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 (Palestine, 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 local analyst to structure requests for RV. Then evaluate inputs.

- Dropped earlier because no feedback mechanism had existed I believe that frequently no response was received from program. Frequent interactions between RVers & AL helped to keep program alive.

- Tasking - re people, objects (ships), some geographical areas. Very specific targets

- RV 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 into 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 tash field collection due to security 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 reports not so good.

- used info to fill in blanks from other sources - try to sort out wheat from chaff in terms of

③

SG1J

SG1J

— analyst are _____
about program. [____] told them
to evaluate info, ignore personal
beliefs and be objective

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

— ~~Then~~ If got ^into^ corresponding of ~~info~~ to
RV data, would ask add'l questions
of RV — but usually add'l 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.
~~relbut~~ relied on only when it was
only source of info
                    as result of sole-RV info.
— did not task anything needs much
evidence of credibility to do there.

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

to assume that RV knew who was doing tasking)

SG1J

to provide detailed, specific data – he
was satisfied with the type of info
they (RV) could provide. Seems to
accept any specific info as "probably
accurate" – fed 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 or contribution 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 RV would lose their objectivity.

- To integrate into org, they would
  have to be legitimized or reputable in some way
  otherwise they would be
  made fun of, etc.

- Would be willing to pay for RV info
  if had to give up source like, e.g.
  the price line would be difficult