruction) of the 50 SCUD warheads unaccounted-for by UNSCOM - but even this has the same failing. (This is why I concentrated on al-Samouds);

- I think we should include my suggestion of accelerated destruction of Al-Samoud IIs (I note that Blix/Perricos had the same idea). But we shouldn't just focus on the airframes/warheads - what the Iraqis really want to keep is the production equipment. I'd also still like to go for the test stand if Blix agrees.

UAVs

- The No10 benchmark is a poor one. It refers to a programme in 1990. If we want to focus on just one specific example, better would be to use the "drone with a wingspan of 7.45 meters" which UNMOVIC have just discovered last week, was not declared by Iraq, and is mentioned in the clusters document as such. The US are pretty confident that this is an illegal system - they think they've tracked it flying over 500km.

- But my preference would be to pitch more widely, for all UAVs with CBW applications - this would draw in the L-29s etc. And we should demand that they be destroyed.

Tim Dowse
NPD

DECLASSIFIED