

- a. Analyst note in file us9aj-000089dp: "Although not identified as an individual NIPF priority, the Kavkaz may fall under the category of the North Caucasus Islamic Extremists."
- b. The LRA, FDLR and Allied Democratic Forces appeared in cablegate file 09STATE37561, they did not list an NIPF priority for terrorism but gave each a priority 4 in the SRCC (Regional Crisis) and LEAD (Intentions of leadership) categories.
- c. A NIPF priority of 1B is given in file us9ym-000440dp, however it is dated October 2008, which is outside the date range when A and B subgroups are used. It is probable that this assessment was based on outdated material.
- d. No NIPF priority was given in file us9pk-001094dp, however a note appears as follows: "Jamiat Islami is not assessed to be the Jamaah Islamiyah which operates in Asia. IIR 6 034 0191 03 states the Jamiat Islami is a terrorist organization that operates in Afghanistan and Pakistan and supported the Taliban government from Pakistan through diplomatic and media outlets." I am not certain whether Jamiat Islami is the same as Jama'at Islami which appears in file us9af-000831dp.
- e. File us9ym-001017dp gives an NIPF priority of 1B, whereas us9ym-000627dp gives a priority of 2. However, both are dated April 2008, which is outside the date range when A and B subgroups are used. My conclusion is that the assessment in us9ym-001017dp was based on outdated material and that correct NIPF priority for this period is 2.
- f. File us9sa-000337dp assigns LT to IICT Tier 1, whereas file us9sa-000005dp gives an NIPF priority of 1B. Both files are dated Oct 2007, which is outside the range where IICT tiers are used. My conclusion is that assessment in file us9sa-000337dp is based on outdated material and that the correct number for this period would be NIPF priority 1B.
- g. Four assessments for Mar 2008 list LT at NIPF priority 1 (us9af-000556dp, us9rs-000702dp, us9su-000719dp, and us9ym-000679dp), however a single assessment (us9ym-000692dp) lists it at NIPF priority 2. My conclusion is that Priority 1 is most likely correct for this period.
- h. Three assessments for April 2008 list LT at NIPF priority 1, (us9le-000722dp, us9ym-000683dp, and us9ym-000686dp), however a single assessment (us9we-000684dp) lists it at NIPF priority 2. My conclusion is that priority 1 is most likely correct for this period.
- i. There are three different conflicting assessments for May 2008. File us9ym-000688dp lists it at NIPF priority 2, file us9ym-000728dp gives priority 1B, and files us9ag-000744dp, us9ym-000689dp both report NIPF priority 1. May 2008 is beyond the range where A and B priorities are given, and therefore the assessment in us9ym-000688dp is based on obsolete data. NIPF 1B on the old scale converts to priority 2 on the latest scale. This leaves 2 assessments at priority 1 and 2 assessments at priority 2. It is probable that the correct priority for May 2008 is 1. To summarize the notes g, h, and i: I believe that the NIPF Priority for LT had increased in March, and that the several dissenting analyses were based on old data.
- j. There are two conflicting assessments for April 2005. One assessment (us9ts-000721dp) lists LIFG at IICT Tier 0, another at IICT tier 1. There is no basis to determine the correct value for this period.
- k. File us9mo-000197dp lists an NIPF priority of 2A. However, the assessment is dated Nov 2008,

which is outside the range where A and B priorities were used. Further the description of the priority listing contradicts the priority listing itself, it lists priority 2A but describes priority 3. "Analyst Note: Individuals associated with the now dissolved Moroccan Islamic Fighting Group, also known as Groupe Islamique Combattant Marocain (GICM), aka Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group remain a National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF) Counterterrorism (CT) priority 2A target. Priority 3 target are defined as Terrorist/extremist groups, countries that sponsor terrorism, or countries that have state organizations involved in terrorism that have demonstrated both intention and the capability to attack U.S. persons and interests, but are believed to pose somewhat less threat to U.S. interests around the world than Priority 2 groups or countries and are taking action to develop or acquire WMD capability." the Definition of Priority 2A on the previous scale matches priority the definition of Priority 3 on the current scale. I conclude the correct NIPF priority is probably 3.

l. File us9sa-000273dp lists al-Wafa as IICT tier 1 in Dec 2005. However, two more (us9jo-000050dp, and us9ku-000228dp) list it at IICT tier 2 for that same month. In light of this, and also the historical rating of al-Wafa at tier 2 generally, I conclude that the correct listing for Jan 2005 is IICT tier 2.

m. File us9af-000753dp lists al-Wafa as NIPF priority 2A in November 2008. However, two more (us9ag-000533dp, and us9gz-010016dp) list it at NIPF Priority 3 for that same month. In addition, this is beyond the range in which A and B priorities were used. In light of this, and also the historical rating of al-Wafa at NIPF Priority 3 generally, I conclude that the correct listing for this period is NIPF Priority 3.

n. File us9rs-000702dp lists JT at NIPF Priority 2A for March 2008, while file us9ym-000679dp lists it at priority 3. Further, this is beyond the range where A and B priorities were used. In light of this, and also the historical rating of JT at NIPF priority 3, I conclude that NIPF priority 3 is the correct rating for this period.

o. An analyst note appears in file us9eg-000535dp as follows: "Although not identified as a National Intelligence Priority Framework (NIPF) Counterterrorism (CT) target, the Muslim Brotherhood is an extremist group and has been the subject of multiple HUMINT collection requirements. "

p. File us4ag-010005dp lists SCHR at NIPF Priority 2B for April 2008, while files us4ag-010001dp, and us4ag-010002dp list it at priority 4. Further, this is beyond the range where A and B priorities were used. The definition of Priority 2B on the previous scale matches the definition of priority 3 on the current scale. I conclude that NIPF priority 4 is NIPF priority for this period.

q. File us4ag-010005dp lists Talbigh as NIPF priority 2A in April 2008, However this is beyond the date where A and B priorities were used. However, the old definition of Priority 2A would correspond to priority 3. Which squared with the remaining data. I conclude the correct NIPF priority for this timeframe is 3.

r. File us9mo-000244dp contains an analyst note as follows: "As a UBL-owned company, the Wadi al-Aqiq assets would be frozen due to UBL's listing on the US Treasury's Specially Designated National's list. "

s. The analyst provided a rating of 2, but the definition provided is inconsistent with the rating. It is likely that either the definition is closer to IICT Tier 3, or the analyst intended to give a rating of 1B. The analyst note in full: "Shaykh Said al-Masri is an al-Qaida financier and facilitator with long

standing ties to Usama bin Laden. Amiraslan Iskenderov was the leader of the Azerbaijani-based al-Qaida Kavkaz terrorist group. Although not identified as an individual NIPF priority, the Kavkaz may fall under the category of the North Caucasus Islamic Extremists, an NIPF Priority 2B target as a group that maintains a capability or group that has demonstrated capability and intention to attack US interests."