

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: ICA Comments

Classification: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
=====

Hi [REDACTED] – Forwarding these comments from FBI for your awareness. They had previously told me that Director Wray signed off on the ICA text, and the only changes since then have been downgrades of [REDACTED] reporting and the DNI's minor initial edits. Most of this we've been over numerous times already. So it's not clear to me if they're backtracking or just commenting for the record.

[REDACTED]
Director, Election Threat Analysis
National Intelligence Council/DNI Election Threat Executive
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: FLORIS, NIKKI L. (CD) (FBI) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 1:42 PM

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: UGORETZ TONYA FBI USA GOV [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Subject: ICA Comments --- [REDACTED]

Classification: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
=====

Hi [REDACTED]

Couple of thoughts on the updated **ICA draft**, all of which center on the minority view and some of which you have previously heard from the FBI team. Generally speaking, while we are fine with the inclusion of the minority view textbox, we firmly believe the analysis in said text box must comport to the same analytic standards as the rest of the ICA. This is an absolute red line for the FBI. **Additionally, we do not support the inclusion of the minority view in the KJs; without proper context and source descriptions, the minority view is given parody to the ICA assessments. Below are some more specific points:**

In the first para, the NIO notes that China's leaders also "intended" some of Beijing's efforts to indirectly affect US candidates, etc. The IC has repeatedly stated, based on a body of intelligence, there is no evidence of said intention, though we note there was an awareness of this potential effect. To state this as bluntly as the NIO does, without evidence to support this claim, is extremely misleading.

In the second para, the NIO notes he gives more weight to several clandestine and liaison reports, without any sort of source description whatsoever. By minimizing the source descriptions, clandestine reporting from US or liaison sources of dubious credibility, poorly identified sourcing chains, and minimal track records of reporting is given the same weight as signals intelligence of identified senior Chinese diplomatic and intelligence figures, as well as clandestine reporting of decision making in Beijing from sources with established records of reporting that is generally reliable.

In the last tic, the NIO assesses China "may" also have encouraged protests. There is no evidence of this in the reporting, and the citations associated with this tic certainly do not support this assessment. This is highly misleading and a misrepresentation of the underlying reports.

The final para in the dissent argues that we have collection gaps on the entities that would probably execute influence operations. This point appears to acknowledge that IC collection demonstrated that China's leaders practiced restraint and did not intend to influence the outcome of the election and instead focuses on where collection gaps might miss evidence of the execution of influence ops. This shift in focus by the NIO is inconsistent with earlier portions of the dissent argumentation and argues that US collection did not find what China has actually done. As we've said before, citing the absence of evidence is an absolute red line for us.

Thanks again for all the work on this [REDACTED] . . . we will continue to stand by for any additional drafts, etc. On a more positive note, the Iran section edits are much improved and we greatly appreciate you working with us on this! I am out of the office tomorrow, but Cynthia is in should you need to reach anyone on the team. We will be back in full force Monday.

Have a wonderful New Year,
Nikki

DAD Nikki L. Floris

Counterintelligence Division

Open: [REDACTED]

NSTS: [REDACTED]

FBIHQ Rm [REDACTED]

=====
Classification: [REDACTED]