

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 16, 2013 3:14 PM  
**To:** 'Warrick, Joby S'  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** [AIN] RE: from joby warrick -- follow-up

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

**CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED**

---

**AIN EMAIL**

(b)(3)

Hey Joby,

A confusing one, indeed. I'll plan to give you a ring once I've done the due diligence.

[REDACTED]

(b)(3)

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

[REDACTED]

(b)(3)

---

**From:** Warrick, Joby S [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 16, 2013 1:35 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: from joby warrick -- follow-up

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

Hey [REDACTED] — hope it was a good weekend there.

(b)(3)

Just circling back after seeing the UN inspectors' report on CW. Oddly, they're also referring to a 330-mm artillery rocket similar to the one mentioned in the HRW report. We'll cite the UN's conclusions in our story but just wanted to mention again in case there's concern there that the UN folks might be wrong.. Definitely a weird, confusing one..

Best,

joby

---

**From:** Warrick, Joby S  
**Sent:** Friday, September 13, 2013 12:05 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: from joby warrick -- two quick syria questions

(b)(3)

Tnx so much...

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 13, 2013, at 11:49 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

(b)(3)

Joby,

Happy to look into this for you. I'll be back in touch later today.

Thanks!

[REDACTED]

(b)(3)

[REDACTED]

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

(b)(3)

[REDACTED]

(b)(3)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 13, 2013 11:27 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** from joby warrick -- two quick syria questions

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

'morning,

Wanted to run two items by you for a Syria CW story in the works today. Easy stuff, hopefully.

--On CW locations in Syria: We saw today's WSJ story on an elite Syrian team moving munitions among up to 50 sites. FWIW, one of my colleagues was at an off-the-record press dinner a few days ago in which a very senior IC official mentioned a total of 50 sites associated with either storage or production. We haven't used the figure since the conservation was off the record, but we're wondering now if it's OK to use the '50 sites' figure and attribute to "u.s. officials," now that it's out there? The context is simply to say that there are lot of potential hiding places and the regime has been moving things around pretty frequently since the conflict began. (if you're able to confirm that the moving is more frequent now, it would be helpful.. The WSJ also asserted that we are less certain about active storage places than we were a few months ago, which runs counter to what we've been told by others.)

--On CW munitions: Human Rights Watch put out a very detailed report this week on the rockets used in the Aug 21 attack.. The HRW report cites recovered evidence of two kinds of rockets, 140 mm and a very unusual 330 mm, both strongly associated with CW delivery. Just wanted to ask there's any disagreement there about whether the regime used those rockets, or their association with chemical warfare. HRW makes the case that neither the rockets nor the launchers have ever been used by rebels, as far as anyone knows.

(Here's the link the hrw report, just for reference. <http://mm.hrw.org/content/syria-government-likely-culprit-chemical-attack>)

Really appreciate the help,

Joby

Joby Warrick  
National Security Correspondent, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071

[Redacted]

email: [Redacted]

cell: [Redacted]

<http://projects.washingtonpost.com/staff/articles> [Redacted]

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)