



MOD-198-0002047-A

- SECRET -

ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION		ACTION /		REG DATE 30/5/19		T531		
RECEIVERS INSTRUCTIONS								
DOCUMENT TITLE: N2108 EMAIL RE SF MEETING WITH a TPE (SIBNMO31)						IRN: NORTHMOOR		
REGISTER TO:		N2108		PRIORITY		LOW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/>		
CLASS CODE		BOM		TAGGING		2011/SEN/F102/T1B		
DOCUMENT SUMMARY								
<p>sent with D1776 and D1785</p> <p>SECRET</p>								
FAST / URGENT ACTION REQUIRED (If YES compile ACTION precis below)			YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		RECEIVER		REGISTRATION INDEXER	
				signature Kwighi 30/5/19		signature Kwighi 30/5/19		
FAST ACTIONS RAISED		/		URGENT ACTIONS		/		
				MIRSAP ACTIONS RAISED		/		
DOCUMENT READING				DOCUMENT READER		DOCUMENT INDEXER		
INSTRUCTIONS:								
				FOOTNOTES READY <input type="checkbox"/>		CHART COMPLETE <input type="checkbox"/>		
				ACTIONS IDENTIFIED <input type="checkbox"/>		ACTIONS RAISED <input type="checkbox"/>		
QUALITY CONTROL				READING COMPLETE <input type="checkbox"/>		INDEXING COMPLETE <input type="checkbox"/>		
MIR OFFICE MANAGER				DISCLOSURE OFFICER		SIO		

sibnm031_00000001-textExtract--JournalArchive2011-05-DG-081920.pst

Thank
you.

Â

N1802

Â

Â

Â

Â _____ Â

From: SFHQ (UK) J1-S01-LEGAL-S

Sent: DG May 2011 16:47

To:

SFHQ(UK) COMD-DIRECTOR-SF-S

Cc: SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-OPS-S; SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-POL-S;

SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-S01-S; SFHQ(UK) COMD-COS-S

Subject: RE: 201105 DG A TPE
Tyburn-S

N1802

A

COS SFHQ(A) confirmed today that the meeting with a TPE has been
scheduled for Mon DG May 11. I will let you know the outcome of the
meeting.

Â

N2108

A

N2108

S01 Legal

Â

Contact Details

Â

Â

Â

Â _____ Â

From: SFHQ(UK) COMD-DIRECTOR-SF-S

Sent: DG

May 2011 16:42

To: SFHQ(UK) J1-S01-LEGAL-S

Cc:

SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-OPS-S; SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-POL-S; SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-S01-S;

SFHQ(UK) COMD-COS-S

Subject: RE: 201105 DG A TPE
Tyburn-S

S01 Legal,

Â

Thank you.Â Let me know when a TPE meeting is
scheduled not just the outcome.

Â

N1802

Â

Â

Â

Â

Â _____ Â

From: SFHQ(UK) J1-S01-LEGAL-S

Sent: DG May

2011 09:32

To: SFHQ(UK) COMD-MA-DSF-S

Cc: SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-OPS-S;

SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-POL-S; SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-S01-S; SFHQ(UK) COMD-COS-S

sibnm031_00000001-textExtract--JournalArchive2011-05-DG-081920.pst

Subject:
201105DG-A TPE Tyburn-S

Name Given (for

D)

Â

Further to the Ops Update

yesterday when a TPE complaint relating to the SU1 DDO against Obj TYBURN was raised, I enclose a briefing note to the D regarding the background to the operation and the proposed way ahead.

Â

I enclose a copy as well

as

LINK.

Â

N2108

A

N2108

S01 Legal

Â

Contact Details

A

sibnm031_00000000-textExtract--JournalArchive2011-05-DG-082614.pst

N2108

A
I'm
happy with this.
Please send.

N1466

A _____ A

From: SFHQ(UK) J1-S01-LEGAL-S
Sent: DG May
2011 08:48
To: SFHQ(UK) COMD-ACOS-OPS-S
Subject: 201105 DG A TPE
Tyburn-S

N1466

A
As tasked yesterday I
enclose a copy of the draft note to DSF regarding the TYBURN
a TPE complaint

A
Are you content that it
goes to the D?

N2108

A

N2108

S01 Legal

A

Contact Details

A

SECRET – UK EYES ONLY

member of the J5 team as well the [REDACTED] UKSF Lawyer in order to provide sufficient detail to rebut the allegation. HQ DSF are liaising with [REDACTED] SFHQ(A) to provide advice as to what should be disclosed [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] a TPE DSF will be informed as to the outcome of the meeting.

SO1 Legal

DRAFT

SECRET – UK EYES ONLY

SFHQ(UK) J1Legal/11/Obj Tyburn

DG May 11

DSF

Copy to:

COS ACOS Pol ACOS Ops SO1 J3/5 Campaigns

A Third Party Entity Complaint

– OBJ TYBURN

Reference:

A. SFHQ(UK) J1Legal/11/Obj Tyburn dated DG May 11.

1. **Introduction.** Reference A detailed a TPE complaint about the SU1 deliberate detention operation (DDO) against Obj TYBURN. The arranged meeting with a TPE was held on DG May.
2. **A TPE Meeting.** SO2 Legal HQ DSF attended the meeting along with SO2 Consequence Management TFH, having been fully briefed on the Op by OC SU1 and agreed the level of detail that could be disclosed to a TPE. Rather annoyingly, just 24 hrs prior to the meeting, TFH revealed that a TPE had raised concerns almost a month earlier about another SFHQ(A) operation, Obj 9 where the same TTP had been utilised. It is not known why this 'complaint' had not been passed on to SFHQ(A). However SO2 Legal was able to speak to OC SU1 and come up with sufficient detail to deal with the complaint. The identity of the unit or the fact that the operation was a SF operation was not revealed to a TPE.
3. SO2 Legal's assessment is that the meeting went well and the two representatives from a TPE appeared genuinely grateful for the level of engagement. It was stressed to a TPE the high level of threat apparent on such operations and what had occurred on both operations. A TPE were curious about the 'call out' procedure adopted on both operations. It was explained that this was an incremental procedure to get inhabitants out of a compound with minimal threat to troops or risk to any detainees. They appeared interested (and positive about) the steps taken to elicit a positive compliant response from occupants of the compound. A TPE revealed that they had heard various stories in relation to the 'call out' which had filtered through generally through allegations regarding 'night raids'.
4. The other issue which they focused on, which was common to both Obj 9 and TYBURN was the TTP of sending a male inhabitant back into a house 'uncuffed'. The rationale behind the TTP was explained to a TPE and they appeared to understand its application and utility. However a TPE suggested that we may wish to review the TTP given the potential that it may allow the male under control to become a threat or even, in extremis, that it could allow the male to be deliberately 'directed' to pick up a weapon and then to be engaged, i.e a manufactured 'self defence' scenario¹.
5. **Next Steps.** A TPE indicated that they may have a few questions in due course. However the meeting appears to have gone well and although time will tell as to whether it will 'nip in the bud' both complaints without reference to the ISAF and national level, it would appear that a TPE are grateful when engagement is forthcoming at the lowest possible level.

SO1 Legal

¹ There was no suggestion by a TPE that this was what had occurred in both cases rather a remark which they offered up as part of the wider discussion.