



Barack Obama Presidential Library

Barcode Systematic Scanning Cover Sheet Per Folder

Systematic File Name:

t066775620-025798-71697



t 0 6 6 7 7 5 6 2 0 - 0 2 5 7 9 8 - 7 1 6 9 7

Folder Title:

FolderID: 25798

Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]

Box Number: 71697

Box Type: Legal Hollinger

Document Classification:

UNCLASSIFIED

National Security Staff



Iran Deal/JCPOA Rollout Papers

July 14, 2015

Document Classification:

UNCLASSIFIED

National Security Staff

Iran Deal/JCPOA Rollout Papers

Table of Contents

July 14, 2015

- A. Comprehensive Deal Rollout Plan
- B. Summary Document of JCPOA Text
- C. Top-line Messaging on JCPOA
- D. Kerry Press Q/A for Vienna
- E. Rebuttal to AIPAC
- F. WINEP Comparison
- G. Lausanne Comparison
- H. Key Arguments
- I. Research Documents on Concessions Accusations
- J. Research Documents on JPOA Initial Opposition/Keep JPOA
- K. Talking Points for Hill Calls
- L. Tools to Counter Iranian Missile and Arms Activity
- M. Iran Deal Graphics

TAB A

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Summary	Tools to Counter Iranian Missile and Arms Activity	3	N.D	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection

SERIES:

Mosteller, Brian - General Files

FOLDER TITLE:

Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]

FRC ID:

9182

OA Num.:

FOIA IDs and Segments:

24-11036-F

NARA Num.:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Briefing	Rollout Plan for Iran Comprehensive Framework	19	07/14/2015	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:**Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection****SERIES:****Mosteller, Brian - General Files****FOLDER TITLE:****Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]****FRC ID:****9182****OA Num.:****FOIA IDs and Segments:****24-11036-F****NARA Num.:**

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

TAB B

Summary: Key Excerpts of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)

Preamble and General Provisions

- The full implementation of this JCPOA will ensure the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program.
- Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.
- This JCPOA will produce the comprehensive lifting of all UN Security Council sanctions as well as multilateral and national sanctions related to Iran's nuclear program.
- A Joint Commission consisting of the E3/EU+3 and Iran will be established to monitor the implementation of this JCPOA and will carry out the functions provided for in this JCPOA.
- The IAEA will be requested to monitor and verify the voluntary nuclear-related measures as detailed in this JCPOA. The IAEA will be requested to provide regular updates to the Board of Governors, and as provided for in this JCPOA, to the UN Security Council.
- The E3+3 will submit a draft resolution to the UN Security Council endorsing this JCPOA affirming that conclusion of this JCPOA marks a fundamental shift in its consideration of this issue and expressing its desire to build a new relationship with Iran.

Nuclear

Enrichment, Enrichment R&D, Stockpiles

- Iran's long term plan includes certain agreed limitations on all uranium enrichment and uranium enrichment-related activities including certain limitations on specific research and development (R&D) activities for the first 8 years, to be followed by gradual evolution, at a reasonable pace, to the next stage of its enrichment activities for exclusively peaceful purposes.
- Iran will begin phasing out its IR-1 centrifuges in 10 years. During this period, Iran will keep its enrichment capacity at Natanz at up to a total installed uranium enrichment capacity of 5060 IR-1 centrifuges. Excess centrifuges and enrichment-related infrastructure at Natanz will be stored under IAEA continuous monitoring.
(Note: Iran currently has about 19,000 IR-1 and advanced IR-2M centrifuges installed)
- Based on its long-term plan, for 15 years, Iran will keep its level of uranium enrichment at up to 3.67%.
(Note: Prior to the Joint Plan of Action, Iran enriched uranium to near 20%)

- Iran will refrain from any uranium enrichment and uranium enrichment R&D and from keeping any nuclear material at Fordow for 15 years.
(*Note: Iran currently has about 2,700 IR-1 centrifuges installed at Fordow of which about 700 are enriching uranium*)
- Iran will convert the Fordow facility into a nuclear, physics and technology center.
- 1044 IR-I machines in six cascades will remain in one wing at Fordow. Two of those six cascades will spin without uranium and will be transitioned, including through appropriate infrastructure modification, for stable isotope production. The other four cascades with all associated infrastructure will remain idle.
- During the 15 year period, Iran will keep its uranium stockpile under 300 kg of up to 3.67% enriched UF₆ or the equivalent in other chemical forms.
(*Note: Iran currently maintains a stockpile of about 10,000 kg of low-enriched UF₆*)
- All other centrifuges and enrichment-related infrastructure will be removed and stored under IAEA continuous monitoring.

Arak, Heavy Water, Reprocessing

- Iran will design and rebuild a modernized heavy water research reactor in Arak, based on an agreed conceptual design, using fuel enrichment up to 3.67%, in the form of an international partnership which will certify the final design. The reactor will support peaceful nuclear research and radioisotope production for medical and instructional purposes. The redesigned and rebuilt Arak reactor will not produce weapons grade plutonium.
- Iran plans to keep pace with the trend of international technological advancement in relying on light water for its future power and research with enhanced international cooperation including assurance of supply of necessary fuel.
- There will be no additional heavy water reactors or accumulation of heavy water in Iran for 15 years.
- Iran intends to ship out all spent fuel for all future and present power and research nuclear reactors.

Transparency and Confidence Building Measures

- Iran will provisionally apply the Additional Protocol to its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement in accordance with Article 17 b) of the Additional Protocol.
- Iran will fully implement the “Roadmap for Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues” agreed with the IAEA, containing arrangements to address past and present issues of concern relating to its nuclear program.

- Iran will allow the IAEA to monitor the implementation of the above voluntary measures for their respective durations, as well as to implement transparency measures, as set out by the JCPOA and its Annexes. These measures include: a long-term presence in Iran; IAEA monitoring of uranium ore concentrate produced by Iran from all uranium ore concentrate plants for 25 years; containment and surveillance of centrifuge rotors and bellows for 20 years; use of IAEA approved and certified modern technologies including on-line enrichment measure and electronic seals; and a reliable mechanism to ensure speedy resolution of IAEA access concerns for 15 years, as defined in Annex I.
- Iran will not engage in activities, including at the R&D level, that could contribute to the development of a nuclear explosive device, including uranium or plutonium metallurgy activities.
- Iran will cooperate and act in accordance with the procurement channel in this JCPOA, as detailed in Annex IV, endorsed by the UN Security Council resolution.

Sanctions

- The UN Security Council resolution endorsing the JCPOA will terminate all the provisions of the previous UN Security Council resolutions on the Iranian nuclear issue simultaneously with the IAEA-verified implementation of agreed nuclear-related measures by Iran and will establish specific restrictions.
- The EU will terminate all provisions of the EU Regulation, as subsequently amended, implementing all the nuclear related economic and financial sanctions, including related designations, simultaneously with IAEA-verified implementation of agreed nuclear-related measures by Iran as specified in Annex V.
- The United States will cease the application, and will continue to do so, in accordance with the JCPOA, of the sanctions specified in Annex II, to take effect simultaneously with the IAEA-verified implementation of the agreed upon related measures by Iran as specified in Appendix V.
(Note: U.S. statutory sanctions focused on Iran's support for terrorism, human rights abuses, and missile activities will remain in effect and continue to be enforced.)
- Eight years after Adoption Day or when the IAEA has reached the Broader Conclusion that all the nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, whichever is earlier, the United States will seek such legislative action as may be appropriate to terminate or modify to effectuate the termination of sanctions specified in Annex II.

Implementation Plan

- Finalization Day is the date on which negotiations of this JCPOA are concluded among the E3/EU+3 and Iran, to be followed promptly by submission of the resolution endorsing this JCPOA to the UN Security Council for adoption without delay.

- Adoption Day is the date 90 days after the endorsement of this JCPOA by the UN Security Council, or such earlier date as may be determined by mutual consent of the JCPOA participants, at which time this JCPOA and the commitments in this JCPOA come into effect.
- Implementation Day is the date on which, simultaneously with the IAEA report verifying implementation by Iran of the nuclear-related measures described in Sections 15.1 to 15.11 of Annex V, the EU and the United States takes the actions described in Sections 16 and 17 of Annex V.
- Transition Day is day 8 years after Adoption Day or the date on which the Director General of the IAEA submits a report stating that the IAEA has reached the Broader Conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, whichever is earlier.
- UN Security Council resolution termination day is the date on which the UN Security Council resolution endorsing this JCPOA terminates according to its terms, which is to be 10 years from Adoption Day.

Dispute Resolution Mechanism

- If Iran believed that any or all of the E3/EU+3 were not meeting their commitments under this JCPOA, Iran could refer the issue to the Joint Commission for resolution; similarly, if any of the E3/EU+3 believed that Iran was not meeting its commitments under the JCPOA, any of the E3/EU+3 can do the same. The Joint Commission would have 15 days to resolve the issue, unless the time period was extended by consensus.
- After Joint Commission consideration, any participant could refer the issue to ministers of foreign affairs, if it believed the compliance issue had not been resolved. Ministers would have 15 days to resolve the issue, unless the time period was extended by consensus.
- If the issue has still not been resolved to the satisfaction of the complaining participant, and if the complaining participant deems the issue to constitute significant non-performance, then that participant could treat the unresolved issue as grounds to cease performing its commitments under this JCPOA in whole or in part and / or notify the UN Security Council that it believes the issue constitutes significant non-performance.

###

TAB C

Talking Points on Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

The United States and our partners have concluded an historic deal that will peacefully and verifiably prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. This deal is the result of nearly 20 months of intensive negotiations since the P5+1 and Iran concluded the Joint Plan of Action.

This is a very good deal. It fulfills the framework for a comprehensive deal that was reached in Lausanne – and goes beyond that framework in several areas. It cuts off all of Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon. It ensures the vigorous inspections and transparency necessary to verify that Iran cannot pursue a nuclear weapon. It ensures that sanctions will snap back into place if Iran violates the deal. And it is a long-term deal, including elements that will be permanent.

The United States refused to take a bad deal – we held out for a deal that met every single one of our bottom lines, and we got it. The reason why these talks were extended so many times – and *why* we were willing to go beyond the July 9 reporting date to Congress – is because we were not going to accept anything less. This is also an incredibly detailed agreement – with a main text and detailed annexes. The deal will now submit to Congress for the 60-day review period – and the President will veto any action by Congress that would prevent the successful implementation of this deal.

Pathways

This deal cuts off Iran’s ability to pursue a nuclear weapon with plutonium.

- The core of Iran’s heavy water reactor at Arak will be removed and filled with concrete so it can never be used again. The United States will be part of the international partnership that will approve the plan to redesign and rebuild the reactor so that it will not produce weapons grade plutonium.
- For the next 15 years, Iran will not be able to build any additional heavy water reactors; will not be able to accumulate excess heavy water; and will not be able to conduct reprocessing.
- Iran will ship out all spent fuel for present and future power and research nuclear reactors for 15 years and has committed to rely on light water for future nuclear reactors.

This deal cuts off Iran’s ability to pursue a nuclear weapon through uranium enrichment.

- Iran will have to remove 2/3 of its centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium. All of the pipework that connects these centrifuges and allows them to enrich uranium will be dismantled, removed and kept under continuous surveillance by the IAEA.
- For a decade Iran will only be able to operate roughly 5,000 centrifuges at Natanz. Iran will not be able to enrich uranium or keep any fissile materials at Fordow for 15 years.
- For the first decade, Iran will only be allowed to use its first generation, IR-1 centrifuges for enrichment purposes. It will have to remove its 1,000 IR-2M centrifuges currently installed at Natanz and place them in IAEA monitored storage. There will also be strict limitations on research and development. For 10 years, Iran will not be able to produce enriched uranium with any its advanced centrifuges.

- Iran will have to reduce its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent. To put that in perspective, Iran currently has enough raw materials to produce about 10 nuclear weapons. When reduced by 98 percent, Iran won't have enough enriched uranium for even a single nuclear weapon. This cap on Iran's stockpile will last for 15 years.
- With this deal, Iran's so-called "breakout timeline" – the amount of time it would take Iran to acquire enough fissile material for one nuclear weapon if Iran breaks its commitments – will be extended from roughly the current 2-3 months, to at least one year during the first decade.
- Iran also has a separate "breakout timeline" of at least a year to build an actual warhead capable of delivering a nuclear payload. This deal goes beyond Lausanne in ensuring commitments against weaponization by Iran, which has committed to not engage in activities, including R&D, that could be related to development of a nuclear explosive device.

Inspections

This deal includes the most comprehensive and intrusive verification regime ever negotiated.

- There will be 24/7 monitoring of Iran's declared nuclear facilities, including Natanz, Fordow, and Arak.
- International inspectors will have access to Iran's entire nuclear supply chain – its uranium mines and mills; its conversion facility; its centrifuge manufacturing and storage facilities; and its other declared nuclear sites – critical elements which will be under watchful eye for 25 years. As a result, Iran would need to construct an entire covert supply chain to pursue a covert nuclear weapons program.
- A dedicated procurement channel will be established to monitor and approve, on a case-by-case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer to Iran of certain nuclear-related and dual-use materials and technology – an additional transparency measure to prevent diversion of sensitive goods to a covert program.
- Iran has agreed to provide the IAEA with the information necessary to address the possible military dimensions of Iran's past program – or PMD. Iran will not receive sanctions relief until the IAEA gets the cooperation it needs to complete its investigation into PMD. The IAEA will have the access to Parchin that the IAEA believes it needs.
- Going forward, Iran will implement the Additional Protocol, which ensures the IAEA can seek access to non-declared facilities or any suspicious site. Put simply, the IAEA will have access when it needs it, and where it needs it. If the IAEA has concerns, no site will be considered off limits in order to address them and this could include military sites.
- The JCPOA will also require that Iran grant the IAEA access to any requested locations within 24 days if a majority of our partners agree it is necessary. This means we can achieve the access IAEA inspectors need if the United States and our European allies are in agreement.

Sanctions

Iran will not receive any new sanctions relief until it verifiably completes important steps to rollback its program, and we can snap sanctions back into place if Iran violates the deal.

- Reports of a “signing bonus” were false – Iran must complete its key nuclear steps before it begins to receive sanctions relief beyond the limited relief provided for under the JPOA. We anticipate that it will take Iran from 6 months to a year to complete these key steps.
- The JCPOA allows us to snap sanctions back into place if Iran violates the deal.
- Since the President will be using his waiver authority to provide relief, the United States can quickly reimpose our unilateral sanctions if Iran cheats. Meanwhile, we will be keeping in place other unilateral sanctions that relate to non-nuclear issues such as support for terrorism and human rights abuses.
- The UN Security Council Resolutions that imposed sanctions on Iran will be replaced by a new UN Security Council Resolution that will last for a decade. For the first decade of the deal, there will be an automatic snapback of these multilateral sanctions if Iran violates the deal— a snapback that cannot be vetoed by Russia or China. In addition, for years 11-15, the P5+1 has agreed to re-impose sanctions if Iran violates the deal.
- This new UN Security Council resolution will re-establish important sanctions restricting the transfer of sensitive nuclear technologies and keep in place sanctions on ballistic missiles for 8 years and conventional arms for 5 years.

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Talking Points	Iran Toplines	1	N.D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:**Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection****SERIES:****Mosteller, Brian - General Files****FOLDER TITLE:****Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]****FRC ID:****9182****OA Num.:****FOIA IDs and Segments:****24-11036-F****NARA Num.:**

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

TAB D

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Talking Points	Kerry Press Q/A for Vienna	17	N.D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:**Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection****SERIES:****Mosteller, Brian - General Files****FOLDER TITLE:****Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]****FRC ID:****9182****OA Num.:****FOIA IDs and Segments:****24-11036-F****NARA Num.:**

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

TAB E

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Talking Points	Rebuttle to AIPAC	4	07/12/2015	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:**Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection****SERIES:****Mosteller, Brian - General Files****FOLDER TITLE:****Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]****FRC ID:****9182****OA Num.:****FOIA IDs and Segments:****24-11036-F****NARA Num.:**

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

TAB F

JCPOA Exceeds WINEP Benchmarks

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) exceeds all five benchmarks for a good deal published by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy's (WINEP) bipartisan group for the Iran nuclear issue. The JCPOA reaffirms U.S. policy to prevent Iran from producing sufficient fissile material for a nuclear weapon – or otherwise acquiring or building one.

WINEP Benchmarks

Monitoring and Verification: *The inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (the "IAEA") charged with monitoring compliance with the agreement must have timely and effective access to any sites in Iran they need to visit in order to verify Iran's compliance with the agreement. This must include military (including IRGC) and other sensitive facilities. Iran must not be able to deny or delay timely access to any site anywhere in the country that the inspectors need to visit in order to carry out their responsibilities.*

JCPOA Commitments

- ✓ **Monitoring and Verification:** The JCPOA ensures both timely and effective International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to any location in Iran necessary in order to verify Iran's compliance. Not only will the IAEA have daily access to Iran's primary nuclear sites, Natanz¹ and Fordow², but it will be able to conduct regular monitoring – using modern technology³ – of Iran's uranium mines and mills⁴ and its centrifuge production, assembly, and storage facilities⁵. This means that the IAEA will have access to the supply chain that supports Iran's nuclear program, as well as be able to continuously monitor the nuclear infrastructure that is removed as a requirement of this deal. In an instance where the IAEA has a question about an undeclared location outside Iran's declared nuclear program, the IAEA will be able to request access under the Additional Protocol (AP), which Iran will implement as part of the JCPOA⁶. Access under the Additional Protocol will be used by the IAEA to verify at undeclared sites that no unapproved nuclear activity is occurring. Military and other sensitive sites are not exempt from the AP. Above and beyond the AP, the JCPOA has an additional procedure that will effectively require Iran to grant IAEA access to any requested location within a predetermined, limited time period.⁷ If Iran denies access through this procedure, it would be in violation of the JCPOA. Moreover, the establishment of a dedicated procurement channel for Iran's nuclear program will also enable the close monitoring and approval of materials so as to minimize the chances of any diversion to a secret program.
- ✓ **Possible Military Dimensions:** Iran has agreed to address all of the outstanding issues with regards to PMD in a comprehensive and time-limited manner. The IAEA and Iran together have developed and agreed on this time-limited process through which Iran will address the IAEA's questions by simultaneously and meaningfully engaging on all of the issues set out in the IAEA Director General's November 2011 report on PMD. Iran has committed, as a condition of the JCPOA⁸, to provide the information and access the IAEA needs to complete its investigation of PMD and issue its independent assessment. Appropriate access will be given to Parchin. Iran will provide this information and access within the next three months – by October 15th. Sanctions relief will not be provided unless and until Iran completes this process and gives the IAEA what it needs. In addition to addressing past weaponization concerns, the JCPOA also puts into place

new commitments by Iran not to engage in select activities which could contribute to the development of a nuclear explosive device.⁹

Advanced Centrifuges: The agreement must establish strict limits on advanced centrifuge R&D, testing, and deployment in the first ten years, and preclude the rapid technical upgrade and expansion of Iran's enrichment capacity after the initial ten-year period. The goal is to push back Iran's deployment of advanced centrifuges as long as possible, and ensure that any such deployment occurs at a measured, incremental pace consonant with a peaceful nuclear program.

Sanctions Relief: Relief must be based on Iran's performance of its obligations.

Suspension or lifting of the most significant sanctions must not occur until the IAEA confirms that Iran has taken the key steps required to come into compliance with the agreement. Non-nuclear sanctions (such as for terrorism) must remain in effect and be vigorously enforced.

Consequences of Violations: The agreement must include a timely and effective mechanism to re-impose sanctions automatically if Iran is found to be in violation of the agreement, including by denying or delaying IAEA access. In addition, the United States must itself articulate the serious consequences Iran will face in that event.

✓ **Advanced Centrifuges:** The JCPOA establishes strict limits on advanced centrifuge R&D, testing, and deployment in the first 10 years, and, after the initial decade, Iran must abide by its enrichment and R&D plan submitted to the IAEA under the Additional Protocol. Pursuant to the JCPOA, this plan ensures a measured, incremental growth in Iran's enrichment capacity consonant with a peaceful nuclear program. Iran's enrichment R&D with uranium will only include IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, and IR-8 centrifuges for the first decade and will be limited to single centrifuges and small cascades (less than 30) at Natanz.¹⁰ Mechanical testing will be limited to not more than 2 single centrifuges on the IR-2m, IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, IR-6s, IR-7, and IR-8 for the first decade.¹¹ These R&D activities will be closely monitored by the IAEA and are sufficiently limited that, even if Iran violates its JCPOA commitments, Iran's breakout timeline for a single nuclear weapon would remain at least 1 year for the first decade of the JCPOA and remain longer than the 2-3 months it is today for several years beyond Year 10.

✓ **Sanctions Relief:** Under the JCPOA, Iran will only receive additional UN, EU, and U.S. sanctions relief beyond the small level of relief in the Joint Plan of Action once the IAEA verifies that Iran has implemented key nuclear-related measures agreed upon in the JCPOA.¹² U.S. sanctions imposed for non-nuclear reasons will remain in effect and will continue to be vigorously enforced.

✓ **Consequences of Violations:** The JCPOA has a procedure that will require Iran to grant IAEA access to any requested location within a predetermined, limited time period.¹³ If Iran denies access through this procedure, it would break its JCPOA commitment and sanctions could be snapped back. This includes a mechanism that will allow any member of the P5+1 to unilaterally snap back UN sanctions if there is a violation for the initial 10 years of the JCPOA. Put simply, neither Iran, Russia, nor China – or all 3 together – could block the snapback of these sanctions. There is also a political understanding among the P5 to reimpose UN sanctions in Years 11-15 if Iran violates the JCPOA. And, the EU and United States can snap back their sanctions at any time if Iran does not meet its commitments. The United States will always retain the ability to take whatever steps necessary to protect America's security and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon if it chooses to seek to acquire one. In fact, this deal puts us in a better position to do so, if necessary, in the future.

- ¹ JCPOA Annex I, Section P
- ² JCPOA Annex I, Section H
- ³ JCPOA Annex I, Section N
- ⁴ JCPOA Annex I, Section O
- ⁵ JCPOA Annex I, Section K
- ⁶ JCPOA Annex I, Section I
- ⁷ JCPOA Annex I, Section Q
- ⁸ JCPOA Main Text
- ⁹ JCPOA Annex I, Section T
- ¹⁰ JCPOA Annex I, Section G
- ¹¹ JCPOA Annex I, Section G
- ¹² JCPOA Annex V, Paragraph 14
- ¹³ JCPOA Annex I, Section Q

TAB G

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Summary	Lausanne Comparison	8	N.D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection

SERIES:

Mosteller, Brian - General Files

FOLDER TITLE:

Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]

FRC ID:

9182

OA Num.:

FOIA IDs and Segments:

24-11036-F

22-20639-F

NARA Num.:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]

b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]

b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]

b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]

b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

Deed of Gift Restrictions

A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.

Records Not Subject to FOIA

B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

TAB H

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Talking Points	Key Arguments	4	N.D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:**Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM) - West Wing Collection****SERIES:****Mosteller, Brian - General Files****FOLDER TITLE:****Binder - Iran Deal/JCPOA (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) Rollout Papers, 07/14/2015 [1]****FRC ID:****9182****OA Num.:****FOIA IDs and Segments:****24-11036-F****NARA Num.:**

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a](5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

TAB I

Iran Deal Critics – U.S. ‘Concessions’

7/12/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “We Have To Remember The Goal Of These Negotiations From The Beginning. It Was To Stop Iran From Enriching Uranium And Developing Nuclear Weapons Capability. The U.N. Security Council Has Said Repeatedly That They Have No Right To Enrich Uranium. That's Been United States' Policy For 40 Years. And The President Has Repeatedly Granted Them More Concessions To Let Them Enrich Uranium. Now We're Talking About What Kind Of Access We Are Going To Have To Inspect Their Military Sites Or Whether They're Going To Get Tens Or Hundreds Of Billions Of Dollars In A Signing Bonus...” “SEN. COTTON: In early April, they said they had agreement in principle, but there was never a text to which they agreed. We don't know if there is going to be a final agreement this weekend or not. But I think the United States has gone way too far down the road of making concessions to Iran. We have to remember the goal of these negotiations from the beginning. It was to stop Iran from enriching uranium and developing nuclear weapons capability. The U.N. Security Council has said repeatedly that they have no right to enrich uranium. That's been United States' policy for 40 years. And the president has repeatedly granted them more concessions to let them enrich uranium. Now we're talking about what kind of access we are going to have to inspect their military sites or whether they're going to get tens or hundreds of billions of dollars in a signing bonus, so I think whatever deal comes out this weekend, it's going to be dangerous for the United States and dangerous for the world. DICKERSON: So, we have gone from trying to prevent the nuclear program to just kind of manage it?

COTTON: Yes. The clear goal, as president himself stated, was to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability, not to manage it, not to limit for a certain period of time, but to stop them from developing it.” [CBS News Face the Nation, 7/12/15]

7/12/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “The Clear Goal, As President Himself Stated, Was To Stop Iran From Developing Nuclear Weapons Capability, Not To Manage It, Not To Limit For A Certain Period Of Time, But To Stop Them From Developing It.” “DICKERSON: So, we have gone from trying to prevent the nuclear program to just kind of manage it? COTTON: Yes. The clear goal, as president himself stated, was to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability, not to manage it, not to limit for a certain period of time, but to stop them from developing it.” [CBS News Face the Nation, 7/12/15]

7/10/15: Sen. Lindsey Graham: “This Administration Started With The Goal Of Dismantling The Program. They're About To Sign A Deal That Will Guarantee That Iran Will Become A Nuclear Power After The Passage Of Ten Years, Maybe 15... I Think What We're Guaranteeing, Even If Iran Complies With The Deal, They Will Be A Nuclear Nation And You Will Create A Nuclear Arms Race If You Go Down The Road They Charted Because They Went From Dismantling To Locking In Place.” “BOLDUAN: Let's bring back in Senator Lindsey Graham. Senator, this is an issue you have spoken out quite a bit about and an issue I want to hear your opinion on as things kind of are now past the clock striking midnight that extra innings, if you will. You have said that you do not believe President Obama can ever strike a satisfactory, acceptable deal with Iran on this nuclear issue, but what about Secretary Kerry? Do you not have faith in him?

GRAHAM: No, I don't. I don't have faith in anybody in the Obama administration to deal with radical Islam effectively. ISIL is running wild. When it comes to the Iranian nuclear program, this administration started with the goal of dismantling the program. They're about to sign a deal that will guarantee that Iran will become a nuclear power after the passage of ten years, maybe 15. They're going to lock in place a robust enrichment program. They're going to give the largest state sponsor of terrorism billions of dollars to put in their war machine. I think what we're guaranteeing, even if Iran complies with the deal, they will be a nuclear nation and you will create a nuclear arms race if you go down the road they charted because they went from dismantling to locking in place. This is a disaster in the making." [CNN, 7/10/15]

7/10/15: Sen. Kelly Ayotte: "...They Have Already Conceded Too Much, Because A Good Agreement Would Dismantle Iran[']s Program. A Good Agreement Would Deal With The Terrorism That They Support In The Region. A Good Agreement Would Allow Inspections Anytime Anywhere, Including Their Military Facilities. A Good Agreement Would Deal With Their ICBM Program And Missiles Program, And We Have Already Conceded Too Much." "CAVUTO: ...Secretary of State Kerry has said that he is running out of patience, but we patiently keep extending this deadline. You say, stop, cease, desis. Why? AYOTTE: I would say at this point we know what needs to happen. And, unfortunately, they have already conceded too much, because a good agreement would dismantle Iran[']s program. A good agreement would deal with the terrorism that they support in the region. A good agreement would allow inspections anytime anywhere, including their military facilities. A good agreement would deal with their ICBM program and missiles program, and we have already conceded too much. And here we. They're extending it." [Fox News Cavuto, 7/10/15]

7/9/15: Sen. John McCain: "...I Agree With Bibi Netanyahu -- We Started Here And Here And We Moved And Keep On Moving In Their Direction. As George Shultz And Henry Kissinger Pointed Out, We've Gone From Elimination Of Iran's Nuclear Capability To The Delaying Of It." "SEN. MCCAIN: his Iran deal here. What are you looking for? Have you been briefed at all? What do you want to hear from John Kerry?

SEN. MCCAIN: Well, we've not been briefed at all. It's obvious that the latest Russian -- excuse me, the latest Iranian demands concerning lifting of sanctions by the U.N. is a new area that they think they can explore and get concessions. After all, I agree with Bibi Netanyahu -- we started here and here and we moved and keep on moving in their direction. As George Shultz and Henry Kissinger pointed out, we've gone from elimination of Iran's nuclear capability to the delaying of it. And many concessions have been made. I guess they're trying to force some more, because it's clear who wants the deal more, and that's the United States.

MITCHELL: Iran does need a deal. They need sanctions relief. Their economy is in shambles. So how does it boil down to the fact that you think at least that the U.S. is projecting it needs it more than Iran needs it? Is Iran, in your view at least, a better negotiator?

MCCAIN: Well, I think the fact is it's been made very clear, because of the enormous concessions that have already been made, as I mentioned from the position of eliminating that to delaying it, and other concessions that have been made, that, yes, Iran wants it but not as badly as the United States does. Because the president bases all of this on the delusion that an agreement will then cause a new partnership between the United States and Iran in the region. Meanwhile, the Iranians continue their aggression in at least four countries and will continue that. [MSNBC Andrea Mitchell, 7/9/15]

7/8/15: Sen. Bob Menendez: “We Started These Negotiations Saying Iran Cannot Have The Capacity For Nuclear Weapons. We Started Talking About That We Needed To Dismantle Some Of Iran's Illicit Nuclear Infrastructures. We Started Saying That There Is No Right To Enrich, And What Do We Have So Far From What I Can See? We Have The Iranians Having An Implicit Ability To Go Ahead And Enrich ... The Iranians Have Been Able To Keep Most Of Their Infrastructure In Place. And At 10 To 15 Years, They Will Have A Clear Pathway Towards, If They Choose To, Towards Pursuing A Nuclear Bomb.”

“BASH: I’m sorry, do you think a good deal is even possible at this point? I mean, remember, the deadline now is allegedly is Friday.

SEN. MENENDEZ: Well, look, I’m afraid that our red lines to the Iranians seem to be green lights. The reality is that how did we start these negotiations? We started these negotiations saying Iran cannot have the capacity for nuclear weapons. We started talking about that we needed to dismantle some of Iran’s illicit nuclear infrastructures. We started saying that there is no right to enrich, and what do we have so far from what I can see? We have the Iranians having an implicit ability to go ahead and enrich. We have a nuclear infrastructure that despite the world powers sitting on the other side of the table, the Iranians have been able to keep most of their infrastructure in place. And at 10 to 15 years, they will have a clear pathway towards, if they choose to, towards pursuing a nuclear bomb. That is not where the national interest of the United States is, nor of our ally, the state of Israel.” [CNN Newsroom, [7/8/15](#)]

7/5/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “...Concessions That Have Already Been Made [Include] Letting Them Keep Their Underground Fortified Bunker, Or Letting Them Keep Their Centrifuges And A Stockpile Of Uranium, Letting Them Keep Their Ballistic Missile Program, Letting Them Keep Their American Hostages And Letting Them Continue To Foment Terrorism All Around The World And Destabilize The Middle East.”

“STEPHANOPOULOS: You know, some of President Obama’s former advisers echoed at least some of your concerns, but they say that if you get a deal that actually provides for inspections of Iran’s military sites that actually holds up on any sanctions relief until it proves that Iran is meeting the terms of the deal, that it will be a good deal, that it will give the United States and the world about 10 to 15 years of breathing space. Why isn’t that good enough?

COTTON: Well, George, it is very inevitable that some of President Obama’s own former advisers have begun to walk away from the proposal that he’s made. If, in fact, those terms were met, if we had any time, anywhere inspections, if there was no sanctions relief until there was long-term demonstrable performance on Iran’s part, if they fully answered all the past work they’ve done to weaponize their nuclear program, then that might be a better deal, but that’s not the deal we’re going to reach and it also doesn’t address the concessions that have already been made like letting them keep their underground fortified bunker, or letting them keep their centrifuges and a stockpile of uranium, letting them keep their ballistic missile program, letting them keep their American hostages and letting them continue to foment terrorism all around the world and destabilize the Middle East.” [ABC News This Week, [7/5/15](#)]

7/5/15: Sen. Bob Corker: “...We've Gone From Dismantling The Program To Managing Proliferation. That's The Biggest Concern. That's Already Done.” “JOHN DICKERSON: For more on the Iran deal we turn to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,

Senator Bob Corker who is in Chattanooga, Tennessee, this morning. Senator Corker, what worries you the most about where things are now in this negotiation?

SEN. CORKER: Well, we've gone from dismantling the program to managing proliferation. That's the biggest concern. That's already done. But right now we have the issues of are we going to have anytime, anywhere inspections? Will we know what their past military dimensions were? It's very important. Every person who has come in to testify has talked about the importance of that. Will the IAEA ever be required to declare that Iran over time has a civil program, not a military program. So there are numbers of issues. It's been going on a negative trend for some time..." [CBS News Face the Nation, 7/5/15]

- **7/5/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "...What We're Going To End Up With, The Deal That We Know About ... You're Going To Have Basically A Ten-Year Pause In Enrichment. But What You're Going To Have During That Time Them Continuing Their Ballistic Missile Development, Which Is Already Very Sophisticated. They're Going To Be Able To Continue Their Research And Development As Was Mentioned."** "SEN. CORKER: One of the things about this, John, is Iran has done excellent job of getting these countries to focus on the IR-1 centrifuges that they have – they're almost antiques. And what we're going to end up with, the deal that we know about -- there's some other things working out right now – but you're going to have basically a ten-year pause in enrichment. But what you're going to have during that time them continuing their ballistic missile development, which is already very sophisticated. They're going to be able to continue their research and development as was mentioned. They're going to have their sanctions released. They're going to have a country whose economy is growing rapidly, that's going to have all kinds -- over \$100 billion of money to help create further terrorism in the region. So they're going to be growing, they're going to be getting more established. And then after ten years something called the Iranian nuclear development program, it's been agreed to. At that point where basically going to be able to industrialize their program. By the way this is a program that has no practical needs. This was the baseline that concerns so many people. Why would they have 19,000 centrifuges they have no practical needs for that." [CBS News Face the Nation, 7/5/15]

6/26/15: Gary Samore: "The Fundamental Concessions We Made To Come Close To An Agreement Was, 'A' To Allow The Iranians To Retain A Substantial Enrichment Infrastructure, Several Thousand Centrifuges, Continuing Research And Development So That They Can Have Equipment And People Trained And So Forth. And Then After 15 Years, All Of The Physical Constraints On That Infrastructure Are Removed, And The Iranians, According To The Agreement, Can Then Expand To Have A Much Larger Industrial Scale Enrichment Program, Which Would Give Them A More Credible Nuclear Weapons Option." "GARY SAMORE: Yeah. The fundamental concessions we made to come close to an agreement was, 'A' to allow the Iranians to retain a substantial enrichment infrastructure, several thousand centrifuges, continuing research and development so that they can have equipment and people trained and so forth. And then after 15 years, all of the physical constraints on that infrastructure are removed, and the Iranians, according to the agreement, can then expand to have a much larger industrial scale enrichment program, which would give them a more credible nuclear weapons option. So basically, this agreement kicks the can down the

road 15 years, which is a long way, but we don't know in 15 years what Iran will be like, what U.S.-Iranian relations will be like. It may turn out enough change will take place in those 15 years so we won't be as concerned about Iran having a basic nuclear capacity. On the other hand, if there's no change, the president, whoever that is in 15 years, may have to be faced with the need to oppose Iran expanding its program, even though they've complied with the agreement for 15 years." [PBS Charlie Rose, 6/26/15]

6/22/15: "SCARBOROUGH: On The First Two Items [Of Anytime/Anywhere Inspections And PMD], These Were Issues That You Didn't Even Think Were Issues Two, Three Months Ago.

SEN. CORKER: Nonnegotiable.

SCARBOROUGH: And The President Has Always Said They Were Going To Be Nonnegotiable?

SEN. CORKER: Nonnegotiable." "SCARBOROUGH: What's the one [issue] that concerns you the most right now?

SEN. CORKER: I think there are several. One is anytime, anyplace inspections. Their supreme leader has been saying, no, you're not going to inspect military sites. Obviously, we want to make sure that we don't end up in a situation like we had in Iraq where the IAEA could never get in and then they always moved the ball. You never knew where they were. Obviously we want to know the possible military dimensions. I think everyone in the Western world believes they were developing a nuclear weapon up until 2003. We want access to their scientists to know what capabilities they have. Thirdly, it appears the administration may be considering negotiating away more than just the nuclear-related sanctions but trying to tie others to it, so those would be three that would be very concerning.

SCARBOROUGH: On the first two items, these were issues that you didn't even think were issues two, three months ago.

SEN. CORKER: Nonnegotiable.

SCARBOROUGH: And the president has always said they were going to be nonnegotiable?

SEN. CORKER: Nonnegotiable." [MSNBC Morning Joe, 6/22/15]

- **6/22/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "Well You Know We've Already Crossed Multiple Red Lines. We Began With Dismantling Their Program. Now It Was Going To Be A 20-Year Teal. Now It's A Ten-Year Deal Where We're Really Managing Their Proliferation. We're Acknowledging That They're Going To Enrich ..."**

"SCARBOROUGH: So do you get any sense that he is actually drawing a red line that he's going to be willing to cross on both of these issues?

SEN. CORKER: Well you know we've already crossed multiple red lines. We began with dismantling their program. Now it was going to be a 20-year teal. Now it's a ten-year deal where we're really managing their proliferation. We're acknowledging that they're going to enrich --

SCARBOROUGH: It is ten years now?

SEN. CORKER: It's a ten-year deal. You remember on NPR the president mentioned, well, in year 13 they're basically going to be at zero breakout. There's a document that none of us have seen. It's called the Iranian Nuclear Development Program document. It's already been written. It lays out what they're going to be able to do after year ten, so it's a shortly thereafter time period where they're really going to be enhancing hugely the

numbers of centrifuges they have. But even during that period, they're going to continue to be doing development and research and on advanced centrifuges and they're still going to do all the work they need to be doing on their sophisticated ballistic missile program. So those lines, many lines have been crossed, but these have been nonnegotiable from day one. And John Kerry is making comments that we don't want to insult their national pride by causing them to come clean with their previous militarization of their nuclear program." [MSNBC Morning Joe, 6/22/15]

- **6/22/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "There's A Document That None Of Us Have Seen. It's Called The Iranian Nuclear Development Program Document. It's Already Been Written. It Lays Out What They're Going To Be Able To Do After Year Ten, So It's A Shortly Thereafter Time Period Where They're Really Going To Be Enhancing Hugely The Numbers Of Centrifuges They Have. But Even During That Period, They're Going To Continue To Be Doing Development And Research And On Advanced Centrifuges And They're Still Going To Do All The Work They Need To Be Doing On Their Sophisticated Ballistic Missile Program. So Those Lines, Many Lines Have Been Crossed, But These Have Been Nonnegotiable From Day One."**
"SEN. CORKER: It's a ten-year deal. You remember on NPR the president mentioned, well, in year 13 they're basically going to be at zero breakout. There's a document that none of us have seen. It's called the Iranian Nuclear Development Program document. It's already been written. It lays out what they're going to be able to do after year ten, so it's a shortly thereafter time period where they're really going to be enhancing hugely the numbers of centrifuges they have. But even during that period, they're going to continue to be doing development and research and on advanced centrifuges and they're still going to do all the work they need to be doing on their sophisticated ballistic missile program. So those lines, many lines have been crossed, but these have been nonnegotiable from day one. And John Kerry is making comments that we don't want to insult their national pride by causing them to come clean with their previous militarization of their nuclear program." [MSNBC Morning Joe, 6/22/15]

6/15/15: Sen. Bob Corker – Letter To President Obama: "It Is Breathtaking To See How Far From Your Original Goals And Statements The P5+1 Have Come During Negotiations With Iran ... [Like] From Having [Iran's] Nuclear Program Dismantled To Having Its Nuclear Proliferation Managed. Negotiators Have Moved From A 20-Year Agreement To What Is In Essence A 10-Year Agreement That Allows Iran To Simultaneously Continue Development Of An Advanced Ballistic Missile Program And Research And Development Of Advanced Centrifuges." "It is breathtaking to see how far from your original goals and statements the P5+1 have come during negotiations with Iran. Under your leadership, six of the world's most important nations have allowed an isolated country with roguish policies to move from having its nuclear program dismantled to having its nuclear proliferation managed. Negotiators have moved from a 20-year agreement to what is in essence a 10-year agreement that allows Iran to simultaneously continue development of an advanced ballistic missile program and research and development of advanced centrifuges. This also will allow Iran's economy to be restored with billions of dollars returned to its coffers, a development that administration officials concede will be used at some level to export terrorism in the region." [Sen. Corker Letter, 6/15/15]

4/21/15: Sen. Kelly Ayotte: “We’re Not Even Expecting Them To Fully Perform To Dismantle Their Program, Which Is What We Should Be Asking Them To Do. And We’re Not Asking Them To Stop Their Terrorism In The Region, Which Is Causing This Confrontation Right Now.”

“SEN. AYOTTE: ...the fact that they could get this \$50 billion bonus is very concerning, because what are they going to do with that money? That’s what they want. This money can be used to fuel terrorism. It can be used to further fuel this conflict in Yemen, support for the murderous Assad regime, Hezbollah, undermining Israel’s interests and our interests. And here we are. We’re not even expecting them to fully perform to dismantle their program, which is what we should be asking them to do. And we’re not asking them to stop their terrorism in the region, which is causing this confrontation right now.

CAVUTO: I don’t know the details of the deal, Senator. You probably do far better than I ever will. But I do see the Iranian regime continuing to say death to Israel, continuing to say death to America, continuing to say we’re everything but pond scum...

AYOTTE: Right.

CAVUTO: ... continuing to meddle in and around the Yemen area, continuing to fund ISIS elements throughout the Middle East.

AYOTTE: Continuing to behave very badly, undermining our national security.” [Fox News Cavuto, 4/21/15]

4/14/15: Sen. John Cornyn: “Based On What I’ve Heard From Senator Kerry, The Administration Has Fallen Woefully Behind In Their Goals And Has Actually Moved The Goal Post. The Administration Has Actually Promised And The President Has Said That His Goal Was To End Iranians’ Nuclear Program, Dismantle It. Instead, Now He’s Talking About Delaying It, Controlling It But Not Stopping It, Not Dismantling.”

“SEN. CORNYN: We know that any deal with Iran has to be verifiable, has to be enforceable, has to be accountable. Now, we met earlier today with Senator Kerry, some from the administration. There were goals that had been started with in terms of the negotiations. Based on what I’ve heard from Senator Kerry, the administration has fallen woefully behind in their goals and has actually moved the goal post. The administration has actually promised and the president has said that his goal was to end Iranians’ nuclear program, dismantle it. Instead, now he’s talking about delaying it, controlling it but not stopping it, not dismantling. Those words aren’t there anymore. We know that a world where Iran has a nuclear weapon, either for them to use or to give to terrorists, is a world that is less safe, less stable and less secure. So Republicans are committed to stopping Iran from getting a nuclear weapon and making sure the American public has there voices heard.”

[Sen. McConnell Media Availability, 4/14/15]

4/13/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “I Don’t Think Of Almost Anything To Which They’ve Agreed As Much Of A Concession When, By The Terms Of Their Own Proposal, President Obama Has Conceded That Iran Will Build And Develop A Nuclear Weapon 11 Years From Today.”

“GOLDBERG: Well, you wouldn’t agree that the Iranians made tremendous concessions?

COTTON: No.

GOLDBERG: How could a provisional decision to reduce their stockpile from 10,000 kilograms to 300 kilograms of highly enriched uranium not be understood by you as a concession?

COTTON: It’s still unclear when or how they will do that—

GOLDBERG: I use the word provisional because we don't know anything about a final deal yet. COTTON: It's unclear how and when they'll do that. It's unclear how that will relate to the number of centrifuges they'll be able to maintain. And I don't think of almost anything to which they've agreed as much of a concession when, by the terms of their own proposal, President Obama has conceded that Iran will build and develop a nuclear weapon 11 years from today." [The Atlantic, 4/13/15]

4/13/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: "President Obama Plainly Said At The Saban Forum In December 2013 That Iran Does Not Need An Underground Fortified Bunker At Fordow. We Have Now Conceded That They Will Have Centrifuge Cascades In That Bunker."

"SEN. COTTON: President Obama plainly said at the Saban Forum in December 2013 that Iran does not need an underground fortified bunker at Fordow. We have now conceded that they will have centrifuge cascades in that bunker.

GOLDBERG: Not spinning uranium though.

COTTON: It doesn't really matter what they spin as long as they're developing the technology and the skill sets to do it. I don't think President Obama or anyone on his negotiating team intends to walk back that concession. I don't see any circumstance under which they will say, 'We insist on the closing of Fordow.' I do, however, see the supreme leader of Iran walking back on virtually everything they're presumed to have agreed to. They did it just last week on exporting their enriched uranium stockpiles to Russia, something that long ago had been conceded." [The Atlantic, 4/13/15]

4/7/15: George Shultz & Henry Kissinger: "For 20 Years, Three Presidents Of Both Major Parties Proclaimed That An Iranian Nuclear Weapon Was Contrary To American And Global Interests—And That They Were Prepared To Use Force To Prevent It. Yet Negotiations That Began 12 Years Ago As An International Effort To Prevent An Iranian Capability To Develop A Nuclear Arsenal Are Ending With An Agreement That Concedes This Very Capability..." "Debate regarding technical details of the deal has thus far inhibited the soul-searching necessary regarding its deeper implications. For 20 years, three presidents of both major parties proclaimed that an Iranian nuclear weapon was contrary to American and global interests—and that they were prepared to use force to prevent it. Yet negotiations that began 12 years ago as an international effort to prevent an Iranian capability to develop a nuclear arsenal are ending with an agreement that concedes this very capability, albeit short of its full capacity in the first 10 years." [WSJ, 4/7/15]

4/2/15: Sen. Marco Rubio: "...Allowing Iran To Retain Thousands Of Centrifuges, Keeping Facilities Such As Fordow Open And Not Limiting Iran's Ballistic Missile Program Indicate To Me That This Deal Is A Colossal Mistake." "I look forward to hearing from administration officials what specific terms Iran has agreed to as part of what was supposed to be a comprehensive framework agreement, but the initial details appear to be very troubling. Through more than a decade of efforts to resolve international concerns about Iran's nuclear program, this regime has consistently lied about its ambitions and hidden the true nature of its efforts from the world. Among other issues, allowing Iran to retain thousands of centrifuges, keeping facilities such as Fordow open and not limiting Iran's ballistic missile program indicate to me that this deal is a colossal mistake." [Sen. Marco Rubio – Press Release, 4/2/15]

4/2/15: Sen. Tom Cotton – Statement: “There Is No Nuclear Deal Or Framework With Iran; There Is Only A List Of Dangerous U.S. Concessions That Will Put Iran On The Path To Nuclear Weapons.” “There is no nuclear deal or framework with Iran; there is only a list of dangerous U.S. concessions that will put Iran on the path to nuclear weapons. Iran will keep a stockpile of enriched uranium and thousands of centrifuges—including centrifuges at a fortified, underground military bunker at Fordow. Iran will also modernize its plutonium reactor at Arak. Iran won’t have to disclose the past military dimensions of its nuclear program, despite longstanding UN demands. In addition, Iran will get massive sanctions relief up front, making potential ‘snap-back’ sanctions for inevitable Iranian violations virtually impossible. Contrary to President Obama’s insistence, the former deputy director of the UN’s nuclear watchdog has said terms such as these will allow Iran to achieve nuclear breakout in just a few months, if not weeks. But in any case, even these dangerous terms will expire in just 10-15 years, even though it only took North Korea 12 years to get the bomb after it signed a similar agreement in 1994.

[Sen. Tom Cotton – Statement, 4/2/15]

4/1/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “Unfortunately, The Administration's Already Made Very Dangerous Concessions. If You Look Just In The Last Week, What They've Conceded, Iran Had Agreed To Ship All Of Its Uranium Outside Of The Country To Russia, So That Wouldn't Be A Risk. They've Reneged On That Agreement. Secondly, Apparently, We're Willing To Allow Iran To Continue To Enrich Uranium In Underground Fortified Military Bunkers. They Have No Reason To Do So.” “SEN. COTTON: Well, Wolf, any kind of agreement, based on the reports we've seen out of Switzerland, is going to kick the can down the road on all the major details. Unfortunately, the administration's already made very dangerous concessions. If you look just in the last week, what they've conceded, Iran had agreed to ship all of its uranium outside of the country to Russia, so that wouldn't be a risk. They've reneged on that agreement.

Secondly, apparently, we're willing to allow Iran to continue to enrich uranium in underground fortified military bunkers. They have no reason to do so. And the president has said so himself. There's no reason that we should be continuing to grant these concessions and kicking the can down the road on these technical details.” [CNN Situation Room, 4/1/15]

4/1/15: Sen. Tom Cotton: “Another [Thing] They Just Walked Back Last Week Was Their Agreement To Export All Of Their Uranium Stockpiles To A Third Country, Most Likely Russia. They Just Completely Reneged On That Deal That They Had Made Several Months Ago, I Think Because They Figured They Could Get Away With It Because President Obama And John Kerry Are So Desperate To Get Any Deal.” “HANNITY: What are we getting out of this deal? What is the one benefit the United States gets out of this deal? COTTON: Sean, it's hard to say what benefit we're getting at all. Another one that they just walked back last week was their agreement to export all of their uranium stockpiles to a third country, most likely Russia. They just completely reneged on that deal that they had made several months ago, I think because they figured they could get away with it because President Obama and John Kerry are so desperate to get any deal. That's why I think it's time for us to walk away from the table, to reimpose the sanctions that were suspended, for Congress to impose new sanctions and to rescind all the concessions we've made and start the negotiations over again from a position of strength, telling Iran exactly what we will not accept. And we should not accept any of the concessions that you just ran through.” [Sean Hannity, 4/1/15]

3/15/15: Sen. John Barrasso: “We Were Supposed To Actually Dismantle Iran’s Capacity For A Nuclear Weapon And Now The President Has Gotten To A Point Where, No, It’s Just About Delaying. It’s Not About Stopping. It’s About Managing.” “SEN. BARRASSO:

This is my concern, a world where Iran has a nuclear weapon is less safe, less secure and the concern is that this is going to be a bad agreement. We were supposed to actually dismantle Iran’s capacity for a nuclear weapon and now the president has gotten to a point where, no, it’s just about delaying. It’s not about stopping. It’s about managing. So, those are the concerns that I see a bad agreement coming. I think that we are seeing Iran taking more and more power and across the whole Middle East they have this arc of dominance that is including not just Iran, but Iraq as well as Syria, all the way to the Mediterranean.” [Fox News Sunday, 3/15/15]

2/5/15: WP Editorial: “...A Process That Began With The Goal Of Eliminating Iran’s Potential To Produce Nuclear Weapons Has Evolved Into A Plan To Tolerate And Temporarily Restrict That Capability.”

“The problems raised by authorities ranging from Henry Kissinger, the country’s most senior former secretary of state, to Sen. Timothy M. Kaine, Virginia’s junior senator, can be summed up in three points: First, a process that began with the goal of eliminating Iran’s potential to produce nuclear weapons has evolved into a plan to tolerate and temporarily restrict that capability. Second, in the course of the negotiations, the Obama administration has declined to counter increasingly aggressive efforts by Iran to extend its influence across the Middle East and seems ready to concede Tehran a place as a regional power at the expense of Israel and other U.S. allies. Finally, the Obama administration is signaling that it will seek to implement any deal it strikes with Iran — including the suspension of sanctions that were originally imposed by Congress — without a vote by either chamber.”

[Washington Post Editorial, 2/5/15]

- **2/5/15: WP Editorial: “Rather Than Contest The Iranian Bid For Regional Hegemony, As Has Every Previous U.S. Administration Since The 1970s, Mr. Obama Appears Ready To Concede Iran A Place In Iraq, Syria, Lebanon And Beyond ...”** “For their part, the Iranians, as Mr. Kaine put it, ‘are currently involved in activities to destabilize the governments of [U.S.-allied] nations as near as Bahrain and as far away as Morocco.’ A Tehran-sponsored militia recently overthrew the U.S.-backed government of Yemen. Rather than contest the Iranian bid for regional hegemony, as has every previous U.S. administration since the 1970s, Mr. Obama appears ready to concede Iran a place in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and beyond — a policy that is viewed with alarm by Israel, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Turkey, among other allies.” [Washington Post Editorial, 2/5/15]

TAB J

Table of Contents

Keep JPOA In Place.....	1
Sen. Bob Corker	1
Sen. Lindsey Graham	2
Sen. Bob Menendez.....	4
Israeli Officials.....	4
Extend Iran Negotiations	5
Sen. John Boozman.....	5
Sen. Richard Burr.....	5
Sen. Tom Cotton	6
Sen. Bob Corker.....	6
Sen. Mark Kirk.....	9
Rep. Darrell Issa.....	10

Keep JPOA In Place

Sen. Bob Corker

6/25/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "...I Believe We'll Be So Much Better Off Because JPOA Has Been What It Is, We'd Be So Much Better Off If We Just Continued To Negotiate And Not Rush To Some Artificial Deadline On June 30th And Try To Shortcut Some Of These Very, Very Important Issues." "CORKER: So it's my own hope, obviously, that we end up with a very strong agreement. I think most people here want to see that happen. I obviously have a lot of concerns and there are some remaining issues that I hope we will hold firm on, and just for the record, I believe we'll be so much better off because JPOA has been what it is, we'd be so much better off if we just continued to negotiate and not rush to some artificial deadline on June 30th and try to shortcut some of these very, very important issues." [Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on Iran, 6/25/15]

6/25/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "... If It Takes Another Month, Two Months, Three Months, We're Better Off Where We Are With The Interim Agreement Than We Are With A Bad Agreement." "Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Bob Corker warned the White House on Thursday there is a 'strong possibility' enough congressional Democrats would join Republicans to block a nuclear deal with Iran if they believe it makes too many concessions to Tehran... Corker said [negotiators] should take more time if it's needed. 'We all want a strong agreement, but we're going to have to live with it for a long time, so if it takes another month, two months,

three months, we're better off where we are with the interim agreement than we are with a bad agreement,' he told USA TODAY's weekly newsmaker series." [USA Today, [6/25/15](#)]

6/22/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "We Have A Situation Right Now... Where We Have An Interim Agreement And We're Much Better Off Just Keeping That Interim Agreement In Place For A While And Continuing To Negotiate." "BRZEZINSKI: So those two questions, if those issued can't be shored up, should we walk away from the deal?

SEN. CORKER: Absolutely. We have a situation right now, Mika, where we have an interim agreement and we're much better off just keeping that interim agreement in place for a while and continuing to negotiate. There's been this artificial -- the administration has felt like they just had to do this deal. I think if we would step away, if they are trying to cross these two remaining red lines, if they try to cross those, I do think we should step away, step away from the table and make sure that we end up with a deal that will stand the test of time. We already have so many weaknesses in it today." [MSNBC Morning Joe, [6/22/15](#)]

4/14/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "...For Us To Conclude A Bad Deal Is Worse Than Just Staying Where We Are, With The JPOA In Place And Waiting Until The Time Is Right To Get Something That Will Stand The Test Of Time." "SEN. CORKER: No one trusts Iran. And there's significant concern about their ability to still develop, through covert activities and even the negotiators being unaware of that. They are the biggest exporter of terrorism in the region and all of you know that. And for us to conclude a bad deal is worse than just staying where we are, with the JPOA in place and waiting until the time is right to get something that will stand the test of time." [MSNBC Morning Joe, [4/14/15](#)]

3/22/15: "BOB SCHIEFFER: But Let's Say The Two Sides Just Can't Get Together. What Do You Do Then?"

SEN. CORKER: Yes. Well, There's A Couple Of Things That Can Happen. Number One, We Do Have JPOA In Place, The Interim Deal. And It Could Continue For Some Time... It Keeps The Existing Sanctions In Place, Although There Is Some Sanctions Relief For Iran, OK, But It -- It Stays In Place For A While." "SCHIEFFER: What happens, Senator, if there is no deal? Obviously, nobody wants a bad deal.

CORKER: Yes.

SCHIEFFER: But let's say the two sides just can't get together. What do you do then?

CORKER: Yes. Well, there's a couple of things that can happen. Number one, we do have JPOA in place, the interim deal. And it could continue for some time. (CROSSTALK)

SCHIEFFER: Which, what, keeps the sanctions on? (CROSSTALK)

CORKER: It keeps the existing sanctions in place, although there is some sanctions relief for Iran, OK, but it -- it stays in place for a while. That's one outcome." [CBS News – Face the Nation, [3/22/15](#)]

Sen. Lindsey Graham

7/12/15: Sen. Lindsey Graham: "... I Would Keep The Interim Deal In Place. I Would Allow A New President To Try To Close Out The Deal. The Interim Deal Has Worked Better Than I Thought It Would, So Hats Off To John Kerry." "DANA BASH: Now, negotiators are back at it in Vienna, trying to reach a deal with Iran diplomatically. If they don't

reach a deal -- I know you have your own views on whether or not it would be good or bad -- but if they don't reach a deal, then what would happen?

SEN. GRAHAM: Right. Well, I would keep the interim deal in place. I would allow a new president to try to close out the deal. The interim deal has worked better than I thought it would, so hats off to John Kerry. I think the best thing for the world and our country is to let a new president have a chance to conclude the deal with Iran, because Obama's so weak in the eyes of the Iranians and our friends at large, to keep the interim deal in place. But if they sign this deal, they're going to ensure that Iran's a nuclear power. Under this deal, if Iran does everything we ask, at the passage of time, they're going to be a nuclear nation, which is going to create a nuclear arms race. And if you give them any money without them changing their behavior, you're funding terrorism." [CNN State of the Union, 7/12/15]

▪ **7/12/15: "DANA BASH: You Said That The Interim Deal That The Secretary Of State Has Negotiated Is Good And That It Should Be Kept In Place?"**

SEN. GRAHAM: Yes. Yes. I Think A Good Outcome Is To Basically Leave The Interim Deal In Place." "DANA BASH: Can I just underscore one thing that you just said, a Republican who is incredibly outspoken against the way the administration is handling Iran? You said that the interim deal that the secretary of state has negotiated is good and that it should be kept in place?

SEN. GRAHAM: Yes. Yes. I think a good outcome is to basically leave the interim deal in place. I think everybody running for president, except Rand Paul, could negotiate a better deal than the Obama administration, because when they drew that red line with Assad and did nothing about it, they're weak in the eyes of the Iranians. They don't believe Obama would use military force. So, give the next president a chance to conclude a final agreement with the Iranians. And please understand, of all the mistakes we can make as a world and as a nation, getting a bad deal with Iran is the worst possible outcome, because it's going to start a nuclear arms race." CNN State of the Union, 7/12/15]

4/5/15: Sen. Lindsey Graham: "What I Would Suggest Is If You Can't Get There With This Deal Is To Keep The Interim Deal In Place ... Keeping The Interim Deal In Place, That's Been Fairly Successful ..." "NORAH O'DONNELL: We want the turn now to Republican Senator Lindsey Graham who is in Clemson, South Carolina, this morning. Senator, you heard the Energy secretary he said this is the best option to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM: Well, my view is probably the best deal that Barack Obama could get with Iranians because the Iranians don't fear nor do-- or do they respect him and our allies in the region don't trust the President. Here's the question for the world is there a better deal to be had? I think so. What I would suggest is if you can't get there with this deal is to keep the interim deal in place, allow new President in 2017--Democrat or Republican--take a crack at the Iranian nuclear program. Obama is a flawed negotiator. His foreign policy has failed on multiple fronts. Nobody in the region trusts him. The Iranians do not fear or respect him so he'll never be able to get the best deal. The best deal I think comes with a new President. Hillary Clinton would do better, I think everybody on our side, except maybe Rand Paul could do better. So that's one way of looking at this program keeping the interim deal in place, that's been fairly successful and

have a new crack at it with a new President that doesn't have the baggage of Obama." [CBS News – Face the Nation, 4/5/15]

- **4/5/15: Sen. Lindsey Graham: "So I Support The Idea Of Giving Them Time To Put The Deal Together... Here Is What I Think We Should Do. Continue The Sanctions Under The Interim Agreement. That's Worked Pretty Well For The World. It Has Controlled Iran's Nuclear Ambitions. They Get Some Money, But Do Not Do A Final Deal Until You Have The Best Opportunity To Get The Best Result."** "SEN. GRAHAM: I don't mind giving the administration the time between now and June to put this deal together. Because when you listen to the Iranians and Secretary Kerry is almost like you're talking to two-- two different deals. So I support the idea of giving them time to put the deal together but I insist that Congress review the deal, debate, and vote on it before it becomes final. Here is what I think we should do. Continue the sanctions under the interim agreement. That's worked pretty well for the world. It has controlled Iran's nuclear ambitions. They get some money, but do not do a final deal until you have the best opportunity to get the best result." [CBS News – Face the Nation, 4/5/15]

Sen. Bob Menendez

6/26/15: Sen. Bob Menendez: "I Probably Wouldn't Dispute With My Colleague That In The Interim, To The Extent That We Have Stopped Forward Progress, We're Better Off." "SEN. MENENDEZ: So this is what I'm concerned about, is where we're headed [with] all of these elements as to any final agreement and then we can make the judgment are we truly better off. I probably wouldn't dispute with my colleague that in the interim, to the extent that we have stopped forward progress, we're better off. It has bought us time." [Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Hearing on Key Components of a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran, 6/26/15]

Israeli Officials

6/5/15: Israeli Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz: "If You Need To Extend Talks A Third Or A Fourth Time...This Is Still Better Than Signing A Half-Baked Agreement." "Israel's point man on Iran pressed the Obama administration this week to extend nuclear negotiations with Tehran beyond the June 30 deadline... Mr. Steinitz added the agreement must be strengthened to address concerns Tehran has conducted past research on nuclear weapons, which the Iranian government has repeatedly denied. 'If you need to extend talks a third or a fourth time...this is still better than signing a half-baked agreement,' Mr. Steinitz said in Washington." [Wall Street Journal, 6/5/15]

6/6/15: Israeli Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz: "It's Better To Extend Than Accept Something That Is Half-Baked." "Israel is urging the Obama administration to delay signing a nuclear agreement with Iran to improve the deal's terms even as the U.S. insists it will stick to a June 30 deadline. 'It's better to extend than accept something that is half-baked,' Yuval Steinitz, Israel's energy minister and a confidant of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, said Friday in an interview with Bloomberg News. Steinitz was in Washington to bring this message to Energy

Secretary Ernest Moniz, a participant in the continuing negotiations with Iran, and Treasury Secretary Jack Lew.” [Bloomberg, [6/5/15](#)]

11/24/14: Reuters: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu Welcomed The Likelihood That Iran And Six World Powers Would Fail To Meet A Deadline On Monday For A Nuclear Agreement ... ‘This Result Is Better, A Lot Better,’ He Said, In Response To News The Vienna Talks Were Likely To Break Off And Resume Next Month.” “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu welcomed the likelihood that Iran and six world powers would fail to meet a deadline on Monday for a nuclear agreement. ‘No deal is better than a bad deal. The deal that Iran was pushing for was terrible. A deal would have left Iran with the ability to enrich uranium for an atom bomb while removing the sanctions,’ Netanyahu told the BBC, according to a video excerpt of the interview provided by the prime minister’s office. ‘The right deal that is needed is to dismantle Iran’s capacity to make atomic bombs and only then dismantle the sanctions. Since that’s not in the offing, this result is better, a lot better,’ he said, in response to news the Vienna talks were likely to break off and resume next month.” [Reuters, [11/24/14](#)]

- **11/24/14: Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu: “The Right Deal That Is Needed Is To Dismantle Iran’s Capacity To Make Atomic Bombs And Only Then Dismantle The Sanctions. Since That’s Not In The Offing, This Result Is Better, A Lot Better.”** “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was interviewed (Monday, 24 November 2014) on the BBC and made the following remarks: ‘No deal is better than a bad deal. The deal that Iran was pushing for was terrible. The deal would have left Iran with the ability to enrich uranium for an atom bomb while removing the sanctions. The right deal that is needed is to dismantle Iran’s capacity to make atomic bombs and only then dismantle the sanctions. Since that’s not in the offing, this result is better, a lot better.’” [PM Netanyahu Interview with the BBC, courtesy Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, [11/24/14](#)]

Extend Iran Negotiations

Sen. John Boozman

11/24/14: Sen. John Boozman: “...It Is Better To Continue Negotiations Than To Capitulate To A Bad Deal...” ““While it is better to continue negotiations than to capitulate to a bad deal, I can’t help but believe these ongoing extensions are nothing more than delay tactics by a regime that has no desire to abandon its nuclear ambitions. If the Iranian regime can continue to get sanction relief with no end in sight and no effort on its part, then this is the fruitless endeavor we predicted it to be at the onset. We must ensure that the Iranians are negotiating in good faith and in order to do that, all options must be on the table, including tough sanctions that make the regime listen,’ Boozman said.” [Sen. John Boozman – Statement, [11/24/14](#)]

Sen. Richard Burr

3/29/15: Sen. Richard Burr: “I Would Encourage The Administration, Let’s Take More Time. Let’s Not Hasten To A Deal.” “SEN. BURR: ...clearly, with a deadline of Tuesday, I’m concerned with what we might give away. The Iranians don’t seem to want to conclude this. But I think, more importantly, right now, when we see ISIL in 12 different countries around the

world, we see Iran playing in about nine countries financially or physically, I think now is the time to push back from the table and ask ourselves, is it really time to trust the people that we're negotiating with, the Iranians? So, I would encourage the administration, let's take more time. Let's not hasten to a deal. And I fear that Secretary Kerry believes that he's got to get a deal by Tuesday.

SCHIEFFER: So, what you're saying is, you would be one of those who would favor postponing the deadline here and keep working?

BURR: Well, listen, I think that's better than a bad deal. And I have got a really bad feeling about what they might come with." [CBS News Face the Nation, [3/29/15](#)]

Sen. Tom Cotton

6/29/15: Sen. Cotton: "The President Should Take His Own Counsel Regarding A Bad Deal. He Should Continue Talks Past Tomorrow's Artificial Deadline For However Long It Takes To Eliminate Iran's Nuclear Weapons Capability. That Would Be A Strategic Gain For Which Lifting Sanctions Would Be Justified." "This is the type of agreement we reached with Libya in 2003, when the Qaddafi regime agreed to dismantle its nuclear weapons program. However, on each of these demands, the Obama administration has ceded ground. But it is not too late to reverse course. President Obama has said on numerous occasions that no deal is better than a bad deal. And make no mistake: The deal currently envisioned is a bad deal. That is not only my opinion. A consensus is building among national security experts — including former inner-circle advisers to President Obama on Iran — that the pending accord gives away the store to the Iranians. The president should take his own counsel regarding a bad deal. He should continue talks past tomorrow's artificial deadline for however long it takes to eliminate Iran's nuclear weapons capability. That would be a strategic gain for which lifting sanctions would be justified. Failing that, the president should cite Iranian intransigence, break off talks, reinstate the full spectrum of economic sanctions and fortify the credible threat of military force. What the ayatollahs respect is strength. And this is a moment — perhaps more than any other time of his presidency — for President Obama to be strong." [Washington Examiner, [6/29/15](#)]

Sen. Bob Corker

7/12/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "I'm Glad That They Are Taking Their Time Because I Believe The Deadline Was Actually Working To Iran's Advantage." "SEN. CORKER: You know, likely Iran will cheat by inches, meaning they will just cheat, cheat, cheat. And over time it's like boiling an egg. They end up with a nuclear weapon. So what are the repercussions for that? Obviously there are other elements that are being brought in at this time. I'm glad that they are taking their time because I believe the deadline was actually working to Iran's advantage. They started throwing in other elements." [NBC News Meet the Press, [7/12/15](#)]

7/5/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "I Did Talk To Secretary Kerry Yesterday. I Urged Him To Please Take Their Time ... I Would Just Hope Again That They Would Take Their Time And Finish This In The Best Way That They Can..." "SEN. CORKER: So, I did talk to Secretary Kerry yesterday. I urged him to please take their time, try to get -- make sure these last remaining red lines that haven't been crossed -- they have crossed so many -- do not get crossed, and, qualitatively, they don't make it worse than where it already is.

DICKERSON: So, just to be clear for people, if they meet the first deadline, if they get it done by Tuesday, and you get it by Thursday, then Congress will have 30 days to discuss it. If they miss that deadline, then Congress will get 60 days to discuss it. Let me ask you this question, Senator Corker. When you talked to Secretary Kerry, what did you get from your conversation with him? Is he too anxious to get a deal?

CORKER: Well, obviously, they're very anxious. I think they look at this as a legacy issue. I have had several conversations with him and meetings to say, look, you create just as much of a legacy walking away from a bad deal as you do headlong rushing into bad deal. So, look, I know they want to consummate this. This has been going on -- actually, the original discussions began back in 2003. I would just hope again that they would take their time and finish this in the best way that they can, even though we have already gone down a bad track." [CBS News Face the Nation, 7/5/15]

6/25/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "We All Want A Strong Agreement, But We're Going To Have To Live With It For A Long Time, So If It Takes Another Month, Two Months, Three Months, We're Better Off Where We Are With The Interim Agreement Than We Are With A Bad Agreement." "Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Bob Corker warned the White House on Thursday there is a 'strong possibility' enough congressional Democrats would join Republicans to block a nuclear deal with Iran if they believe it makes too many concessions to Tehran... Corker said [negotiators] should take more time if it's needed. 'We all want a strong agreement, but we're going to have to live with it for a long time, so if it takes another month, two months, three months, we're better off where we are with the interim agreement than we are with a bad agreement,' he told USA TODAY's weekly newsmaker series." [USA Today, 6/25/15]

6/25/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "...We'd Be So Much Better Off If We Just Continued To Negotiate And Not Rush To Some Artificial Deadline On June 30th And Try To Shortcut Some Of These Very, Very Important Issues." "CORKER: So it's my own hope, obviously, that we end up with a very strong agreement. I think most people here want to see that happen. I obviously have a lot of concerns and there are some remaining issues that I hope we will hold firm on, and just for the record, I believe we'll be so much better off because JPOA has been what it is, we'd be so much better off if we just continued to negotiate and not rush to some artificial deadline on June 30th and try to shortcut some of these very, very important issues." [Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on Iran, 6/25/15]

6/22/15: Sen. Bob Corker: "We Have A Situation Right Now... Where We Have An Interim Agreement And We're Much Better Off Just Keeping That Interim Agreement In Place For A While And Continuing To Negotiate." "BRZEZINSKI: So those two questions, if those issued can't be shored up, should we walk away from the deal?

SEN. CORKER: Absolutely. We have a situation right now, Mika, where we have an interim agreement and we're much better off just keeping that interim agreement in place for a while and continuing to negotiate. There's been this artificial -- the administration has felt like they just had to do this deal. I think if we would step away, if they are trying to cross these two remaining red lines, if they try to cross those, I do think we should step away, step away from the table and make sure that we end up with a deal that will stand the test of time. We already have so many weaknesses in it today." [MSNBC Morning Joe, 6/22/15]

6/17/15: Sen. Bob Corker: “If It Takes Longer [Than June 30] To Get The Right Deal, Take Longer, Please. Don’t Start Cutting Corners. I Know Group Dynamics; When You’re Close To The End Of A Deal, And Your Aides Are Pushing Part Of What’s Going To Be A Major Legacy, I Understand How That Can Affect Things. But Please, Please Stop!” “[Sen. Bob Corker] said Wednesday that he had urged Secretary of State John F. Kerry to ignore a looming deadline for -nuclear negotiations with Iran if that’s what it takes to secure a more ironclad deal... ‘June 30 is an artificial deadline,’ Corker said he told Kerry. ‘If it takes longer to get the right deal, take longer, please. Don’t start cutting corners. I know group dynamics; when you’re close to the end of a deal, and your aides are pushing part of what’s going to be a major legacy, I understand how that can affect things. But please, please stop!’” [Washington Post, 6/17/15]

6/17/15: Bloomberg: “I Hope They Don’t Meet The June 30 Deadline” [Sen. Corker Said] ... ‘I’d Rather Them Keep Talking And Getting It To The Right Place Than Artificially Having A Line In The Sand.’ Corker Said He Wouldn’t Support Adding More Sanctions As Long As Talks Continue, And Added That He Hasn’t Heard Other Lawmakers Speak Of Imposing Additional Penalties If A Deal Isn’t Reached By June 30.” “I hope they don’t meet the June 30 deadline,’ Corker said in an interview on Wednesday in his Senate office. ‘I’d rather them keep talking and getting it to the right place than artificially having a line in the sand.’ Corker said he wouldn’t support adding more sanctions as long as talks continue, and added that he hasn’t heard other lawmakers speak of imposing additional penalties if a deal isn’t reached by June 30. Corker’s comments are significant because the Obama administration has been negotiating under pressure from lawmakers, who have threatened to impose additional sanctions on Iran if it failed to reach a timely agreement with the U.S. and five other world powers.” [Bloomberg, 6/17/15]

6/15/15: Sen. Bob Corker – Letter To President Obama: “As Your Team Continues Their Work, If Iran Tries To Cross These Few Remaining Red Lines, I Would Urge You To Please Pause ...” “SEN. CORKER: I understand the dynamics that can develop when a group believes they are close to a deal and how your aides may view this as a major legacy accomplishment. However, as you know, the stakes here are incredibly high and the security implications of these negotiations are difficult to overstate. As your team continues their work, if Iran tries to cross these few remaining red lines, I would urge you to please pause and consider rethinking the entire approach.” [Sen. Bob Corker – Letter to President Obama, 6/15/15]

11/24/14: Sen. Bob Corker: “... I Would Rather The Administration Continue To Negotiate Than Agree To A Bad Deal That Would Only Create More Instability In The Region And Around The World.” “U.S. Senator Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made the following statement on the Iran nuclear negotiations. ‘Since the beginning, I have been concerned about a series of rolling extensions becoming the norm and reducing our leverage. However, I would rather the administration continue to negotiate than agree to a bad deal that would only create more instability in the region and around the world,’ said Corker. ‘With so much riding on these talks for the security of our nation and that of the region, Congress must have the opportunity to weigh in before implementation of any final agreement and begin preparing alternatives, including tougher sanctions, should negotiations fail.’” [Sen. Bob Corker – Statement, 11/24/14]

11/13/14: Sen. Bob Corker: “If There’s No Extension And No Deal, Absolutely You Would Want To Add Sanctions ... [But] My Sense Is That There Will Be Either An Extension Or A Deal, And If That’s The Case, We Can Weigh What That Extension Says.” “In a joint Nov. 12 statement, the bipartisan architects of pending sanctions legislation indicated that they would wait to see what a ‘potential deal’ looks like before acting. In addition, the chairman-in-waiting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn., appears open to a further extension of the talks past the Nov. 24 deadline, as seems increasingly likely. ‘Why don’t we wait until the 24th to start talking about alternatives,’ Corker told Al-Monitor and a handful of other reporters Nov. 12. ‘Let’s see what actually occurs over the course of the next couple weeks.’ ‘If there’s no extension and no deal, absolutely you would want to add sanctions. [But] I would find it difficult to believe at this moment that there will just be a walkaway from the table on the 24th. My sense is that there will be either an extension or a deal, and if that’s the case, we can weigh what that extension says,’ Corker stated. ‘Always, I want to see what a document says [before acting].’” [Al-Monitor, 11/13/14]

Sen. Mark Kirk

6/30/15: Sen. Mark Kirk: “Rather Than Rush To Meet Politically Driven Deadlines, The White House Should Work Cooperatively With Congress To Increase Pressure For Iran To Accept A Stronger Deal.” “The Obama administration and its negotiating partners blew through Tuesday’s self-imposed deadline for a major nuclear accord with Iran — prolonging for at least another week some 20 months of exhausting and convoluted closed-door talks that have capped more than a decade of brinkmanship between Tehran and the West ... Sen. Mark Kirk, Illinois Republican, said that, ‘rather than rush to meet politically driven deadlines, the White House should work cooperatively with Congress to increase pressure for Iran to accept a stronger deal.’” [Washington Times, 6/30/15]

3/31/15: Sen. Mark Kirk: “If The Administration Were Patient And Smart, It’d Stop Imposing Arbitrary Deadlines That Create Pressure For The United States To Make Big Concessions But Not Iran.” “The failure of nuclear talks with Iran to produce an agreement by midnight Tuesday has no practical effect — but it leaves the Obama administration with a public relations black eye, and new charges that Iran has the upper hand in the talks... ‘If the Administration were patient and smart, it’d stop imposing arbitrary deadlines that create pressure for the United States to make big concessions but not Iran,’ Republican Senator Mark Kirk, a lead critic of the nuclear talks, said over the weekend.” [Politico, 3/31/15]

Rep. Ed Royce

7/8/15: Rep. Ed Royce: “...There Is No Push From Congress To Conclude Negotiations In The Next Few Days... What Is The Rush?” “While negotiations with Iran can’t continue forever, there is no push from Congress to conclude negotiations in the next few days. The only one pushing to get this done quickly — and reduce congressional scrutiny — is the Obama Administration. If the Administration negotiates a sound agreement, it should be able to withstand congressional scrutiny for 30, 60, or even 90 or 120 days. What is the rush?” [Rep. Ed Royce Statement, 7/7/15]

Rep. Darrell Issa

7/6/15: Rep. Darrell Issa: "I Don't Think It's Time To Walk Away. It's Time To At Least Make Sure That We Don't Give Any Greater Concessions Than The President Told Congress He Was Going To Get." "PAMELA BROWN: As we heard from Elise there, she's reporting that the deadline for a deal with Iran is becoming less and less firm. In your view, is it time for the U.S. to walk away?

REP. DARRELL ISSA (R), CALIFORNIA: I don't think it's time to walk away. It's time to at least make sure that we don't give any greater concessions than the president told Congress he was going to get. Very clearly, this is a deal that may have difficulty getting approved even if the president got everything that he said he was going to get. If he gives further concessions, it won't be the time, the 30 days vs. 60 days Congress has to respond. It will be the deal itself that kills any kind of a resolution." [CNN Situation Room, 7/6/15]