

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION SHEET

INFORMATION and INSTRUCTIONS:

The information in this report was obtained in direct response to an intelligence collection requirement provided by your office. The material furnished to you has been acquired through a unique and highly sensitive collection technique. Your care in evaluating this information will form the basis by which USI can assess this technique and/or modify and refine the technology to improve its overall value. While formulating your evaluation the following comments concerning this unique collection technique may be helpful.

Foremost it must be stated that the information obtained through this technique is likely to consist of a mixture of correct, incorrect or at times apparently, irrelevant data. Given this anomaly the consumer should be sensitive to the following:

a. Conceptual descriptive data tends to be more reliable than analytic labeling. As an example, a source may inappropriately report (label) a body of water in an artificial holding device at a designated target as a "recreational swimming pool," when in fact it is a water purification sewage pool. More critical however, is that an aircraft fuselage may be erroneously labeled by the source as a submarine hull. Caution is therefore advised when a source's descriptions evidence a great deal of analytic labeling. Again, conceptual descriptive data tends to be more reliable than analytic labeling.

b. Certain anomalies may exist in the overall descriptive reporting. A report on a known three building complex may, for example, only contain data pertaining to two buildings. Furthermore, significant buildings or facilities may be attributed to a site when it is known that such "additions" do not exist. Such gaps or additions are neither intentional nor an attempt to fabricate information. In fact, they occasionally may prove useful with careful analysis on the part of the consumer. When this type of serious gap or addition is encountered it should only be weighed in the context of the actual tasking and how it affects the results of the information sought. In other words, if you were initially seeking the purpose of a deep circular hole in the ground, do not be concerned about additional descriptions of a nearby lake when previously confirmed information indicated no lake is present at the site. Instead, focus your evaluation on the data pertaining to the deep circular hole, while within reason, ignoring extraneous data.

c. At times, some data may appear to be abstract with no apparent importance even though other data tends to confirm and improve upon the known data base on a target. Information of this nature may, at a later date, be valuable. For example, a reported lack of personnel at a normally bustling defense installation may seem incongruous until it is learned at a later date that this particular reporting period coincided with a evacuation drill.

d. The consumer should be aware that for reasons of security, strict compartmentation and operational effectiveness, the actual collectors (sources) of this data are given only general guidance. Therefore, the collectors may tend to report on many seemingly extraneous facets of a target as well as the specific area of interest to the consumer. If this otherwise superfluous data is known to be true, the veracity of the source's other descriptions is enhanced.

It is recommended that the consumer first examine the information provided to isolate the data already known, if any, about the target. From this data base the consumer should extract any new and heretofore unknown information relevant to the specific target. The "irrelevant" information should be examined carefully in light of the comments listed above. Patently false or irrelevant information should be weighted as a facet of your evaluation only when this data contradicts previously confirmed information pertaining to the target.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, the Intelligence Evaluation Sheet (IES), or any information provided to you by this activity please contact this office at any time.

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION SHEET

IES Control Number: _____

Source Number: _____

SECTION I

Collection Requirement:

Collection Requirement Generated By:
(ICR/CIR/DIRM/INITIATIVE/OTHER)

Does the information YES IN PART NO CANNOT BE
satisfy your Intelli- DETERMINED
gence Collection
Requirement?

A narrative explanation is required:

(Use a continuation sheet if necessary.)

(classification)

SECTION II

This section deals exclusively with the accuracy of the information provided, not its usefulness. Responses are scaled from 0-3 utilizing the following explanatory criteria. If a source has not addressed a particular item then select UNKNOWN. If a source describes an item which cannot be verified then select CANNOT BE DETERMINED.

0 - Little or no correspondence with known or suspected components of the target site.

1 - Evidence that the proper target site is being described, however the information contains a mixture of correct and incorrect elements.

2 - Good site correspondence with several items recognizable or confirmatory in nature but some incorrect or irrelevant information is reported.

3 - Good correspondence with the target with unambiguous and unique information and relatively little known incorrect information.

	0-3	UNKNOWN	CANNOT BE DETERMINED
IIa - Geographic locale description, i.e., terrain, bodies of water, mountains, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIb - Large scale manmade objects, i.e., cities, rail yards, silos, docks, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIc - Small scale manmade structures, i.e., antennae, computers, vehicles, missiles, small buildings, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIId.- General target functions, i.e., research, production, training, storage, troop billets, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(classification)

0- Little or no correspondence with known or suspected components of the target site.

1 - Evidence that the proper target site is being described, however the information contains a mixture of correct and incorrect elements.

2 - Good site correspondence with several items recognizable or confirmatory in nature but some incorrect or irrelevant information is reported.

3 - Good correspondence with the target with unambiguous and unique information and relatively little known incorrect information.

	0-3	UNKNOWN	CANNOT BE DETERMINED
IIf - Specific target functions, i.e., nuclear testing, CBR storage/research, missile testing etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIg - Personalities at site, i.e., descriptions, activities, responsibilities, political proclivity, support for government.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIh - Data of predictive importance, i.e., plans, preparations hostile intentions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A narrative elaboration is requested:

(Use a continuation sheet if necessary.)

(classification)

