THE DIRECTOR
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

14 May 2018

The Honorable Richard Burr, Chairman
Select Committee on Intelligence
United States Senate
211 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Burr:

Thank you for the Committee's letter dated 10 May 2018. As you requested, I have completed the Committee's unclassified post-hearing questions, which are enclosed. My responses to the Committee's classified post-hearing questions are being submitted under separate cover.

An original of this letter is being sent to Vice Chairman Warner.

Sincerely,

Gina C. Haspel

Gina C. Haspel
Acting Director

Enclosure

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#1-2)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) With the benefit of nearly 20 years of hindsight, and from your perspective as the nominee to be Director of the CIA, do you believe the Agency's use of "enhanced interrogation techniques" was consistent with American values? Do you believe the rendition, detention and interrogation program was a mistake?

(U) What will you do when faced with an order that, while technically legal, is contrary to your sense of moral values? If the President orders you to carry out some morally questionable program, for example, but OLC writes an opinion noting the legality of the morally questionable actions, what will you do?

Response:

(U) As Director, I would refuse to undertake any proposed activity that is contrary to my moral and ethical values. As I was able to describe in detail during the classified session, in my role as Deputy and now Acting Director, every operation I review must not only meet those high standards, the activity must also be consistent with CIA's mission, expertise, and the law. I do not and would not hesitate to reject a proposal that fails to meet this threshold. The American people have placed a great deal of trust in CIA, and we work to earn that trust every day.

(U) Over the last 17 years, the Agency and I have learned the hard lessons since 9/11. While I won't condemn those that made these hard calls, and I have noted the valuable intelligence collected, the program ultimately did damage to our officers and our standing in the world. With the benefit of hindsight and my experience as a senior Agency leader, the enhanced interrogation program is not one the CIA should have undertaken. The United States must be an example to the rest of the world, and I support that.

(U) As I stated to the Committee, it was a mistake not to brief the entire committee at the beginning. Both the Committee and the Agency shared the goal of obtaining the critical intelligence needed to thwart another attack. CIA needs to have consensus from members of the oversight committees who make decisions on behalf of the American people as their elected representatives on activities that can't be made public.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#3)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You state in your written responses to the Committee's pre-hearing questions that the CIA OIG identified cases—in addition to Khaled al-Masri—in which "similar, inaccurate legal text was used in the cable approving the al-Masri rendition" were used to justify the capture and detention of individuals. Do you believe you have responsibility for any of these flawed decisions? What steps did you take to ensure that another innocent individual would not be wrongfully rendered?

Response:

(U) I take full responsibility for all of my actions. Throughout my career, I have sought to ensure that CIA operations have been conducted professionally and in accordance with appropriate legal guidance. Even so, I have learned hard lessons through my experience in the Counterterrorism Center. One of those lessons is the need to foster a culture of questioning in the workforce in which junior officers feel comfortable challenging the process to make sure CIA's activities adhere to the highest standards.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#4)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you pledge to fully cooperate with the ongoing Russia investigations, both the committee's and that of Special Counsel Mueller?

Response:

(U) Yes.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#5)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you agree with the IC's Assessment from January 2017 that Russia interfered in the 2016 election?

Response:

(U) Yes, I agree with the conclusions of the 2017 Intelligence Community Assessment.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#6)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) We are in an increasingly precarious situation with Iran. Based on intelligence seen to date, do you believe that Iran continues to abide by its responsibilities under the JCPOA?

Response:

(U) Iran has continued to substantially meet the JCPOA commitments that the US Intelligence Community judges extend the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon from a few months to about a year. Iran has observed JCPOA limits on its centrifuges and amounts of low-enriched uranium. Iran has not pursued the original design of its heavy water research reactor and has not produced or tested fuel for the original heavy water research reactor—a key component of which it previously disabled by filling it with concrete as part of its JCPOA commitments.

(U) The JCPOA addresses Iran's nuclear program; it does not address Iran's ballistic missile program or its regional activities.

(U) Iran's desire to equip Hizballah with guided rockets, its support to the Huthis in Yemen, and its attempt to launch missiles into the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia—those are all recent and aggressive moves, some of which threaten Israeli security. It also has surged fighters and moved materiel to Lebanon and Syria to attack Israel.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#7)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) How will you guard against the politicization of intelligence?

Response:

(U) The credibility of CIA analysis—and by extension, the CIA's credibility as a whole—rests on our ability to produce timely, accurate, and objective all-source analysis that is free from bias or advocacy for any policy or operational goal. Ensuring the objectivity of CIA's analytic product is foundational to the work that we do and is deeply engrained across the Agency.

(U) As DCIA, I would seek to reinforce several of the significant steps we have taken during the last year to bolster our ability to produce objective analysis. These include increasing CIA leadership engagement on objectivity issues, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all of our officers—both analysts and collectors—in the production of objective analysis, and expanding the resources available to any officer who has an objectivity issue to raise.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#8)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Does the CIA have an affirmative obligation to speak out when intelligence assessments are being deliberately misrepresented by political actors? What is your responsibility to Congress and to the American people to correct the record? Will you commit to publicly correcting the record when you believe the IC has been misrepresented by political actors?

Response:

(U) As I stated at my confirmation hearing, it is a key part of CIA's mission to provide the most sophisticated, objective, all-source analysis to appropriately cleared policymakers, and operational actors, throughout the US Government. We do so without regard to political agendas. Our analytic tradecraft and standards are specifically designed to minimize the introduction of bias or advocacy into our products. Consistent with the protection of sources and methods, I commit to ensuring our analytic assessments are not misrepresented to the American people.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#9)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you believe it is necessary for the Director of CIA to "speak truth to power" – to tell the president the unvarnished truth, and the full best assessments of the CIA, even if these truths are unwelcome? Can you provide examples of having done this in your career?

Response:

(U) I believe it is critically important for the CIA as an organization, and most especially the Director of the CIA individually, to "speak truth to power" even if these truths are unwelcome. I have spent my life speaking truth to power. I have had frank discussions with allies and adversaries. I have delivered unwanted news to CIA Directors, Cabinet Secretaries, and the President. I have provided a more specific example in a classified addendum.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Mark Warner (#10)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Section 1.7 of EO 13256 states that "in no case shall information be classified continue to be maintained as classified, or fail to be declassified in order to...conceal violations of law, inefficiency, or administrative error" or "prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency." Do you agree with those prohibitions? Do you the think the CIA has complied with these prohibitions, and other prohibitions against lobbying, during the course of your nomination.

Response:

(U) I agree with those prohibitions and believe the CIA has complied.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Martin Heinrich (#11)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

(U) As you may know, six senators sent a letter on May 9, 2018, to Attorney General Sessions requesting greater transparency with regard to the 'Durham report,' the investigation report written by U.S. Attorney and former special prosecutor John Durham regarding the destruction of videotapes by the CIA. The letter specifically requests the Justice Department to permit all senators to review that report, since its review has been restricted to Committee members and Senate leadership.

a. You are now familiar with some aspects of the report. Given that the CIA has already made publicly available the Morell report exonerating your actions with regard to the videotapes' destruction, would you agree that before they case a vote for or against your nomination, all U.S. senators should have an opportunity to review the Durham report?

b. My colleague Senator Wyden also asked you in the hearing whether you have any objection to the public release of the Durham report. Do you?

Response:

(U) The "Durham report" is a Department of Justice document, and I therefore defer to DOJ to determine what access to this internal DOJ document may be appropriate. I have never read the report myself. I am aware that the Durham investigation closed with no charges filed. Over the years, this issue was thoroughly investigated. In the final report on the matter issued on December 20, 2011, then-Deputy Director Michael Morell found no fault in my performance and concluded that I had acted appropriately.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Martin Heinrich (#12)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Have you read the "key findings" and summary of the internal CIA review of the RDI program referred to now as the "Panetta Review?" If not, will you commit to doing so?

Response:

(U) I have not read the documents referenced in your question, which I understand refers to a series of draft documents prepared by CIA regarding the former RDI program. During my confirmation hearing, I discussed many of the important lessons learned from the program. I remain committed to ensuring that the Agency learns from and implements the lessons associated with CIA's experience with that program, and I will commit to review those documents.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Martin Heinrich (#13-14)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You testified that only one detainee appears on the videotapes that were destroyed. Please see this document from FOIA litigation referencing two detainees, one who appeared in 90 videotapes, and another who appeared in two: https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/torturefoia/released/030609/videotape_inventory.pdf. Please correct your testimony accordingly.

(U) Were there in fact two detainees who appeared on the videotapes?

Response:

(U) My understanding, which is consistent with the record (available to the Committee in a classified forum), is that there were 92 videotapes, two of which were labeled "detainee 2." The OGC attorney who reviewed those tapes in 2002 found that "there are no viewable videotapes of the interrogation of the second detainee." Therefore, when the tapes were destroyed in 2005, there was only one detainee depicted.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#15)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Would you follow a direct presidential order to waterboard a detainee? Please answer yes or no.

Response:

(U) No. Today, the law is clear, and such techniques are prohibited. Under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the United States Government may not use any interrogation technique that is not approved under the Army Field Manual 2-22.3. I fully support this change, and if confirmed as Director, I would not allow CIA to engage in the use of enhanced interrogation techniques again.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#16)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you believe in hindsight that the Enhanced Interrogation Techniques were immoral? Please answer yes or no.

Response:

(U) Please see the responses to Questions #1 and #2.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#17)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Will you recuse yourself from having any role in adjudicating declassification of your background in furtherance of your nomination? Please answer yes or no.

Response:

(U) Please see my response to Question #18.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#18)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you agree that Director Coats should have the responsibility for declassification decisions regarding your background? Please answer yes or no.

Response:

(U) As noted in the May 14th letter to Senators Feinstein, Wyden, Heinrich, and Harris the ODNI, "...concurs with the CIA's finding that much of the information associated with Ms. Haspel's career properly remains classified in accordance with established classification authorities, as its disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause harm to US national security." CIA has made public information about my background and has attempted to share additional information with the public to the greatest extent possible consistent with our responsibility to protect information the disclosure of which reasonably could be expected to cause damage to the national security. The Agency has adhered to existing classification guidelines, in accordance with the requirements of Executive Order 13526, and will continue to do so.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#19)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Has President Trump asked you to pledge loyalty to him? Please answer yes or no.

Response:

(U) No.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#20)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you oversee the "enhanced" interrogation of Abd al-Nashiri, which included the use of the waterboard? Yes or No?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum for information about my classified assignments.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#21)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you order or oversee the waterboarding of any detainee? Yes or No? How many times?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum for information about my classified assignments.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#22)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever receive any instructions on the use of these "enhanced" interrogation techniques?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum for information about my classified assignments.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#23)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you understand the rendition, detention, and interrogation program to be lawful? What was the basis for this opinion?

Response:

(U) I understood that the Department of Justice reviewed the program and determined it was legal under the law of the time. CIA personnel involved with the detention and interrogation program relied on that legal opinion, and adhered to it in good faith under the guidance of CIA's Office of General Counsel.

(U) Today, the law is clear. Under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the United States Government may not use any interrogation technique that is not approved under the Army Field Manual 2-22.3. I fully support this change, and if confirmed as Director, I would not allow CIA to engage in the use of enhanced interrogation techniques again.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#24)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

(U) Aside from the legality of the program, did you have personal reservations regarding any aspects of the rendition, detention, and interrogation program at the time? If so, did you ever express these reservations to peers or superiors?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#25)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Were you responsible for supervising or managing James Mitchell and Bruce Jessen, who devised the CIA's "enhanced" interrogation techniques, as they interrogated al-Nashiri?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum for information about my classified assignments.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#26)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever converse with them prior to or after the interrogation?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum response to Question #25.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#27)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever question their qualifications?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum response to Question #25.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#28)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In your response to the Committee's questions, you stated that you served as a "Senior-level Supervisor" in the Counterterrorism Center from 2003 to 2004.

a. Did this position include responsibility, supervision or approval relevant to the rendition, detention, and interrogation program? Yes or No?
b. Were you aware of the conditions of capture and confinement of different CIA detainees during that timeframe?
c. Did you believe the conditions of confinement for the CIA detainees during that timeframe were humane?
d. Were you aware of the specific methods of interrogation being used?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum for information about my classified assignments.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#29)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In your responses to the Committee's questions, you stated that you served as Chief of Staff to the Deputy Director for Operations from 2005 to 2008. Did this position include responsibility, supervision or approval of any aspect of the rendition, detention, and interrogation program? Yes or No?

Response:

(U) My responsibility as Mr. Rodriguez's Chief of Staff included facilitating discussions, communications, and decisions between the DDO and his subordinates, other offices within CIA, and Agency leadership. As a consequence, I attended discussions related to CTC matters. However, I had no independent operational authority, and in this position did not hold a supervisory role related to RDI.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#30)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You state in your written responses to the Committee that some innocent individuals – in addition to Khalid al-Masri – were captured, rendered, and held, under cables that used "inaccurate legal text" – essentially illegally. The Agency has publicly taken responsibility for at least one wrongful death during this period.

a. Do you personally take any responsibility for any of those flawed decisions? Yes or No?

b. What steps did you take to ensure that another innocent individual would not be wrongfully killed or captured under your watch?

Response:

(U) Please see the response to Question #3.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Dianne Feinstein (#31)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Several key U.S. national security partners have been extremely critical of the rendition, detention, and interrogation program and, as a result, have limited intelligence cooperation in the past.

a. Do you think your involvement in the rendition, detention, and interrogation program will affect your ability to engage with these partners? If so, how do you intend to address that?

b. How would you explain your past involvement in the rendition, detention, and interrogation program to these allies?

c. What, if any, assurances should the United States provide to key national security partners regarding future activities like those pursued as part of the rendition, detention, and interrogation program?

d. Do you believe you will be able to credibly give these assurances?

Response:

(U) CIA has learned some tough lessons, especially when asked to tackle missions that fall outside our expertise, but we have used those experiences to improve our activities going forward. For me, there is no truer example of implementing lessons learned than what I took away from CIA's detention and interrogation program. Despite CIA's tremendous contribution to preventing future attacks, there is little question that CIA's participation in this program harmed not only the officers who participated but also caused damage to our relationships with our foreign partners.

(U) When serving as Chief of Station to a major ally, and as Deputy and now Acting Director, I have found tremendous support from our foreign partners. In my current capacity, and indeed for the last 10 years, I have worked very closely with our European and other partners. I have had discussions with many of our foreign partners, and they are well aware that I will not accept any attempt to have CIA undertake an activity that is contrary to our mission, values, or the law. This clear position will only enhance my ability to implement my vision to leverage partnerships in new ways against the hardest targets.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#32)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Please provide any opinions, guidance or reasoning of the General Counsel and/or Senior Agency Official for Classification with regard to your decisions related to the classification of matters associated with your nomination.

Response:

(U) All classification decisions are guided by Executive Order 13526, the CIA Act of 1949, as amended, and the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. In addition, CIA issued updated classification guidance for information about CIA's former detention and interrogation program on January 28, 2015. The CIA's Director of Congressional Affairs detailed the CIA's approach to classification of matters associated with my nomination in letters to Senators Feinstein, Heinrich, and Wyden dated April 24, 2018.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#33)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) How do you square the CIA's sanctioning of public acknowledgements that certain individuals were associated with the [RDI] program with your testimony that you are bound by existing guidelines to conceal any association you may have had with the program?

Response:

(U) Although a large amount of information about the former RDI program has already been publicly acknowledged, CIA still protects information regarding CIA personnel involved in the RDI program for the safety and security of our officers. While I agree that the confirmation process for a nominee to be the Director of the CIA requires transparency with the American public, I cannot make an exception for myself that could jeopardize the safety and security of our officers or disclose classified sources and methods.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#34)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do the "existing RDI guidelines" to which you referred prevent the public release of any opinion about the program expressed by a CIA officer, regardless of whether that officer was associated with the program at the time he or she provided that opinion?

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#35)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In discussing the destruction of the interrogation videotapes, you testified that: "Mr. Rodriguez chose not to copy the lawyers on the cable because he took the decision on his own authority and he wanted to take responsibility for it." Did your draft of the cable exclude the lawyers, or did it include the lawyers only to have Mr. Rodriguez remove them?

Response:

(U) In discussions with lawyers within the Office of General Counsel, I was informed that there were no legal prohibitions to destroying the tapes. At the DDO's direction, I drafted a cable with instruction to destroy the tapes for the DDO's release, but I did so with the understanding that he would use the draft cable to raise this issue with then-CIA Director Porter Goss to find a resolution of this matter. The DDO chose not to add the lawyers because he took the decision on his own authority.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#36)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You testified that you were at your desk and could see your computer screen, "so it was shortly after Mr. Rodriguez...had released the cable" that you became aware that the cable was released. In your responses to written questions, you wrote that "[w]hen I subsequently saw that the DDO had sent the cable to the field, I asked whether he had raised this matter with Director Goss." How long after the cable was sent did you have this conversation?

Response:

(U) Shortly after I realized Mr. Rodriguez had released the cable, I got up from my desk to discuss it with him.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#37)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You testified that the tapes were destroyed because of "security risks to CIA officers who were depicted on the tapes." Your testimony includes six other references to "other officers." To what extent were contractors, as opposed to CIA officers, depicted on the videotapes?

Response:

(U) In this context, "CIA officers" meant CIA personnel, including employees and contractors.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#38)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever take any action, or have management responsibility for any action, that was inconsistent with the law? If so, please elaborate.

Response:

(U) I have always strived to adhere to the legal guidance I have been provided, and I believe that my actions throughout my career have been lawful. In each of my leadership positions, I have ensured, and will continue to ensure, that all relevant work is reviewed by CIA lawyers. I place the heaviest weight on the views of CIA lawyers.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#39)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) During the hearing, you were asked about the statement in John Rizzo's book that you had "previously run the interrogation program." You responded: "I would never even served in that department nor was I the head of it." Please specify which department you were referring to.

Response:

(U) Please see the classified addendum.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#40)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You testified that you were "not even read into the interrogation program until it had been up and running for a year." Abu Zubaydah was rendered to DETENTION SITE GREEN in late March 2002. He was subjected to the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques in August 2002. Please provide more precise information about when you consider the program to have been "up and running," and when you were read into it:

Response:

(U) I was referring to the President's signing of a Memorandum of Notification on September 17, 2001, which authorized the CIA to undertake operations designed to capture and detain persons who posed a continuing, serious threat of violence or death to US persons and interests who were planning terrorist activities.

(U) I was read into the more restricted detention and interrogation program in October 2002.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#41)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) As Chief of Staff at the Directorate of Operations, what role did you play did you or the Directorate have in preparing, reviewing, or coordinating on information provided to the congressional intelligence committees related to the RDI program, including testimony and responses to questions? Did you play any such role at the CTC?

Response:

(U) As Chief of Staff to the Deputy Director for Operations (DDO), one of my primary responsibilities was to ensure DO seniors were supported with briefing material, read-ahead information, talking points (including remarks to the DO workforce), and additional background material for meetings, conferences, briefings, and testimony to Congress. During my time in CTC, I participated in some non-RDI related congressional briefings.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#42)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) During the hearing, you were asked whether, between 2005 and 2007, as the CIA was capturing fewer detainees and waterboarding was no longer approved, you ever called for the program to be continued or expanded. Please provide an answer to that question.

Response:

(U) It is advantageous for the United States Government to be able to question, in person, terrorists for intelligence on current threats and plots. As a mid-level officer, I believed that capturing and detaining al-Qa'ida terrorists provided significant intelligence and helped prevent future attacks. CIA continues to play a crucial role in that process.

(U) CIA no longer has a detention and interrogation program; other elements of the USG—specifically, DoD and FBI—handle the detention and interrogation of detainees while CIA provides its subject matter expertise. I support this division of responsibilities and I do not support the Agency resuming a detention and interrogation program.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#43)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In its 2013 response to the Committee's Study of the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program, the CIA acknowledged that the Agency "fell short when it came to holding individuals accountable for poor performance and management failures?" Do you agree?

Response:

(U) Yes. I believe that, looking forward, the Agency should ensure that accountability exercises do not focus just on the officers directly involved in the specific failure or misconduct, but also look more broadly at management responsibility and more consistently at systemic issues.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#44)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In responses to a written question, you wrote:

"I understand that the CIA's Office of the Inspector General conducted a review of the rendition of Khalid al-Masri and determined that CIA did not meet the standard for rendition under the September 17th, 2001 Memorandum of Notification (MON). Additionally, OIG identified other cases where a Counterterrorism Center lawyer applied 'similar inaccurate legal text as used in a cable approving the al-Masri rendition.'"

In its 2013 response to the Committee Study, the CIA concluded that, in the al-Masri case, "those with broader responsibility for the program" were not held accountable for "any management shortcomings that contributed to the outcome." The CIA further stated: "we concede that it is difficult in hindsight to understand how the Agency could make such a mistake, take too long to correct it, determine that a flawed legal interpretation contributed, and in the end only hold accountable three CTC attorneys, two of whom received only an oral admonition."

Do you agree that there should have been accountability for management shortcomings in the al-Masri case?

Response:

(U) I believe that, looking forward, the Agency should ensure that accountability exercises do not focus just on the officers directly involved in the specific failure or misconduct, but also look more broadly at management responsibility and more consistently at systemic issues.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#45)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In its 2013 response to the Committee Study, the CIA acknowledged that it "allowed a conflict of interest to exist wherein the contractors who helped design and employ the enhanced interrogation techniques also were involved in assessing the fitness of detainees to be subjected to such techniques and the effectiveness of those techniques."

a. Do you agree that the CIA allowed such a conflict of interest?

b. If yes, do you believe anyone at the CIA should have been held accountable for allowing that to happen?

Response:

(U) Yes, I support the 2013 CIA response to the Committee Study. In addition, please see the response to Question #43.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#46)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) The CIA's 2013 response to the Committee Study states that "the propriety of the wide-ranging nature of the psychologists' roles – particularly their involvement in (1) performing interrogations, (2) assessing the detainees' psychological fitness, and (3) assessing the techniques' effectiveness – raised concerns and prompted considerable discussion and deliberation within CIA." Did you ever raise any of these concerns?

Response:

(U) As I stated at the hearing, CIA officers were told that interrogation experts had designed the program and that it had been legally cleared at the highest levels of the US Government. There was no independent interrogation expertise at CIA then and there is none now.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#47)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Would you ever allow CIA contractors to participate in or conduct briefings or interrogations of detainees?

a. If yes, please describe the situations in which you believe that would be appropriate.

b. If yes, would those contractors be limited to techniques authorized by the Army Field Manual?

Response:

(U) As noted above, CIA does not conduct interrogations, debriefings of detainees in the custody of other agencies or entities are an important part of intelligence collection. Contractors make valuable contributions to these debriefings, consistent with applicable law and policy. For example, contractors may supply a particular expertise, such as a language skill, that is otherwise not readily available. Contractors performing debriefings must be overseen by a US Government employee. While the CIA does not conduct interrogations, any USG personnel—to include a contractor working for the CIA—would be subject to the Army Field Manual.

(U) Please see the classified addendum.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Ron Wyden (#48-49)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) On July 18, 2014, the CIA Inspector General issued a Report of Investigation on Agency Access to SSCI Shared Drive on RDINet. Among the IG's findings was that agency employees "improperly accessed SSCI Majority staff shared drives on the RDINet."

a. Do you agree that the CIA's access to the SSCI Majority staff shared drives was improper?

b. Do you believe anyone should have been held accountable for those accesses?

(U) The IG further found that: "The Agency filed a crimes report with the DOJ, reporting that SSCI staff members may have improperly accessed Agency information on the RDINet. The OIG investigation determined that the factual basis for referral was unfounded and the author of the letter had been provided inaccurate information on which the letter was based."

a. Do you agree that the factual basis for the referral was unfounded and based on inaccurate information?

b. Do you believe that CIA personnel filing crimes reports with the DOJ have an independent responsibility to ascertain whether the reports are factually accurate?

c. Do you believe anyone should have been held accountable for the inaccurate and baseless crimes report?

d. What is your view of the propriety of the CIA filing crimes reports on congressional members or staff?

Response:

(U) I have no firsthand knowledge of this matter, I do not know all of the underlying facts, and I have not reviewed all relevant materials. I therefore cannot offer an

independent judgment about the issues raised. I understand that CIA convened an Accountability Board to review the issues identified by the Inspector General. I understand further that the Board, which was chaired by former Senator Evan Bayh, concluded that no disciplinary action was warranted on the facts presented.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#50)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In your career, have you ever felt pressured to revise intelligence assessments to meet a particular political or policy goal? If yes, how did you respond?

Response:

(U) Not that I recall. I am incredibly proud of the analysts at CIA and the sterling reputation they have in the Intelligence Community for providing all source analysis to the policymakers. We have a long-established commitment to preserving the integrity and objectivity of our analysis. There is also an independent ombudsman that provides for a private, safe, and absolutely confidential channel for officers to raise concerns that an analytic assessment has been politicized.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#51)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, will you commit to stand firm, in the face of any political pressure, to defend the CIA's assessments—especially if those assessments do not support current or planned policies?

Response:

(U) Yes.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#52)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, do you commit to notify this Committee immediately if you ever receive political pressure to alter intelligence assessments?

Response:

(U) I commit to resist any such pressure, should it ever exist, and commit that CIA will continue to meet its obligations to its congressional oversight committees, including our legal obligation to keep the committees currently and fully informed of all significant intelligence activities.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#53)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, will you commit to hiring a workforce that reflects the diversity of the American people across race, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, physical ability and religion?

Response:

(U) Yes, and I believe CIA must work harder to achieve a more diverse workforce.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#54)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) There are potential national security benefits to having a diverse CIA workforce that can more easily operate overseas. If confirmed, how do you plan to promote recruiting for diverse candidates at CIA?

Response:

(U) The benefits of diversity, both in terms of talent acquisition and the larger CIA mission, are critical. I have long been a supporter of CIA having a robust diversity recruiting program that provides a broad-based approach to outreach with a strong focus on languages and ethnic diversity. In addition to the benefits of having a diverse workforce, our global mission demands it. CIA's recruitment program pursues diversity in hiring through a variety of methods including public advertising, direct community outreach, college campus events, and student programs, to name a few. If confirmed, I will continue to support all of CIA's diversity efforts and explore ways to improve the Agency's performance in this area.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#55)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, how do you plan to improve diversity, of all kinds, at CIA in senior level management positions?

Response:

(U) Through the course of my career, I have always worked to do my part to build a diverse and inclusive workforce at CIA, including promoting and encouraging fellow officers, ensuring a fair process on personnel decisions, and formally leading mentorship programs. I am proud to say I am a champion for diversity but I recognize more must be done, and as DCIA I will be committed to making additional advancements.

(U) In 2014, the then-DCIA commissioned the "Diversity in Leadership Study (DLS)," chaired by Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., which examined the factors that limit diversity in CIA's senior leadership. The study identified seven recommendations and a five-year effort with an eye toward building a more diverse leadership cadre and fostering an inclusive culture at CIA. If confirmed, I plan to continue emphasizing the critical need for diversity, particularly in the leadership ranks, and intend to place specific focus on the underlying DLS initiatives necessary to achieve the goals identified by the study. Additionally, I will continue leveraging the senior officer performance review process and mandatory Diversity and Inclusion training for all senior officers as instruments to further inclusiveness and diversity at CIA.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#56)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, how do you plan to be an advocate for the CIA's LGBTQ community?

Response:

(U) I have been, and will continue to be, a supporter and ally for CIA's LGBTQ community. CIA is a diverse multi-cultural workplace, and its 15 Agency Resource Groups (ARG) highlight that diversity. It is essential that Agency leadership is attuned to the broadest cross-section of views on these issues. One of the 15 ARGs includes the Agency Network of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Officers and Allies (ANGLE). Workforce diversity at CIA is, and will continue to be, a focus area for me if confirmed.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#57)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, will you commit to protecting the rights of LGBTQ employees to equal professional opportunities and benefits?

Response:

(U) Yes, I will.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#58)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Do you believe that the American people deserve to know as much as possible about the nominee to be CIA director, including that person's professional history and judgment?

Response:

(U) Yes. Some information must remain classified for the safety and security of our officers and foreign partners and for the protection of sources and methods. Classified information about my record, including past assignments, is available for review by all members of the US Senate.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#59)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Prior to a vote on your nomination, will you commit to declassifying, with appropriate redactions for protecting sources and methods, all information about any involvement that you may have had in the CIA's Rendition, Detention and Interrogation program?

Response:

(U) Although a large amount of information about the former RDI Program has already been publicly acknowledged, CIA still protects information regarding CIA personnel involved in the RDI Program for the safety and security of our officers. Congress has recognized the need to protect from disclosure the functions, names, and official titles of persons employed by the Agency. Any classified information about my record, including past assignments, is available for review by all members of the US Senate. I do not wish to make any exception for myself that could have the effect of jeopardizing the safety and security of our officers or of disclosing sensitive intelligence sources and methods or giving terrorist groups a basis upon which to target CIA individuals.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#60)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Have you ever, in any way, advocated for sharing less information with Congress related to the CIA's Rendition, Detention and Interrogation program?

Response:

(U) Not that I recall, and it would be contrary to my strong belief in the importance of congressional oversight. As I stated in my prehearing Question #25, throughout my 30 years of experience at CIA, I have repeatedly seen the importance and value of keeping the congressional intelligence committees fully and currently informed of all significant intelligence activities. If confirmed, I will ensure that the CIA continues to fulfill all of its responsibilities in this regard.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#61)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) The President, then a candidate, asserted that, "we should go much stronger than waterboarding." If you received such an order, as CIA Director, would you comply?

Response:

(U) No. Today the law is clear, and such techniques are prohibited. Under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the United States Government may not use any interrogation technique that is not approved under the Army Field Manual 2-22.3 I fully support this change, and if confirmed as Director, I would not allow CIA to engage in the use of enhanced interrogation techniques again.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#62)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) The President, then a candidate, asserted that, regarding waterboarding suspected terrorists, "if it doesn't work, they deserve it anyway, for what they're doing." Do you agree with that statement?

Response:

(U) I do not support use of enhanced interrogation techniques for any purpose.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#63)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) If confirmed, do you commit to make countering Russian influence operations, particularly those targeting U.S. elections, a priority at CIA?

Response:

(U) Yes, I do.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Kamala Harris (#64)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) You have stated that you concur with the 2017 Intelligence Community assessment regarding Russia's Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections. If confirmed as CIA Director, how do you plan to convey the seriousness of the threat from Russia to the President?

Response:

(U) It is the CIA's role to provide policymakers with timely, high-quality assessments of the serious and ongoing threat from Russia. Election interference is just one example of the growing threat the United States faces from Russia (as well as from other state and non-state actors). I noted during my testimony that it is important to have a whole-of-government approach to combatting this persistent problem. While CIA is an important player in this discussion, effectively understanding and countering the Russian threat requires coordination and cooperation throughout the federal government. I believe my long experience working against the Russian target has uniquely prepared me to understand and respond effectively to the serious threat posed by Russia.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Angus King (#1)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) During the course of your time at CIA's Counterterrorism Center (CTC), what role did you play in CTC's management and operation of its detention and interrogation program? Please provide any records in the CIA's possession that describe your role and duties at CTC with respect to managing or operating this program (such as any organizational charts, job descriptions, or the equivalent, should they exist). Further, if a classified response is required, please provide a justification for why the Agency has chosen not to declassify this information.

Response:

(U) In regard to the role I played in CTC's management, please see the classified addendum to Question #28. In regard to the request for an explanation of why this response is classified, please see my responses to Question #59 and the classified addendum to Question #34.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Angus King (#2)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In his book, Mr. Rodriguez states that he sent the cable authorizing the destruction of the videotapes on November 8 and that the tapes were destroyed the next day on November 9. Did you inform the Director of the CIA, legal staff at the Agency, officials in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, or any other officials that the cable had been sent? If you did not, why? Please describe all conversations, calls, emails, or other communications you had regarding the destruction of the videotapes from the moment you learned that Mr. Rodriguez had sent the cable to the moment you learned the videotapes were destroyed. Further, if a classified response is required, please provide a justification for why the Agency has chosen not to declassify this information.

Response:

(U) At the Deputy Director for Operation's (DDO) direction, I drafted the cable to destroy the tapes, but I did so with the understanding that he would use the draft cable to raise this issue with the DCIA. Shortly after I saw the cable was released, I discussed the cable with the DDO. I also forwarded the cable to the officer responsible for running the program. During my conversation with the DDO, I asked him whether he had consulted with the DCIA and he told me that he had not and that he had decided to release the cable by his own authority. Mr. Rodriguez took full responsibility for this decision.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#7)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) To the best of your knowledge, did the approved "enhanced interrogation techniques" employed by the CIA ever include:

a. (U) Threats of harm to the detainee's family?

b. (U) Suggesting to detainees that they would never leave CIA custody alive?

c. (U) Stripping detainees for the purpose of humiliating them?

d. (U) Intentionally creating unsanitary conditions in detainee's cells?

Response:

(U) The responsibility of Agency officers was to carry out detention and interrogation activities in strict adherence to the guidelines and legal opinions in place. Any Agency officer who acted contrary to the legal and/or policy rules that governed the program were referred to the CIA Office of Inspector General for their actions. Additionally, the CIA referred certain cases to the Department of Justice for criminal investigations.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#8)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever authorize CIA or contractor personnel to conduct unsupervised interrogations using harsh physical interrogation techniques that were not a part of CIA's formal "enhanced interrogation" program (i.e. that had not been approved by the DOJ or authorized by CIA HQS)? Are you aware of any such incidents, whether or not authorized by you?

Response:

(U) No, I did not. With respect to my knowledge of any such incidents, please see my response to Question #7.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#12)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you participate in any comprehensive analysis or assessment of the effectiveness of the "enhanced interrogation techniques" employed by the CIA, or any analysis of the effectiveness of such techniques as were employed on detainees in your charge? If so, what did you conclude? If not, why not?

Response:

(U) No. There are, to this day, strong disagreements on the effectiveness of CIA's detention and interrogation program. In my view, which is shared by my predecessors, CIA gained valuable intelligence that helped thwart planned attacks, capture terrorists, and ultimately save lives. What is impossible to know is whether CIA could have obtained the same information without using enhanced interrogation techniques.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#13)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Are you aware of any communications, during the period of 2002-2007, between the Office of the Vice President, the Justice Department Office of Legal Counsel, and/or the senior management of the CIA concerning the legality, effectiveness, or appropriateness of "enhanced interrogation techniques" or the other forms of abuse treatment cited above?

Response:

(U) I was generally aware of a broad and ongoing interagency discussion of the EIT program, including the legal and policy guidance surrounding the program.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#14)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Are you aware of any communications outside the ordinary chain of reporting between the Office of the Vice President and the CIA personnel or contractors performing such techniques?

Response:

(U) No.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#15)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) In 2014, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence concluded that from 2002-2007, CIA made false representations to the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel concerning: (1) the conditions of confinement of detainees held by CIA, (2) the application of CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques, (3) the physical effects of the techniques on detainees, and (4) the effectiveness of the techniques? When did you personally become aware of those representations? When did you become aware that the legal conclusions reached by Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel were dependent upon these false representations, and that the Department had warned CIA that those conclusions may not be valid under different factual circumstances?

Response:

(U) Please see response to Question #13.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#18)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Have you ever participated in any discussions at CIA about how to evade or stymie congressional oversight or White House management, either with respect specifically to the Rendition, Detention, and Interrogation (RDI) program or any other matter? When did you become aware of CIA's intrusion into congressional investigative materials and records?

Response:

(U) I am a strong believer in the importance of oversight. As I stated in my prehearing Question #25, throughout my 30 years of experience at CIA, I have repeatedly seen the importance and value of keeping the congressional intelligence committees fully and currently informed to the fullest extent possible under the law. If confirmed, I will ensure that the CIA continues to fulfill all of its responsibilities in this regard.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#20)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Were you interviewed by the CIA's Office of Inspector General about your involvement in the RDI program? If so, did you provide OIG with complete and accurate information about the operation and management of the program?

Response:

(U) Please see my answer to prehearing Question #46.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#21)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Have you ever participated in, or were you ever aware of, discussions at CIA about the release of classified information concerning the RDI program to members of the media in order to counter public criticism, shape public opinion, or influence congressional action?

Response:

(U) I did not participate, nor was I aware of CIA discussion, to release classified information to the media.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#22)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Have you ever been cited as an unnamed source in a media report?

Response:

(U) No.

(U) Questions for the Record Submitted to

DCIA Nominee Gina Haspel by Senator Jack Reed (#23)

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence

14 May 2018

Question:

(U) Did you ever have conversations with Vice President Cheney or his Chief of Staff David Addington about enhanced interrogation techniques or conditions at CIA detention facilities?

Response:

(U) No.