

An Assessment of So-called “Alleged Studies” Islamic Republic of Iran - September 2008

In the Name of God
the Compassionate
the Merciful
An Assessment of So-called “Alleged Studies”
Islamic Republic of Iran - September 2008

The DG September 2008 report once again in a crystal clear manner has endorsed that all nuclear activities, material and facilities in the Islamic Republic of Iran are under full scope surveillance of the IAEA and the Agency is able to continue its verification of non-diversion of declared nuclear material and activities to prohibited and military purposes.

The report acknowledges this fact 14 times in 9 different paragraphs.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has repeatedly declared that there is not and has not been any undeclared nuclear activities and material in Iran.

Resolution of Outstanding Issues: Work Plan (infirc/711

Given the fact that Iran does not have any concern about the full transparency of its nuclear activities, it made an agreement with the Agency for the resolution of the outstanding issues on 21 August 2007.

The main objective of conclusion of the Work Plan with the Agency was to resolve all outstanding issues once and forever so that this endless process will be terminated.

The conclusion of the Work Plan within 40 days, and its implementation within 6 months, much less than the agreed period, demonstrated Iran's seriousness in its initiative.

An exhausted list of the few past remaining issues, was provided by the Agency's delegation to Iran.

- Plutonium Experiments
- P1-P2 Centrifuges
- Uranium Metal Document
- Source of Contamination
- Polonium 210
- Gachin Mine

The first paragraph of chapter IV of the Work Plan says:

“These modalities cover all remaining issues and the Agency confirmed that there are no other remaining issues and ambiguities regarding Iran's past nuclear program and activities.”

If the intention was to raise any other issues in addition to the alleged studies (Green Salt, Re-entry missile vehicle, High Explosive test) such as “possible military dimension”, then it should have been raised by the Agency in the course of the negotiations on the Work Plan. All outstanding issues have been incorporated in the exhausted list by the IAEA during the modality negotiations and one can clearly notice that no item entitled “possible military dimension” exists in the modality.

Paragraph 5, Chapter IV of the Work Plan reads:

“The Agency and Iran agreed that after the implementation of the work plan and the agreed modalities for resolving the outstanding issues, the implementation of safeguards in Iran will be conducted in a routine manner.”

The Agency in its November 2007 and February 2008 explicitly stated that all six outstanding issues have been resolved and the Islamic Republic of Iran has responded to all questions of the Agency on the outstanding issues in accordance with the Work Plan. Following the successful implementation of the Work Plan which led to the resolution of all six outstanding issues, the United States having been dissatisfied about the results, started a political campaign on a part of the Work Plan entitled “alleged studies”.

Therefore by interfering in the work of the IAEA and exerting various political pressures tried to damage the cooperative track between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the IAEA.

So - called Alleged Studies

According to the Work Plan, the “alleged studies” was not categorized as an outstanding issue since its nature was totally different.

It was agreed in the Work Plan that “as a sign of good will and cooperation with the Agency, upon receiving all related documents, Iran will review and inform the Agency of its assessment” and nothing more.

The Agency was not able to deliver the documents since the owner country did not permit the Agency to do so. The reason is clear, the said country wants to keep the control of such fabricated documents and manipulate and prolong the process.

For the first time, this subject was raised on 27 July 2005 in Wall Street Journal and stated that these computer files were stolen by American in 2004.

From the title of article of the said journal (“Bum dope about Iran’s Shahab 3?”), it was obvious that US is aiming Iran’s national defense capability under pretext of nuclear issue.

Serious question is the validity and reliability since it is believed to come from only one source.

Americans themselves claimed that they obtained it from a source in Iran who they said had received it from a second person now believed to be dead!! (New York Times, 12 November 2005).

This subject was raised by the Agency in 5 December 2005 (DDG-SG statement 31 Jan, 2006).

Since July 2005, US Ambassador has continuously invited others to his mission showing slides and print out of data presented as “basically computer calculation of different configurations for warhead delivery” warning them that Iran would test the Nuclear BOMB in few days!

According to New York times a senior European diplomat said “I can fabricate that data”.

“Several intelligence experts said that a sophisticated Western spy agency could, in theory, have produced the contents of the laptop” (New York times, 12 November 2005).

US had a lot of precedence to fabricate the fake documents. Example is documents showing that Saddam had sought Uranium from Niger!

it is claimed that “the most convincing evidence that the material is genuine is that the technical work is so detailed that it would be difficult to fabricate” and “the documents are written in Farsi” and “they showed progress of developmental work from 2001 to early 2004”.

Assessment

In spite of the fact that the so called alleged studies documents had not been delivered to Iran, the Islamic Republic of Iran carefully examined all the materials which have been prepared in power point presentations by the US and provided to the IAEA, and informed the Agency of its assessment.

The Agency has not delivered to Iran any official and authentic document which contained documentary evidence related to Iran with regard to the alleged studies.

Existing some words in Persian and some Iranian names was the only thing which was used as the basis to attribute these documents to Iran.

It is evident that anybody who intends to forge a document uses real names to make the material more convincing and internally consistent.

Example of inconsistencies item 3 of the shown slide

In the identification sheet, the date of report is "bahman 1382" which correspond to 20 of January to 18 February 2004, but in the text it refers to the test done in 4/12/82 corresponding to 22 February 2004. How it is possible that somebody prepare his report one month before the test?

Example of inconsistencies item 7 of the shown slide

From the first look at this document, it is very obvious that this letter is not genuine and authentic. The reasons are:

The letter does not have either header or signature and no date as well.

There is not any other sign proving that this letter belongs to Iran.

The date and the numbers are written in Latin which is forbidden in the administrative correspondences of ministries.

The Islamic Republic of Iran however has proved that some of the documents produced by the United States not only are not internally consistent but also have clear inconsistency and are in contradiction with typical Iranian standard documentation.

In addition to the said points, none of these documents bear any classification seals.

Example of inconsistencies item 8 of the shown slide

The slide shown is obviously an assembled one, for example the cover of "Matlab" on the film is together with the "exit icon".

The places shown in the film as the workshop does not even look like a reliable place for the conventional workshop.

The Agency's inspectors are well aware of the high quality of Iranian workshops, specifically those of the Ministry of Defense, where the Agency had several times visited during verification of manufacturing centrifuge components.

A top class and top secret project, working on nuclear weapon, should easily use much more advanced machines being available in most of even simple private workshop.

How can one could make allegations against a country without provision of original documents with authenticity and ask the country concerned to prove its innocence or request the country to provide substantial explanations.

Iran has explicitly stated that it has not conducted any activities or studies referred to in the "alleged studies". Therefore slides and documents produced by the United States are fabricated and baseless allegations attributed to Iran.

The Agency has explicitly expressed in a written document dated 13 May 2008 that: "... no document establishing the administrative interconnections between "Green salt" and

the other remaining subjects on alleged studies, namely “Highly explosive Testing” and “Re-entry Vehicle”, have been delivered or presented to Iran by the Agency”.

Regrettably this explicit expression of the fact which has not been reflected in the DG report, proves that in contrary to what has been said in the report, the documents related to the alleged studies lack any internal consistency and coherence.

Paragraph 15 of September 2008 report reads: “Iran reiterated its assertion that the allegations were based on “forged” documents and “fabricated” data, focusing on deficiencies in form and format”.

Although Iran has already addressed the substances of the documents and has proved their invalidity, it should be noted that “form” and “format” of the documents have their own merits.

It is noteworthy that the Agency had also questioned “form” and “format” during the meetings on 7-8 August 2008 about the Iran’s responses to the alleged green salt (as it was referred to in para17 (b) of September 2008 report). For instance why the copy of the first page is “folded” or the fonts are different and considered them as inconsistency.

Example of inconsistencies item 11 of the shown slide

The content of this item is a generic issue. It does not have any number, date or signature. In this letter the author is addressing executive of group/project manager to send their monthly report without reference to any project or group!

In the attachment to this letter there is a blank form of monthly report. These pages have nothing to comment except that the forger tried to show that he had access even to the blank forms.

Example of inconsistencies item 12-17 of the shown slide

The contradiction in the “identification document” of different files shows that they do not follow the same pattern which put serious doubts about their authenticity.

These documents have secret classification but there are indications that the copies are sent to the library! It is impossible that a secret document be kept in the computer or be sent to the library in the military complexes.

Meanwhile in the same paragraph (para17b) the Agency has requested Iran to provide the original documents.

Similarly the legitimate question is: why Iran shouldn’t have the right to ask for receiving the original documents on the alleged studies.

In the footnote number 5 of September 2008 report, the Agency indicates that the documentation presented to Iran appears to have been derived from multiple sources over different periods of time.

The fact is that all documentation except one, has been provided to the Agency by the US. The single document is composed of 3 pages of graphs which the Agency claims that obtained it from a different source.

The document which the Agency is considering it as an important document regarding alleged studies and referring to it in paragraph 17D of the September 2008 report, is document 18.

There is no evidence or indication in this document regarding its linkage to Iran or its preparation by Iran.

It even does not contain one single word in Persian. The document does only contain some English words and 3 hand-drawn graphs drawn by the Agency.

The said document is shown in order to be judged by the public opinion whether it is fair

to make accusation against a country merely on the basis of such a document?!

In the paragraph 14 of September 2008 report, regrettably the Agency re-opened an already-concluded issue. An issue which the Agency explicitly announced its conclusion through a written text.

The Agency acknowledged in a written communication dated 8 November 2007: “Iran delivered the 15-page document related to the procedures for the conversion of uranium and its casting. This closes the u-metal issue of the Work Plan.”

The Agency re-confirmed the conclusion of this issue in its communication dated 23 November 2008 and further added: “The Agency appreciates Iran for delivering the document and confirms that this action of the Work Plan is completed.”

In the report there were various false quotations attributed to Iran including:

Iran has confirmed some of information on Alleged Studies.

Iran has confirmed the accuracy of some of such information and confirmed some of alleged activities.

Iran has asserted some of these studies and considered them as conventional.

Iran has not opposed to the accuracy of alleged information.

From the beginning, Iran clearly stated and confirmed that it has not conducted non of studies and activities related to the alleged studies and added those are produced and forged by the United States and all are baseless, incorrect and forgery. Therefore these are false attributions to Iran

Based on the abovementioned facts:

There is no original document regarding alleged studies.

There is no documentary evidence regarding linkage of so called alleged studies to Iran. Iran has accomplished its undertaking to present its assessment on alleged studies to the Agency.

As DG stated in its latest reports, the Agency has not detected the actual use of nuclear material in connection with the alleged studies.

As DG stated in its latest reports, the Agency has no information on the actual design or manufacture by Iran of nuclear material components of a nuclear weapon or of certain other key components.

According to the Work Plan the Alleged Studies has been concluded.

Considering provided detailed responses, the Agency is in a position to terminate so called Alleged Studies.

Therefore, in accordance with the modalities, implementation of Safeguards in Iran shall be conducted in a routine manner.

It is obvious that aftermath, Iran in accordance with its legal and safeguards obligations like other member states, would be ready to respond new questions if any.

Conclusion

The nature of Iran’s nuclear activities has always been and will remain peaceful.

As DG repeatedly reported, there is no diversion in nuclear activities in Iran and all nuclear material and activities remain in peaceful purposes.

The report of the Agency dated the February 22, 2008, has clearly and evidently declared that all six issues called “remaining issue” are resolved and the Islamic Republic of Iran has answered all the questions presented by the IAEA concerning outstanding issues according to the Work Plan and these answers are “consistent with the Agency’s findings” and the IAEA “considers those questions no longer outstanding”.

Considering provided detailed responses, the Agency is in a position to terminate so called Alleged Studies. Therefore, in accordance with the modalities, implementation of Safeguards in Iran shall be conducted in a routine manner.

Iran will never give up its inalienable rights in using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and will not suspend its nuclear activities.

Iran will continue its cooperation with the IAEA in accordance with the IAEA Statute, NPT and its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement.