



MOD-198-0003437-A

N2272

Ã,Â

I enclose a copy of the draft note to DSF on this - as requested by ACOS Ops today.

Ã,Â

Are we able to find out whayt the outcome of the phone call between Mills and N2132 was on 20 Feb 11 as referred in the FIR?

Ã,Â

We can populate the last para after the VTC tomorrow.

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

N2108

Ã,Â

N2108

SO1 Legal

Ã,Â

Contact Details

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

Ã,Â \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From SFHQ (UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-B-S

Sent:

DG May 2011 18:25

To: SFHQ (UK) J1-SO1-LEGAL-S SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-A-S;

SFHQ(UK) J9-POL-A-S; SFHQ(UK) J35 other recipient ; SFHQ(UK) OPS other recipient

Subject: RE:

Obj TYBURN 16 Feb 11

All,

Ã,Â

N889 is keen to do tomorrow's staff VTC a little earlier.Ã,Â Conscious that Name Given is in at 9, does 0945 work for everyone?

Ã,Â

Name Given

Ã,Â

Please could you inform COMCEN.

Ã,Â

Thanks,

Ã,Â

N2272

Ã,Â

N2272

SO2

J35, COS-S  
COS-S

Contact Details

From: SFHQ(A) COS-S  
Sent: DG May 2011  
18:15  
To: SFHQ(UK) J1-SO1-LEGAL-S  
Cc: SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-A-S;  
SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-B-S  
Subject: RE: Obj TYBURN 16 Feb  
11

N2108

Gather

N2272 is away. I'll assume he cannot make it and we are after alternative solutions.

Can we use the TFH lawyer to assist?

Can

you re-work your email below into an email I can share with the CM SO2 in TFH as a 'heads-up' on how we might confront the issue. We can discuss tactics tmr on the VTC if you have time. Gather we are going to try and run this earlier than usual. N2272 has the detail.

Regards,

N889

,

, \_\_\_\_\_

From: SFHQ(UK) J1-SO1-LEGAL-S

Sent: DG May

2011 13:11

To: SFHQ(A) COS-S SFHQ(UK) 35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-A-S;

SFHQ(UK) 35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-B-S

Cc: SFHQ(UK) Ops other recipient;

SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO1-S

Subject: RE: Obj TYBURN 16 Feb

11

N889

A, A  
Thanks for this. A, A It would seem that the complaint has not yet got as far as the Obj <sup>QR</sup> complaint - it is still at TFH level as opposed to ISAF level.

A, A  
If we all agree that the aspiration to 'nip in the bud' at the lowest level is sound, then we will need A, A to be prepared to release something a bit more than the usual 'it's not true' to head this off. A, A I am concerned that if this particular complaint gets elevated to a higher level then we will lose control of it - and our political masters could knee-jerk and apply pressure for a SIB investigation. A, A A, A

A, A  
Therefore it comes down to crafting a response that gives them an explanation that satisfies their curiosity without jeopardising TTPs/OPSEC. A, A In A, A terms of what we would agree to release, I would propose that we could include:

\*

Confirmation that the operation took place;

\*

That 4 were EKIA - all were engaged after separate and immediate threats to members of the <sup>SU</sup>

\*

With regard to the central allegation, we could say that an indiv was taken under control but was later allowed to go back into the compound when he attempted to engage members of the <sup>SU</sup> and was EKIA (if we are content to go into this much detail and that this is a reasonable supposition);

\*

That an initial unit investigation was conducted into the operation and <sup>N2132</sup> and Gen Mills were briefed: both were content with the actions of the <sup>SU</sup> (do we have a read out of <sup>N2132</sup> /MILLS telecon on 20 Feb 11?);

With regard to the property deeds - can we check any remaining SSE to double check whether we still have it? A, A If we do is there any reason why we cannot return it through <sup>a TPE</sup>? (give a dog a bone...it appears that this may be motivated more by a desire to get the deeds rather than any concern for the victim). A, A If we do not have it can we say where it has gone.

A, A  
In terms of presentation of this information we could seek to use the tried and tested method of <sup>UKSF Lawyer</sup> and the SO2 CM TFH going to meet them and engaging with them. A, A I do not know when he is next out there but this approach seemed to work last time

If we dont think that such an approach is necessary.

A, A  
<sup>N889</sup> - I am in and out but will try to get you on the blower later to discuss.

Ã,Â

N2272/N2444 Comments?

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

N2108

Ã,Â

N2108

SO1 Legal

Ã,Â

Contact Details

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

Ã,Â \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From: SFHQ(A) COS-S

Sent: DG May 2011

10:35

To: SFHQ(UK) J1-SO1-LEGAL-S SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-A-S;

SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO2-B-S

Cc: SFHQ(UK) Ops other recipient;

SFHQ(UK) J35-CAMPAIGNS-SO1-S

Subject: FW: Obj TYBURN 16 Feb

11

N2108

Please have a scan down

this.Ã,Â Similar to a number of recent queries from a TPE Ã,Â I don't think this will require anything more than a conversation once you are read-in - and then potentially some D&G from you / N2444/ N2272 to Name Given (TFH SO2 CM) on howÃ,Â he engages with \_\_\_\_\_ a TPE.

Name Given should be able to

provide you with further OSW for TYBURN if you need it.

Regards,

N889

Ã,Â

Ã,Â

N889

COS SFHQ(A)

Contact Details

Ã,Â \_\_\_\_\_ Ã,Â

From: ISAF 2 SFHQ(A) COS IS

Sent: DG

May 2011 08:50

To: SFHQ(A) COS-S

Subject: FW: Obj

TYBURN 16 Feb 11



Contact Details