

Appendix F

DETERIORATION OF MISSION COMPOUND SECURITY

Overview

The decision by State Department senior officials to leave the Benghazi Mission in an undefined status left it without typical security measures and a dedicated funding stream that would otherwise apply to official overseas posts. Benghazi's security posture was further eroded by other factors such as constant equipment failures and insufficient quantities of personal protection equipment. Furthermore, notwithstanding the insufficient number of Diplomatic Security Agents sent to Benghazi, intervening factors such as problems with the Libyan visa system further limited the number of Diplomatic Security Agents deployed to Benghazi.

Funding Issues

The Benghazi Mission's requests for even the most basic security measures were impacted by the lack of dedicated funding made available by the State Department. Senior officials within the State Department were well aware of the funding implications associated with continuing the Benghazi Mission into 2012. Jeffrey D. Feltman, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, testified:

What we were trying to ... figure out was, how could we make a compelling enough argument that in the zero sum game that we have in terms of our budget and our resources, that we could find enough resources to keep Benghazi operating through the critical transition period? [sic]¹

Patrick F. Kennedy, the Under Secretary of State for Management, testified: "OBO has the funding authority ... for our permanent facilities It [funding authority for temporary facilities] ranges between the regional bureau in which the facility is located or the Bureau of Diplomatic Secu-

¹ Testimony of Jeffrey D. Feltman, Ass't Sec'y of State for Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 47 (Aug. 8, 2015) [hereinafter Feltman Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

urity.”² To that end, there was awareness at the senior level that the Benghazi Mission’s limited duration prevented it from receiving any type of dedicated funding for its physical security needs from the State Department’s Overseas Building Office [OBO], the office responsible for funding security measures.³

The December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum, approved by Kennedy, outlining the future operations of the Benghazi Mission for another year would have been an appropriate place to address the funding limitations within the OBO; and to designate a funding source to ensure the Benghazi Mission’s security needs were met in 2012.⁴ The Action Memorandum’s failure to address the issue forced nontraditional funding sources to be identified, with quick turnaround, in order to respond to Benghazi Mission’s basic security needs.⁵

Gentry O. Smith, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Countermeasures, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, testified funding was never an issue for physical security.⁶ Nevertheless, on January 12, 2012, the phys-

² Testimony of Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Sec’y for Management, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 18 (Feb. 3, 2016) [hereinafter Kennedy Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

³ Summary of group interview with Physical Security Specialist and others (on file with the Committee, SCB0046921) (“OBO is precluded from funding upgrades to short term leases, so it did not fund upgrades in Benghazi.”).

⁴ Memorandum from Jeffrey D. Feltman, Ass’t Sec’y for Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Sec’y for Management, U.S. Dep’t of State (Dec. 27, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05261557).

⁵ Summary of group interview with Physical Security Specialist and others (on file with the Committee, SCB 0046922) (“nontraditional DS funding” was identified for Benghazi.”). See also Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 80 (April 2, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 10 Testimony] (on file with the Committee) (“In terms of funding issues for programmatic stuff and security upgrades, ... you’re not going to get the money because Pat Kennedy hasn’t given you guys any money. So there’s no money at all that exists for the security budget for Benghazi. Every single penny you get we have to take from some other operational budget from some other office somewhere.”).

⁶ Testimony of Gentry O. Smith, Deputy Ass’t Sec’y of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 76 (Feb. 25, 2016) [hereinafter Smith Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

Q: Let me ask you this. As the DAS for Countermeasures, were you concerned about the ability to fund sufficiently the physical security measures needed to secure the facility?

A: It had not become an issue for me yet at that time, based on, as we spoke of in the first hour, the sources that were providing funds for the operation, particularly from the physical security side. You had Physical Security Programs, you had International Programs, you had OBO, and then you had the regional bureau as well.

ical security desk officer was informed “OBO/SM ... advised ... they cannot provide the funding” for the security requests.⁷ As a result, the State Department’s physical security specialist was forced to locate other offices within the Department to find the funds the Benghazi Mission needed.⁸ On February 15, 2012, the physical security desk officer explained to the Benghazi Mission “how the funding process normally works ... with short term leases in place at Benghazi, OBO/SM cannot get involved due to OBO policy ... funding security upgrades would have to be identified from other sources (DS).”⁹

The Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground described the impact the lack of funding had on the Mission.

I was told that the only way that we can get you security upgrades is if they basically don't cost anything and we can, sort of, you know, steal a couple bucks here and there from other pots of money, that there is no budget for Benghazi.¹⁰

If we had the money at post and if I had the money at post, you know, if I was able to spend the money you know, I'm an official for the U.S. Government. I'm entrusted with a lot as a DS agent. You know, I wanted the ability to go ahead and perform work, pay for that work, and then on the back end be able to tell people, ‘This is what I spent it for,’ and be able to you know, justify it that way, because it just made sense in my mind. Not necessarily I don't know if that's the appropriate way to do it, but for me, that was some of my frustration.¹¹

Q: You said it had not been a concern at that time. Did it ever, did funding for physical security upgrades ever become an issue for you or a concern of yours?

A: No.

⁷ Email from Physical Security Specialist, Physical Security Programs, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep’t of State (Jan. 12, 2012 6:29 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05397166).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Email from Physical Security Specialist, Physical Security Programs, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Diplomatic Security Agent 24, U.S. Dep’t of State, *et al.* (Feb. 15, 2012 2:39 PM) (on file with the Committee, SCB0048394).

¹⁰ Diplomatic Security Agent 10 Testimony at 27.

¹¹ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 24 (Apr. 9, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 12 Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

Further complicating the funding issue was the fact that Benghazi was a cash economy. Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground told the Committee “it was a cash economy at the time, so that money had to get to us before we could identify contractors and work to be under way.”¹² Yet, even getting the money to Libya was a problem. State Department officials indicated: “[s]ince it [Benghazi] was not a post, it had no formal designation in Department systems, and no electronic way to get the fund transfers.”¹³

Technical Equipment

The security challenges at the Mission compound were not limited to the rudimentary security measures that were being requested by the Diplomatic Security Agents or the challenges with funding the requests. The Benghazi Mission was constantly requesting assistance with routine items such as door locks, monitors, batteries, radios, and cameras.¹⁴ More often than not the Benghazi Mission sought help fixing constant equipment malfunctions.

The challenges with finding, installing, and fixing the equipment were exacerbated by the fact it could not be done locally.¹⁵ The Benghazi Mission was dependent on “the Cairo engineering center ... [which had] responsibility for US Missions in Libya.”¹⁶ When the U.S. Embassy in Cairo was not available, other embassies, such as Frankfurt, “augment[ed] the Cairo team.”¹⁷ Thus, notwithstanding the logistics of getting into Benghazi, the Benghazi Mission was subject to the U.S. Embassy in Cairo’s schedule as well as that of other embassies. For example, in early January 2012, Benghazi Mission personnel requested the assistance of the Electrical Security Officer [ESO] in Cairo to, among other things,

¹² *Id.* at 21.

¹³ Summary of group interview with Physical Security Specialist and others (on file with the Committee, SCB 0046921).

¹⁴ Email from Principal Officer 3, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Principal Officer 4, U.S. Dep’t of State (Aug. 29, 2012, 6:01 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05390852).

¹⁵ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 46 (Mar. 12, 2015) [Hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 15 Testimony] (on file with the Committee) (“I was asking for things that were not just readily available in Benghazi. And it wasn’t I could go to the drop arm store. There wasn’t one. So they would have to be locally procured and then put together.”).

¹⁶ Email from Regional Dir. for Security Engineering, Cairo, Egypt, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Travel Specialist, Cairo, Egypt, U.S. Dep’t of State, and Security Engineering Officer, U.S. Dep’t of State (Jun. 11, 2012 12:00 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05392482).

¹⁷ *Id.*

help decommission Villa A and install equipment in Villas B and C.¹⁸ The ESO could not travel to Benghazi until February 26, 2012 to assist with the requests.¹⁹

Compounding the equipment challenges was the Benghazi Mission's constant need for technical assistance throughout 2012. For example, in early February 2012, the Benghazi Mission sought help from the Radio Program Branch in Cairo for new radio equipment because "DS [Diplomatic Security] Washington has requested that the majority of radio equipment initially brought into Benghazi now must be returned."²⁰ This was preceded by a request for, among other things, replacing the radio antenna and repeater.²¹ This was followed by a request in late February 2012 to help again with radio repeaters. The Benghazi Mission wrote:

[T]he government authority in Libya responsible for allocating/assigning radio frequencies has declined our current frequencies in use and has provided us with an "acceptable" frequency range for use. As a result, we need to replace the current radio repeaters at site (Benghazi and Tripoli) with repeaters that will accommodate the frequencies that the Libyan government has agreed to let us use.²²

In late April 2012, after the first improvised explosive device [IED] attack on the perimeter wall at the Mission compound, Benghazi had problems with much of its security equipment, including: the loud speaker, the itemizer, walk-through metal detector, and camera 1.²³ In addition to fixing the malfunctioning equipment, the Mission sought help procuring additional equipment to strengthen the security on the compound such as a camera to screen the C-gate; monitors in [quick reaction force] QRF

¹⁸ Email from Information Management Officer, U.S. Dep't of State, to Diplomatic Security Agent 15 (Jan. 11, 2012, 10:28 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05392732).

¹⁹ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 15 to Diplomatic Security Agent 24 (Jan. 31, 2012 7:32AM) (on file with the Committee, C05410045).

²⁰ Email from Information Management Officer, U.S. Dep't of State (Feb. 1, 2012 4:08 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05395451).

²¹ See *id.*

²² Email to Deputy Ex. Dir., Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State (Feb. 21, 2012 2:09 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05393043).

²³ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 17 to Diplomatic Security Agent 24 (Apr. 21, 2012 10:20 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05409948).

bungalow, and locks for doors. Finally, the Benghazi Mission needed help relocating its lighting around the perimeter.²⁴

In June 2012, the second IED attack on the Mission compound damaged not only the perimeter wall but also cameras and the secondary metal detector. The Benghazi Mission sought help from the U.S. Embassy in Cairo to fix the damage but also sought help with the installation of additional cameras to strengthen security.²⁵ Three weeks later, power surges in Benghazi damaged the “voltage regulator and 220-110V transformer,” shutting all of the Benghazi Mission’s technical equipment down and necessitating the need for technical help from Cairo again.²⁶ Because the U.S. Embassy in Cairo couldn’t make the trip, the post in Frankfurt Germany sent personnel and equipment to make the necessary repairs.²⁷

Later, in August 2012, the Benghazi Mission sought the assistance of Cairo to fix additional malfunctioning equipment, including: seeking a new Immediate Distress Notification System [IDNS], old pendants for the current IDNS system, camera and monitors for its technical operations center and Villa Safe Haven, additional cameras with visibility outside the compound walls, upgraded critical cameras for night vision, louder IDNS system and a hardened [technical operations center] TOC door.²⁸

The constant malfunctions frustrated personnel on the ground.²⁹ In his turnover notes, the departing principal officer in Benghazi told his replacement: “[t]he tendency has been to conduct triage in the interim. We are, for example, on the fourth visit from an Embassy electrician of my brief tenure because we continue to repair rather than replace equipment.”³⁰

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 19 to Security Engineering Officer, U.S. Dep’t of State (Jun. 6, 2012, 5:07 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05392482).

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ Email from Information Management Officer, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Security Engineering Officer, U.S. Dep’t of State (Jun. 25, 2012, 9:23 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05392482).

²⁸ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 26 to Security Engineering Officer, U.S. Dep’t of State (Aug. 6, 2012 2:58 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05390265).

²⁹ See email from Principal Officer 3, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Principal Officer 4, U.S. Dep’t of State (Aug. 29, 2012 6:01 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05390852).

³⁰ *Id.*

On August 23, 2012, the Benghazi Mission requested additional technical equipment to help secure the compound. The request included an expert to analyze the loss of exterior lighting, new IDNS panel and pendants, weapons cabinet, better personal tracking device software, disintegrator if post increases its footprint, belt-fed crew-served weapon with bi-pod, CS gas canisters, badging machine, computer program to make access requests and computer at the guard house to view the approved access requests, an additional itemizer and an alarm system for the office villa.³¹

Protective Equipment

The Benghazi Mission was constantly securing adequate supplies of protective equipment for personnel in 2012. For example, on January 24, 2012, the lead Diplomatic Security Agent on the ground requested additional helmets, vests and [e]scape hoods after an insufficient number were sent to the Benghazi Mission.³² The U.S. Embassy in Tripoli acknowledged it mixed up the Benghazi Mission's request for the equipment.³³ In sending the protective equipment to Benghazi, the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli stated: "It's not exactly what you asked for but is what we could get together to get up to you."³⁴

In early February 2012, the Benghazi Mission requested ballistic vests, ballistic plates, complete personal medical kit, radio wires with pig tail, low profile holster, magazine pouches, low profile chest vest, individual GPS, flashlight, strobe, multi-tool, camel pak hydration system, and go bags.³⁵ With one Diplomatic Security Agent arriving without luggage and protective equipment in Benghazi, the Mission was concerned future Diplomatic Security Agents would also arrive without their personal protective gear. Further prompting the request was an incident that occurred on the compound while the Diplomatic Security Agent was without his

³¹ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 8 to Diplomatic Security Agent 23 (Aug. 23, 2012 2:44 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05390126-C05390127).

³² Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 15 to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Jan. 24, 2012 9:38PM) (on file with the Committee, C05393735).

³³ Email to Diplomatic Security Agent 15 (Jan. 29, 2012 1:56 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05412863).

³⁴ *Id.* ("It is not exactly what you asked for but is what we could get together to get up to you. We believe the original order that was made is mixed in with the commo [sic] equipment that needs to get up to you. We'll have to open the crates to see if your original order is included.").

³⁵ Email from Agent 12 to Agent 25 (Feb. 5, 2012 6:42 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05394222).

equipment.³⁶ To ensure this didn't happen again, the Benghazi Mission sought to have additional equipment at the ready.³⁷ The equipment was not sent until March 2012.³⁸

Additional requests for personal protection equipment were made on June 24, 2012, three weeks after the second attack on the facility. The request first went to Washington D.C. and then to the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli for a response.³⁹ The Embassy in Tripoli responded it had some items but that the others "will have to be post procured."⁴⁰

Security Staffing and the Mission

In addition to physical security, the Benghazi Mission's security deficiencies extended to State Department's unwillingness to commit the number of personnel needed to adequately secure the compound and personnel. The December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum authorized five Diplomatic Security Agents to serve at the Benghazi Mission compound.⁴¹ It was the expectation of those personnel on the ground that five Diplomatic Security Agents would be deployed to secure the compound.

Yet Benghazi "achieved a level of five DS Agents (not counting Defense Department provided temporary duty [TDY] Site Security Team personnel sent by the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli) for only 23 days between January 1 and September 9, 2012."⁴² Efforts to secure five Diplomatic Security Agents were either ignored or dismissed. As a result, the Benghazi Mission did not have five Diplomatic Security Agents on the Mission

³⁶ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Feb. 14, 2012, 8:54 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05393444).

³⁷ *See Id.*

³⁸ Email to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Mar. 5, 2012 11:27 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05393444).

³⁹ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 19 to Diplomatic Security Agent 24 (Jun. 24, 2012 11:28 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05411697).

⁴⁰ Email from Agent 24 to Agent 19, (Jun. 24, 2012) (on file with the Committee, C05411697).

⁴¹ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Libya Desk Officer, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 17 (Aug. 8, 2013) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony] (on file with the Committee) ("[A]t the time it was Acting Regional Director ... to come to that number. I don't know specifically what was his thinking on the matter, but I know in the summer of 2011 they were down to five agents for several months, so that was the in Benghazi that was the lowest number that was on the ground in Benghazi that I'm aware of at that time timeframe prior to December of 2012.").

⁴² See Department of State, Accountability Review Board for Benghazi Attack of September 2012, December 19, 2012, at 31.

compound during the first IED attack on April 6, 2012. The Benghazi Mission did not have five Diplomatic Security Agents on the compound during the second IED attack. The Benghazi Mission did not have five Diplomatic Security Agents at the time Ambassador Stevens arrived at the Mission compound on September 10, 2012.

PROTECTIVE DETAIL—OFFICE OF DIGNITARY PROTECTION

Because of the Defense Department's "no boots on the ground" policy, military security assets were only available in emergency circumstances.⁴³ Hence, only State Department Diplomatic Security Agents traveled with J. Christopher Stevens, U.S. Representative to the Transitional National Council [TNC] and his team into Benghazi. The Diplomatic Security Agents accompanying Stevens and his team needed certain skills for the Benghazi Mission in order to conduct "protective security functions."⁴⁴ The Diplomatic Security Agent in charge of Stevens' protective detail described the qualifications of his team.

A: I think it was pretty much people were selected because of their skill sets. You know, they spent, they spent time to make sure they had the right team makeup. And, for example, my shift leader ... , he had, I would estimate he had been on Diplomatic Security for eight years. He had some advanced training on a mobile training team where they it's a tactical team that the State Department has. He was on that team, and they trained for like nine months.

Q: Is that known as the MSD [mobile security deployment]?

A: MSD.

Q: Okay.

A: And anybody else on the team either had prior military experience, which I think all but two had prior military experience, and they had all gone through the State Department's high threat training.

⁴³ Benghazi Party Ops Plan (March 30, 2011)(on file with the Committee, SCB0095930)("DOD provide QRF for security and medical extraction").

⁴⁴ See Action Memorandum For DSS Director Jeffrey W. Culver (June 30, 2011)(on file with the Committee, C05579256).

Q: Okay.

A: As I recall.

Q: Okay. And you had too?

A: Yes.

Q: To your knowledge, was that a requirement that everyone have this high threat tactical course prior to going?

A: I think that was a requirement as far as the boss' thought when they were trying to put the team together, you know, that they wanted people to have that experience.⁴⁵

Two additional Diplomatic Security Agents traveled to Benghazi in late April 2011 to augment the Stevens' protective detail. The two additional Diplomatic Security Agents brought the total number of Agents to ten.⁴⁶ The Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to the Stevens' protective detail served in temporary capacities contingent on the Mission's duration.⁴⁷ When senior State Department officials made the decision to extend Stevens' Mission in Benghazi beyond the initial 30-day mark, the next Diplomatic Security Agent team rotated in for another 30-45 days.⁴⁸ The incoming Diplomatic Security Agent in charge described the process: "The first team that went in, the Dignitary Protection team that went in, it was a 30-day Mission, and they were in need of an agent in

⁴⁵ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 20 (Feb. 10, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 6 Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

⁴⁶ See Memorandum from Exec. Dir., NEA-SCA/EX, to Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Sec'y of State for Mgmt., U.S. Dep't of State (Apr. 15, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05390734); see also email from SMART Core (Apr. 19, 2011, 12:17 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05390733).

⁴⁷ See Diplomatic Security Agent 6 Testimony at 14 ("I was on a 60 day TDY, but I think I spent less than 45 days in Benghazi because I know I did. I spent 30 some days in Benghazi because it took time for us to get there."). See also, transcript of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 25 (Feb. 26, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 7 Testimony] (on file with the Committee) ("[T]he first team that went in, the Dignitary Protection team that went in, it was a thirty day Mission.").

⁴⁸ Diplomatic Security Agent 7 Testimony at 26 ("I would say that when they recognized that the Mission was viable and that they were going to continue it, they started to look for a replacement knowing that the agreement was that the agent in charge was going to do 30 days. So then they thought, okay, now we need to find somebody to continue on.").

charge to go in and take over from that agent in charge and to continue on the Mission.”⁴⁹

The number of Diplomatic Security Agents dropped from ten to five when Stevens and his team were forced to leave the Tibesti Hotel and find other accommodations. When Stevens and his team relocated to Villas A, B, and C in early August 2011, additional Diplomatic Security Agents were needed again to secure the 13 acre compound. The Diplomatic Security Agent in charge informed Washington D.C.:

[m]ore agents required: Between the three compounds, we’re looking at roughly 15 acres of property to secure. This will require additional SAs (up to five more) by early to mid-August. For REACT purposes, teams of agents will reside on all three compounds. Once resources permit, RSO TOC will be staffed 24/7.⁵⁰

By mid-September, the Mission had increased back to “10 bodies [DS agents] on compound.”⁵¹

SHIFT IN SECURITY POSTURE FROM A PROTECTIVE DETAIL TO A QUASI- RSO PROGRAM

By mid-September 2011, efforts were also under way to restart operations at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli. Predictably, resources and personnel shifted away from the Mission in Benghazi back to the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli.⁵² This precipitated a number of conversations about the Benghazi Mission’s future. At the time the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli restarted operations, the Benghazi Mission’s security posture changed from that of a protective detail to a regional security officer [RSO] program, a program similar to those implemented in embassies and official posts locat-

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 25.

⁵⁰ Email Diplomatic Security Agent to DS-IP-NEA (Jul. 21, 2011, 3:22 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05396529).

⁵¹ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 24 (May 21, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 13 Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

⁵² See email from Joan A. Polaschik, Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, U.S. Dep’t of State, to John C. Stevens, U.S. Representative to Transitional National Council, William V. Roebuck, Dir. Office of Maghreb Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State, Post Management Officer for Libya, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (Sept. 18, 2011, 11:54 AM)(on file with the Committee, C05395962)(stating “and when can we get . . . here”).

ed abroad.⁵³ Unlike the protective detail that focused primarily on the security of Stevens and his team using U.S. security assets, the new security posture would be overseen by a rotation of volunteer Diplomatic Security Agents. In addition, the Benghazi Mission focused more on employing host nation support for security, including using the February 17 Martyrs Brigade as a QRF team and employing an unarmed local guard force [LGF]. The Diplomatic Security Agent in charge in September described his response when learning about the change in security:

When I got solicited to go out, I was supposed to be the agent in charge of this detail. So I assumed as you know, you don't want to do that too often that the 10 would be part of my bodyguard staff and that's all I would have to deal with.

So when I got close to the drop date or the day I arrived, they basically said, "We don't know how long we're going to be here. So we're going to make you the RSO, and we're going to make your number two the AIC," at which time I tried to get back on the airplane.

But, nonetheless, it was myself and my number two. Rank wise, he was senior. He did more of the movement portion with Ambassador Stevens, but I did the overall security aspects of the job, access control and all the policy crap.⁵⁴

When asked to describe the caliber of host nation support available, he told the Committee:

[W]e were a quasi RSO office at best, so meaning Benghazi was unique in the fact that Benghazi really didn't know who they were either. . . . They were still jockeying to figure out who was going to be in power and who wasn't.

So, normally speaking, you would have already known that when you go into an environment. If you were going to establish yourself or an embassy, you'd already know who your minister of security is or who your DOD counterparts would be.

⁵³ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 18.

⁵⁴ Diplomatic Security Agent 13 Testimony at 28-29.

There it was a little different because you had different I'll say tribal, for lack of a better term. But you had different groups there and sects that you were trying to figure out who were friendly and who weren't.

And, I mean, for all intents and purposes, we thought everybody was friendly at that time. But, from my perspective, we didn't want to befriend one group versus somebody else without you know, we didn't want to cause an international incident.

At the time, 17 Feb. had already stepped up and said that they were going to be the point people for diplomatic interests or security purposes under this function.

So my interest while I was there was trying to plus that contingent up because knowing they only had a local guard force contingent of 10 people or 12 or whatever it was, unarmed and poorly equipped and poorly trained, I wanted at least some firepower. At least I could put them to at least have a presence.

But we only had three at the time. So I was trying to befriend them, trying to get more activity, more interest, additional bodies, because three bodies on 24/7 is long days, long weeks.⁵⁵

The change in security posture together with the reopening of the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli left the Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground uncertain about their future in Benghazi and their ability to do their jobs. The Diplomatic Security Agent in charge in September testified:

As we downsized to a lesser number, it's more difficult to run, keep up with the off tempo. That's where the 10 bodies kind of helped because, with additional bodies there, I could farm them out to support USAID interests or the MANPAD guy or ... and what have you. But as you start reducing those resources, then you have to prioritize your Missions.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 43-44.

⁵⁶ *Id.* at 32.

[W]e were still in this situation where we didn't know how long Benghazi was going to be. Tripoli was kicking off. And so there was a lot of interest in supporting that. So we were trying to figure out or headquarters was trying to figure out where to prioritize our deficiencies, if you want to call it that. So no one knows.

I mean, we were planning for the worst, phasing people out and trying to figure out how best to support the Mission there. If I remember correctly, with the Embassy being opened it opened towards the latter part of my tenure there. So the Envoy lost his, quote unquote, status because there was now an Ambassador in country I think they were going to bring in a political officer, probably my rank. I'm pretty sure he was my rank. He was going to be the foothold there in Benghazi for the short term, but no one knew how long.⁵⁷

As Stevens closed out his time in Benghazi, the number of Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to secure the Benghazi Mission continued to decrease. By the end of October 2011 the number of Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to secure the Benghazi Mission decreased to six.⁵⁸ By the end of November 2011, as Stevens' was departing, the number of Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to the Benghazi Mission was expected to drop to three.⁵⁹

Diplomatic Security personnel responsible for staffing overseas posts including Benghazi recognized early on the problems associated with finding Diplomatic Security Agents available to serve in Benghazi. With a protective detail, the Diplomatic Security Command Center could direct Diplomatic Security Agents to serve on a temporary basis. Under a

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 33-34.

⁵⁸ *See id.* at 72. *See also* Memorandum from Regional Director, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, to Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Int'l Programs, U.S. Dep't of State (Oct. 24, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05391928).

⁵⁹ Memorandum from Regional Director, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State to Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Int'l Programs, U.S. Dep't of State (Oct. 24, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05391928).

RSO program, temporary duty positions were filled by volunteers.⁶⁰ The desk officer in charge of staffing in Benghazi testified:

The Mission in ... September, October, the Mission in Benghazi changed essentially from a protection Mission, which was run by our dignitary protection unit here in Washington, to a more traditional RSO program management position, which pushed it back into DS/IP's, my office's realm.

So at that time the mechanism to get agents changed, they have a task oriented system, we have a it's hard to describe, but it's a system where basically we get volunteers to go. It's usually the high threat posts. And our system is, generally we cover traditionally we cover one RSO position like over a summer transition or during a break. It was very difficult for us to get the type of numbers on kind of a continuous basis through the volunteer system.⁶¹

Typically we just cover the gaps, but we did do occasionally we would do particularly in the beginning of Arab spring, it was very busy, and we had to find TDY support. But generally it wasn't near that number. It was never near that number. And it was for a much shorter timeframe, usually only one or two 60 to 30 day deployments for agents.⁶²

To address the emerging issue, the desk officer drafted an Action Memorandum for the approval of Charlene Lamb, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Programs in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security.⁶³ The October 24, 2011 Action Memorandum described the emerging problems associated with identifying enough volunteer Diplomatic Security Agents to serve 30-45 day rotations in Benghazi on a consistent basis and identified solutions including deploying Diplomatic Security Agents through the Diplomatic Security Command Center as had

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 18-19.

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ Memorandum from Regional Dir., Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, to Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State (Oct. 24, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05391928).

been done previously.⁶⁴ When asked by the Committee whether the October 24, 2011 Action Memorandum was approved, Lamb testified:

I had actually requested that they draft this memo because it's very easy for people to take for granted when there's a need for TDY people, they don't take the budget into consideration. And when we don't have full time positions authorized, this TDY money is coming out of the international program's budget. And at \$9,000 per agent for 45 days on a continual basis for a year, this money adds up very, very quickly and depletes the budget that I have for worldwide TDY assignments. So I wanted this to be documented and I wanted to be able to forward this forward and to go to the DS budget people to make sure that we had appropriate funding, and that they knew we were going to need additional funding, should this TDY status continue for a long period of time.⁶⁵

I'll be honest, there were so many operational things going on, my intent with this memo was to get this into the hands of the budget people and to have the budget people work together to come up with a solution to get the money that was needed.⁶⁶

We never ran we never ran out of money to the point where we said, okay, we can't send anybody else, there's no more money. We never went anti deficient with funding. So the Department, collectively, between DS, financial personnel, and the Department, we were always funded for these types of posts.⁶⁷

When asked by the Committee directly whether funding was approved for five, 45-day assistant regional security officer [ARSO] TDYs in Benghazi, Lamb testified: "yes."⁶⁸ However, the October 24, 2011 Action

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ Testimony of Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y for Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 77-78 (Jan. 7, 2016) [hereinafter Lamb Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

⁶⁶ *Id.* at 92.

⁶⁷ *Id.* at 92-93.

⁶⁸ *Id.* at 93.

Memorandum, which outlined proposed solutions including funding for five Diplomatic Security Agents, was never signed.⁶⁹ The desk officer testified:

A: I identified the problem immediately because you can see the staffing chart as was coming down. So when I took over the program in October, I immediately had conversations with my direct supervisors, and we generated an action memorandum with numerous recommendations on how we thought or I thought we could alleviate this problem.

Q: And was this just specifically focused on Benghazi or

A: I believe it was Libya centric

Q: Libya.

A: but I can't remember if it was Benghazi specific.

Q: And do you recall the timeframe that that actual memorandum circulated?

A: The date was mid to late October of 2011.

Q: And was that ever signed?

A: It was approved by my immediate supervisors.

Q: Did that help alleviate the concerns?

A: It was not approved through their superiors, so it never

Q: So where did it stop?

Q: But, specifically, this request for \$47,000, do you recall whether that was approved?

A: Yes.

Q: That was approved?

A: It would yes.

⁶⁹Memorandum from Regional Dir., Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U. S. Dep't of State, to Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State (Oct. 24, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05391928).

A: It stopped, as far as I know, at the I don't know where it went. I know it went up to the Deputy Director/DAS level. Which one of them looked at it or which one didn't, I don't know.

Q: Did you ever understand why it didn't get approved at that level?

A: No, I did not.⁷⁰

Lamb informed the Committee that Kennedy was aware of the funding issues associated with staffing the Mission in Benghazi.

Q: So is it fair to say that Pat Kennedy was aware of the funding issues that were associated with the TDYs in Benghazi?

A: It would be, during his regular staff meetings when we discussed all of the Tripoli and Benghazi issues, he was aware, and he had financial people there from his staff that reported to him directly.

Q: So he was shifting resources as it relates to

A: If it was necessary, he would not hesitate to do that.⁷¹

STAFFING SHORTAGES—DECEMBER 27
ACTION MEMORANDUM: FUTURE OF BENGHAZI OPERATIONS

By December 2011, Diplomatic Security Agent staffing in Benghazi was a problem. Two Diplomatic Security Agents secured the 13 acre compound in mid-December. Without reinforcements from Washington D.C. there was every expectation it would drop to one and then to zero in January.⁷² One of the Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground expressed his concerns:

It was down to two agents, myself and one other agent. And as I was getting ready to depart, we were going to go to one agent. And if the staffing pattern remained the way it was, with our expected incoming agents, we were going to go down to zero

⁷⁰ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 20.

⁷¹ Lamb Testimony at 89.

⁷² Diplomatic Security Agent 10 Testimony at 41-42.

agents. And that would have been around January 4th or 5th or so, we would go down to zero agents.⁷³

The principal officer who replaced Stevens also alerted Washington D.C. about the impact of the shortages in Diplomatic Security Agents in December 2011. He wrote:

[o]n a much more serious matter, something I flagged for Bill [Roebuck] yesterday on the phone, but pledged to send the details. We're going to be short on the RSO end of things from December 19 through the end of the year. During that period, we will be down to just 2 A/RSs or the practical equivalent thereof

What this all means is that all non-DS TDYs to Benghazi should be discouraged through the end of the year for sure (and we're still pretty limited the first week of January as the new folks get spun up), as even the basic movements are going to overextend us

We are a little too close to being down to a single agent here if arrival dates (or visa issuance?) slips to the right ... and if we're going to need to extend anyone here (one of whom has already done so), we need to get that sorted out sooner rather than later. Also, it's a little curious to hear about DS intensions to staff Benghazi with a RSO and 4 A/RSOs, while at this rate, we won't hit that target during my first two months here.⁷⁴

At the time Benghazi Mission was experiencing shortages in Diplomatic Security Agents, the December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum was being circulated for approval. The Action Memorandum acknowledged "Diplomatic Security's current presence consists of two Special Agents, with an additional three slots currently unfilled" and attributed the unfilled slots "to budget constraints and the reduced footprint."⁷⁵ The Action

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ Email from Principal Officer 1, U.S. Dep't of State, to Post Management Officer for Libya, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State (Dec. 15, 2011, 1:11 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05391603).

⁷⁵ Action Memorandum from Jeffrey Feltman, Ass't Sec'y of State for Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State, to Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Sec'y for Mgmt., U.S. Dep't of State (Dec. 27, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05261557).

Memorandum authorized a “full complement of five Special Agents.”⁷⁶ Kennedy provided a different interpretation to the Committee:

It says eight U.S. direct hire employees and two slots for political military and USAID. So that's 8, plus 2 is 10, of which 5 are substantive or management and 5 are Diplomatic Security. So you have five to protect five⁷⁷

How many people the Near East Bureau, looking at what was going on, how many people the Near East Bureau ultimately decided to deploy, kind of a cost benefit analysis. How much activity are they going to do? How much reporting do they want to do? That's a call made by the Near East Bureau. My point is that you judge the number of Diplomatic Security on two factors. It's the facility and the number of sorties that you need to make out into the city.⁷⁸

Lamb described Diplomatic Security's responsibilities to provide five Diplomatic Security Agents in Benghazi as “kind of the cap of what the bureau was asking ... Kennedy to approve. What they're saying is, at the most, we're not going to exceed this staffing level in Benghazi.”⁷⁹ Others such as the Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground and the principal officers they were protecting saw Diplomatic Security's staffing obligations as five Diplomatic Security Agents for Benghazi.⁸⁰

Though the effect of budget constraints on Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to the Benghazi Mission was known well before the decision to extend the Benghazi Mission, the December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum

⁷⁶ See *id.* See also Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 17 (“at the time it was Action Regional Director to come to that number. I don't know specifically what his thinking on the matter, but I know in the summer of 2011 they were down to five agents for several months, so that was the—in Benghazi—that was the lowest number that was on the ground that I'm aware of at that time timeframe prior to December of 2012 [sic].”).

⁷⁷ Kennedy Testimony at 301.

⁷⁸ *Id.* at 302.

⁷⁹ Lamb Testimony at 224.

⁸⁰ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 15 to Diplomatic Security Agent 12 (Jan. 27, 2012, 11:10 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05411094). (“U/S Kennedy stated there should be 5 agents here and I agree.”).

dum was silent on a funding solution.⁸¹ The Bureau of Diplomatic Security cleared the December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum with the “comment that this operation continues to be an unfunded mandate and a drain on personnel resources.”⁸² Neither Smith whose office was responsible for ensuring security standards and adequate physical security measures were in place at the Benghazi Mission and who cleared the Action Memorandum for Diplomatic Security, nor Lamb whose office was responsible for staffing had any recollection of why the comment was made.⁸³

REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL DIPLOMATIC SECURITY AGENTS

Concerns about Diplomatic Security Agent staffing shortages going into 2012 precipitated another Action Memorandum for Lamb’s approval.⁸⁴ The January 10, 2012 Action Memorandum highlighted Diplomatic Security’s responsibilities under the December 27, 2011 Action Memorandum to provide five Diplomatic Security Agents for Benghazi and recognized the Offices’ inability to “identify, seek necessary approvals and obtain the required visa approvals for this many agents on a continuing basis.”⁸⁵ The January 10, 2012 Action Memorandum requested Lamb approve efforts to:

request assistance from Domestic Operations, so that personnel can be selected and directed from the Field Offices by the DS Command Center as well as authorize funding for five, 45 day ARSO [assistant regional security officer] TDYs [temporary du-

⁸¹ Action Memorandum from Jeffrey Feltman, Ass’t Sec’y of State for Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Sec’y for Mgmt., U.S. Dep’t of State (Dec. 27, 2011) (on file with the Committee, C05261557).

⁸² Email from Special Ass’t to the Ass’t Sec’y for Diplomatic Security, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Post Management Officer, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State (Dec. 23, 2011, 3:27 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05578953).

⁸³ Lamb Transcript at 221 (“I did not see [the Action Memorandum] until after the event in Benghazi.”). See also Smith Testimony at 75 (“[I]t didn’t come from Countermeasures, it would not have been solely for physical security.”).

⁸⁴ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 25 to Principal Officer 1, U.S. Dep’t of State (Jan. 13, 2012, 10:05 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05411094) (“We have submitted an Action Memorandum that if approved should significantly improve our ability to identify and obtain approvals for staffing Benghazi.”); Action Memorandum for DAS Charlene Lamb (January 10, 2012) (on file with the Committee, C05578986).

⁸⁵ *Id.*

ty] in Benghazi from Feb.1 through September 30 at a total estimated cost of \$283,050.”⁸⁶

The January 10, 2012 Action Memorandum was never approved.⁸⁷

Without a mechanism to identify a constant pool of Diplomatic Security Agents to serve in Benghazi, the Mission continued to experience shortages. The principal officers on the ground expressed concern back to Washington D.C. about the impact the Diplomatic Security Agent staffing shortages was having on the security of the compound, in addition to their reporting obligations.⁸⁸ Moreover, the principal officers were concerned about the vulnerabilities created by the shortages in relation to the overall security environment in Benghazi. For example, the principal officer was concerned only two Diplomatic Security Agents were scheduled to be at the compound during the upcoming February 17th anniversary.⁸⁹ With no option available within Diplomatic Security, members of the Defense Department’s SST who were currently deployed to the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli offered to travel to Benghazi to address the Diplomatic Security Agent shortage.⁹⁰ SST agents deployed to the Benghazi

⁸⁶ *Id.*

⁸⁷ See Testimony of James Bacigalupo, Regional Dir. of Near Eastern Affairs Bureau, Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 17-18 (Sept. 4, 2013) (on file with the Committee).

A: I believe it was January, maybe December/January timeframe we had talked about it in the office, and I think I was out on leave because my deputy I had seen a document that my deputy had sent up to Director Lamb, to DAS Lamb requesting we use the system that they use domestically to direct a certain number of agents from the field offices for assignments. We use that on protection. And we sent the memo up suggesting maybe we could use this mechanism for overseas.

Q: Specifically for Libya or

A: It was specifically for Libya.

Q: And do you know what happened to that memo?

A: It was never signed off on.

⁸⁸ See email from Principal Officer 5, U.S. Dep’t of State, to U.S. Embassy in Tripoli, *et al.* (Feb. 11, 2012, 5:29 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05409829). See also email from Principal Officer 1 to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Jan. 17, 2012, 8:38 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05411094).

⁸⁹ See *id.*

⁹⁰ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 24 to Joan Polaschik, Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya (Feb. 6, 2012, 11:05 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05411434) (“From DS HQ (DAS Lamb and MSD Director) has indicated, they are not in favor of pulling MSD out of Tripoli to support from Benghazi and from what I understand they are keeping the staffing in Benghazi at 3-4 agents. DS HQ continues to complain about Benghazi being an unfunded mandate and there are no agents or funds to support it, so I doubt anything is

Mission compound on three more occasions: March 27-30, 2012, April 12-27, 2012, after the first attack, and June 9-23, 2012, after the second attack.⁹¹

On February 16, 2012, Joan Polaschik, the Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, met with Lamb to discuss among other things the staffing issues in Benghazi. According to personnel in the meeting:

Joan essentially briefed Charlene on the situation in Tripoli, primarily because that's where Joan was currently serving. They then discuss Benghazi some. And Joan was primarily seeking to get clarity from Charlene on DS' plan moving forward for security in both Tripoli and Benghazi.

During the meeting, there was what appeared to be a different policy set forward by Charlene about our security posture in Benghazi that advocated for local hire drivers and only one armed DS officer per vehicle with some reference to maybe in the future, once people had the foreign affairs counter threat training, some individuals could potentially self-drive. That seemed very different from what the previous stated policy of having two DS in any vehicle leaving the compound in Benghazi. It seemed a significant difference in policy, which raised alarm bells.⁹²

The policy change made by Lamb to cap the number of Diplomatic Security Agents assigned to the Benghazi Mission at three was confirmed by the desk officer responsible for staffing in Benghazi.

A: In mid-February, in conversations with DAS Lamb, it became quite she made it quite apparent that she wanted three agents on the ground in Benghazi. From that time on, I was attempting to get three agents into Benghazi at all times.

going to change unless the status of Benghazi is formalized. SST has indicated that they would be willing to support.”).

⁹¹ See Benghazi DS and SST TDY staffing for Jan. 2012—September 11 (on file with the Committee, C0539433).

⁹² Testimony of Post Management Officer for Libya, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 165-166 (Jul. 23, 2015) [hereinafter Post Management Officer Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

Q: How did you I mean, you said she made it clear. How did that become clear to you that was her position?

A: I don't specifically remember. I believe the on or about February 16th we were preparing for DCM from Tripoli to come in for a meeting on security related issues, and at that time I specifically recall the conversation about the number of agents in Benghazi. So that's the last thing I can recall specifically?

Q: Can you elaborate on that conversation?

A: Certainly. While discussing RSO staffing in Libya, the topic came up in Benghazi, and DAS Lamb became aware of the fact that two of the agents were essentially excuse me their primary duty was driving the movement team vehicle. And traditionally overseas posts, the vast majority of them, their drivers are provided by the post. They're locally engaged staff drivers. So she wanted to alleviate that program or that duty, so to speak, in her mind. That was one of the factors. There could have been more. That was the factors that she made known to me and my superiors.⁹³

The policy change was not communicated to the Diplomatic Security Agents on the ground or other State Department personnel who nonetheless believed five Diplomatic Security Agents were needed to adequately secure the Benghazi Mission. For example, the lead Diplomatic Security Agent in Benghazi at the time wrote:

I've enjoyed four agents for six days now and it's been a treat to allow agents to properly turnover programs with one another. We'll be back down to three tomorrow and then 2 on March 21 ... Having been here for six weeks now, I've had to deal with two Principal Officers who expect five DS agents to accommodate their travel, maintain the security integrity (and programs) on the compound.⁹⁴

Further to same, on March 28, 2012, Embassy Tripoli made a request on behalf of Benghazi for "five TDY Diplomatic Security agents for 45-60 day rotations in Benghazi." Advocating for the Benghazi Mission, Gene

⁹³ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 23-24.

⁹⁴ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 12 to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (March 14, 2012, 11:02 PM)(on file with the Committee, C05411904).

A. Cretz, U.S. Ambassador to Libya, wrote in his cable to Washington D.C.:⁹⁵

This number is required to ensure that we have an appropriate USDH [direct hire] presence to protect our COMSEC; support the two long term USDH TDYers, and support an increasing number of program/assistance TDY's from both Tripoli and Washington. The number of TDY'ers in Benghazi is expected to increase in the run up to the elections. Embassy Tripoli is in the process of recruiting four LES drivers and an RSO LES SPSS, which will support operations in Benghazi. Post also plans to deploy a TDY RSO from Tripoli once expanded permanent staffing is established and stabilized. Once these positions are filled; Post anticipates requiring fewer TDY DS agents to support Benghazi. Although an LGF contractor has begun operations in Benghazi, initial discussions regarding contractor-provided armed close protection/movement support does not appear viable based on complications regarding GOL firearms permits. Currently, the LGF contractor is able to obtain only short term (48-72 hr) firearms permits for specific VIP visits.⁹⁶

VISAS

At the time the March 28, 2012 staffing request was sent to Washington D.C., the number of Diplomatic Security Agents at the compound dropped to two.⁹⁷

Notwithstanding Lamb's decision to limit the number of Diplomatic Security Agents serving at the Benghazi Mission to three, those Diplomatic Security Agents who were available to deploy were prevented from traveling because they could not get visas from the Libyan Government.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ U.S. Dep't of State, Cable, Request for DS TDY and FTE Support (March 28, 2012) (on file with the Committee, SCB004625-27).

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ See email from Diplomatic Security Agent 12 of State, to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Mar. 21, 2012, 8:03 AM) (on file with the Committee, SCB0049976) ("[W]e are down to 2 agents in Benghazi which stifles movements and puts [us] in bad shape on compound.").

⁹⁸ See email from Diplomatic Security Agent 25 to Post Management Officer for Libya, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State, *et al.* (Mar. 20, 2012, 9:09 PM) (on file with the Committee, SCB0049977) ("I just went to the Libyan Embassy and was told that their 'system' was down. They could not check the status of currently approved visas nor do anything having to do with visas. When asked when the system may be back up,

Thus, the pool of Diplomatic Security Agents available to serve was further limited. The desk officer in charge of staffing in Benghazi described the problem with the Libyan visa system:

When they first initiated it, it was a surprise to us, we weren't aware it was going to happen. So basically you went from airport visas where you just kind of show up and was having to see if you had the right passport and you get stamped. And then you go to a visa process where they weren't quite ready yet, this end in at the Embassy to issue visas. So it was very confusing. They didn't have their process down. The bureaucracy wasn't working too well in their Ministry of Foreign Affairs, we call it the MFA, and back here in Washington. And that was in the December 2011 timeframe.

That kind of got sorted out in the early January 2012 timeframe and it did that way the process at least, it would take 2 or 3 weeks, but as long as we know the process, we can usually work around it.

And then it collapsed again in that end of March/April timeframe, and that one was pretty significant. That one was much longer, and it was difficult, and they were essentially, to my knowledge, they were changing from a they were using stamps before. This is probably too much detail for you guys, but and then they went to foils, and they didn't have the foils, so they had to get the foils, no one had the foils. I mean, it was convoluted. . . .

It actually got longer after the foil issue was resolved. So it was probably it usually took me about 6 weeks to get from identified to out there, and 4 weeks of that would be about for the visa process. I tried to get the visas in 1 month before the departure date, and that was standard until basically 9/11.⁹⁹

The visa delays prevented two Diplomatic Security Agents from traveling to the Benghazi Mission in late March and early April.¹⁰⁰ As a result,

the clerk told me that there was no way of telling when (or if) it will be up at any point in the future. 'It is being worked on' is what I was told.'").

⁹⁹ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 34-35.

¹⁰⁰ See email from Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (Apr. 7, 2012, 2:56 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05392858).

only one Diplomatic Security Agent was on the compound at the time of the first IED attack.¹⁰¹ On April 6, 2012, an “IED was thrown over the perimeter wall at 1650 EDT/2250 Benghazi.”¹⁰² The single Diplomatic Security Agent described the sequence of events to the Committee:

Shortly after I went inside, I know the principal officer and the IMO had already retired. I was sitting there, and I just turned on the TV, and I heard a very loud explosion. And, as I told you before, you heard explosions throughout, but you would know by the force of this explosion, not only the noise but also the way it rocked the building, I knew that it was inside the compound.

At that point, I was sitting in the living room. I had my weapons with me. I did not have my vest. I ran into my bedroom, grabbed my vest. I spoke to the IMO and to the principal officer. I instructed them to allow me out, lock themselves lock the door and lock themselves in the safe haven. I had an extra pistol and an extra shotgun. I left it there for them. I left two radios. One that is communication for them and me and communications for them and [REDACTED]. I told them that I would be constant contact with them on the radio or on the phone; if they did not hear from me, then to contact [REDACTED] for assistance.

I also called our QRF [quick reaction force], basically reacted them. We had a plan: On a situation like that, they would take up positions throughout the compound. One of the positions would be outside of our building. As I stepped outside, one of the QRF members was already out there waiting for me. This is possibly, I don't know, 3 minutes after the bombing.

At some point, the guard finally activated the alarm. Our guard force had a push button alarm; in case of any attack, they would activate it. As I step outside, the QRF member is there. We cleared our way to the TOC. Went inside the TOC [technical operations center]. I turn off the alarm, and I use our camera system to view or to try to determine if there was any other people, any

¹⁰¹ See email from Diplomatic Security Agent 24 to Principal Officer 2, U.S. Dep't of State, and Deputy Dir. Office of Maghreb Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep't of State (Apr. 7, 2012, 9:10 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05409502).

¹⁰² Email (Apr. 6, 2012, 8:28 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05409502).

other attackers in the compound. That took approximately 3, 4 minutes.

I did not see anybody in our camera system. There are some blind spots, but we did have a pretty good system throughout the compound. I thought that with that, I would be able to determine something, something blatant, something that would really stand out.

Afterwards, I stepped outside of the TOC. I had two QRF members with me, and we commenced on clearing the compound.

While we were doing that, I heard two shots. It sounded to me like rifle fire, something bigger than an M4, which is what I had. So I thought initially that it was shooting in the compound. One of the QRF members received, if I am not mistaken, a call that told him that a third QRF member was outside and had detained someone.

* * *

There was a third QRF member, [REDACTED], who was outside of the compound and had detained two Libyan nationals. Eventually I found out that he's the one who fired the two shots. It is common; it is standard operating procedure for Libyans to shoot warning shots, and that is what he did.

So we were clearing the compound when I learned that he was outside and he was possibly engaged with the attackers. I kept one of the QRF members guarding the entry to our house. I communicated with the principal officer that everything was still okay; we are still clearing. I went outside, and [REDACTED] had two people on the ground.

Shortly afterwards, reinforcements from the 17th February Militia arrived. They took them away. I requested from the militia to provide a security ring outside of the compound. I made contact with [REDACTED]. And I asked them to hold off on sending reinforcements to prevent a blue on blue situation the Militia did not know who they were; they did not know who the Militia were but to be on standby in case we needed additional assistance.

At that time, all QRF members and myself cleared the whole compound. It took us several hours to do so. We did not find evidence of any other intruders, attackers, enemy on the grounds. I went back inside, and I briefed the principal officer as to what had taken place. She and I then commenced our notifications to D.C. and our report writing.¹⁰³

The principal officer in Benghazi expressed concern to the lead Diplomatic Security Agent in Tripoli “had the attack been even slightly less amateur, I don’t know what we would have done.”¹⁰⁴

Less than two weeks after the first IED attack on the Benghazi Mission compound occurred, Washington D.C. rejected the March 28, 2012 request to deploy five Diplomatic Security Agents to Benghazi.¹⁰⁵ In denying the request, Washington D.C. stated:

DS will continue to provide DS agent support in Benghazi. DS/IP recommends that post continues its efforts to hire LES drivers for Benghazi to enable the DS TDYers to solely perform their protective security function. DS/IP also recommends a joint assessment of the number of DS agents requested for Benghazi to include input from RSO Tripoli, TDY RSO Benghazi, and DS/IP in an effort to develop a way forward.¹⁰⁶

Throughout the remainder of spring 2012, the number of Diplomatic Security Agents deployed to the compound never exceeded three.¹⁰⁷ Half the time, there were only two Diplomatic Security Agents.¹⁰⁸ During this time, the security environment in Benghazi started to deteriorate. Less than one week before Stevens returned to Tripoli as the Ambassador in May 2012, a rocket propelled grenade [RPG] attack occurred on the In-

¹⁰³ Testimony of Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr.at 30-32 (April 13, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 16 Testimony](on file with the Committee).

¹⁰⁴ See Email from Principal Officer 2, U.S. Dep’t of State, to Diplomatic Security Agent 24 and Deputy Dir. Office of Maghreb Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State (April 7, 2012, 3:25 AM) (on file with the Committee , C05409502).

¹⁰⁵ U.S. Dep’t of State, Cable—Tripoli, Request for DS TDY and FTE Support (April 19, 2012)(on file with the Committee, SCB 0046263).

¹⁰⁶ See *id.*

¹⁰⁷ See Benghazi DS and SST TDY staffing for Jan. 2012—September 11 (on file with the Committee, C0539433).

¹⁰⁸ See *id.*

ternational Committee of the Red Cross.¹⁰⁹ The International Committee of the Red Cross was located approximately one kilometer from the Benghazi Mission. A “vague Facebook post claiming responsibility for the RPG attack” also indicated it was “preparing to send a message to the Americans.”¹¹⁰

On June 6, 2012, a week after the threat to the Mission compound, the Benghazi Mission was attacked for a second time. An IED along the Benghazi Mission’s perimeter wall - - blowing a hole “6 feet by 4 feet,” large enough for an individual to walk through.¹¹¹ At the time of the second IED attack, three Diplomatic Security Agents were on the ground. A Diplomatic Security Agent on the ground at the time described the attack to the Committee:

Around 3:00 in the morning, give or take 20, 30 minutes, the imminent danger and notification system alarm went off, affectionately called the duck and cover alarm. That woke all of us up. I got up. I put on my armor, grabbed my weapon, got dressed of course, and then went outside to find out what was going on. I go outside, and I see a bunch of our I see our local Guard Force members around the front of the gate making, gesturing with their hands, you know, towards their nose. I did not speak Arabic. At the time they did not speak English, so, that's how we communicated. I believe at the time during that shift there was one person that didn't speak English. So, you know, I started smelling; then I had this distinct smell, not like something burning, but some kind of chemical burn, whatever. Come to find out, you know, 5 minutes later that it's a fuse.

But at that point so I asked everyone to start backing away from the wall. Then as I back away, that's when the bomb detonates.

From there it knocked me down. Ears were ringing. I get up with the local guards. We run back. There are some sandbags right there at the corner. Get behind those sandbags, point my M 4 at

¹⁰⁹ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 24 to Diplomatic Security Agent 25 (June 14, 2012, 1:56 PM)(on file with the Committee, C05391830).

¹¹⁰ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 18 to Diplomatic Security Agent 17 (May 28, 2012, 5:36 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05392202).

¹¹¹ Testimony of Principal Officer 2, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 109 (Mar. 13, 2015) [hereinafter Principal Officer 2 Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

the hole in the wall and wait for any follow up attack that may occur. And that was the

And no follow up attack did occur, so after that the February 17th Martyrs Brigade showed up in a matter of minutes. Then from there we set up a perimeter outside on the street. As we had this large hole in our wall, we wanted to push our security perimeter back even further. We set up the large hole I mean set up the perimeter, sorry; and then from there, once that perimeter was set up, I went with one of our QRF guys [REDACTED] And we went there and secured the rest of the compound.

As there was a security incident at the front of our compound, we had lost attention and lost visibility on other aspects of our compound. So, before we decided to let the principal officer out of the safe haven and call the all clear, we went through, me with my M4, him with his AK-47, and we just moved through the compound making sure nobody else had entered and there were no other devices. After that was done, we called the all clear.¹¹²

Two days after the second attack on the compound the number of Diplomatic Security Agents dropped to two.¹¹³ Five days later, on June 11, 2012, an RPG attack was launched on the UK Ambassador's motorcade. Some speculated the RPG was directed toward the Mission given the proximity of the attack to the Mission compound. Polaschik testified:

A: There were two main reasons. One was the physical location of the attack. It occurred, I believe, on Venezia Street, which is right by our compound. And it was actually, as I understood it, not having been there at the time of the attack, close by our rear exit from our compound. And, also, given the fact that we had been storing British armored vehicles on our compound, again, if someone had been watching, you know, did they know for sure whether that was British or American.

¹¹² Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep't of State, at 59-61 (Mar. 24, 2015) [hereinafter Diplomatic Security Agent 22 Testimony] (on file with the Committee).

¹¹³ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 25 to Diplomatic Security Agent 21 (Jun. 7, 2012, 3:03 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05391125).

Also, around the same time, a figure named Abu Yahya is it Abu Yahya al Libi? a senior Al Qaeda operative, had been killed, I believe, in either Pakistan or Afghanistan. So I was—

Q: By the U.S. Government?

A: Correct.

Q: In a drone strike or something like that?

A: Correct. In some U.S. operations. So, given that he was a Libyan, I was concerned whether or not there could have been some retaliatory action taken by Al Qaeda, you know, for that act. So it was murky. There were a lot of things that were unclear, but I was concerned that there could have been links to the U.S. Government.

Q: At that time, in June of 2012, the Brits were storing their vehicles and their weapons on the U.S. compound, the Benghazi compound; is that correct?

A: Correct.¹¹⁴

In fact, between the first attack on the Benghazi Mission on April 6 and June 2012, there were more than 21 separate incidents in Benghazi.¹¹⁵ While a member of the Defense Department's SST was temporarily diverted to bolster security after the series of attacks against the Mission compound and U.K. Ambassador's motorcade, Diplomatic Security Agent staffing never increased to five.¹¹⁶ The sequence of attacks raised enough concern in Washington D.C., for Lamb to acknowledge to her supervisors there were not enough resources diverted to Benghazi.

We are not staffed or resourced adequately to protect our people in that type of environment. We are a soft target against resources available to the bad guys there. Not to mention there is no continuity because we do everything there with TDY person-

¹¹⁴ Testimony of Joan Polaschik, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Dep't of State, at 95-96 (Aug. 12, 2015) [hereinafter Polaschik Transcript] (on file with the Committee).

¹¹⁵ Security Incidents in Benghazi, Libya, from June 1, 2011- Aug. 20, 2012 (on file with the Committee); *see also* Benghazi Spot Report, EAC and Significant Event Timeline (DS/IP/RD) (on file with the Committee, C05394332).

¹¹⁶ *See* Benghazi DS and SST TDY staffing for Jan. 2012—September 11 (on file with the Committee, C0539433).

nel. The cost to continue to do business there may become more challenging.¹¹⁷

Washington D.C. did nothing to provide additional resources or personnel. For example, a day before the second IED attack on the Mission compound, Stevens requested the support of the State Department's highly trained mobile security deployment team to remain in Tripoli through the end of the summer.¹¹⁸ More resources in Tripoli meant possibly more available resources at the Benghazi Mission. However, on the day of the second IED attack against the Benghazi Mission on June 6, 2012 the request was denied.¹¹⁹

On June 14, 2012, eight days after the second IED attack on the compound, the Diplomatic Security Agent in charge sent a staffing request to Diplomatic Security requesting "five DS agents be deployed to secure the facility, with a MSD team on standby."¹²⁰ One day later, on June 15, 2012, an Action Memorandum requesting five additional staff for Benghazi was directed to Lamb for approval.¹²¹ The Action Memorandum described "the uncertainty of the security situation in Benghazi and the fact that there appears to be an active terrorist cell in Benghazi, Libya planning and implementing attack operations against western interests including the U.S. Mission in Benghazi."¹²² No response was ever received.¹²³ The desk officer responsible for staffing in Benghazi described his role in developing the Action Memorandum.¹²⁴

A: The RSO in Benghazi also requested and received additional local guard support, which was the Blue Mountain Group. So

¹¹⁷ Email from Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y for Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, to Scott Bultrowicz, Principal Deputy Sec'y for Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State (Jun. 11, 2012, 4:16 PM) (on file with the Committee, C05388866).

¹¹⁸ Email from John C. Stevens, U.S. Ambassador to Libya, to Diplomatic Security Agent 7 (Jun. 5, 2012, 10:55 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05409979).

¹¹⁹ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 7 to John C. Stevens, U.S. Ambassador to Libya (Jun. 6, 2012, 3:00PM) (on file with the Committee, C05409979).

¹²⁰ Email from Diplomatic Security Agent 19 to Diplomatic Security Agent 25, James Bacigalupo, Regional Dir. of the Near East Asia Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State (Jun. 14, 2012, 11:40 AM) (on file with the Committee, C05393692).

¹²¹ Memorandum from James Bacigalupo, Regional Dir. of the Near East Asia Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, to Charlene Lamb, Deputy Ass't Sec'y for Diplomatic Security, U.S. Dep't of State, (Jun. 15, 2012) (on file with the Committee, C05578316).

¹²² *Id.*

¹²³ Diplomatic Security Agent 25 Testimony at 42-43.

¹²⁴ *Id.*

they had additional guards on at night. And then the RSO in Benghazi, they requested me for additional staffing, RSO staffing, agents staffing.

Q: How did that request come in?

A: I believe we definitely talked on the phone and then he sent an email to follow up with that. But first we spoke on the phone and then we sent an email.

Q: And what was the number requested or

A: Sure.

Q: How did that proceed when that after that request came in?

A: Certainly. The number he requested at the time was I think he said five agents, and he specified a timeframe through the election period, which was going to be probably in a month, so on or about I think it was earlier scheduled it was early July, so roughly about a month, and then he recommended having four agents remain at the compound.

Q: Based on your experience, just from a personal perspective, did you support that number or support that assessment?

A: Yes. Not only did I support it, I sent it to the RSO for clearance as well, which he supported fully, and I drafted an action memorandum stating the RSO's request.

Q: And what happened to that action memorandum?

A: It was approved by my direct supervisors, and then it was upstairs for a while. And we didn't hear anything. We felt it urgent enough, my supervisor scheduled a meeting with DAS Lamb, and in the meeting with DAS Lamb, essentially the long and short of it, the memo was denied for additional resources, personnel wise.

Q: Can you walk us through that in a little more detail? How long was it upstairs? So your immediate supervisor, that would be Mr. Bacigalupo?

A: At that time it was James Bacigalupo, correct.

Q: So he approved this action memorandum, and then it would go to Charlene Lamb. Is that correct?

A: It went to I know it was in I don't know where it went in between. Probably to her staff assistants or the deputy prior to her. But it definitely made it to her because that's who we had the meeting with.

Q: And how long was it up there before the meeting?

A: I think the memo actually didn't get sent up until after the incident with the UK protective detail, so it was probably mid-June, June 15th, I believe, the date on the memo. So I think it was late that week. Maybe June 18th. I can't recall it specifically.¹²⁵

Concerned about the impending loss of security personnel and the deteriorating security environment in Tripoli and in Benghazi, the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli sent a staffing request to Washington D.C.¹²⁶ The July 9, 2012 staffing request included a request for a minimum of four additional Diplomatic Security Agents for the Benghazi Mission—which would be comprised of at least one permanently assigned Diplomatic Security Agent from the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli, as well as a minimum of three temporary duty Diplomatic Security Agents identified by Washington D.C. The Diplomatic Security Agent in charge in Benghazi in July explained his reasoning for the request.¹²⁷

With all the security situation on the ground going on and putting everything in place, and all the transition taking place in regards to American personnel leaving and coming in, and after discussion with the RSO and chief of Mission, this was a cable suggesting at that time this is what we need to maintain operations in the best safe manner as soon as possible. We wrote this cable on July 9, prior to the Ambassador leaving for Benghazi.

At that time, MSD personnel were, when we started off with two teams; now there was less teams on the ground. Actually, I don't

¹²⁵ *Id.*

¹²⁶ U.S. Dep't of State, Cable, Request for Extension of TDY Security Personnel (July 9, 2012) (on file with the Committee, SCB 0049439).

¹²⁷ Testimony Diplomatic Security Agent, Diplomatic Security Service, U.S. Dep't of State, at 78-79 (May 19, 2015) (on file with the Committee).

believe there was any MSD team on the ground. There was just TDYers and two permanent ARSOs on the ground. This is in July. I'm sorry. I'm confused on the dates. Not September. This is July 9. So, at this time, we had another ARSO on the ground that was permanent and myself and the RSO.

* * *

So we wrote this in July because all these elements were leaving. MSD was leaving. The SST team was leaving, or they were going to change their Mission from being in the Embassy to being outside of the Embassy so they could train the Libyan government military. So we came up with this as a suggestion, for example, in line 4, or paragraph 4, under the current arrangement, and this was the main one, 34 U.S. security personnel, the 16 SSTs, the 11 MSD, the 2 RSOs and 3 TDY RSOs, that was the number that we had there, and it was going to drawn down to 27. And we said: Wait, we're basically losing people. We need people, specifically because security is not in the best position now.

We requested weapons permits and weapons for the local ambassador bodyguard detail, and funding for security. Yes, and this was the cable that we sent out in concurrence with the Ambassador?¹²⁸

Again, going based on the numbers of agents that were going to Benghazi while we were averaging one, two, or three, and we never actually had five, we're suggesting: Hey, international programs, how about you making sure that we always have three, and we're going to put a permanent RSO on the ground, and that would give us at least four if you cannot provide us with enough TDYers to do the job. That's basically why we went with that number. It was an average of the amount of agents that we had at any time at that post.¹²⁹

No response was received. Lamb explained the lack of response to the Committee:

¹²⁸ *Id.* at 79.

¹²⁹ *Id.*, at 80.

So when I read this cable in this format, [REDACTED] wrote it as a reporting cable in paragraph format, and it's very hard to line everything up by the needs. So I asked the desk officer to have his ... at the time was the person working with [REDACTED] for them to get on a conference call and to go through this cable, paragraph by paragraph, line by line, and to switch this into the format that shows how many people do you need for which activities, to support VIP visits, movement security, static security, a quick reaction force. Just tell me exactly what you need and then the numbers will pop out the other side showing what you need.

And they sat down and they did this. And all of that was compiled into the response that unfortunately never went out. But my guidance to them was before that cable went up to Scott Bul-trowicz and Eric Boswell, I wanted it to be pre approved at post, because I didn't want to dictate to post their staffing needs, I wanted to support them. But in this format, it was not clear exact because they were coming up on the 1 year transition when everybody was going to leave post and the new team was going to come in, so I wanted it to be laid out, very clear, the current operating support that was being provided for security.¹³⁰

She further explained: "And just because it didn't get sent out with a cable number on it, I am testifying to you that everything in that cable was followed through and carried out."¹³¹

Kennedy explained his involvement in the July 9, 2012 staffing cable and the decision to terminate the Defense Department's SST protective responsibilities at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli. He testified to the Committee: "I consulted, as I said earlier, with the subject matter experts in this field, and after consulting with them, I responded no, we would not be asking for another extension."¹³² This is a much different description of Kennedy's involvement than what Cheryl D. Mills, Chief of Staff and Counselor to the Secretary of State, described to the Committee. She described the Under Secretary as the person "who managed security related issues."¹³³

¹³⁰ Lamb Transcript at 245-246.

¹³¹ *Id.* at 248.

¹³² Kennedy Transcript at 46.

¹³³ Testimony of Cheryl Mills, Chief of Staff to the U.S. Sec'y of State, U.S. Dep't of State, Tr. at 72 (Sept. 2, 2015) (on file with the Committee).

Additional resources were never sent to Tripoli or Benghazi, despite the requests of the security professionals on the ground. Beginning in August, the number of security personnel at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli was 34. By the end of August, the number of security personnel at Embassy Tripoli dropped to six Diplomatic Security Agents.¹³⁴ In Benghazi, the number of Diplomatic Security Agents continued to fluctuate. By August, the desk officer responsible for staffing in Benghazi conveyed to the Regional Bureau “DS has had no volunteers for Benghazi for the upcoming few months ... DS’s plan is to maintain 3 DS staff in Benghazi at all times by drawing on Tripoli’s resources.”¹³⁵

On September 1, 2012, a Diplomatic Security Agent, who was originally scheduled to serve at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli, arrived at the Benghazi Mission to serve as the Diplomatic Security Agent in charge. With the addition from Tripoli in early September 2012, three Diplomatic Security Agents secured the Benghazi compound, including on the morning of September 10, 2012 prior to Stevens’ arrival.

¹³⁴ Testimony of Gregory Hicks, Deputy Chief of Mission at U.S. Embassy Tripoli, U.S. Dep’t of State, Tr. at 13-14 (Apr. 11, 2013, U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Gov’t Reform) (on file with the Committee); *see also* Cable from Embassy Tripoli to U.S. Dep’t of State (Jul. 9, 2012) (on file with the Committee, SCB 0049439).

¹³⁵ Email from Deputy Dir. for of Maghreb Affairs, U.S. Dep’t of State (Aug. 27, 2012, 4:47PM) (on file with the Committee, C05394203).