FW: Report Summary

To:

Inspection Team Leader Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons Johan de Wittlaan 32 ,2517 JR The Hague , Netherlands

Tel.:

+31 (0) 70 416

Email:

@opcw.org



Working Together for a World Free of Chemical Weapons

From:	.						
Sent: 05	July 2018	3 13:37					
To: Sami Barrek <sami.barrek@opcw.org>;</sami.barrek@opcw.org>							،@opcw.org>
<1	 @o	pcw.org>;	1	• •	^¹		·o@opcw.org>
	<j< td=""><td>່ n@opcw.org>; /</td><td>··· <ē</td><td></td><td colspan="3">pcw.org></td></j<>	່ n@opcw.org>; /	··· <ē		pcw.org>		
Subject:	RE: Repo	rt Summary				19000	

Maybe you're right. What about then removing "trace". Or some other wording may work?

For me the main worry is the free-standing sentence *chlorine-containing compounds were detected.* Implicit within that statement are:

- 1. the investigation is (currently) all about chlorine
- 2. chlorine was searched for
- 3. chlorine was found (political/media readers will not discriminate between chlorine and chlorine-containing compounds)
- 4. therefore, because they were found (the "were detected") that's a conclusion.

It's because the stakes are so high that we have a repsonsibility to guard against misrepresentation, by both sides.

Hope this helps.

Regards,

Subject: RE: Report Summary

101

1/5

Thank you for this positive initiative Trace levels and ppb are the same From: Sent: 05 July 2018 12:37 To: Sami Barrek: Subject: RE: Report Summary Hi Sami, I'm hoping it's worth still tryng to reach a compromise within the team. I am still worried that a stock-standard phrase such as "chlorine-containing compounds were detected" (or similar) present the danger of it being misrepresented as a damning conclusion. There needs to be relevance to why that phrase is significant, in particular, at the very least for example, the comparison against a background sample of the same matrix. All we have now is the concentration at ppb that provides the needed context. However, if reporting that ppb statement is seen to be tending towrads the danger of being misrepresented by the other side of readers, is there a neutral version? For example, "the team is conducting further work and sample analysis to assess the significance of trace levels of chlorine-containing compounds" or similar. you may disagree with this approach, so please let us know your views. But I'd like to se if we can compromise. Sami I know you've got the worst job of being stuck in the middle so it's further headache for you, so please be patient. As we saw the other day, there are pressures and expectations from all sides. It's a political wordsmithing situation, not purely technical. Cheers, From: Sami Barrek Sent: 05 July 2018 12:04 To: __@opcw.org>; @opcw.org>; <u>v.org</u>>; @opcw.org>; 1@opcw.org>; A Subject: RE: Report Summary I concidered inputs from all team members; I have the support of most team members. I would like to remind you that I can take unilateral decisions, nonetheless I try to take into account inputs from everyone when possible. From: Sent: 05 July 2018 11:40 To: Sami Barrek < sami.barrek@opcw.org < mailto:sami.barrek@opcw.org >>; <u>@opcw.org<mailto:i</u> ົ<u>າກ</u> <u>ົາເ</u>g>>; ໄ @opcw.org< i@opcw.org>>; @opcw.org<mailto: @opcw.org>>; j

Can we take it then that you are unilaterally deciding to remove this fact from the report against the recommendations of the team ?

Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons Johan de Wittlaan 32 ,2517 JR The Hague , Netherlands

<u>1@opcw.org>>;</u>

@opcw.org>>

Tel.: +31 (0) 70 416

Email:

lir ----/mail/se

@opcw.org<mailto:

en@opcw.org<mailto:j

<u>elli@opcw.org<mailto:a</u>

Subject: RE: Report Summary

@opcw.org>

Working Together for a World Free of Chemical Weapons

From: Sami Barrek Sent: 05 July 2018 11:37 To: n@opcw.org<mailto:ian. @opcw.org>>; < 1@opcw.org<mailto: pcw.org>>; 1@opcw.org<mailto: opcw.org>>; 2ro@opcw.org<mailto:</pre> ro@opcw.org>>; <u>டூopcw.org<mailto:</u> JOPCW.org>> 'lali@opcw.org<mailto:a i@opcw.org>> Subject: RE: Report Summary Thank you all for your emails I think we should keep the same level of details everywhere in the interim report. There are also other very important facts that we decided not to release in this interim report. Best regards From: Sent: 05 July 2018 10:44 To: Sami Barrek < sami.barrek@opcw.org < mailto:sami.barrek@opcw.org >>; @opcw.org<mailto: Dopcw.org>>; Dopcw.org<mailto:ilija. i@opcw.org>>; < ro@opcw.org<mailto:r <u>~o@opcw.org</u>>>; J <; n@opcw.org<mailto.,___ _pcw.org>>; @opcw.org<mailto:a w.org>> Subject: RE: Report Summary Morning Sami,

Isn't there a danger that leaving out the reference to concentration, is going to allow some readers to arrive at a simplistic conclusion. Presence of chlorine/chlorides "therefore it was an attack". The ppb concentrations is what qualifies the subsequent statement that we need to figure out whether these levels have any real relevance. The other thing is relating the ppb concentrations to a background level in similar matrices in a nearby non-incident affected location. Do we have this?

Anyway, I think it would be a mistake to leave out the ppb concentration qualifier. If we get higher results in later analyses that would be reported as a new fact.

Regards,

From: Sami Barrek Sent: 05 July 2018 09:26 To: opcw.org<mailto <u>@opcw.org>>;</u> . on@opcw.org<mailto:i <u>`pcw.org>>;</u>| @opcw.org<mailto:il <u>opcw.org</u>>>; ۱ @opcw.org<mailto: <u>'o@opcw.org</u>>>; ! 1@opcw.org<mailto: @opcw.org>>; A .@opcw.org<mailto:a w.org>> Subject: RE: Report Summary

Good morning,

After reflecting on the second to last sentence in par 2.5, I decided to remove the detail we discussed 2 days ago about the concentration, especially that the next sentence covers the idea. Best regards

...-101011/1/100...

FIUIL
Sent: 04 July 2018 10:38
To: Sami Barrek < <u>sami.barrek@opcw.org<mailto< u="">:sami<u>.barrek@opcw.org</u>>>; I</mailto<></u>
<u>@opcw.org<mailto:i< u=""></mailto:i<></u> pcw.org>>;
<, @opcw.org <mailto:@opcw.org>>; tt</mailto:@opcw.org>
<u>aro@opcw.org<mailto:r< u=""> <u>@opcw.org>>; leff N</u></mailto:r<></u>
@opcw.org <mailto: @opcw.org="">>; /</mailto:>
< li>li@opcw.org <mailto:a 3="">></mailto:a>
Subject: RE: Report Summary
Sami, so as not to understate the scope of the work remaining, can I suggest a slight change to the wording
"The FFM team needs to continue its work to draw final conclusions regarding the alleged incident and to this end the investigation is on-going".
From: Sami Barrek Sent: 04 July 2018 09:20 To: <
Subject: RE: Report Summary I will add this at the end of the summary too The FFM still needs to clarify some of the details and to this end, the investigation remains on-going
From: Sent: 04 July 2018 09:11 To:
Agree. Just one thing: Perhaps we should avoid the use of the term "possible trajectories" as that appears to already presuppose a major Newtonian-type motion, almost implying flying out of the sky, which at this stage we are not necessarily concluding. Maybe a wording similar to the body text, i.e. the "provenance"word, or "how the cylinders arrived at their final resting places".
Regards, .
From: Sent: 04 July 2018 08:36 To: Sami Barrek < sami.barrek@opcw.org <mailto:sami.barrek@opcw.org>>; n@opcw.org<mailto:ian.!< td=""></mailto:ian.!<></mailto:sami.barrek@opcw.org>

Dear all, just one further suggestion for the report. In the summary we did not include anything about the cylinders. For completeness (and mainly because nobody will read beyond the summary!)I think it important to add a few lines to say the work is on-going in this area. I propose something like:

"The FFM team visited Locations 2 & 4 where it observed the presence of an industrial gas cylinder on a top floor patio at Location 2 and a similar one lying on the bed of a top floor apartment at Location 4. Close to the spot where each cylinder was located there were crater-like openings in the respective rebar-reinforced concrete roofs. Work is on-going to assess the relative damage to the cylinders and the roofs as well as the provenance the cylinders and their possible trajectories."

Regards

Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons Johan de Wittlaan 32,2517 JR The Hague, Netherlands

Tel.: +31 (0) 70 416

ý.

Email:

1

Working Together for a World Free of Chemical Weapons

This email and any attached documents contain OPCW related information and are intended only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any use, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify immediately the sender and delete this message and any attached documents from your system. This email has been scanned for viruses upon leaving OPCW e-mail systems