ORGANIZATION: CALL - INTEL TEAM

UNIT: 3rd BCT, 101AD

EVENT DATE: 24 Feb 2011

ID: 626

LEGACY ID:

EVENT NAME: Operation Enduring Freedom

EVENT TYPE: Operation

LOCATION: Afghanistan

COUNTRY: Afghanistan

START DATE: 07 Oct 2001

END DATE:

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED FOUO

TOPIC: Expectation management for tactical bandwidth to support CoISTs at remote locations

OBSERVATIONS: (U) FOUO (U) Company intelligence support teams (CoIST) at more remote locations in the 3/101 area of operations did not have the necessary bandwidth to support intelligence-enabling systems.

DISCUSSION: (U) FOUO (U) Bandwidth management in Afghanistan is a challenge for the signal community. At the company level, there was only 2-3 megabytes (MB) of available bandwidth. Mountainous and varying terrain limited the widespread use of line-of-sight (LoS) systems for connectivity at remote locations. Company command posts (CPs) require NIPR, SIPR, and Blue Force Tracker (BFT) at a minimum for maintaining communications and reporting with higher headquarters. Systems that enable a company CP to provide an intelligence support function can require significant bandwidth. TIGR, Command Post of the Future (CPOF), Analyst Notebook, AXIS-PRO, and biometrics systems are image intensive. These intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) synchronization tool (IST) enabling systems can consume more bandwidth than is available for the company-level CP. This tactical network reality requires expectation management by commanders. This creates a situation where commanders must prioritize what systems will be used within the company CP. Primary command and control (C2) systems are a must. IST-enabling systems are nice to have when bandwidth is limited. As a result, IST-enabling systems could not be leveraged to provide a true IST function.

RECOMMENDATION:

	(U) FOUO (U) There is currently no technical solution for delivering sufficient bandwidth to support IST-enabling systems and applications for CoISTs where LoS systems are not practical. The upper tactical Internet was not designed to provide robust connectivity to company CPs. Commanders must prioritize which C2 and intelligence systems will be integrated into the tactical network. The problem can be mitigated by using LoS, terrestrial delivery systems where the topography allows. The proponent for CoIST (USAICoE) should reevaluate how IST functions are conducted and supported in bandwidth-restrictive environments. The proponents for CoISTs (non-MTOE resourced) must determine if this capability is an enduring concept and capability, or just a good idea that is best suited for a COIN environment, where mature network infrastructures can deliver sufficient bandwidth at the point of use.
IMPLICATIONS:	(U) FOUO (U) There appear to be no enduring implications. Intelligence support is still available to company level CPs at echelons battalion and above. This requires analytical products being “pushed” to company level commanders.
COMMENTS:	
EVENT DESCRIPTION:	(U) FOUO (U) 3/101 ABN (AASLT) IBCT KLI, 22-25 FEB 2011, FT CAMPBELL, KY

Metadata

Metadata Type	Metadata
DOTMLPF-P	
	FACILITIES
ECHELON	
	Company/Troop
WfF	
	INTEL
	MISSION COMMAND

Analysis Codes

Analysis Code Type	Analysis Code

UJTLS

Number	Title

Perspectives

Created By:	**Bruce Adams**
Create Date:	**31 Mar 2011**
Classification:	**Unclassified : Rel To :**
Discussion:	31 Mar 2011 13:18:23How did the unit work around the bandwidth limitations? How did the limited bandwidth effect CoIST operations? Mr. Bruce Adams bruce.d.adams@us.army.mil 913-684-3576

FIRST NAME:	Timothy
LAST NAME:	Stinnett
RANK:	CTR
UNIT:	SBCT WfF (SWfF)
PHONE:	360-556-2017
DSN:	
EMAIL:	tim.stinnett@us.army.mil

CLASSIFICATION:	Unclassified
AUTHORITY:	
DECLASSIFICATION DATE:	2/9/2012 12:00:00 AM
SOURCE:	