






ACLU 2004 Remand Documents

CIA OIG Releases

1. 2004 CIA OIG Report
2. 07 March 2003 CIA business plan discussing RDI program [OIG Vaughn # Other-29]
3. 31 January 2003 Draft psychological assessment of Abu Zubaydah [OIG Vaughn # Other-39]
4. 20 November 2002 Spot report discussing interrogation of al-Nashiri [OIG Vaughn # Other-63]
5. 24 July 2002 Draft psychological assessment of Abu Zubaydah [OIG Vaughn # Other-71]
6. Undated certification sheet used in interrogation training [OIG Vaughn # Other-93]
7. Undated blank "Enhanced Pressures" sheet used for waterboard training [OIG Vaughn # Other-103]
8. 17 July 2003 interview with a senior CIA officer regarding CIA RDI program [OIG Vaughn # Interview-83]

9. 22 January 2003 Email with attached spot report regarding interrogation of al-Nashiri [OIG Vaughn # Email-196]



~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

CIA LOAN COPY
DO NOT COPY

*Central Intelligence Agency
Inspector General*

SPECIAL REVIEW



(TS [REDACTED]) COUNTERTERRORISM DETENTION AND
INTERROGATION ACTIVITIES
(SEPTEMBER 2001 – OCTOBER 2003)
(2003-7123-IG)

7 May 2004

Copy 43



~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SUMMARY.....	2
BACKGROUND.....	9
DISCUSSION	11
<i>GENESIS OF POST 9/11 AGENCY DETENTION AND INTERROGATION ACTIVITIES.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>THE CAPTURE OF ABU ZUBAYDAH AND DEVELOPMENT OF EITs</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>DOJ LEGAL ANALYSIS</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>NOTICE TO AND CONSULTATION WITH EXECUTIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL OFFICIALS.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>GUIDANCE ON CAPTURE, DETENTION, AND INTERROGATION.....</i>	<i>24</i>
[REDACTED].....	25
DCI Confinement Guidelines.....	27
DCI Interrogation Guidelines.....	29
Medical Guidelines.....	31
Training for Interrogations.....	31
<i>DETENTION AND INTERROGATION OPERATIONS AT [REDACTED]</i>	<i>33</i>
[REDACTED].....	34
[REDACTED].....	34
Videotapes of Interrogations.....	36
[REDACTED].....	37
Background and Detainees.....	38

[REDACTED]39

Guidance Prior to DCI Guidelines 40

Specific Unauthorized or Undocumented Techniques..... 41

 Handgun and Power Drill41

 Threats42

 Smoke.....43

 Stress Positions44

 Stiff Brush and Shackles.....44

 Waterboard Technique44

[REDACTED]46

[REDACTED]47

[REDACTED]48

[REDACTED]48

[REDACTED]50

[REDACTED]54

[REDACTED]57

[REDACTED]58

[REDACTED]61

[REDACTED]65

[REDACTED]67

Specific Unauthorized or Undocumented Techniques69

 Pressure Points69

 Mock Executions70

 Use of Smoke72

 Use of Cold.....73

 Water Dousing.....76

 Hard Takedown77

Abuse [REDACTED] at Other Locations Outside of the CTC
Program.....78

[REDACTED].....80

ANALYTICAL SUPPORT TO INTERROGATIONS.....82

EFFECTIVENESS85

*POLICY CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCERNS REGARDING THE DETENTION
AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM*.....91

 Policy Considerations.....92

 Concerns Over Participation in the CTC Program94

ENDGAME95

CONCLUSIONS.....100

RECOMMENDATIONS.....106

APPENDICES

 A. Procedures and Resources

 B. Chronology of Significant Events

 C. Memorandum for John Rizzo, Acting General Counsel of the
 Central Intelligence Agency, Re: Interrogation of an Al-Qa'ida
 Operative, 1 August 2002

 D. DCI Guidelines on Confinement Conditions for CIA Detainees,
 28 January 2003

 E. DCI Guidelines on Interrogations Conducted Pursuant to the
 [REDACTED]
 28 January 2003

~~TOP SECRET/~~ [REDACTED]

F. Draft Office of Medical Services Guidelines on Medical and Psychological Support to Detainee Interrogations, 4 September 2003

~~TOP SECRET/~~ [REDACTED]

~~TOP SECRET~~/ [REDACTED]

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SPECIAL REVIEW

(TS [REDACTED]) COUNTERTERRORISM DETENTION AND
INTERROGATION ACTIVITIES
(SEPTEMBER 2001 - OCTOBER 2003)
(2003-7123-IG)

7 May 2004

INTRODUCTION

1. [REDACTED]

2. (TS [REDACTED]) In November 2002, the Deputy Director for Operations (DDO) informed the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that the Agency had established a program in the Counterterrorist Center to detain and interrogate terrorists at sites abroad ("the CTC Program"). He also informed OIG that he had just learned of and had dispatched a team to investigate [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In January 2003, the DDO informed OIG that he had received allegations that Agency personnel had used unauthorized interrogation techniques with a detainee, 'Abd Al-Rahim Al-Nashiri, at another foreign site, and requested that

~~TOP SECRET~~/ [REDACTED]

OIG investigate. Separately, OIG received information that some employees were concerned that certain covert Agency activities at an overseas detention and interrogation site might involve violations of human rights. In January 2003, OIG initiated a review of Agency counterterrorism detention and interrogation activities [REDACTED] and the incident with Al-Nashiri.¹ This Review covers the period September 2001 to mid-October 2003.² [REDACTED]

SUMMARY

3. (TS) [REDACTED] the DCI assigned responsibility for implementing capture and detention authority to the DDO and to the Director of the DCI Counterterrorist Center (D/CTC). When U.S. military forces began detaining individuals in Afghanistan and at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, [REDACTED]

4. (TS) [REDACTED] the Agency began to detain and interrogate directly a number of suspected terrorists. The capture and initial Agency interrogation of the first high value detainee, Abu Zubaydah, [REDACTED]

¹ (S) [REDACTED] (NF) Appendix A addresses the Procedures and Resources that OIG employed in conducting this Review. The Review does not address renditions conducted by the Agency or interrogations conducted jointly with [REDACTED] the U.S. military.

² (U) Appendix B is a chronology of significant events that occurred during the period of this Review. [REDACTED]

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

in March 2002, presented the Agency with a significant dilemma.⁴ The Agency was under pressure to do everything possible to prevent additional terrorist attacks. Senior Agency officials believed Abu Zubaydah was withholding information that could not be obtained through then-authorized interrogation techniques. Agency officials believed that a more robust approach was necessary to elicit threat information from Abu Zubaydah and possibly from other senior Al-Qa'ida high value detainees.

5. (TS [REDACTED]) The conduct of detention and interrogation activities presented new challenges for CIA. These included determining where detention and interrogation facilities could be securely located and operated, and identifying and preparing qualified personnel to manage and carry out detention and interrogation activities. With the knowledge that Al-Qa'ida personnel had been trained in the use of resistance techniques, another challenge was to identify interrogation techniques that Agency personnel could lawfully use to overcome the resistance. In this context, CTC, with the assistance of the Office of Technical Service (OTS), proposed certain more coercive physical techniques to use on Abu Zubaydah. All of these considerations took place against the backdrop of pre-September 11, 2001 CIA avoidance of interrogations and repeated U.S. policy statements condemning torture and advocating the humane treatment of political prisoners and detainees in the international community.

6. (TS [REDACTED]) The Office of General Counsel (OGC) took the lead in determining and documenting the legal parameters and constraints for interrogations. OGC conducted independent research

⁴ (TS [REDACTED]) The use of "high value" or "medium value" to describe terrorist targets and detainees in this Review is based on how they have been generally categorized by CTC. CTC distinguishes targets according to the quality of the intelligence that they are believed likely to be able to provide about current terrorist threats against the United States. Senior Al-Qa'ida planners and operators, such as Abu Zubaydah and Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, fall into the category of "high value" and are given the highest priority for capture, detention, and interrogation. CTC categorizes those individuals who are believed to have lesser direct knowledge of such threats, but to have information of intelligence value, as "medium value" targets/detainees.

~~TOP SECRET~~ [REDACTED]

and consulted extensively with Department of Justice (DoJ) and National Security Council (NSC) legal and policy staff. Working with DoJ's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC), OGC determined that in most instances relevant to the counterterrorism detention and interrogation activities [REDACTED] the criminal prohibition against torture, 18 U.S.C. 2340-2340B, is the controlling legal constraint on interrogations of detainees outside the United States. In August 2002, DoJ provided to the Agency a legal opinion in which it determined that 10 specific "Enhanced Interrogation Techniques" (EITs) would not violate the torture prohibition. This work provided the foundation for the policy and administrative decisions that guide the CTC Program.

7. (TS [REDACTED]) By November 2002, the Agency had Abu Zubaydah and another high value detainee, 'Abd Al-Rahim Al-Nashiri, in custody [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and the Office of Medical Services (OMS) provided medical care to the detainees.

8. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9. (TS) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From the beginning, OGC briefed DO officers assigned to these [REDACTED] facilities on their legal authorities, and Agency personnel staffing these facilities documented interrogations and the condition of detainees in cables.

10. (TS) [REDACTED] There were few instances of deviations from approved procedures [REDACTED] with one notable exception described in this Review. With respect to two detainees at those sites, the use and frequency of one EIT, the waterboard, went beyond the projected use of the technique as originally described to DoJ. The Agency, on 29 July 2003, secured oral DoJ concurrence that certain deviations are not significant for purposes of DoJ's legal opinions.

11. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

13. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] there were instances of improvisation and other undocumented interrogation techniques [REDACTED]

14. [REDACTED]

15. (TS, [REDACTED]) Agency efforts to provide systematic, clear and timely guidance to those involved in the CTC Detention and Interrogation Program was inadequate at first but have improved considerably during the life of the Program as problems have been identified and addressed. CTC implemented training programs for interrogators and debriefers.⁶ Moreover, building upon operational and legal guidance previously sent to the field, the DCI

⁶ (TS, [REDACTED]) Before 11 September (9/11) 2001, Agency personnel sometimes used the terms *interrogation/interrogator* and *debriefing/debriefer* interchangeably. The use of these terms has since evolved and, today, CTC more clearly distinguishes their meanings. A debriefer engages a detainee solely through question and answer. An interrogator is a person who completes a two-week interrogations training program, which is designed to train, qualify, and certify a person to administer EITs. An interrogator can administer EITs during an interrogation of a detainee only after the field, in coordination with Headquarters, assesses the detainee as withholding information. An interrogator transitions the detainee from a non-cooperative to a cooperative phase in order that a debriefer can elicit actionable intelligence through non-aggressive techniques during debriefing sessions. An interrogator may debrief a detainee during an interrogation; however, a debriefer may not interrogate a detainee.

~~TOP SECRET~~/ [REDACTED]

on 28 January 2003 signed "Guidelines on Confinement Conditions for CIA Detainees" and "Guidelines on Interrogations Conducted Pursuant [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The DCI Guidelines require individuals engaged in or supporting interrogations [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] be made aware of the guidelines and sign an acknowledgment that they have read them. The DCI Interrogation Guidelines make formal the existing CTC practice of requiring the field to obtain specific Headquarters approvals prior to the application of all EITs. Although the DCI Guidelines are an improvement over the absence of such DCI Guidelines in the past, they still leave substantial room for misinterpretation and do not cover all Agency detention and interrogation activities.

16. (TS [REDACTED]) The Agency's detention and interrogation of terrorists has provided intelligence that has enabled the identification and apprehension of other terrorists and warned of terrorist plots planned for the United States and around the world. The CTC Program has resulted in the issuance of thousands of individual intelligence reports and analytic products supporting the counterterrorism efforts of U.S. policymakers and military commanders.

17. (TS [REDACTED]) The current CTC Detention and Interrogation Program has been subject to DoJ legal review and Administration approval but diverges sharply from previous Agency policy and rules that govern interrogations by U.S. military and law enforcement officers. Officers are concerned that public revelation of the CTC Program will seriously damage Agency officers' personal reputations, as well as the reputation and effectiveness of the Agency itself.

18. (TS [REDACTED]) recognized that detainees may be held in U.S. Government custody indefinitely if appropriate law enforcement jurisdiction is not asserted. Although there has been ongoing discussion of the issue inside the Agency and among NSC,

~~TOP SECRET~~/ [REDACTED]

Defense Department, and Justice Department officials, no decisions on any "endgame" for Agency detainees have been made. Senior Agency officials see this as a policy issue for the U.S. Government rather than a CIA issue. Even with Agency initiatives to address the endgame with policymakers, some detainees who cannot be prosecuted will likely remain in CIA custody indefinitely.

19. (TS [REDACTED]) The Agency faces potentially serious long-term political and legal challenges as a result of the CTC Detention and Interrogation Program, particularly its use of EITs and the inability of the U.S. Government to decide what it will ultimately do with terrorists detained by the Agency.

20. (TS [REDACTED]) This Review makes a number of recommendations that are designed to strengthen the management and conduct of Agency detention and interrogation activities. Although the DCI Guidelines were an important step forward, they were only designed to address the CTC Program, rather than all Agency debriefing or interrogation activities.

