

Report on
Building International Coalitions to Combat
Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism



International Security Advisory Board

February 5, 2007

Disclaimer

This is a report of the International Security Advisory Board (ISAB), a Federal Advisory Committee established to provide the Department of State with a continuing source of independent insight, advice and innovation on scientific, military, diplomatic, political, and public diplomacy aspects of arms control, disarmament, international security, and nonproliferation. The views expressed herein do not represent official positions or policies of the Department of State or any other entity of the United States Government.



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

www.state.gov

MEMORANDUM FOR U/S ROBERT JOSEPH

SUBJECT: Final Report of the International Security Advisory Board (ISAB) on
Building Coalitions to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism

I am forwarding herewith the ISAB's report on Building International Coalitions to Combat Weapons of Mass (WMD) Destruction Terrorism. The report responds to your request of March 14, 2006, that the Board undertake such a study. The report was drafted by a Task Force chaired by Senator Charles Robb. It was reviewed by all ISAB members and unanimously approved at our plenary meeting on February 5, 2007.

The report includes ten specific recommendations to improve State Department and, more broadly, United States Government (USG) efforts to build international coalitions to combat WMD terrorism. As a first order conclusion, the ISAB recommends that the Department establish a task force to identify the appropriate parameters of the State Department's role in deterring, dissuading and coercing terrorists acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction using a methodology outlined in the report. The report categorizes the Board's ten recommendations to illustrate how each recommended action relates to the others and to the broad range of challenges inherent in this problem. We believe that implementing these recommendations would enhance significantly the State Department's, and more broadly the USG's, efforts to build international coalitions tailored to counter specific WMD terrorist threats.

I encourage you to consider all of the report's recommendations carefully. The Task Force members and I stand ready to brief you and other members of the Administration on the findings, as requested.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Fred Thompson", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Fred Thompson

Chairman

International Security Advisory Board

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

Report on Building Coalitions to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Terrorism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report on Building International Coalitions to Combat WMD Terrorism.....	1
Appendix A –Summary of Recommendations	A-1
Appendix B - Terms of Reference	B-1
Appendix C - Members and Project Staff.....	C-1
Appendix D - Individuals Consulted	D-1

Report on

Building International Coalitions to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism

TASKING. The International Security Advisory Board (ISAB) was asked to undertake four tasks: review weapons of mass destruction (WMD) terrorist threats; assess U.S. efforts to build international coalitions to combat WMD terrorism; identify effective means of building international coalitions to combat WMD terrorism; and, identify elements of a public-private outreach strategy to industries essential to combating WMD terrorism. Additionally, the Secretary of State asked that ISAB specifically focus on the example of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.

At the outset, ISAB determined that a framework for analyzing how best to dissuade, deter, and coerce terrorists is essential. This methodology is similar to that required for the “targeted strategies” recommended for North Korea and Iran contained in the ISAB Report on the Review of the 2002 National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction. This framework is not only a guide for information collection and analysis; its employment can inform the formulation of policy, defense strategy, and strategic communications.

This report is divided into two sections. The first is a suggested methodological framework for analysis. The second section addresses the specific tasks assigned in the Terms of Reference for our study, with a specific focus on recommendations to improve international coalition-building.

SECTION I: Combating WMD Terrorism: Deterrence, Dissuasion and Coercion

Background. During the Cold War, the U.S. policy of mutual nuclear deterrence was geared to the specific conditions of the Cold War and was intended to prevent Soviet attack against the United States and its friends and allies. While the success of deterrence during the Cold War cannot be proven *per se*, it appears to have played an important role in preventing superpower and possibly regional conflict.

Today, there are not two principal actors and a single paramount threat, but a spectrum of opponents and threats. Rogue states, sub-national and non-state terrorist groups, elements of organized crime, and perhaps even individuals acting alone may have the capability to use or realistically threaten to use WMD against the U.S. and its allies. Each of these types of opponents must now be deterred to the extent practicable.

Establishing effective policies to deter these opponents and threats, especially including terrorists armed with WMD and their state sponsors, poses significant and unprecedented challenges. Our

Cold War experience and traditional deterrence policies provide limited guidance in this new threat environment.

For example, during the Cold War, there was heavy emphasis on order-of-battle information to support our deterrence efforts, and there was essentially only one target, the Soviet Union. Now there are multiple and diverse opponents, and the information we need to understand how best to deter them is both broader and more target-specific than was considered necessary during the Cold War.

In addition, states and non-state actors with apocalyptic worldviews may not be deterred predictably and reliably by traditional U.S. deterrence threats of escalation and retaliation. As Bernard Lewis points out: “At the end of time [according to the apocalyptic vision] there will be general destruction anyway. What will matter will be the final destination of the dead—hell for infidels, and heaven for the believers. For people of this mindset, MAD [mutually assured destruction] is not a constraint; it is an inducement.”¹

This conclusion does not suggest that deterrence of contemporary terrorist threats should, *a priori*, be considered impossible. Considerable historical evidence exists to illustrate that deterrence was made to “work” in the past against some extremely violent, eccentric, and highly determined non-state actors. Nevertheless, the greater limits of what can be expected of deterrence *vis-a-vis* contemporary terrorist threats must be recognized, as is the need to identify new approaches to deterrence better suited to these threats.

During much of the Cold War, declared U.S. deterrence policy focused on “punitive” deterrence threats, i.e., targeting what we believed to be of great value to the Soviet leadership. Punitive deterrence may contribute to deterring today’s apocalyptic groups, including threats to terrorists’ social and familial support networks, and organizational leaderships. Deterrence by “denial” threats, however, may also be important against terrorists. Deterrence by denial includes, in particular, our ability to prevent terrorists and their sponsors from realizing the desired effect of WMD terrorism. Denial measures could include defensive measures designed to protect potential targets and drive up the price of attack. Examples include active and passive defenses for seaports, airports and aircraft, forward deployed forces, and urban and industrial centers.

To deal with this enormously complicated and highly variable environment, the U.S. must develop a new intellectual framework for deterring, dissuading, and coercing terrorists, their organizations and state-sponsors. These are three separate and related goals identified in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review.

Dissuasion includes discouraging WMD acquisition and military challenges by terrorists and their state supporters. Should dissuasion fail, we may seek to deter WMD possessors from carrying out attacks and/or transferring WMD capabilities to others, and to coerce them to give up their WMD programs, capabilities and tactics. Each of these goals—dissuasion, deterrence, and coercion—must include U.S. threats and capabilities, strategic communications, and diplomacy tailored to the target audience.

¹ *Wall Street Journal*, “August 22,” August 8, 2006.

The United States may be able to dissuade, deter, and coerce target audiences who are one step removed from terrorist organizations but nevertheless are critical to their operations, including terrorists' state sponsors and support networks. This may be particularly important with regard to the potential for nuclear terrorism because no terrorist organization is capable of enriching uranium or reprocessing plutonium.

To be as effective as possible, our efforts to deter, dissuade, and coerce should be informed by an understanding of the potentially unique motives, goals, practices, risk propensities, communication channels and vulnerabilities of those who sponsor, support and enable terrorists, as well as the terrorists themselves. We need an understanding of their various strategic decision-making processes, the optimal combination of U.S. and allied tools and threats for making WMD terrorism too costly, risky, difficult, or ineffective, and the optimal channels and modes for communicating our threats. To gain this level of understanding of contemporary opponents for these purposes requires that we acquire and integrate information far beyond our Cold War practice.

The first step in doing this is to learn as much as we can about the terrorists, their supporters and sponsors—the “targets” whose decision-making we want to influence. This requires heavy emphasis on intelligence and analysis at the levels of individual, familial, state and non-state organization decision-making. Answers to the types of questions and topics listed below, primarily from the intelligence community and other potential sources of information, will be critical to this effort:

1. Who are the terrorists, their supporters and sponsors, and what are their assets, values and goals we might threaten for the purposes of dissuasion, deterrence and coercion?
 - A. Who is the state sponsor and what motivates its leaders?
 - B. Who are the terrorists' leaders and what motivates them?
 - C. What is the social and familial supportive infrastructure?
 - D. Who are the individual “trigger-pullers” who will carry out the attacks?
 - E. What are the values, goals, power, authority, and organizational structure of the various actors?
 - F. What are the incentives for each group in the terrorist chain to support terrorists?
 - G. What are our available channels of communication to these target audiences and how can we best communicate credible threats?

2. How are they acquiring WMD?
 - A. What are the sources of personnel, information, education, training, and insight that are available to potential WMD terrorists?
 - B. Are there freelancers such as A.Q. Khan who are providing WMD technologies?
 - C. Are there states that are providing WMD technologies?
 - D. Are there rogue scientists who are providing the necessary knowledge?

- E. What might paths to acquisition of WMD include, highlighting critical junctures and technologies?
3. How do they operate?
 - A. Who are the terrorist recruiters and their operatives?
 - B. What are their goals, values, and motivations?
 - C. How is WMD terrorism financed, from recruiters to “trigger-puller”?
 - D. Where and how the terrorists are trained?
 - E. Do they have/need safe haven to develop WMD and operations?
 - F. How and where do they obtain the equipment and material they need to acquire and deploy WMD?
 - G. Where do they carry out their activities, store their materials, and locate their facilities for WMD activities?
 - H. How can the U.S. develop deep insight into the above?
 4. Where are the points we might detect and influence in the chain from sponsor/director to operative?
 - A. Which specific target audiences are most susceptible to U.S. threats and actions?
 - B. What communications channels are potentially vulnerable to disruption or influence?
 - C. What financial networks are subject to our intervention?
 - D. Are the terrorists’ organizational ties vulnerable to disruption or influence?
 - E. Can we identify doubters who question the terrorist mission or see the consequences as too costly?

The goal of addressing this list of questions is to identify the specific target audiences, types of threats and forces, channels and modes of communication, and contributing actions that will best serve our dissuasion, deterrence and coercion goals. Essentially, the task is to develop an understanding of terrorist groups, their supporters and state sponsors to inform our efforts to tailor our threats and supporting actions to specific opponents. Although a complete understanding of each audience is impossible, our goal is to increase our useful understanding of specific targets, their importance in planning, enabling, and executing WMD terrorist operations, and their potential vulnerabilities. Once this information is assembled, the United States will be in a stronger position to identify the states and private partners needed to construct tailored coalitions to deter, dissuade and coerce specific terrorists and terrorist organizations.

The collection, analysis, and integration of this type of information pose significant challenges. Pertinent expertise and resources are dispersed among various government departments and agencies. For example, the Department of Defense in February 2006 assigned U.S. Strategic Command with the responsibility for combating WMD. In turn, Strategic Command established a Combating WMD Center at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

The Intelligence Community has multiple sources of expertise, including the National Counter Terrorism Center, which is implementing a strategic framework designed to prevent terrorists' acquisition and use of WMD. A central element of this plan is to determine terrorists' intentions, capabilities, and plans to develop or acquire WMD. The plan also emphasizes understanding and being able to affect terrorists' capacities at several levels, including: travel, communications, recruitment and training, funding, foreign sponsorship, and intelligence tradecraft. As part of this effort, the plan specifies that as much information as possible should be obtained regarding terrorist leaderships and their motivations.

In addition, the Department of State has a draft Diplomatic Strategy to Combat WMD Terrorism. This Strategy, which needs to be completed, has a principal objective of defeating WMD terrorists by undertaking a number of steps, including: developing targeted regional country plans; improving information-sharing; building partnerships with other nations, international organizations, and the private sector; and, undertaking exercises and initiatives to counter terrorism.

Information about this array of adversaries and access to them may also come from foreign governmental sources and non-governmental sources. The private sector, including NGOs, industry, and academia, both at home and abroad are potentially critical sources of important information.

Tools. All tools that will help dissuade, deter, and coerce WMD terrorists, their supporters and sponsors must be examined. A wide range of tools—political, military, economic, diplomatic, and psychological—will be necessary to exploit the potential vulnerabilities of these diverse opponents. The U.S. government has autonomous control over some tools, but not all. They are scattered institutionally and not traditionally integrated across the departments and agencies. Also, the private sector has considerable influence over some possible tools, especially financial and economic. And, of course, other nations, international bodies, and multinational groups have influence over some tools. Because of the diverse origins of information and tools, there is likely to be much less U.S. autonomy than was the case during the Cold War.

Communicating the Message. Effective strategic communication is essential to dissuasion, deterrence and coercion. It communicates to terrorists and their sponsors the potential cost of WMD acquisition, threats, transfer or employment. It conveys our will, determination and capabilities.

The means of communication affects how the recipient understands the message. The more a message is tailored to the audience, the better the chances are that it will be understood correctly with predictable effect. For any given audience, we must assess which communication channels are available, the optimal mode of signaling, and what level of confidence we have in the information flow to the target. In other words, are we able to communicate our message to the target and is the target capable of receiving and understanding what we intend to communicate?

Even though a message may be carefully and clearly communicated, many factors may intervene helpfully or otherwise to influence how our intended signals are perceived by the recipient, particularly including “background noise” unintended for these purposes. Former Soviet leaders have commented, for example, that President Reagan’s strict handling of the domestic air traffic

controllers' strike early in his tenure had a strong impression on them with regard to the credibility they attributed to him.

Clearly, combating WMD terrorism remains an interagency responsibility and will require close coordination and integration among many organizations in the U.S. Government and our private sector, as well as with our allies and friends. The Department of State's role in identifying, establishing and implementing contemporary U.S. policies of deterrence, dissuasion, and coercion will be much greater, however, than was the case during the Cold War, particularly relative to the Department of Defense. Prior to completion of the draft Diplomatic Strategy to Combat WMD Terrorism, it is important that the Department of State conduct the analysis described above and prepare a thorough assessment of how best to dissuade, deter, and coerce WMD terrorists.

Recommendation 1. The Department of State should establish a Task Force to prepare a Framework for Combating WMD Terrorism. It should identify the appropriate parameters of the State Department's role in deterring, dissuading and coercing terrorists, including how State's global assets can contribute to the accumulation and integration of the detailed information necessary for targeted dissuasion, deterrence and coercion, and to coherent and integrated strategic communications for these purposes. This should be completed in conjunction with the Diplomatic Strategy to Combat WMD Terrorism. These efforts should draw on interagency expertise in order to leverage and enlist cooperative activity across the interagency.

SECTION II: BUILDING INTERNATIONAL COALITIONS TO COMBAT WMD TERRORISM

TOR TASK #1: Review Current and Projected WMD Threats

At the outset, it is important to make a distinction between the three types of WMD. Chemical weapons (CW) can kill large numbers of people and can cause economic havoc, but it is relatively easy to mitigate their effects, and the devastation they can cause is likely to be much less than that of biological weapons (BW) and, particularly, nuclear weapons. BW, depending on the type of agent involved, can cause many more deaths and have more lasting economic effects than CW. Capable terrorists can produce CW and BW. As the Japanese terrorist group Aum Shinrikyo proved, some types of CW and BW are relatively easy to develop technologically and are not costly. Also, several states that are known to be in possession of these weapons, arms control treaties notwithstanding, could supply CW or BW to terrorists. In the future, we can expect that more terrorists will acquire CW and BW, if they have not already done so.

In comparison to CW and BW, nuclear weapons, and particularly the special nuclear materials they require, are extremely difficult and expensive to develop. A terrorist group might be able to steal a nuclear weapon, or be given or sold one by a possessor state. Alternatively, it might even be able to steal, buy, or otherwise receive special nuclear materials from which it might make a nuclear device.

Radiation dispersal devices (RDDs) use conventional explosives to spread radioactive materials. They can contaminate property, resulting in economic costs (not only for clean-up, but also denial of use until clean up is completed) and psychological setback. However, these weapons are not weapons of mass destruction and do not pose the same threat as a nuclear weapon.

The risk that terrorists may acquire a nuclear weapon is grave. In the past, there has been great worry that a weapon might be obtained from entrepreneurial, disgruntled or careless Russians. That threat has faded to some degree with the increased controls over Russian nuclear capabilities. Today, there is increasing concern that Iran will acquire weapons and supply them to its proxy terrorists, that North Korea will supply them to terrorists, or that a country currently in possession of nuclear weapons will become so destabilized that control of its nuclear weapons will be lost.

Terrorists have attempted to acquire WMD, particularly CW and BW. But, the ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have significantly reduced the capabilities of al Qaeda and other terrorists to conduct operations against the U.S. and its allies to-date. At the same time, we expect that extremists will continue to organize and present threats to the U.S. and its allies well into the future. In the case of the Middle East, the continuing expansion of Iranian influence since the fall of Saddam and the election of Ahmadinejad will feed further terrorist organization and activity. Dealing with the source of WMD is the single best way that the U.S. can prevent WMD terrorism because the terrorists themselves will be difficult to dissuade or deter.

TOR TASK #2: Assess the Effectiveness of Current Efforts to Build International Support for, and Coordination of, WMD Counter-Terrorism Activities

International support for U.S. counter-terrorism policies and activities has been excellent in some cases, but weak in others. An example of where the US worked effectively with the international community to address the WMD terrorism threat was the unanimous passage of UNSCR 1540 that requires states to enact legislation that criminalizes proliferation activities. The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), which focuses on interdiction of WMD-related shipments, is another example of success. Over 70 nations participate in PSI activities and dozens of interventions have occurred, including one that led to unraveling of the A.Q. Khan proliferation network and Libya's decision to give up WMD. Two other initiatives that have garnered significant international participation are the Container Security Initiative and the Megaports Initiative. A fourth initiative, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, has gotten off to a good start and holds great promise. Begun in 2006, this group already has 13 partner nations and is moving forward on exercises and other cooperation.

Other efforts have not been so successful. International support for efforts to deal with Iran and North Korea has been difficult to muster. In the case of North Korea, South Korea has not supported taking a harder line, despite the fact that years of taking a soft position have failed. China, although it denounced North Korea's nuclear test, has tended to take a middle road in trying to influence Pyongyang's behavior and has indicated it is unwilling to apply sanctions in retaliation for the test.

In the case of Iran, European partners shy away from dealing firmly even though their own efforts to offer Iran carrots instead of sticks have been an abject failure. Middle Eastern countries, particularly those that border Iran, should have a direct interest in curtailing Iran's nuclear ambitions. Not only are they unwilling to oppose Iran's nuclear activities, they talk of matching Iran's efforts.

In South Korea, Europe, and the Middle East, the governments are not out-of-step with their peoples. Opinion polls show that publics there do not share the depth of U.S. concern about Iranian and North Korean proliferation. In some cases, publics indicate greater concern over U.S. reactions to these proliferation threats than to the proliferation itself.

Why are some efforts to muster international support for counter-terrorism more successful than others? A central obstacle to garnering support is the reticence of nations to undertake punitive action against any other state. When the objective of a coalition is more general—such as interdicting *any* illegal WMD shipment or enhancing nuclear security on facilities *everywhere*—there is more cooperation. If a specific nation is the target of a coalition, then fewer nations are likely to want to be party to it. The issue of sanctions provides an instructive example.

The U.S. has sought, with minimal success, to organize international coalitions to cajole or coerce Iran to give up its WMD programs. The most potent diplomatic tool, perhaps, would be sanctions. Yet, nations are unwilling to apply strong sanctions against Iran for several reasons. One basic reason is that Iran has something that they want, oil. Iran has the 5th largest oil reserves in the world—approximately 100 billion barrels—and currently produces about 4 million barrels/day. Europe, Russia, Japan, and China have multi-billion-dollar energy deals with Iran. If they participate in sanctions against Iran, their investments and their energy supplies will be at risk.

Another reason that nations are reticent to join the U.S. in a coalition to sway Iran and North Korea is that they do not share the U.S. perception of threat. For cooperation to work it is imperative that the U.S. successfully convey why a goal is important and why it requires the actions we want taken. Communication with allies is every bit as important as communication with those whom we want to dissuade or deter.

For the future, building coalitions with European partners is likely to become more difficult and maintaining them even harder. One complicating factor is that European birthrates are very low and immigration has been an important factor in maintaining economic growth. The pool of immigrants is mostly Muslims from the Middle East, Turkey, and North Africa. Currently, there are some 28 million Muslims residing in Europe, increasing by about 2.5 million per year. They are becoming a significant political force with which European politicians must reckon. These immigrants bring with them a decidedly anti-American stance because of U.S. support for Israel

and other actions in the Middle East. Also, given that an estimated 10-30 % of these immigrants support a radical jihad against Israel and Western interests, European politicians need to tread lightly for fear of internal instability. The change in government following the terrorist attack in Spain was clearly driven by this concern.

Additionally, China and Russia—both of which we need to make counter-terrorism work—have their own Muslim jihadist problems. Siding with the U.S., which is widely perceived as anti-Islamic, will not always be opportune for them and the easier course is to let the U.S. take the brunt of criticism.

The complex problems associated with radical Islam affect not only our abilities to create and maintain coalitions, but also, of course, are tied closely with the overall WMD terrorism threat. A principal tool being used by the Department of State in combating WMD terrorism—a coalition or initiative—could be employed to address radical Islam as well.

Recommendation 2. The Department of State should consider formulating a Global Initiative on Religious Tolerance and Moderation. States as well as groups and local governments could be invited to subscribe to its statement of principles. Fora could be held to consult with moderate Muslim leaders on key issues such as assimilation, counter-terrorism, and equality.

As the above discussion suggests, communication with allies can be critical to our ability to dissuade and deter. There will be some cases in which we may never be able to reach common ground with those from whom we want cooperation simply because they have interests or objectives that conflict directly with our own. However, in most cases, at least a degree of cooperation will be achievable, depending on the success of our communication to build shared goals, perceptions, and knowledge-base. As we discuss in greater detail below, more and better U.S. public diplomacy is essential to improving international cooperation and coalition-building.

TOR TASK #3: Identify the Most Effective Means of Securing International Cooperation and Building International Coalitions to Prevent and Respond to WMD Acquisition or Use by Terrorists, Including the Role of Formal Agreements and Combined Exercises

Even though other nations may have different priorities than the U.S. (such as valuing oil supply over nonproliferation goals) or differing perceptions of threat, it is imperative that the U.S. succeed in building effective international coalitions; we are unlikely to dissuade, deter or defeat WMD terrorism alone. In building coalitions, we should keep some key points in mind. First, coalitions shouldn't necessarily be formal structures with associated statements of principles and work programs. At times, informal cooperation, tailored to a specific, limited objective, can both better succeed and result in a more lasting relationship. Also, a proliferation of formal initiatives can result in "initiative burnout" by our partners, some of whom have only limited personnel to send to the meetings and exercises. Our measure of success should not be how many initiatives

we create and partners we sign up; it should be what work is accomplished through the partnerships we forge.

Second, we should not assume that the G-8 or traditional allies need be involved in every counter-terrorism coalition. For example, we may want to pursue WMD counter-terrorism with Black Sea states. The best way to do this might be to start, informally, with a subset that does not involve a major partner.

Third, although it may be more cumbersome, it may be better to pursue some counter-terrorism work through existing international organizations. For example, some of the work that might be pursued in the context of the Global Initiative (e.g., building regulatory oversight in countries with nuclear materials and facilities) might be better done under the International Atomic Energy Agency. This would have the added benefit that the financing for the training or exercises would be internationalized.

Fourth, spending financial and diplomatic resources on reducing the threat of RDDs does not necessarily reduce the threat of catastrophic WMD terrorism. Indeed, one could question, for example, whether several initiatives on ports and container security that are expensive and time-consuming are likely to have much impact on the high-consequence threats of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. An evaluation of the effectiveness of these strategies in addressing the WMD threat should be undertaken to determine what funding levels, resource allocation, and priority is warranted.

Some measures that might make our international coalitions and cooperative efforts more successful are suggested below.

Widening Bases of Coalitions. Although there are exceptions, the U.S. turns less frequently to regional states (e.g., in Africa, Latin America, South and Southeast Asia) for support on counter-terrorism and nonproliferation. This is partly because the dominant WMD proliferation problems are in the Middle East and North Asia. Also, to some extent, the U.S. tends to focus on like-minded states and those whose participation is most essential.

Nations in these other regions should be included, however. One reason is that they can wield influence in the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and other international fora. A second reason is that we should have long-range vision; the next proliferation challenge or WMD terrorist threat could emerge from one of these regions. By engaging these nations in counter-terrorism efforts now, we heighten their awareness of the problems and help build their capabilities to fight terrorism. Thirdly, these states often have greater access and rapport with those whom we wish to dissuade. It is therefore likely that U.S. nonproliferation and counter-terrorism efforts will be more successful if they involve an ever-wider set of nations.

An excellent example where broadening the participation would be useful is the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism (GI). The 13 GI partner nations do not include some of the nations that would be highly useful partners—those which would not only have much to offer, but which would greatly benefit by participation. For example, Pakistan and India should be invited to join, as should South Korea.

Recommendation 3. The Department of State should engage nations in *all geographic regions* in formal and informal cooperative efforts to combat WMD terrorism. In particular, countries integral to WMD counter-terrorism should be invited to join the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. In some important cases, informal and non-public participation by key states may be preferable to joining formal initiatives.

Public Diplomacy. One of the most important obstacles to securing international cooperation or building coalitions is low or negative public support abroad. In some cases, governments may be willing to help the U.S., but feel that they cannot because of likely adverse public reaction. In others, governments themselves do not share the same set of values and objectives that would prompt them to participate in U.S.-led nonproliferation and counter-terrorism efforts. The jobs of gaining international cooperation and building coalitions would be easier if U.S. public diplomacy—the communication of U.S. policies, perceptions, values, facts, and intent to foreign publics and elites—were more effective.

The U.S. public diplomacy task is made more difficult by the fact that others have recognized the value of having public opinion on one's side. For example, Iranian President Ahmadinejad visited numerous foreign capitals of Muslim nations, and has even appeared on *60 Minutes*, to drum up support for Iran's position that its nuclear program is peaceful. He achieved a fair measure of success abroad; a number of high-level statements of support were issued and his arguments, in detail, were repeated in the news media.

State Department public diplomacy resources are underutilized in the campaign to achieve U.S. nonproliferation and counter-terrorism policy goals. To some extent, adversaries like al Qaeda have shown a greater capacity for using the Internet, distributing influential DVDs, and using audio media than has the U.S. This must change if we are to accomplish our goals.

Good public diplomacy doesn't just happen; it is the product of intensive planning and effective use of a host of media. Those experts who are responsible for public diplomacy must understand very, very well the audience, the message, the means available to deliver the message, and must have metrics to gauge the success of message delivery. If public diplomacy isn't working, then new or different techniques must be brought into play to improve it (e.g., red team-blue team exercises, tabletop exercises, trial runs, focus groups, etc.).

Clearly, the U.S. is not winning the hearts and minds of most foreign audiences regarding proliferation in Iran and North Korea or, on the subject of WMD counter-terrorism. And, we are failing to appeal to moderate Muslims as a counter to the growing threat of radical Islam. U.S. public diplomacy needs to be more creative, responsive, and pro-active.

Recommendation 4. Public diplomacy related to WMD terrorism should be expanded and strengthened. Some steps that should be considered are:

- A. A clear plan is being implemented to guide U.S. public diplomacy efforts related to proliferation in Iran. A similar plan to that for Iran should be developed for the North Korea proliferation problem. Responsibility for the plan should be

assigned and a working group for implementation set up.

- B. The focus of U.S. public diplomacy regarding nonproliferation and counter-terrorism, which has been on Europe and like-minded nations, should be broadened both in terms of countries and arenas of engagement. Countries neighboring countries of concern should be targeted specifically, as should Muslim nations².
- C. The Department of State, in coordination with the Department of Defense, should actively incorporate the U.S. deterrent posture into public diplomacy.
- D. Radio Farda and Radio Sawa should develop significantly more programming on nonproliferation and why WMD programs are a threat to all. Review of progress should be by an appropriate interagency working group.
- E. Increasingly, people receive news and information via the Internet, DVD, text-messaging, etc. The U.S. public diplomacy effort should utilize these media. For example, the U.S. should establish more local-language chat rooms and should update information pages much more frequently.
- F. U.S. officials responsible for nonproliferation and counter-terrorism policies should regularly give briefings and policy perspectives at, for example, the Foreign Press Center and to Radios Sawa and Farda.

Top-Level Guidance. Documentation that conveys U.S. goals and intent can play an important role in recruiting others to join coalitions. Additionally, it can guide those who have the job of making our public diplomacy effective. A good example of such top-level guidance is the National Military Strategy for Combating WMD.

Top-level guidance on WMD counter-terrorism, a draft of which is in a very preliminary stage, should address all six objectives contained in the President's *Strategy for Winning the War on Terror*, including a prioritization of our diplomatic and policy efforts. Specifically, it should provide guidance on how we will respond to terrorists' threats or use of WMD.

We urge that the following three key points be considered for inclusion in the guidance. First, the U.S. response to WMD terrorism will be broad: we will retaliate against any person, group, or state that has aided or abetted the attacker(s), wittingly or unwittingly. Second, there should be provision for the policy being shared; any country that wishes to subscribe to our policy in advance should be welcomed. Third, we should extend deterrence against WMD terrorist attacks to our allies explicitly.

² One Board Member believes that U.S. efforts should include an enhanced set of cooperative activities in education as well as Science and Technology (S&T) in addition to traditional areas of diplomatic effort dealing with nonproliferation and counter-terrorism.

Recommendation 5. The Department of State should establish a working group to develop a publicly releasable Diplomatic Strategy for Combating WMD Terrorism. It should clearly address how the U.S. will respond to terrorists' threats or use of WMD. Results should be presented to the Secretary within 60 days.

Formal Agreements. In combating terrorism, formal agreements with international partners can be of use in a host of ways—interdiction of supplies, control of financial transactions, capture and extradition, etc. Not only do such agreements facilitate action, they also increase other nations' understanding of U.S. concerns and goals. At present, however, the U.S. focus is primarily on the supplier, not the buyer. That is, we seek agreements mostly with those nations that can play a role in restricting the flow of technology, materials, or weaponry. Formal agreements with potential proliferants can also be of great use. For example, there may be additional states that would forgo seeking WMD if they were protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

Recommendation 6. The Department of State should task an existing or new organizational unit with reviewing what role security assurances might play in reducing the motivations of some states to acquire WMD, with specific reference to the Middle East.

Often, coalitions are cumbersome means to an end that could be better achieved by short, tailored formal agreements. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), for example, don't require the extensive clearance processes that would be necessary for legally binding agreement. MOUs can facilitate international cooperation by providing for the exchange of points-of-contact, training exercises, and procedures for enabling technical assistance.

Recommendation 7. The Department of State should consider expanding the use of Memoranda of Understanding to strengthen targeted cooperation and coalition-building on high-priority WMD counter-terrorism activities.

Exercises And Training. Most U.S. initiatives on WMD counter-terrorism focus on training and exercises as means of beefing up security around WMD-related materials and facilities, preparing partner nations to respond to WMD events, and enabling prosecution of terrorists. For example, the Biosecurity Engagement Program is helping to build biological threat reduction activities such as lab pathogen security and biosafety infrastructure upgrades. Similar efforts are underway regarding nuclear, chemical, and radiological technologies. A host of U.S. agencies are involved in these exercises and they, overall, appear productive. It is important to keep in mind, however, that many nations do not have the breadth of bureaucracy and personnel as is found among the G8 countries. The exercises and training that are most important for a given country should be carefully prioritized.

A disincentive for potential coalition partners to participate in exercises or other projects is cost. Although the U.S. intends that the funding burden be shared, the willingness of others to

participate may diminish as the costs they are asked to pay increase. The U.S. should take care to assure appropriate international funding prior to undertaking new training and exercises. This is of particular concern with regard to the Global Initiative, which has the objective of involving private sector entities.

For example, one of the most important contributors to the Global Initiative will be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In particular, the NRC can help non-G8 countries with information and procedures on how to protect their civilian nuclear materials and facilities. Because it is likely that the NRC's services will be in much demand by GI member countries, it is important to determine in advance how these services will be paid for. Unlike other US Government agencies, the NRC is required by law to recover most of its budget each year through fees to licensees and applicants. It would be both unfair and irregular to expect these entities to fund education and collaborative efforts abroad.

TOR TASK #4: Identify the Elements of a Targeted Public-Private Outreach Strategy to Industries whose Cooperation is Essential to Combating WMD Terrorism

There is no more dangerous threat than terrorists with nuclear weapons. As no terrorist group is likely to be able to enrich uranium or reprocess plutonium, the most likely source for such weapons materials would be a state in possession of fuel cycle capabilities. There is no question that nuclear power is a global necessity, so nations will continue to build new nuclear power plants. It is therefore imperative that there be secure, economical fuel supplies for these reactors and that enrichment and reprocessing be restricted to the nations that have historically performed these services. In this context, we would like to reinforce our recommendation made in our *Report on the Review of the 2002 National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Namely, we strongly encourage immediate action to assure that the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership receive the priority and funding to advance at the fastest possible pace.

Private Involvement in the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. In July 2006, Presidents Bush and Putin announced the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism to expand and accelerate our individual and collective partnership capacity to combat nuclear terrorism. Since then, thirteen partner nations, as well as the IAEA have joined the effort. However, national governments lack substantial control over privately owned or operated ports, airports, or financial institutions; large metropolitan area governments; and many civilian nuclear facility operators through which nuclear terrorist threats and resources are likely to pass or against which they are likely to be targeted. As the 9/11 Commission made clear, terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda seek to exploit such gaps between national government will and capabilities at the local and private sector level. City governments and private sector entities, such as nuclear power operators and financial institutions, share a strong common interest in seeing the Global Initiative succeed, and they can and will be galvanized to act if invited to do so.

Recommendation 8. The Department of State should seek to accelerate public endorsement of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism by local governments and private sector entities, especially those in a position to support and contribute to the activities of the Initiative.

Private Involvement in Countering Bio-Chemical Terrorism. The President's WMD Commission (Robb-Silberman Commission) highlighted the growing global threat we face from biological and chemical weapons (CBW) in the hands of terrorists. As noted above, the relative simplicity of the technologies to produce CBW, together with the dual-use nature of the requisite materials and equipment needed to produce CBW, make it impossible to counter CBW terrorism through technology controls.

To combat this complex and diffuse threat, the WMD Commission advocated a closer role between government and the private sector. Although several programs are underway to reach out to U.S. private sector, no focused international outreach effort exists to galvanize the international private sector or local governments of willing partner nations to work together against the bio-chemical terrorist threat.

A good example of outreach to the private sector is the U.S. Department of Justice Chemical and Biological Outreach Program, which helps suppliers, distributors, and manufacturers nationwide become aware of the risks of CW and BW terrorism. It provides them with information such as checklists of materials to keep special tabs on and guidance on what information can guide law enforcement in counter-terrorism.

Recommendation 9. The Department of State should consider establishing a global public-private partnership to reduce the risk of bio-chemical terrorism. A central element of this new partnership initiative could entail partner nations gaining the public endorsement of and adherence to a voluntary code of management best practices by willing private sector entities and local governments.

Private Involvement in WMD Terrorism Insurance. In passing the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act of 2005, Congress and the President recognized the unique challenge associated with developing a private insurance market to help mitigate the risks of WMD terrorism and protect our citizens and economy from such risks. The 2005 law called on the President's Working Group on Financial Markets to examine the availability and affordability of WMD terrorism insurance, on which it recently issued an inconclusive report.

Private industry has begun to respond to the need for WMD terrorism insurance. Recently a London-based transport insurer announced that in 2007 it will make WMD and RDD coverage available for physical loss, business interruption and liabilities, and will be applicable in incidents involving both actual damage as well as trade disruption.

While U.S. law acknowledges the relationship between insurance and the mitigation of catastrophic WMD terrorism risks, there has been no systematic effort to examine the

appropriate role of international insurance markets in mitigating global WMD terrorism risks and the kinds of laws, regulations, and agreements that would enable such a role. The pace of economic globalization as well as the limited federal government resources available to allocate to incremental security measures that might otherwise be borne by the private sector has made such an examination increasingly urgent.

Recommendation 10. The Department of State should consider establishing an interagency working group to examine the relationship between international insurance markets and WMD terrorism risk and to consider appropriate reforms to laws, regulations, agreements, and conventions to strengthen private insurance markets' role in mitigating catastrophic terrorism risk. This working group should include national security, economic, legal, and technical experts and should report its recommendations within 90 days.

Appendix A – Summary of Recommendations

The recommendations contained in this report can be grouped into five categories: (1) Building the Methodology; (2) Enhance and Improve Communications; (3) Expand the Set of Coalition Partners; (4) Engage Muslims Specifically; and (5) Try New Approaches. These categories can be used to develop priorities for implementation of the recommendations and to identify how the recommendations collectively reinforce and interact with each other. Some recommendations contribute to two categories and therefore are listed twice below.

Building the Methodology

Recommendation 1. The Department of State should establish a Task Force to prepare a Framework for Combating WMD Terrorism. It should identify the appropriate parameters of the State Department's role in deterring, dissuading and coercing terrorists, including how State's global assets can contribute to the accumulation and integration of the detailed information necessary for targeted dissuasion, deterrence and coercion, and to coherent and integrated strategic communications for these purposes. This should be completed in conjunction with the Diplomatic Strategy to Combat WMD Terrorism. These efforts should draw on interagency expertise in order to leverage and enlist cooperative activity across the interagency.

Enhance and Improve Communications

Recommendation 4. Public diplomacy related to WMD terrorism should be expanded and strengthened. Some steps that should be considered are:

- A. A clear plan is being implemented to guide U.S. public diplomacy efforts related to proliferation in Iran. A similar plan to that for Iran should be developed for the North Korea proliferation problem. Responsibility for the plan should be assigned and a working group for implementation set up.
- B. The focus of the U.S. public diplomacy regarding nonproliferation and counter-terrorism, which has been on Europe and like-minded nations, should be broadened both in terms of countries and arenas of engagement. Countries neighboring countries of concern should be targeted specifically, as should Muslim nations³.
- C. The Department of State, in coordination with the Department of Defense, should actively incorporate the U.S. deterrent posture into public diplomacy.
- D. Radio Farda and Radio Sawa should develop significantly more programming on nonproliferation and why WMD programs are a threat to all. Review of progress should be by an appropriate interagency working group.

³ One Board Member believes that U.S. efforts should include an enhanced set of cooperative activities in education as well as Science and Technology (S&T) in addition to traditional areas of diplomatic effort dealing with nonproliferation and counter-terrorism.

- E. Increasingly, people receive news and information via the Internet, DVD, text-messaging, etc. The U.S. public diplomacy effort should utilize these media. For example, the U.S. should establish more local-language chat rooms and should update information pages much more frequently.
- F. U.S. officials responsible for nonproliferation and counter-terrorism policies should regularly give briefings and policy perspectives at, for example, the Foreign Press Center and to Radios Sawa and Farda.
(also contributes to: Engage Muslims Specifically)

Recommendation 5. The Department of State should establish a working group to develop a publicly releasable Diplomatic Strategy for Combating WMD Terrorism. It should clearly address how the U.S. will respond to terrorists' threats or use of WMD. Results should be presented to the Secretary within 60 days.

Expand the Set of Coalition Partners

Recommendation 3. The Department of State should engage nations *in all geographic regions* in formal and informal cooperative efforts to combat WMD terrorism. In particular, countries integral to WMD counter-terrorism should be invited to join the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. In some important cases, informal and non-public participation by key states may be preferable to joining formal initiatives. (also contributes to: Engage Muslims Specifically)

Recommendation 8. The Department of State should seek to accelerate public endorsement of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism by local governments and private sector entities, especially those in a position to support and contribute to the activities of the Initiative. (also contributes to: Try New Approaches)

Recommendation 9. The Department of State should consider establishing a global public-private partnership to reduce the risk of bio-chemical terrorism. A central element of this new partnership initiative could entail partner nations gaining the public endorsement of and adherence to a voluntary code of management best practices by willing private sector entities and local governments. (also contributes to: Try New Approaches)

Recommendation 10. The Department of State should consider establishing an interagency working group to examine the relationship between international insurance markets and WMD terrorism risk and to consider appropriate reforms to laws, regulations, agreements, and conventions to strengthen private insurance markets' role in mitigating catastrophic terrorism risk. This working group should include national security, economic, legal, and technical experts and should report its recommendations within 90 days.

Engage Muslims Specifically

Recommendation 2. The Department of State should consider formulating a Global Initiative on Religious Tolerance and Moderation. States as well as groups and local governments could be invited to subscribe to its statement of principles. Fora could be held to consult with moderate Muslim leaders on key issues such as assimilation, counter-terrorism, and equality. (also contributes to: Try New Approaches)

Recommendation 3. The Department of State should engage nations *in all geographic regions* in formal and informal cooperative efforts to combat WMD terrorism. In particular, countries integral to WMD counter-terrorism should be invited to join the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. In some important cases, informal and non-public participation by key states may be preferable to joining formal initiatives. (also contributes to: Expand the Set of Coalition Partners)

Recommendation 4. Public diplomacy related to WMD terrorism should be expanded and strengthened. Some steps that should be considered are:

- A. A clear plan is being implemented to guide U.S. public diplomacy efforts related to proliferation in Iran. A similar plan to that for Iran should be developed for the North Korea proliferation problem. Responsibility for the plan should be assigned and a working group for implementation set up.
- B. The focus of the U.S. public diplomacy regarding nonproliferation and counter-terrorism, which has been on Europe and like-minded nations, should be broadened both in terms of countries and arenas of engagement. Countries neighboring countries of concern should be targeted specifically, as should Muslim nations⁴.
- C. The Department of State, in coordination with the Department of Defense, should actively incorporate the U.S. deterrent posture into public diplomacy.
- D. Radio Farda and Radio Sawa should develop significantly more programming on nonproliferation and why WMD programs are a threat to all. Review of progress should be by an appropriate interagency working group.
- E. Increasingly, people receive news and information via the Internet, DVD, text-messaging, etc. The U.S. public diplomacy effort should utilize these media. For example, the U.S. should establish more local-language chat rooms and should update information pages much more frequently.
- F. U.S. officials responsible for nonproliferation and counter-terrorism policies should regularly give briefings and policy perspectives at, for example, the Foreign Press Center and to Radios Sawa and Farda.
(also contributes to: Enhance and Improve Communications)

⁴ One Board Member believes that U.S. efforts should include an enhanced set of cooperative activities in education as well as Science and Technology (S&T) in addition to traditional areas of diplomatic effort dealing with nonproliferation and counter-terrorism.

Recommendation 6. The Department of State should task an existing or new organizational unit with reviewing what role security assurances might play in reducing the motivations of some states to acquire WMD, with specific reference to the Middle East.

Try New Approaches

Recommendation 2. The Department of State should consider formulating a Global Initiative on Religious Tolerance and Moderation. States as well as groups and local governments could be invited to subscribe to its statement of principles. Fora could be held to consult with moderate Muslim leaders on key issues such as assimilation, counter-terrorism, and equality. (also contributes to: Engage Muslims Directly)

Recommendation 7. The Department of State should consider expanding the use of Memoranda of Understanding to strengthen targeted cooperation and coalition-building on high-priority WMD counter-terrorism activities.

Recommendation 8. The Department of State should seek to accelerate public endorsement of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism by local governments and private sector entities, especially those in a position to support and contribute to the activities of the Initiative. (also contributes to: Expand the Set of Coalition Partners)

Recommendation 9. The Department of State should consider establishing a global public-private partnership to reduce the risk of bio-chemical terrorism. A central element of this new partnership initiative could entail partner nations gaining the public endorsement of and adherence to a voluntary code of management best practices by willing private sector entities and local governments. (also contributes to: Expand the Set of Coalition Partners)

Appendix B - Terms of Reference

**UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
WASHINGTON**

March 14, 2006

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHAIRMAN, ARMS CONTROL AND
NONPROLIFERATION ADVISORY BOARD (ACNAB)**

**SUBJECT: Terms of Reference – ACNAB Study on Building International
Coalitions to Combat WMD Terrorism**

The ACNAB is requested to undertake a study on building international coalitions to combat weapons of mass destruction (WMD) terrorism.

The events of 9/11 demonstrated graphically the extent of the terrorist threat against the United States. The international reach of terrorist groups requires a coordinated, international effort to fight terrorism. Terrorists are increasingly interested in developing or acquiring WMD. It is believed that these groups will use such weapons if they are successful in obtaining them. The United States is undertaking efforts to build international coalitions to fight WMD terrorism, but more can and should be done to enhance these efforts.

It would be of great assistance if the ACNAB examination of U.S. efforts to build international coalitions to combat WMD terrorism could:

- Review current and projected WMD terrorist threats;
- Assess the effectiveness of current efforts in building international support for, and coordination of, WMD counter-terrorism activities;
- Identify the most effective means of securing international cooperation and building international coalitions to prevent and respond to WMD acquisition or use by terrorists, including the role of formal agreements and combined exercises; and
- Identify the elements of a targeted public-private outreach strategy to industries whose cooperation is essential to combating WMD terrorism (e.g. inter-modal transport, insurance, financial services, nuclear power utilities, internet/ISPs, biotech).

This study should be completed in 180 days. Completed work should be submitted to the office of the ACNAB Executive Directorate no later than October 1, 2006.

The Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security will sponsor the study. The Office of WMD Terrorism will support the study. Major Christopher Byrom will serve as the Executive Secretary for the study and Matthew Zartman will represent the ACNAB Executive Directorate.

The study will operate in accordance with the provisions of P.L. 92-463, the "Federal Advisory Board Committee Act."

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Joseph". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Robert G. Joseph

Appendix C - Members and Project Staff

Board Members

Senator Fred Thompson (Chairman)

Dr. Michael R. Anastasio

Dr. Kathleen Bailey

Dr. Ashton B. Carter

Ms. Alison B. Fortier

Dr. William Graham

Mr. Mitchel B. Kugler

Dr. Ronald F. Lehman

VADM Robert Monroe, USN (ret.)

Dr. Gordon Oehler

Dr. Keith B. Payne

Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff

Senator Charles Robb

Dr. C. Paul Robinson

Dr. Amy Sands

Dr. James Schlesinger

Dr. William Schneider

Dr. William Van Cleave

Mr. James Woolsey

Task Force Members

Senator Charles Robb (Chairman)

Dr. Kathleen Bailey

Dr. Gordon Oehler

Dr. Keith B. Payne

Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff

Dr. Amy Sands

Dr. William Schneider

Project Staff

Dr. George Look
Executive Director, ISAB

Maj. Chris Byrom, USAF
Executive Secretary

Mr. Matthew Zartman
Deputy Executive Director,
ISAB

Mr. Brandon Buttrick
Deputy Director, Office of
Strategic Planning and Outreach
(SPO), DOS

Ms. Thelma Jenkins-
Anthony
Executive Assistant

Ms. M. Wendy Reid
Mr. Gonzalo Suarez
SAIC Senior Analysts

Appendix D - Individuals Consulted by the Task Force

Persons Consulted in Task Force Meetings

May 10, 2006

Mr. David Conway	Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Weapons Expert, Office of Weapons Tactics and Training, Directorate of Intelligence, National Counterterrorism Center
Mr. Doug Humphries	Director, Office of Weapons Tactics and Training, Directorate of Intelligence, National Counterterrorism Center
Carol Burans	Director, Strategic and Operational Planning, National Counterterrorism Center
Mr. Mike Hutton	Strategic and Operational Planning Directorate, National Counterterrorism Center
Mr. Jason Herring	Strategy and Evaluation Directorate, National Counterproliferation Center
Dr. Carol Linden	Senior Scientist, Directorate for Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security
Thomas Lehrman	Director, Office of Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism, Department of State

June 16, 2006

Mr. Rolf Mowatt-Larssen	Director of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, Department of Energy
Mr. Stephen DeAngelis	President and CEO, Enterra Solutions, LLC

July 06, 2006

Mr. Edward Salazar	Secretary's Office for Counter-Terrorism (S/CT), Department of State
--------------------	--

Other Persons Consulted by Task Force Members

June - December 2006

Dr. Shmuel Bar	Director of Studies, Institute of Policy and Strategy, Herzliya, Israel
Mr. Bernard P. Bogdan, Jr.	Intelligence Operations Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Joyce L. Connery	Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, National Nuclear Security Administration
Mike Evenson	Director, Operations Enterprises, Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Patrick Heffernan	Department of Treasury
Stephanie E. Lenzenweger	Program Manager, Chemical Counterterrorism Team, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Vahid Majidi	Assistant Director, Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Ambassador David Miller	Independent Advisor
Jeff Muller	Unit Chief, WMD Countermeasures Unit, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Linh Nguyen	Counterproliferation Initiatives Unit, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Robert M. Scripp	Bioterrorism Program Manager, Counterterrorism Directorate, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Mark Shaffer	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
William Tobey	National Nuclear Security Agency
Thomas Whalen	WMD National Preparedness, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Mark Wittrock	Senior Advisor, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, Department of Energy (DOE)