



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS AND FORT BRAGG
2175 REILLY ROAD, STOP A
FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA 28310

AFZA-IWfF

10 March 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR IBCT Community of Purpose (CoP)

SUBJECT: IBCT Senior Mentor Symposium #30, Executive Summary

1. LTG Townsend, CG, XVIII ABN CORPS, hosted the IBCT SMS #30 from Ft Bragg, NC. Key leaders representing commands throughout the operational and institutional Army logged into the DCS-S session; many hosting multiple unit representatives and attendees.
2. First Brief – COL Chris LaNeve, COG, JRTC, Ft Polk, LA, provided his observations from the past year's IBCT Decisive Action Training Environment (DATE) rotations at JRTC. He covered both positive and negative trends and observations for JFE, Defense, and Attack at the Soldier/Leader, BN, and BCT levels. He transitioned to a discussion on BCT and BN Command Post complexity with observations on the Mission Command systems, heavy reliance on Field Service Representatives (FSRs), and unit challenges at setting up and employing systems for efficient and timely Mission Command. The key observation was BCTs are more situationally aware in the 48-72 hours immediately following a JFE because they are relying on FM and Analog products. Loss of situational awareness is a result of the BCT's transition to stand up digital systems. COL LaNeve has observed value added in the Digital Master Gunner program (producing 5S ASI) in solving some of the challenges of digital systems; need more Soldiers with these skill sets to sustain 24 hour operations. He concluded with three key Mission Command observations: 1) BCTs with Agile, Expeditionary, and Tailored systems experience greater flexibility and understanding through all phases of the operation. 2) BCTs that clearly articulate Mission Command systems requirements in support of the commander's decision making are more successful. 3) BNs that are less hindered by Mission Command system footprint and upkeep have improved understanding.

LTG Townsend provided feedback (key highlights):

- 1) Addressing the observation of poor tactical movement at night: at the Soldier/leader level, moving and fighting at night must be one of the areas of excellence for Infantry units; we must rebuild this skill. LTG Townsend has also observed great tactical success for units using or leading night movements with IR/thermal night vision devices; observation and engagement of enemy well before friendly detection.
- 2) Addressing the observation/trend that staffs lack confidence and competence at using the MDMP to produce rapid and adequate staff analysis of problems: we must work through this, need to get this fixed at unit level; MDMP is the battle drill of the BN/BCT staff; confident that BCT commanders will work through the friction to get this done.
- 3) Addressing poor use of graphic control measures: believes there is too much emphasis on intent graphics; need a simple battlefield framework to flex from – boundary lines, CPs, TRPs, etc. Recommends only 3-5 TRPs as a maximum, don't oversaturate the map. Units need enough basic control measures to communicate effectively and adjust a plan in contact; graphics need to be on BFT and JCR.
- 4) CS Fielding: the rapid and continuous fielding of different Mission Command Capability Sets has exacerbated the problem of standardization and synchronization within unit formations. Units need

the opportunity to fix the training and education gaps on their current equipment before they are fielded another iteration.

3. Second Brief – LTC Josh Walker, G3, 1st SFC (A), Ft Bragg, NC, discussed SOF/CF Integration, Interoperability, and Interdependence (I3) and some initiatives with XVIII ABC to gain better situational awareness and synchronization of training opportunities at the BCT/SFG level. LTC Walker provided observations from the Joint Staff J7 I3 study highlighting the CJCS concern over Ad Hoc force generation and training cycles between SOF and CF; too late to figure out I3 in the fight. He discussed I3 terms of reference from JP 3-05.1 (Unconventional Warfare) and FM 6-05 (Multi-Service TTPs for CF/SOF I3) and went on to describe some of the current I3 initiatives already in place at the Institutional, Tactical, and Operational levels. Concluding with a way-ahead, LTC Walker described some of the on-going synchronization initiatives between XVIII ABC and 1st SFC (A) for OIR and XVIII ABC and USASOC for bi-annual training calendar synchronization over DCS at the G3/S3 level. Intent is to increase situational awareness and help highlight training opportunities beneficial for all; working on POC lists/directories by post to help enable I3 efforts at the appropriate level. Need to build SOF/CF I3 well before CTC rotations and deployments. BG Brower (ADC, 101st ABN DIV (AASLT)) provided comments on the need to include more I3 education to junior officers at the LT/CPT level; increase the exposure in BOLC. BG Brower is one of five SOF GOs currently serving as ADCs in CF Divisions as there are also CF GOs serving as ADCs in SOF HQs; another Army initiative to help institutionalize SOF/CF I3.

LTG Townsend provided feedback (key highlights):

1) Addressing Command Relationships: supporting/supported relationship is a good start point, but recommends METT-TC as we get closer to BN/CO/ODA level. Beneficial to establish a directive of expectations by the supported command and have the higher commander approve it.

2) Convergence of SOF/CF on an OBJ: need one commander in charge on the OBJ; need to coordinate the time, location, and duration where one element is TACON to the other (as an example); don't need SOF/CF in small arms range of each other and have indecision or no unity of command.

3) Great value added with the recent USASOC participation in the Army Airborne Board (AAB). The AAB focuses on conventional aspects of airborne operations but both commands are working on many of the same challenges.

4. Third Brief – BG Pete Jones, Commandant USAIS, MCoE, Ft Benning GA, provided a progress update on Gender Neutral Physical Standards and conditions to receive female trainees at Infantry School. BG Jones discussed the 2020 Physical Testing Implementation and the Occupation Physical Assessment Test (OPAT), the Physical Demands Test (PDT), and MOS Physical Demands tasks. These tests would help the Army screen recruits, define graduation requirements for courses, and have a physical fitness standard throughout the Army. He went over the current testing of the Gender Neutral Physical Requirements task list for both IBOLC and INF OSUT as well as the thinking behind it and way-ahead.

LTG Townsend provided feedback (key highlights):

1) Asked USAIS to look at standardizing the IBOLC list of uniform weights and relook the INF OSUT packing list to determine what the weights are replicating (ammo, pyro, MRE, etc).

2) Asked USAIS to relook the language for passing the Obstacle Course at IBOLC/OSUT; current standards state students must "attempt" each obstacle; recommends a standard on certain obstacles that must be negotiated.

5. Fourth Brief – COL Chris Stone, Dir, TCM-IBCT, MCoE, Ft Benning, NC, provided an update on the outcomes from the IBCT ARCIC Portfolio Assessment (APA). COL Stone presented the final

SUBJECT: IBCT Senior Mentor Symposium #30, Executive Summary, 10 March 2016

recommended investment priorities from the assessment and showed where they fit in the near (FY16-20), mid (FY21-25), and far term (FY26 and beyond). This assessment and recommendation will be sent to DA through ARCIC to help guide the Army's IBCT investment priorities.

6. Concluding Comments:

a. Due to time constraints we were unable to get to one of the standby briefs, National Guard RAF Lessons Learned from LTC George Rosser, Dep CDR, 53rd IBCT, FLARNG. The briefing is on the IWfF webpage for download (see paragraph 7).

b. Next SMS is scheduled for 2 JUN 16, 0930-1100 (Eastern). Commanders are encouraged to submit topics for this SMS to the IWfF (POC information in paragraph 8).

c. Current topics in consideration for the next IBCT SMS Agenda; more to follow:

- 1) CSA-directed Next Generation Warfare (NGW) Study: Russia-Ukraine
- 2) IBCT Lessons Learned from the Russian – Ukraine War
- 3) MCoE Update
- 4) Additional topics TBD

7. All SMS #30 briefs were unclassified - download from the new IWfF Webpage on the Corps Portal under "Shared Documents", "SMS 30" folder;
https://army.deps.mil/army/cmds/18abc_msc/iwff/sitespages/home.aspx use the "DOD Email" certificate if having difficulty logging in.

8. POC for this EXSUM is Mr Milt Loffert at email: NIPR james.m.loffert.civ@mail.mil
SIPR james.m.loffert.civ@mail.smil.mil or phone: COM (910) 432-4064 DSN 239-4064.

// S //

ISAAC J. RADEMACHER
Director, Infantry Warfighters' Forum
XVIII Airborne Corps, Ft Bragg, NC