

~~SECRET // REL TO USA, FVEY~~

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
HEADQUARTERS, 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION AND  
COMBINED JOINT FORCES LAND COMPONENT COMMAND - OIR  
ERBIL, IRAQ  
APO AE 09316

IRIZ-JA-OPL

9 February 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR CIVCAS Team, Combined Joint Task Force - Operation Inherent Resolve, APO, AE 09306

SUBJECT: CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report (CCAR) - Strike (b)(1)1.4a  
(b)(1)1.4a 08(b)(1)1.4a February 2017 (CJFLCC-OIR 10/17)

1. BLUE. This allegation is NOT CREDIBLE. A thorough review of all the available intelligence indicates that it is more likely than not that no civilian casualties occurred as a result of this Coalition airstrike.

2. CIVCAS Allegation.

a. *Source*. J34 Fires, Combined Joint Land Forces Component Command, Operation Inherent Resolve.

b. *Time and Location*. 08(b)(1)1.4a February 2017, Badr al Kubrá ath Thāniyah, West Mosul, Iraq (Sector C.06, MGRS (b)(1)1.4a).

c. *Description*. CJOC-Erbil conducted an offensive engagement against an ISIL VBIED Facility, based on a CJFLCC-OIR deliberate target (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6). (b)(1)1.4a observed the airstrike. (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) prosecuted the target with (b)(1)1.4a munitions. After weapons release, two transient civilians walked down the road adjacent to the target site. The first munition impacted as one civilian was directly parallel to the target facility, and the explosion appears to kill the individual. A post-strike assessment by CJOC-E has determined, however, that the civilian was shielded from the blast by a vehicle and took shelter in a nearby house, and the second civilian was not injured and ran away.

3. Strike Narrative and Analysis. The following is a chronological breakdown of the strike based on analysis of relevant mlRC logs, FMV footage, and post-strike assessments.

a. CJFLCC-OIR tasked CJOC-E to prosecute approved deliberate target (b)(1)1.4a in West Mosul.

b. Following TEA approval of the strike, (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) was assigned to provide transient scans at the time of the engagement. (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) noted transient civilians in the general area, however, CJOC-E assessed that none were in the vicinity of the target area and all were outside of the collateral hazard area. (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) was cleared hot to prosecute

~~SECRET // REL TO USA, FVEY~~



IRIZ-JA-OPL

SUBJECT: CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report (CCAR) - Strike (b)(1)1.4a

(b)(1)1.4a 08 (b)(1)1.4a February 2017

the target at (b)(1)1.4a by the TEA. At this time, no transients were observed in or near the target area.

c. Weapons were released from (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) z, with a flight time of (b)(1)1.4a (b)(1)1.4a. Approximately (b)(1)1.4a before impact, two transient civilians entered the frame of view along the road north of the target compound. At impact, these individuals were approximately 15 meters apart. Footage from (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) shows that the first civilian was shielded by the blast from a vehicle, while the second civilian was outside of the blast radius. The first civilian can then be observed to run from behind the car and into a house, while the second civilian can be observed to run back up the street and around the corner of another house. Both civilians remain out of the frame of view at the time of impact for the remaining four munitions. After impact, no civilian casualties can be observed on the road.

d. Post-strike, CJFLCC-OIR J34 reported a potential CIVCAS incident, indicating that one or more civilians were possibly killed by the blast. The CJOC-E J2 certified video analyst reviewed the footage from the attack and assessed that the first civilian is unlikely to have been injured as a consequence of the attack as they were shielded by a parked vehicle and were able to run into a nearby building after the first impact. Further, the J2 assessment is that the second civilian was likely uninjured from the first impact and escaped further exposure to the following impacts by running down a road away from the target.

e. Neither (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) have assessed a possible CIVCAS incident as a consequence of conducting their post-mission debriefs and reports.

4. Credibility Assessment. Based on a thorough assessment of all reasonably available evidence, this CIVCAS allegation is deemed NOT CREDIBLE. That is, it is more likely than not that neither civilian was killed or seriously injured as a consequence of the strike based on the following:

a. The videos clearly indicate that after weapons release, two transient civilians entered the frame of view;

b. The first civilian was shielded from the blast and fragmentation from the first impact by the vehicle, while the second civilian was not affected by either; and

c. The first civilian was inside a nearby building while the second civilian was outside the collateral hazard area at the time of the subsequent impacts.

~~SECRET // REL TO USA, FVEY~~

IRIZ-JA-OPL

SUBJECT: CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report (CCAR) - Strike (b)(1)1.4a

(b)(1)1.4a

08 (b)(1)1.4a February 2017

5. The point of contact for this CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report is the undersigned at (b)(3) 10 USC 130b; (b)(6)

(b)(3) 10 USC 130b; (b)(6)

Enclosure

1. (b)(1)1.4a, (b)(6) Video

~~SECRET // REL TO USA, FVEY~~

IRIZ-JA-OPL

SUBJECT: CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report (CCAR) - Strike (b)(1)1.4a

(b)(1)1.4a, 08(b)(1)1.4z February 2017

I have conducted a legal review of the information in this CCAR and the supporting evidence. Based upon all reasonably available information at this time, I find that:

(b)(5)

(b)(3) 10 USC 130b; (b)(6)

13 Feb 17



IRIZ-JA-OPL

SUBJECT: CIVCAS Credibility Assessment Report (CCAR) - Strike (b)(1)1.4a


(b)(1)1.4a 08 (b)(1)1.4a February 2017

I have reviewed the information contained in this CCAR and the supporting evidence. Based upon all reasonably available information at this time, I find that:

\_\_\_ The evidence supports a finding of CREDIBLE. That is, it is more likely than not that the CIVCAS incident occurred. I direct an investigation be conducted by this command.

\_\_\_ The evidence supports a finding of CREDIBLE. That is, it is more likely than not that the CIVCAS incident occurred. However, at this time I direct no investigation be conducted by this command, as no additional information could be discovered by further investigation.

4 The evidence supports a finding of NOT CREDIBLE. Without additional evidence, I direct that no further action be taken by this command.

  
JOSEPH M. MARTIN  
Major General, USA  
CG, CJFLCC-OIR

FEB 14 2017

Pages 63 through 66 redacted for the following reasons:

Exhibits removed per agreement - Bates 3016-3019

Approved for Release