

DOCUMENT 3

- An email between officials dated 13 September 2002, sent at 14:58 titled 'RE: IRAQ UK / US NUCLEAR ESTIMATES – IMPLICATIONS FOR SANCTIONS'

I'm not sure that the differences will be that great. Remember US & UK signed up to maintaining sanctions US can hardly do that and then turn round and say that they are having no effect

- An email between officials dated 13 September 2002, sent at 13:44 titled 'RE: IRAQ UK / US NUCLEAR ESTIMATES – IMPLICATIONS FOR SANCTIONS'

Agree - no sign of anything being published yet on any US site - once it appears, we will need to look at the specific wording and go forward. Suspect however there will be a significant difference in the UK/US views on effectiveness of sanctions.

- An email between officials dated 13 September 2002, sent at 13:21 titled 'IRAQ UK / US NUCLEAR ESTIMATES – IMPLICATIONS FOR SANCTIONS'

[redacted] makes a very good point about how comparisons of the UK and US positions on nuclear estimates could have fallout(!) in terms of follow on questioning about the effectiveness of sanctions. (Depending on the actual text of the US NIE/White paper).

It unrolls thus.

UK says Iraq could build a bomb in 5 years if sanctions have gone away.

US says Iraq could build a bomb in 5 years

The implication of the US statement is that this can be achieved whether sanctions are in place or not.

The potential line of follow on questioning is therefore - are we in disagreement with the US about whether sanctions are achieving anything?

I know that there is already a first draft of a Q&A pack to support the publication of the dossier, and that the Cabinet Office may circulate it soon for comment. This is one area that might need some attention.

Rgds.