CAPT [redacted]

To: [redacted] CDR
Subject: RE: Greetings

Thanks, but you may have me confused with someone else. I'm a LDO Engineer, surface guy. R[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] CDR [SMTP:n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2000 12:37 AM
To: "CAPT [redacted] tarawa.navy.smil.mil"
Subject: Greetings

CAPT [redacted] here. As a fellow "moleholer," you may remember me as one of those pesky aviators that used to roam around the Air Room with [redacted] and [redacted] causing trouble while you submariners did all the important work! Yeah right! I ended up running J5233 after [redacted] left. I miss STRATCOM - it was lots of fun. But it's great to be back with the fleet doing Navy ops! I joined the CCDG3 N6 here in the Gulf as Staff C2W Officer (a VQ/EP3 aviator billet of sorts). For now, I've been assigned the primary duty of Battle Group/TF Force Protection Officer. LCDR [redacted] is my assistant. I stand ready to provide alpos assistance and answer anything you need wrt the investigation. I'll forward a response to your follow-up question and some amplifying information later today. Hope the Marines are being nice to you in Tarawa! v/r, [redacted]

CDR [redacted]
Abraham Lincoln Battle Group Force Protection Officer/C2W
POTS 619-545-8962
DSN 318-439-4795
nipmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.mil
jpmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil

Encl (123)
Page 1 of 5

CAPT[redacted]

From: CAPT [redacted]
[redacted]: Monday, October 30, 2000 3:00 PM
[redacted] CDR'
[redacted]ct: RE: Follow-up question response

I understand the common sense rule has to apply, but, if a ship can not perform a measure, and it doesn't matter what threatcon we are in, wouldn't you expect them to let you know what they could not do right away? That way you might be able to run a check and balance, agree/disagree. With respect to Cole you as the ISIC assumed they were doing all measures you approved. When you say applicable, unless you hear otherwise all were applicable in Cole's case. Am I correct? At least that is what the traffic says.

Some Questions:

Is it CTF 50's position that ships not report deviations from an approved FPP?

If so, what is your written authority (not part of the C5F OPORD)?

Thanks,[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]CDR [SMTP:n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2000 4:35 AM
To: 'CAPT [redacted]
Subject: Follow-up question response

CAPT [redacted] here's some additional info and the response to your follow-up question from yesterday. v/r,[redacted]

To answer this question and provide some amplifying information on the previous answer: COLE was scheduled for a BSF. Accordingly, we did not expect COLE to go pierside or go on liberty. Since we cannot anticipate all [redacted]nditions TF50 units may encounter during port calls, we address the full [redacted]nge of measures that might arise for every port visit in our force protection plan approvals. Hence, we expect units to comply with all directed applicable measures, based on conditions they actually encounter. COLE requested no deviations and we approved none. We therefore expected them to comply with all applicable measures pertaining to the conditions they would encounter during their BSF. The approval of all measures listed under a THREATCON level allows the CO and crew to adjust to changing conditions by employing all measures required to meet the situation. For example, we should not and do not try to predict if the ship will need to set a quarterdeck watch; however, we do direct appropriate measures, in accordance with the THREATCON criteria, be adhered to if/when a quarterdeck watch is set. The complete set of THREATCON Measures contained in NAVCENT OPORD 99/01 provides for this flexibility, while covering inport operations both pierside and at anchor. For all TF50 units, we thoroughly review each proposed force protection plan against the applicable AOR THREATCON measures, current intelligence for the proposed port, and all available information on the expected threat. Requested deviations are carefully considered before any force protection plan is approved. So far this deployment in the 5F AOR, we have approved 18 force protection plans. Minor deviations to modify measures, where port configuration or ship's forces varied, were approved for 11 measures, or 0.9% of the measures applied. For example, on multiple occasions we approved substitution of M14 rifles in place of M16 rifles, which some ships do not carry. We denied deviation requests on, or directed the implementation of, an additional 49 measures. While each port visit is handled on a case-by-case basis, one can see that [redacted]re almost always require ships to comply with the full number of measures [redacted]uired for a set THREATCON. To date, we have received no information [redacted]arding the exact conditions COLE encountered while inport Aden or to what extent any of measures 1-62 were implemented. Like most port visits, COLE

Encl (123)
Page 2 of 5

may have encountered conditions rendering some of the THREATCON BRAVO measures not applicable.

-----Original Message-----
From: CAPT[redacted] [SMTP:CAPT_[redacted]@tarawa.navy.smil.mil]
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2000 10:19 AM
To: [redacted] LCDR'
Subject: RE: Force protection plan for USS Cole

LCDR [redacted] if you knew no one was going ashore (i.e., no liberty), what about measures 6, 10, 12, 13,15,17,22, 27, 30, 32, 33?. And if they did not have a brow, there are others that may not have applied. They did not perform 31. Thanks, [redacted]

CDR [redacted]
Abraham Lincoln Battle Group Force Protection Officer/C2W
POTS 619-545-8962
DSN 318-439-4795
nipmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.mil
sipmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil

Encl (123)
Page 3 of 5

UNCLASSIFIED

CAPT[redacted]

To: [redacted] CDR
ject: RE: Follow-up question response

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] CDR [SMTP:n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2000 12:57 PM
To: 'CAPT[redacted]
Subject: RE: Follow-up question response

CAPT[redacted] We do not want to confuse the terms "applicable" and "required." Fleet guidelines dictate that ships comply with all required THREATCON measures as specified in their approved FPP. If a unit determines it cannot perform a measure, they are required to tell us. We can then authorize a deviation on that measure, provide additional support to the unit in order to comply with the measure, or tell the ship they are not to enter port. Also see specific remarks next to your questions below. Bottom line: The overall goal of this notification process is to determine if a change in the security posture from the approved FPP has occurred.

v/r,
CDR[redacted]
Abraham Lincoln Battle Group Force Protection Officer/C2W
POTS 619-545-8962
DSN 318-439-4795
nipmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.mil
sipmet: n62a@ccdg3.navy.smil.mil

> -----Original Message-----
> From: CAPT [redacted] [SMTP:CAPT[redacted]@tarawa.navy.smil.mil]
> Sent: Monday, October 30, 2000 1:00 AM
> To: [redacted] CDR'
> Subject: RE: Follow-up question response
>
> I understand the common sense rule has to apply, but, if a ship can not
> perform a measure, and it doesn't matter what threatcon we are in,
> wouldn't
> you expect them to let you know what they could not do right away? [redacted]
> [redacted] CDR] Yes. Anytime a unit encounters conditions that make them
> unable to comply with a required measure, military convention dictates
> that they must notify us by quickest means.
> That way you might be able to run a check and balance, agree/disagree.
> With respect
> to Cole you as the ISIC assumed they were doing all measures you approved.
> When you say applicable, unless you hear otherwise all were applicable in
> Cole's case. Am I correct? At least that is what the traffic says.
[redacted] CDR] Not necessarily. Cole should report any measure she does not comply with. The goal of notification here is to determine if a change in security posture from the approved FPP has occurred. If COLE's port stop did not require her to obtain vehicles, we would not expect her to report deviation from THREATCON BRAVO Measure 30 since such a report has no bearing on the security posture of the ship. In other words there is no deviation because the measure turned out to be not applicable to the port visit in question and the security posture of the ship. This truly is "common sense." The ISIC cannot and should not attempt to "crystal ball" exactly what measures a ship will need in a particular port visit. We can approve an all inclusive list to guide the ship's security posture across the full range of circumstances.

Encl (123)
Page 4 of 5

> Some [redacted]
>
> Is it CTF 50's position that ships not report deviations from an approved
> FPP? [redacted] CDR] No. Ships must report all deviations from
> approved plans. "Deviation" means a unit is unable to comply with a
> required measure, and that non-compliance changes the security posture of
> the ship. Ships do not have to report if a required measure is not
> needed, which means the circumstances encountered inport make it
> unnecessary or inappropriate for a particular measure to be implemented.

> If so, what is your written authority (not part of the C5F OPORD)? [redacted]
> [redacted] CDR] n/a
>

Finally, Some informal analogies may help: The approved FPP establishes a "toolbox" that gives the CO a set of tools to "fix" problems he may encounter inport. We don't say "you have to use a screwdriver" when he may not encounter any screws. Or like driving a car in winter - you take tire chains, a blanket, a flashlight, food, and water. All are required winter driving items. However, if you never encounter snow, you never use the blanket. If you're never stuck in the dark, you never use the flashlight. But you don't say, "well, it's not snowing now, I'd better ask whether I need to bring the chains." You just bring them. Likewise, when you advise someone on what to take and they say, "Ain't snowin', don't need 'em." You say, "take 'em anyway." Required measure. May not be applicable. The NAVCENT OPORD 99-01 gives CTF 50 written authority to approve FPPs for TF50 units. The formatted force protection plan message and our response makes sure each CO has a complete toolbox prior to entering port. Which tools are used depends on the circumstances encountered. In addition, the CO may add tools as he deems necessary. The CO does not, however, have the option to not use an approved tool when there is a circumstance which requires the use of that tool. Our goal is to ensure every TF50 unit is optimally prepared, vis' a vis' the THREATCON, threat and resources available.

[redacted]

Encl (123)
Page 5 of 5

UNCLASSIFIED