

CIVCAS CELL INITIAL ASSESSMENT

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------|--------------|
| Allegation # | 690 | | |
| Source(s) | Airwars | Date Received | 21 June 2017 |
| Casualty Estimate | "Wounded six in Hamar al Sharquiya" | | |
| Incident Date | 23 - 25 October 2016 | | |
| Location | al Hamar al Sharqiya, SY IVO (b)(1)1.4g | | |
| Allegation | <p>1. Description of allegation: October 25th 2016: قرية الحمير الشرقية al Hamar al Sharqiya north of الخفسة al Khafsa, Aleppo governorate, Syria Summary: Syria News Desk quoted a resident of the town who said "planes launched more than three raids on the villages of Al Hamar al Sharqiya and al Madoura and Tal Asward... which led to the killing of two civilians and wounding six others in Hamar al Sharqiya." Another report from a local facebook page said a raid took place on the edges of the town, targeting "the house of Nasser al Ibrahim al Sheikho while IS elements were inside." It added that "the villagers were not harmed." Civilians reported killed: 0-2 Civilians reported injured: 0-6 Sources: Syria News Desk [Arabic] [Archived], Al Khafsa Direct [Arabic] [Archived], Al Hamar and Surrounding Area News (Facebook) [Arabic] [Archived], Al Hamar and Surrounding Area News (Facebook) (2) [Arabi] [Archived] Quality of reporting: Contested</p> | | |
| Analysis | <p>1. Is this allegation a self-report? NO If yes, add details of corroborating strike below and task a CCAR. If no, move to 2.</p> <p>2. Does the allegation include a) video/photo evidence of CIVCAS NO b) a general location, YES AND c) a way to identify the date or a 48 hour date range? YES If yes to all three, move to 6. If any are no, then move to number 3.</p> <p>3. Does the allegation contain a a) General Day, YES AND b) Specific location, e.g., MGRS or specific building? NO If yes to the two, then move to 6. If any are no, move to number 4.</p> | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>4.a. Is the allegation from a single source (even if there are multiple sources, look at whether the sources lack independence, i.e., all derived from one source)? NO If yes, move to 4.b. If no, move to 5.</p> <p>4.b. Is the single source a high quality source OR does it provide specific facts that may warrant a CCAR. If yes, move to 6. If no, then move to 4.e.</p> <p>4.c. Has media interviewed witnesses and/or victims? If yes, then contact journalist and re-assess. If no, then close the allegation.</p> <p>5.a. Are any of the sources high quality? YES If yes, move to 6. If no, move to 5.b.</p> <p>5.b. Are there at least two corroborating sources (total of 3) that independently reported the allegation, OR does it provide specific facts that may warrant a CCAR? If yes, move to 6. If no, close the allegation.</p> <p>6. Does the allegation contain sufficient information on the time, location and details to make an assessment of credibility? YES I.e., does it provide enough information to determine the date within 48 hour; does it provide enough information to determine a neighborhood, landmark, or other way to where the alleged incident occurred within a .5km radius? If yes, move to 7. If no, close the allegation.</p> <p>7. Are there any potentially corroborating strikes? If yes, answer the below questions and task CCAR. If no, close allegation. NO</p> |
| Non-US Coalition Involvement | None |
| Decision | Close at IA; insufficient evidence to corroborate the allegation. |
| Report Approved By: | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">(b)(3) 10 USC 130b; (b)(6)</div> |

Page 48 redacted for the following reason:

Exhibits removed per agreement - Bates Number 3844

Approved for Release