

7/26 (1)

JTF-5



- Would be more useful if good briefing 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 & behavior that frequently no response was received from program. Frequent interchanges both between Russ & Al helped to keep program alive.

- Tasking - re people, objects (shyis),

some of the 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 fold 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 ~~set~~ 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 procedure: order with drug organizations

3

analysts are... 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 into to RV data, would ask odd questions of PW - but usually add into was not corroborated.

- Cites a case of into provided by PW on an individual in Pakistan was corroborated as very accurate.

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

- did not take anything <sup>as result of solo - RV into,</sup> needs search evidence of reliability to do these.

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

SG1J

to assume that PW <sup>knows who's doing talking</sup>

SG1J

(4)

to provide detailed, specific data - he was satisfied with the type of info they ~~could~~ <sup>(or)</sup> could provide. Seems to accept any specific info as "probably accurate" - "I'd feed into the data base as one more piece of unclassified 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 PW would ~~lose~~ lose their objectivity.
- To integrate into org they would have to be legitimized <sup>in reasonable</sup> in some way otherwise they ~~would~~ would be made fear of, etc.
- Would be willing to pay for PW info if had to give up source like, e.g.,

the ~~line~~ line would be difficult due to ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~line~~ <sup>line</sup> ~~above~~ <sup>above</sup>.

SG1J

Approved For Release 2003/09/16 : CIA-RDP96-00791R000200190004-3

Approved For Release 2003/09/16 : CIA-RDP96-00791R000200190004-3