Volume 6, Issue 1

April 2001

Combat Developments Newsletter

Deputy Chief of Staff for Combat Developments
Fort Monroe, Virginia

Architect of the Future Army

Inside this issue:

TRADOC Concepts and Operational and Organizational Plan (O&O Plan) Relationships	1
Operational and Organizational Plans (O&O Plans)	1
Emerging Objective Force Concepts	3
Mission Needs Analysis (MNA)	3
Simulation Support Plan (SSP)	4
CSA Approval of Army Warfighting Requirements and the AROC	4
TRADOC Pam 71-9 (2001 update)	5
New Force Management Analysis (FORMAL) Review Process	5
CD Training	6
Notes	6

DCSCD Home Page: www.tradoc.army.mil/dcscd

TRADOC Concepts and Operational and Organizational Plan (O&O Plan) Relationships

All TRADOC 525-series Concepts describe capabilities, ideas, and warfighting descriptions that are addressed in the Army Capstone Concept. These qualities of the concept are broad based, usually general in nature, and are expressed in conceptual language. To further define and lend clarity to the conceptual development process, an O&O Plan may be needed.

The O&O Plan, is a document developed under the parent Capstone Concept or subordinate concept. The O&O Plan usually meets a specific need. This document provides clarity for conceptual language, provides guidance for the Science and Technology Community, and provides broad views of structure for the Force Designers.

The O&O Plan is an indication of how the proponent wants to proceed. It identifies the more detailed operational environment, operational missions, and capabilities planned to be carried out in a full military role. The O&O Plan also puts forth an organizational structure that is to be placed on the battlefield to carry out that operational mission. The O&O Plan says what is going to happen and who is going to do it.

The requirements determination process remains concept-based. The concept development process requires all warfighting requirements to have a lineage through concepts back to the Army's Capstone Concept. O&O Plans must be directly linked to the Capstone Concept or a Subordinate Concept. Together, these concepts determine DTLOMS requirements and focus the Army's transformation efforts.

HQ TRADOC POC: Mr. David Dodd, DSN: 680-3995, doddd@monroe.army.mil.

Operational & Organizational Plans (O&O Plans)

As the requirements determination process proceeds, more detailed analysis is needed to examine the concepts, needs, or solutions presented. The O&O Plan is published as a separate document to provide a more definitive and detailed description of the ideas and view of a parent concept (Capstone or Subordinate). These plans support the process to achieve the goals of a balanced change that will

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)
maintain the Legacy Force, as well as support the Army Transformation effort. Each O&O Plan is designed to guide a process; create a dialogue between our partners; to drive Science and Technology (S&T); and describe parameters for Objective Force utility and quality.

The O&O Plan also is primarily a link to connect different levels of Army concepts. Subordinate Concept writers did not always have an understandable view of the battle space as envisioned by Capstone Concept writers. In the past, results were often disjointed views of the operational battlespace and larger than necessary organizations that would cover all possible missions of the Capstone Concept. The O&O Plan should not be construed, however, as a replacement for the development of a Subordinate Concept document. The use of an O&O Plan provides guidance and direction for Subordinate Concept writers. To document a broader and more defined description of the parent concept requirements, the O&O Plan is basically designed in two parts: operational and organizational.

The *operational description* deals directly with development of a more detailed view of how a military operation would be conducted based on the parent concept. For example, the Interim Division O&O Plan provides an overview of that division's operations. The generalities of the operational considerations, expressed and identified in the Army Capstone Concept, are now focused into a more detailed plan of how specific military operations will be accomplished. This more detailed view of the operation helps Subordinate Concept developers view the operations of the parent concept. This section also helps doctrine writers better understand the operational functions of the concept and aids them in identifying the appropriate changes needed to update current doctrine or influence future doctrinal developments.

The second part of the O&O Plan is the basic supporting *organizational design*. This organizational structure is the force that will support the concept of operation described in the (Capstone or Subordinate) concept. This force is described, and elements of brigades, battalions, companies, and if needed, platoons, teams and sections are identified. The organization structure will support mission completion and the capabilities described in operational part of the O&O Plan and that are the operations sections of the parent concept. This part of the plan helps organization designers and force designers understand how the writers of the parent concept looked at an organization and its mission.

The Operational and Organizational Plan is a descriptive document focusing on force structure (the Organization portion of DTLOMS considerations). The content of an O&O Plan supports its use as the basic tool to build the O&O Description in paragraph 1 of an Operational Requirement Document (ORD). The ORD is a system document in the requirements determination process. Paragraph 1 of the ORD requires that the operational and organizational capabilities of a material solution be described at the beginning of the document. The O&O Plan provides that needed information for this basic description. ORD developers must know where and how the proposed system is to operate and the basic organizational structure that was envisioned by the original concept developer. Sufficient details of operational needs and organizational structure can be gleaned from the O&O Plan.

O&O Plans, when needed, are developed to provide greater clarity for the parent concept and provide information which will abridge the DTLOMS determination activity that follows concept approval. Concepts are basically general documents by nature and do not provide specific details. The parent concept may be the Capstone Concept (TRADOC Pam 525-5) or a Subordinate Concept (TRADOC Pam 525-series).

A basic outline for the development of an O&O Plan is available at: www.tradoc.army.mil/dcscd/documents/O&O.pdf . This will be added to the next revision of TRADOC Pam 71-9.

Emerging Objective Force Concepts

HQ TRADOC work on the Objective Force is also committed to developing organizational designs for forces to execute operational concepts. For example, developmental work on organizational design for the Objective Force has led to a framework of Units of Purpose organized at two levels: *Units of Employment* and *Units of Action*. *Units of Employment* are higher-level echelons, division and above, that integrate and synchronize Army forces for full dimensional operations. A central tenet of this concept is to reduce reliance on fixed or standing organization at higher echelons. Rather, they are modular units with greater tailorability for specific missions and the flexibility to change, even during employment. *Units of Action* are standing (fixed) organizations of maneuver, maneuver support, and maneuver sustainment functions, represented today by the echelons brigade and below. These units accomplish discrete sets of functions in accordance with mission-essential tasks. Empowered by the previously described FCS, maneuver units of action are the fighting components of the Objective Force.

HQ TRADOC POC: Mr. David Dodd, DSN: 680-3995, doddd@monroe.army.mil.

Mission Needs Analysis (MNA)

Whenever a MNS is required, a documented Mission Needs Analysis (MNA) must be first completed. As per CJCSI 3170, MNA defines the mission (maybe in terms of AUTLS), identifies non-new materiel alternatives and evaluates each alternative. The resulting documented MNA clearly defines the need or opportunity to be satisfied.

The ICT, or CD representative (school or Battle Lab), is responsible for researching the concepts, S&T research, technology opportunities, and experimentation results to identify possible alternatives that will meet the need. The most effective, timely, and least costly means to achieve the OFC/FOC should be chosen for further development and analysis. A combination of DTLOMS changes may be appropriate. These results must be documented and supported by the TRADOC proponent (ICT or CD rep).

DTLOS changes affect specific domain plans or programs. Doctrine changes are documented in HQ TRADOC's Doctrine Literature Master Plan. Training changes are addressed using the Systems Approach to Training (SAT). Significant leader development changes are addressed in the Leadership Development Support System (LDSS). Organizational changes are documented to HQDA (DCSOPS) through the Structure and Manpower Allocation System Army Master Force List. Soldier changes are presented to HQDA (DCSPER) through the Military Occupation Classification and Structure (MOCS).

The Doctrine, Training, Leader Development, and Soldier (DTLOS) determination documented in the MNA should provide the rationale as to why non-materiel options are inadequate, infeasible, or undesirable, and thereby support the Army's rationale for a materiel requirement. The MNA should then assess what type of materiel change is needed to provide the desired capability. *The MNA will accompany all ORDS for HQ TRADOC ORD approval; additionally, the MNA will be used to complete paragraph 4 of the ORD.*

HQ TRADOC POC: Mr. Mark Murray, DSN: 680-5834, murraym@monroe.army.mil

Simulation Support Plan (SSP)

Modeling and Simulation planning is an integral part of system development. The SSP outlines the initial plan for management of modeling and simulations throughout the system's life cycle. The ICT is responsible for developing the initial SSP. The SSP is one of the vehicles used to implement simulation and modeling for acquisition, requirements, and training (SMART) concepts to assist the Army in fielding highly capable materiel systems in a timely manner and at affordable costs. SSPs provide a management strategy for the CBTDEV and MATDEV for planning M&S support throughout the acquisition life cycle. The SSP describes the M&S programs that will or have supported analyses, will support testing, training, evaluation, and other functions to be accomplished in the program's evolution. The SSP must accompany the ORD when it is staffed, and when the ORD is forwarded for approval. HQ TRADOC will not approve an ORD without an accompanying SSP, or justification explaining why an SSP is not required.

A basic outline for the development of an SSP is available at: www.tradoc.army.mil/dcscd/documents/ssp.pdf. Additionally, CoS, TRADOC instituted a TRADOC SSP Working Group to develop guidelines, policy, and recommendations for preparation, coordination, and transition (to PM) of simulation support plans by integrated concept teams and exercise planners. The products of the Working Group will be added to the next revision of TRADOC Pam 71-9.

DCSCD POC: CPT Robert Boerjan, DSN: 680-2823, boerjanra@monroe.army.mil .

CSA Approval of Army Warfighting Requirements and the AROC

As of 19 Mar 01, the CSA approves all Army warfighting requirements (MNS, ORDs, and CRDs) regardless of Acquisition Category (see memorandum: www.tradoc.army.mil/dcscd/documents/AROC Interim Implementation Guidance.pdf). This also applies to Soldier Enhancement Programs (SEP). The CSA will also approve major warfighting concepts.

This new development will not change the process TRADOC uses to develop materiel requirements. When the materiel requirement approval package is ready for final TRADOC endorsement, the responsible DCSCD directorate will draft the endorsement memorandum (see new memo format: www.tradoc.army.mil/dcscd/documents/approval memo.pdf) and forward the package to the ADCSCD(R). After the DCSCD/CG TRADOC have reviewed and endorsed the package, the responsible DCSCD Directorate will scan the signed memo into a .pdf file and electronically forward the entire approval package to jonesd1@monroe.army.mil (hand carry to PMSD if classified). PMSD will electronically forward the package to DCSOPS for Army Requirements Oversight Council (AROC) review and CSA approval.

The AROC has been established to advise the CSA on Army warfighting requirements. The chair of the AROC is the VCSA, and the DCSCD is one of the ten permanent members.

For materiel requirements, the AROC will recommend one of the following to the CSA:

- approval (with or without AROC modification) and HQDA retention of approval authority of any subsequent changes to the document,
- approval (with or without AROC modification) and HQDA retention of approval authority of any subsequent changes to the KPPs (CG TRADOC would approve all non-KPP changes),
- approval (with or without AROC modification) and delegation of approval of any subsequent changes to the CG TRADOC,
- approval and forward to the JROC (for JROC oversight programs),
- disapproval.

The AROC may also return the materiel requirement to the ARSTAF for additional development.

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 4)
Even though approval of selected documents may be delegated to the DCSOPS, authority to disapprove remains with the CSA.

DCSCD POC: Mr. Sean O'Malley, DSN: 680-3478, omalleys@monroe.army.mil.

TRADOC PAM 71-9 (2001 Update)

The draft TP 71-9 created during the 2000 update cycle will not be published, but will instead be used as the start point for the 2001 update. The 2001 update began in April with authors of each of the sections/chapters updating their portions of the 2000 draft. This updated draft will be staffed with the field for comments in late May 2001. The publication date is Oct 2001.

HQ TRADOC POC: Mr. Sean O'Malley, DSN: 680-3478, omalleys@monroe.army.mil.

New Force Management Analysis (FORMAL) Review Process

The Force Management Analysis (FORMAL) review process will replace the current FAA. FORMAL Reviews will serve several purposes: (1) Provide a force management tool for the VCSA; (2) Facilitate Army-wide integration to produce and sustain mission capable units; (3) Identify and resolve issues that affect the execution of HQDA short and mid-range programs; (4) Are not stand alone assessments – but are an integral part of the Army's Force Integration Process. (5) Focus is to maintain readiness, force capability to support CINC requirements, and Army other missions across the POM years.

FORMAL review is an ARSTAF product with TRADOC and other MACOM support. It will identify "important" issues to achieve goals for senior leader decisions.

The first FORMAL review will address the Corps. It will focus on identifying and resolving issues associated with the Army's ability to achieve two goals: (1) Maintain Corps readiness and force capability required to support CINC requirements and other Army missions while (2) developing and fielding revolutionary capabilities that facilitate movement to the Objective Force. The end state of the process is an assessment of Corps ability to meet the two goals over; the designated period (FY 02-09) and the identification of issues that highlight impediment and offer recommended solution, method to mitigate impediment or accept risk.

TRADOC's responsibility is to support HQDA sponsors where TRADOC is the proponent (doctrine, training, leader development, organization and information systems). TRADOC leads will coordinate assessment and development of issues with proponent schools and centers as required. TRADOC leads are responsible to synchronize TRADOC positions and ensure issues are relevant to the Corps.

An ICT, chaired by the TRADOC CofS, will be formed. Its purpose is to filter and synchronize TRADOC issues.

DCSCD POC: COL John Twohig, DSN: 552-8617, twohigj@leav-emh.army.mil

Combat Developments Training

Combat Developments (CD) Executive Course. The Army Force Management School at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, administers the four-week course. The course is mandatory for incoming and newly assigned DCSCD Directors, Directors of Futures Development Integrating Centers, Directors of Combat Developments, Deputy Directors of Battle Laboratories, TRADOC System Managers and TRADOC Program Integration Officers. Deputies to the above positions are also eligible to a attend. The next class is 10 Sep – 5 Oct 01. Students can be scheduled for the class by e-mailing the point of contact below.

CD Course. The two-week course is for Army officers (CPT to LTC), warrant officers, noncommissioned officers (SFC and above), and civilians (CS-11 to CS-14) recently assigned to, or enroute to, their initial assignment in a CD or materiel acquisition position. The course is taught by the Army Logistics Management College at Fort Lee, Virginia. A course schedule is provided below.

COMBAT DEVELOPMENTS COURSE—ALMC				
Class #	Start Date	End Date	Nominations Due	Location
2001 - 004	14 May 2001	25 May 2001	30 Mar 2001	ALMC, FT LEE, VA
2001 - 005	24 Sep 2001	05 Oct 2001	10 Aug 2001	ALMC, FT LEE, VA

DCSCD POC: Mr. Carl Harris, DSN:680-3278, harrisc@monroe.army.mil

Notes

⇒ Operational Requirements Document (ORD) Guidelines. A new guide for the development of ORDs has been drafted and will shortly be approved and published by PMSD. Until then, ORD developers should continue to use the CJCSI 3170 and CJCSI 6212 as the basis for ORD development.

⇒ CJCSI 3170, Requirements Determination was updated on 15 April 2001 to conform to the new DOD acquisition model, increase emphasis on time-phased requirements, and clarification of the requirement to address environmental issues in requirements documents. The new CJSCI 3170.01B can be accessed at: www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/cjcsd/cjcsi/3170_01b.pdf

⇒ Catalog of Approved Requirements Documents (CARDS). DCSCD AOs are reminded that a CARDS # must be obtained before publication of a requirements document. The AO must e-mail the approved document (as an attachment) and the following data (in the e-mail) to jonesd1@monroe.army.mil:

- Document title
- Functional Area
- Document Type
- Predecessor document
- Approval date
- Combat developer (who)
- Materiel developer (who)
- Decision level

Editor: Mr Sean O'Malley, omalleys@monroe.army.mil
Policy & Operations Division Chief: Mr. Dale Jones, jonesd1@monroe.army.mil
Director, PMSD: Ms Billie Young, youngb@monroe.army.mil