



MOD-198-0003417-A

Ack.

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

Yours

Ã,Â

N1786

Ã,Â

N1786

Comd SFHQ(A)

Ã,Â

Contact Details

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

Ã,Â \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From: SFHQ (UK) COMD-ACOS-OPS-S

Sent: 11

April 2011 11:47

To: SFHQ(A) COMD-S;

SFHQ (UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO1-S

Cc: SFHQ (UK) COMD-COS-S;

SFHQ (UK) COMD-MA-DSF-S

Subject: RE: 20110408-LIMDIS SU1 TTP Review

TOR-S

N1786

A,A

I've

refreshed the TORs in order to:

(1)Ã,Â address them to you.

(2)

take account of the issues you raise below.

Ã,Â

With

reference to your second point (yr vs 4.5 months), N1788's study for DSF

suggested that although the TTP has been used for over a year, the instances of

Afghans being shot post call-out are relatively recent.Ã,Â We understand that

there are no such incidents recorded beforeÃ,Â Oct 10, but eleven during

SU1A's time as SU1. It appears thatÃ,Â some may have occurred towards the end

of SU1C's time but this is not clear as yet.

Ã,Â

Rgds,

N1466

A,A \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From: SFHQ(A) COMD-S

Sent: 08 April

**Prepared for OPEN publication in relation to the Independent Inquiry Relating to Afghanistan**

2011 16:09

To: **SFHQ** (UK) **COMD-ACOS-OPS-S;**  
**SFHQ(UK)** **J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO1-S**

Cc: **SFHQ(UK)** COMD-COS-S;

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

Subject: RE: 20110408-LIMDIS SU1 TTP Review

TOR-S

Importance: High

Thanks N1466

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

I would be content to proceed as shown of course - it is indeed entirely consistent with my discussion / telcon with DSF - but offer the following observations:

My preference would be for deletion of the second and third sentence of the third bullet of the third paragraph. The reasons for waxing/waning APU1 enthusiasm for providing support to SU1 ops run wider than the TTP issue in question here.

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

The opening lines refer to a year's worth of ops; at paragraph 3 this is narrowed down to the last 4 1/2 months.Ã,Â Has HQ DSF run the rule over all of the ops conducted over the previous 7 1/2 months?Ã,Â

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

The first paragraph might include reference to this method being taught/exercised on PDT.

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

We are still using 'DDO' for ISAF-led ops such as this. **Deliberate Detention** is normally used for Afghan-led ops such as those mounted by **M1** supported by **UKSF5**

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

At [REDACTED] request we have ceased using the term/TLA 'APU' (or at least I have tried to - takes months to iron out, of course!)

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

'Head of household' might be over-specific.

Yours

 $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$ 

N1786

N1786

11

Comd SFHQ(A)

 $\tilde{A} \cdot \hat{A}$ 

## Contact Details

 $\hat{A} \quad \hat{A}$  $\Lambda, \Lambda$  $\tilde{A}, \hat{A}$

Prepared for OPEN publication in relation to the Independent Inquiry Relating to Afghanistan

Ã,Â \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From [SFHQ (UK)] -COMD-ACOS-OPS-S

Sent: 08

April 2011 14:45

To: [SFHQ (UK)] -J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO1-S

Cc: [SFHQ(A)] -COMD-S; [SFHQ (UK)] -COMD-COS-S; [SFHQ (UK)] -COMD-MA-DSF-S

Subject:  
20110408-LIMDIS [SU1] TTP Review TOR-S

[N1788]

Ã,Â  
Here are your TORs  
for the review.Ã,Â  
Ã,Â

[N1786] I was tasked  
to write TORs from DSF to [N1788]

In fact,  
[N1788] Ã,Â is supporting your review, so these are effectively your  
TORs.

(I'll speak to COS  
when he's back in next week and suggest that I re-draft these to that  
effect).

Ã,Â  
I know DSF has  
spoken to you, so you have his intent.Ã,Â  
This should be  
absolutely in line with that discussion, since DSF was clear to me what he  
wanted and madeÃ,Â a fewÃ,Â word-by-word changes before authorising  
release.

If there is  
anything in here that doesn't fit with your understanding, please let me  
know.

Ã,Â

Rgds,

[N1466]