

19th ICCRTS

“C2 Agility: Lessons Learned from Research and Operations”

Theater Special Operations Commands Realignment

Topic 1: Concepts, Theory, and Policy

Topic 2: Organizational Concepts and Approaches

Topic 3: Data, Information and Knowledge

Mr. Michael D. Tisdell

Mr. Ken D. Teske

Mr. William C. Fleser

United States Special Operations Command

7701 Tampa Point Boulevard

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621

Point of Contact

Ken D. Teske

United States Special Operations Command

7701 Tampa Point Boulevard

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida 33621

(757) 510-0915 ken.teske.ctr@socom.mil or Kenneth.teske.ctr@mail.mil

Report Documentation Page		Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.		
1. REPORT DATE JUN 2014	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2014 to 00-00-2014
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Theater Special Operations Commands Realignment		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
		5b. GRANT NUMBER
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
	5e. TASK NUMBER	
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) United States Special Operations Command, 7701 Tampa Point Boulevard, MacDill AFB, FL, 33621		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Presented at the 18th International Command & Control Research & Technology Symposium (ICCRTS) held 16-19 June, 2014 in Alexandria, VA.		
14. ABSTRACT On 11 February 2013, the Secretary of Defense assigned all Special Operations Forces (SOF) worldwide to U. S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), shifting combatant command authority (COCOM) to USSOCOM. This change was undertaken with the full coordination and concurrence of all Geographic Combatant Commanders (GCC), Military Services, and Defense Support Agencies, and approved with the Secretary of Defense's signing of the Fiscal Year 2013 (FY13) Global Force Management Implementation Guidance. Operational Control (OPCON) of SOF is retained by GCCs. A key element of the change in command relationships is the realignment of the Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOC) to USSOCOM. On 19 April 2013, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) issued Commander, USSOCOM a Planning Order to draft a campaign plan for providing U.S. SOF capability to the GCCs for employment in support of GCC requirements. The resulting Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how USSOCOM aligns, postures, deploys and sustains SOF in support of GCC operational requirements. This Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how a robust, regionally aligned, agile, and networked SOF capability can rapidly and persistently address regional contingencies and threats to stability, as well as achieve GCC objectives and theater end states. TSOCs, as subordinate unified commands of USSOCOM and under OPCON of GCCs, are the regional operational hubs of the Global SOF Network (GSN). TSOCs perform continuous Command and Control (C2) of special operations in support of GCC steady-state requirements and national objectives. As a deployable operational headquarters, TSOCs will play an essential role in accomplishing GCC Theater Campaign Plan (TCP) objectives as well as National objectives.		
15. SUBJECT TERMS		

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 27	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Abstract

On 11 February 2013, the Secretary of Defense assigned all Special Operations Forces (SOF) worldwide to U. S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), shifting combatant command authority (COCOM) to USSOCOM. This change was undertaken with the full coordination and concurrence of all Geographic Combatant Commanders (GCC), Military Services, and Defense Support Agencies, and approved with the Secretary of Defense's signing of the Fiscal Year 2013 (FY13) Global Force Management Implementation Guidance. Operational Control (OPCON) of SOF is retained by GCCs. A key element of the change in command relationships is the realignment of the Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOC) to USSOCOM.

On 19 April 2013, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) issued Commander, USSOCOM a Planning Order to draft a campaign plan for providing U.S. SOF capability to the GCCs for employment in support of GCC requirements. The resulting Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how USSOCOM aligns, postures, deploys and sustains SOF in support of GCC operational requirements. This Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how a robust, regionally aligned, agile, and networked SOF capability can rapidly and persistently address regional contingencies and threats to stability, as well as achieve GCC objectives and theater end states.

TSOCs, as subordinate unified commands of USSOCOM and under OPCON of GCCs, are the regional operational hubs of the Global SOF Network (GSN). TSOCs perform continuous Command and Control (C2) of special operations in support of GCC steady-state requirements and national objectives. As a deployable operational headquarters, TSOCs will play an essential role in accomplishing GCC Theater Campaign Plan (TCP) objectives as well as National objectives.

Introduction

In the current fiscal environment and with ongoing and emerging geopolitical situations around the world, it is evident that the United States cannot address the challenges of tomorrow alone. In an era of increasing responsibilities, competing priorities and reduced resources, we must build relationships with like-minded interagency, allies and partners who proactively anticipate threats and are prepared to operate toward cooperative security solutions in cost-effective ways. The SOF community must think differently, seek greater understanding of local, regional, and global contexts, and strengthen trust through interagency and multinational partner cooperation. This trust relationship with the interagency and SOF mission partners fosters a network that is agile, responsive and adaptive—the Global SOF Network.

USSOCOM has always been committed to providing the GCCs with special operation forces organized, trained, educated and equipped to rapidly and persistently address regional

contingencies and threats to stability. In support of this commitment, USSOCOM is poised to transform SOF capabilities through implementation of the GSN to accomplish the following three objectives:

- Provide GCCs with improved special operations capabilities and capacity by increasing SOFs forward footprint, improving human and technological connectivity, and streamlining authorities at each TSOC.
- Support U.S. Government (USG) partners, partner nation SOF, and other organizations to increase global situational awareness and interoperability with partners.
- Evolve USSOCOM's role as a Functional Combatant Command with global responsibilities focused on supporting GCC efforts to achieve national and theater strategic objectives.

This document will address the required capabilities and identified gaps associated with the changes in the alignment of the Theater Special Operations Commands to support GCC theater objectives.

Background

TSOCs were initially formed by the Secretary of Defense on the advice of the CJCS. In some cases, TSOCs were formed even before the creation of USSOCOM in April 1987 in support of the GCCs. Over the past 25 years and without a clear definition of the joint requirement, TSOCs were individually developed and designed by their respective GCC to support their individual GCC's theater strategy. With GCC control of the TSOCs and without USSOCOM oversight, the various GCC manning and equipping approaches resulted in seven sub-unified commands, each organized differently with varying capabilities. This uneven development produced gaps in the capability of the various TSOCs to extend C2 horizontally across mission partners and vertically down to other GCC subordinate organizations.

In January 2012, upon receipt of the Defense Strategy Guidance (DSG), USSOCOM reviewed and assessed the implications of the guidance on how it would affect SOF around the world. After the assessment, USSOCOM worked with the TSOCs to define their future requirements to support their theater strategy. To ensure key elements and requirements were fully understood and validated at senior levels, USSOCOM hosted a global SOF Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) Drill in April 2012. A ROC Drill is well known in the military as chance to practice combat mission plans and put contingency plans into place and is a means for defining roles and streamlining processes. The intent of this ROC Drill was to identify and analyze TSOC requirements and to ensure they were aligned with strategic guidance, rooted in GCC strategy, and connected

to geo-located interests in theater. The first SOF ROC Drill was attended by the TSOC and SOF component commanders.

In July 2012, USSOCOM hosted a second ROC Drill attended by GCC commanders or deputy commanders with the intent to validate the TSOC requirements identified during the first ROC Drill in April. With the TSOC requirements receiving validation from the GCCs, the July event culminated in a Secure Video Teleconference with the CJCS in which the Chairman indicated his support for transforming the TSOCs.

On 11 February 2013, the Secretary of Defense assigned all Special Operations Forces worldwide to USSOCOM, shifting combatant command authority to USSOCOM. This change was undertaken with the full coordination and concurrence of all Geographic Combatant Commanders, Military Services, and Defense Support Agencies, and approved with the Secretary of Defense signing the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Global Force Management Implementation Guidance, Forces for Annex. OPCON of SOF was retained by the GCCs. The key element of the change in command relationships was the assignment of the TSOCs to USSOCOM.

On 19 April 2013, the CJCS issued Commander, USSOCOM a Planning Order to draft a campaign plan for providing U.S. SOF capability to the GCCs for employment in support of GCC requirements. The resulting Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how USSOCOM aligns, postures, deploys and sustains SOF in support of GCC operational requirements. This Global SOF Campaign Plan describes how a robust, regionally aligned, agile, and networked SOF capability can rapidly and persistently address regional contingencies and threats to stability, as well as achieve GCC objectives and theater end states.

In conjunction with the Global SOF Campaign Plan USSOCOM developed a GSN Concept of Operations (CONOPS) that describes the vision for expanding the GSN and provides a starting point for identifying capability requirements for the network. The term “GSN” primarily refers to the human network, or those entities that plan, synchronize, and conduct SOF activities in support of GCC requirements and/or mutual security objectives. The goal being to create an enduring framework in which the GSN can effectively contribute to solving regional problems. The GSN provides the operational context for joint force commanders to plan and execute SOF activities across the full range of military operations for both national and theater forces. The GSN will support U.S. and mission partners and processes and enable the conduct of operations from Phase 0 (Shape) through Phase V (Enable Civil Authority) as described in Table 1.

The TSOCs, as subordinate unified commands of USSOCOM and under the OPCON of GCCs, are the regional operational hubs of the GSN. TSOCs perform continuous Command and

Control (C2) of special operations in support of GCC steady-state requirements and national objectives.

CONTINUUM OF MILITARY OPERATIONS		
Phase 0	Shape the Environment	Activities performed to dissuade or deter potential adversaries and to assure or solidify relationships with friends and allies
Phase 1	Deter the Enemy	Deter adversary action by demonstrating the capabilities and resolve of the joint force
Phase 2	Seize the Initiative	Operations to gain access to theater infrastructure and to expand friendly freedom of action and degrade adversary capabilities
Phase 3	Dominate the Enemy	Exploitation, pursuit, and destruction of the enemy in order to break the opponent's will for organized resistance
Phase 4	Stabilize the Environment	Stability operations, the reconstitution of infrastructure, and the restoration of services
Phase 5	Enable Civil Authorities	Legitimate civil authorities are enabled in their efforts to provide essential services to the populace

Table 1. Continuum of Military Operations

The Chairman directed Global SOF Campaign Plan includes the analysis and ramifications that identifies operational forces requirements and the re-balancing of SOF forces on a global scale to support all GCC operational needs. This paper presents the TSOCs required capabilities for the new organizational structure to command and control as an operational headquarters the future named operations envisioned in the Global SOF Campaign Plan.

Required Capabilities

Throughout 2012 and 2013, the TSOCs and GCCs, working with USSOCOM, identified and forwarded requirements for SOF to the CJCS. In April 2013, the CJCS directed USSOCOM to operationalize those requirements via a Global SOF Campaign Plan that persistently aligns SOF capability and provides the requisite SOF support to the GCCs. Executing the Campaign Plan will provide the GCCs with the ways and means to establish and maintain enduring partnerships and counter regional and external threats to stability and security posed by the kind of irregular adversaries described in the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO).

Increasing the capability and capacity of the TSOCs is required to meet the objectives of the Global SOF Campaign Plan. Providing solutions to the capability gaps in this document will

provide the GCCs with the ability to persistently execute steady-state, Phase 0 activities, improve interoperability with partners, and help integrate capabilities across the Department of Defense (DoD). The sustained level of SOF effort that will be provided to the GCCs requires TSOCs to be fully manned, trained, and equipped to counter these irregular adversaries.

The 2013 GSN CONOPS provides the conceptual basis for this paper. It describes the framework of the GSN and provides the linkage between strategic guidance and GCC-validated requirements for joint SOF. The capability requirements in this paper directly support the guidance outlined in the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance, the Secretary's Guidance for the Employment of the Force, Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, and the Chairman's Strategic Guidance.

This paper shows the capability requirements and capability gaps (presented in the next section) resulting from 25 years of uneven and non-standard TSOC development. To optimize and standardize the TSOCs a required capability and gap based analysis was conducted by USSOCOM and GCC stakeholders. The analysis focused on the functional requirements necessary for the TSOCs to support the sustained level of SOF effort required by the GCCs. Independent studies, including a detailed study of the Global SOF network conducted by RAND Corporation, and a Joint Capability Area (JCA) analysis was conducted down to Tier 3. Findings were cross-walked to the Universal Joint Task List and the Command and Control Capability FY14 Operational Priorities List validated by Joint Requirements Oversight Council, (JROCM 068-13). The analysis included the ROC Drills which included TSOC and SOF component commanders and the GCC Commanders. From the analysis the following Required Capabilities (RC) were identified that TSOCs require to fully supporting the GCC Theater and national objectives:

RC-1 An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations that supports GCC requirements as envisioned in the Chairman's Global SOF Campaign Plan.

RC-2 Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force (JTF) Headquarters (HQ).

RC-3 Ability to C2 distributed SOF and integrates with partners and General Purpose Force (GPF) from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.

RC-4 Enhanced ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding.

RC-5 Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners.

Table 2 shows the required capabilities and their relationship to applicable JCAs and attributes.

Tier 1 & Tier 2 JCAs	Capability Requirements and Attributes	Metrics	Minimum Value
Tier 1: Force Support/ Force Application Tier 2: Force Management	RC-1: An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations Timeliness Completeness Operational Trust	Personnel available to fill core organizational structure to support TSOC operations by 2020	Core – 100% Theater specific – 90% Mission specific – 90%
Tier 1: Command and Control Tier 2: Organize, Understand, Plan, Decide, Direct and Monitor	RC-2: Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force Headquarters Interoperability Completeness Robustness	TSOC CDRS and Staffs have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF by 2020	95% of JTF capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive within the TSOCs
Tier 1: Command and Control Tier 2: Organize, Understand, Plan, Decide, Direct and Monitor	RC-3: Ability to Command and Control (C2) distributed SOF and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD. Understanding Agility Accuracy Completeness	TSOC have RCs and training to C2 numerous, concurrent “named” SOF, partner nation, and GPF activities and distributed operations by 2020	TSOCs have all required capabilities and training completed to C2 activities and distributed operations 95% of the time
Tier 1: Battle Space Awareness / Command and Control Tier 2: Understand Planning, Direction, Collection, Processing, Analysis, Prediction, Production, and Data Dissemination	RC-4: Ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding Comprehensive Integrated Accuracy Relevance Timeliness Completeness Accessibility Security	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure robust situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	98% accuracy of translation
Tier 1: Building Partnerships Tier 2: Shape	RC-5: Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners Understanding Accessibility Operational Trust	Rapidly identify, establish and facilitate appropriate relationships, collaboration and communications with mission partners and interagency	95% of critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react 85% of mission partner capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive IAW commander’s risk assessment

Table 2. Required Capabilities Table with Links to JCAs

TSOC C2 Gaps

During the strategy-to-requirements capability and gap analysis conducted by SOCOM and the GCCs, gaps were identified that limited the TSOCs' ability to support the Global SOF Campaign Plan objectives and GCCs. The Analysis identified the overall differences in each of the TSOCs organizational structure, their capabilities, and capacity required to command and control, as an operational headquarters, any future named operations.

The resulting capability gaps were assessed as limiting the TSOCs ability to meet the requirements of their GCCs in geo-located areas where SOF operations are required to achieve desired effects. The February 2013 decision by the Secretary of Defense provides an opportunity to fix these problem areas. By placing the TSOCs under the combatant command authority of USSOCOM, the Secretary has given responsibility to organize, train, and equip the TSOCs to Commander, USSOCOM. In order for the TSOCs to support GCC requirements and be interoperable with the Services, partner SOF, and the interagency, the following gaps and issues need to be addressed. The table below shows the required capabilities, gaps and the current and future metrics of the TSOC capabilities.

GAP 1: The current organizational structure of the TSOCs limit their ability to support GCC requirements as envisioned in the Chairman's Global SOF Campaign Plan.

Issue 1: Each TSOC has a different organizational structure, capabilities, and capacities. USSOCOM does not intend to standardize the TSOCs, but rather intends to ensure each one possesses the requisite core capabilities to plan and execute the full spectrum of special operations and activities commensurate with GCCs SOF requirements. Meeting this requires additional manpower and a C2 structure that enables the conduct of distributed C2. USSOCOM will rebalance SOF globally to better support GCC requirements through the revision of the TSOCs' Joint Tables of Distribution (JTD) and alignment of SOF operational units to the GCCs. In aligning its SOF units, USSOCOM, through the TSOCs, can sustain a persistent level of effort for special operations activities.

Issue 2: TSOCs require enhancement in current facilities to plan, command and control SOF activities and the anticipated operational tempo of the GCCs. USSOCOM continues to coordinate with GCCs and Services on updating the global posture plan; however the time constraints for military construction (MILCON) actions pose risk to sufficiently meeting SOF global posture. USSOCOM will continue to provide requirements to support their new missions and appropriate manpower to perform the RCs to the Services for Military Construction (MILCON) and Program Objective Memorandum (POM) items to support reallocation of TSOC C2 as directed by the GCCs TCPs.

GAP 2: TSOCs either do not possess or have limited ability to form the core of a JTF Headquarters.

Issue 1: As envisioned in the Chairman’s Global SOF Campaign Plan TSOCs must have the ability to form JTF headquarters, while simultaneously sustaining theater-wide C2 for distributed special operations in support of their GCC. This requires communication, collaboration, and synchronization among the TSOCs. As the GCCs SOF operational headquarters, TSOCs are not sufficiently resourced to meet the requirement to be JTF-capable as established in the DSG, CCJO, and Mission Command White Paper that clearly establish that operational headquarters should be fully capable of forming a JTF headquarters around which joint force responses can be formed.

Issue 2: TSOCs require Joint Operations Centers, Mission Partner Operations Centers, and Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities to support operations and integrate with partners.

GAP 3: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to execute C2 over distributed SOF, and integrate with partners and GPF to effectively influence the GCCs battle space from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.

Issue 1: As the GCCs forward deploy SOF operational HQs, TSOCs require the ability to employ powerful, pervasive, real-time information sharing and collaboration capabilities in order to enable distributed operations down to the lowest levels. The requirements associated with this gap apply to all domains: air, land, sea and space.

Issue 2: Today’s security environment often precludes the employment of large JTFs. In order to effectively employ flexible, low signature, or small footprint capabilities, TSOCs require the ability to manage distributed operations. Globally integrated operations represents how the joint force will fight in the future and requires a forward based and agile C2 structure to quickly combine capabilities with Service components and interagency and partner nation forces.

Issue 3: The improved TSOC, with the requisite joint force capabilities, can employ a hybrid command arrangement that will provide GCCs with options and flexibility to accomplish the mission. Improved C2 enables high levels of effective integration between SOF and GPF, a defining lesson learned from the past decade of conflict.

Table 3 below shows the required capabilities, the identified capability gaps and the current and future metrics for the TSOCs.

Required Capabilities and Gaps		Future Capabilities		Current Capabilities	
Required Capabilities	Capability Gaps	Metrics	Minimum Value	Metrics	Minimum Value
RC-1: An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations	GAP 1: TSOC current org structure limits their ability to support GCC requirements	Capabilities available to fulfill core organizational structure to support TSOC operations by 2020	Core – 100% Theater – 90% Mission – 90%	Capabilities are available to fulfill current TSOC requirements	Current capability average across TSOCs is ~57.3% High ~78.0 Low ~ 21.7
RC-2: Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force Headquarters	GAP 2: TSOCs either do not possess or have limited ability to form the core of a JTF Headquarters.	TSOC CDRS and Staffs have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF by 2020	95% of JTF capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive within the TSOCs	Not a current requirement: TSOCs do not have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF	~50% capability available to form the core of a JTF if tasked.
RC-3: Ability to Command and Control (C2) distributed SOF and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.	GAP 3: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to C2 distributed SOF, and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.	TSOC have required capabilities and training to C2 numerous, concurrent “named” SOF, partner nation, and GPF activities and distributed operations by 2020	TSOCs have all required capabilities and training completed to C2 activities and distributed operations 95% of the time	Not a current requirement: TSOC CDRS and Staffs do not have the required capabilities and training to perform the C2 and integration functions required	~50% required capabilities and training completed and available to C2 activities and distributed operations
RC-4: Ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding	GAP 4: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	98% accuracy of translation	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	~50% availability to conduct develop and maintain shared situational awareness in TSOCs
RC-5: Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners	GAP 5: TSOCs currently do not possess or have limited ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners	Rapidly identify, establish and facilitate appropriate relationships, collaboration and communications with mission partners and interagency	95% of critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react	Mission partner capabilities are integrated, synchronized IAW commander’s risk assessment	~50% availability to process critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react

Table 3. TSOC C2 Capability Gap

GAP 4: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness to support the planning and executions of GCCs foundational activities.

Issue 1: TSOCs require a decentralized command structure with personnel and tools that empowers subordinate leaders to advance the GCCs commanders intent through the most effective means at their disposal.

Issue 2: TSOCs require the ability to share timely and accurate information with partners.

- Accurate and timely receipt of commander's intent allows mission partners to synchronize their operations thus enabling unity of effort.
- Information is received and shared with mission partners in time to affect operations.

GAP 5: TSOCs currently do not possess or have limited ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners to accomplish regional objectives.

Issue 1: TSOCs require the ability to collaborate with mission partners and GPF.

Issue 2: TSOCs require the ability to share timely and accurate information with partners.

- Accurate and timely receipt of commander's intent allows mission partners to synchronize their operations thus enabling unity of effort.
- Information is received, understood and shared with mission partners in time to affect operations.

Issue 3: International cooperation enhances the legitimacy and effectiveness of implementing the Global SOF Campaign Plan and meeting the strategic goals of the GCCs. To this end, filling this gap would support and strengthen the joint force and enhances the growth and interoperability of global partners.

Issue 4: The Mission Partner Environment (MPE) ICD (formerly Future Mission Network ICD) identifies required capabilities, capability gaps and associated analysis. The MPE solutions should be used to support TSOC mission partner requirements.

Issue 5: The TSOCs require ability to establish internal structures and processes as well as external interfaces to accomplish GCC goals.

Further analysis was accomplished which identified a relationships between each capability gap and the required capabilities. The analysis looked at if a solution for a capability gap for a required capability is provided then does that solution have an impact or satisfy a portion of any of the other required capabilities. In Table 4 an "X" in the box depicts a correlation between the required capabilities and the capability gap. The priorities shown in the last row of the table are

based upon determination of which gaps, if closed, would have the greatest impact on achieving the desired success. In a fiscally constrained environment it is necessary to identify these relationships to be more cost effective. Table 4 depicts this analysis. You can read the full version of each of the required capabilities and gaps in their respective tables.

Gap and Required Capability Analysis					
Capability to Gap Relationship for TSOC C2	GAP 1: TSOC organization structure	GAP 2: Limited ability to form the core of a JTF Headquarters.	GAP 3: Limited ability to C2 distributed SOF,	GAP 4: Limited shared situational awareness	GAP 5: Limited ability to collaborate with interagency and mission partners
RC-1: Org Structure	X	X	X		X
RC-2 Form JTFHQ	X	X	X		X
RC-3 C2 SOF	X	X	X	X	X
RC-4 shared SA	X	X		X	X
RC-5: collaborate with partners	X	X		X	X
Derived Priorities	High	High	Med	Med	High

Table 4. Required Capability and Capability Gap Correlation Table

Desired Outcome

More than ever before, we share security responsibilities with other nations and Mission Partners to help address security challenges around the world. The global security environment is characterized by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the rise of modern competitor states, non-state actors, pervasive violent extremism, regional instability, transnational criminal activity, and competition for resources. The challenges posed by the confluence of these trends dictate that the SOF enterprise must be an agile and enduring capability to coordinate and execute sustained special operations activities with mission partners.

We know that our adversaries will seek to offset U.S. military advantages in the global security environment and will use both lethal and non-lethal means to attack our ability to execute operations in any of the phases of military operations. This highlights the need to focus SOF capabilities on enduring pre-hostility or shaping efforts while maintaining a crisis response capability. Whether it is fighting alongside our forces, countering terrorist and international criminal networks, or building institutions capable of maintaining security, law, and order TSOCs will be key to successful shared security responsibility.

Using the already programmed force structure, USSOCOM is enhancing TSOC capacity and capabilities to meet the desired end state of SOF 2020. Providing the TSOCs with the organizational structure, equipment, personnel, facilities and communications that satisfy the identified required capabilities outlined in this document would increase the flexibility and responsiveness of SOF to meet GCCs and Chief of Mission's needs and national strategic objectives. The restructured TSOCs will enable planning and execution of long-term shaping activities and direct action as required, enable integration with GCC Service components, and enable decentralized execution that provides subordinate commanders the latitude to accomplish assigned tasks in accordance with commander's intent and the principles of mission command.

Appendix A: References

- A. Unified Command Plan (UCP), 6 April 2011 (Under Review) (S)
- B. Global Force Management Implementation Guidance (GFMIG), 15 November 2011 (S)
- C. The National Military Strategy of the United States, Redefining America's Military Leadership, 8 February, 2011
- D. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3110.06D Special Operations Supplement to the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan FY 2010, 14 Sep 2012 (S)
- E. Defense Strategic Guidance (DSG), Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense, 5 January 2012
- F. 2012 Guidance for Employment of the Force (GEF), 16 August 2012 (S)
- G. Fiscal Year 2014-2018 Defense Planning Guidance, 11 April 2012
- H. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO), Joint Force 2020, 10 September 2012
- I. After Action Report for the Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) Drill conducted by CDRUSSOCOM with Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOCS) at USSOCOM Wargame Center on 17-19 April 2012
- J. After Action Report for the Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) Drill conducted by CDRUSSOCOM with TSOC and Geographic Combatant Command (GCC) representatives at USSOCOM Wargame Center on 12 July 2012
- K. After Action Report for the Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) Drill conducted by CDRUSSOCOM with TSOC representatives at USSOCOM Wargame Center on 17-18 October 2012
- L. CDRUSSOCOM message, 091727JUL12, Subject: Geographic Combatant Command validated requirements for Special Operations Forces (SOF)
- M. Secretary of Defense FY 2013 Forces For Unified Command Memorandum, 11 February 2013
- N. Presidential Policy Directive (PPD) 23, the United States policy on Security Sector Assistance 05 Apr 2013.
- O. Logistics supplement to the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP) CJCSI 3110.03D, 25 June 2009
- P. Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 5100.1, Functions of the Department of Defense and Its Major Components, 21 December 2010

- Q. DODD 5100.03, Support of the Headquarters of Combatant and Subordinate Unified Commands, 9 February 2011
- R. Joint Publication 3-0, Joint Operations, 11 August 2011
- S. JP 4-0, Joint Staff Keystone Document for Joint Logistics Doctrine, 18 July
- T. JP 5-0, Joint Operation Planning, 11 August 2011
- U. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mission Command White Paper, 3 April 2012
- V. The Joint Operating Environment, United States Joint Forces Command, 18 February 2010
- W. U.S. Special Operations Command Fact Book, 2012
- X. Special Operations Forces Reference Manual, September 2011
- Y. Chairman's Strategic Direction to the Joint Force, 6 February 2012
- Z. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual 3130.03, Adaptive Planning and Execution (APEX) Planning Formats and Guidance, 31 August 2012
- AA. The National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2012
- BB. U.S. Code, Title 10: US Forces; Section 162 (Combatant Commands: assigned Forces; Chain of Command), Section 164 (Commanders of Combatant Commands: Assignment; Powers and Duties), and section 167 (Unified Combatant Command for Special Operations Forces)
- CC. Expanding Global SOF Network CONOPS, 29 July 2013
- DD. CJCSI 3170.01H, Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, 10 Jan 2012
- EE. Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum, JROCM 068-13, Subject: Joint command and Control Capability FY14 Operational Priorities, 27 March 2013
- FF. Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum, JROCM 165-13, Subject: Global SOF Network (GSN) 2020 Concept of Operations (CONOPS) Acceptance, 10 September 2013
- GG. Support of the Headquarter of Combatant and Subordinate Unified Commands, DODI 5100.03, 9 Feb 2011.
- HH. JCIDS Manual, 19 Jan 2012.
- II. Theater Special Operations Command, Command and Control, 11 Sep 2013

Appendix B: Acronym List

AOR	Area of Responsibility
BPC	Building Partner Capacity
C2	Command and Control
CCDR	Combatant Commander
CCJO	Capstone Concept for Joint Operations
CCMD	Combatant Command
CDR	Commander
CJCS	Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
COCOM	Combatant Command Authority
CONOPS	Concept of Operations
DOD	Department of Defense
DOTMLPF-P	Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy
DSG	Defense Strategic Guidance
FY	Fiscal Year
GCC	Geographic Combatant Command
GSN	Global Special Operations Forces Network
HQ	Headquarters
IAW	In Accordance With
ICD	Initial Capabilities Document
IT	Information Technology
JCA	Joint Capability Area
JP	Joint Publication
JROC	Joint Requirements Oversight Council
JROCM	Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum
JTD	Joint Table of Distribution
JTF	Joint Task Force
MILCON	Military Construction
MPE	Mission Partner Environment
OPCON	Operational Control
RC	Required Capability
ROC	Rehearsal of Concept
ROMO	Range of Military Operations
SECDEF	Secretary of Defense
SOCFWD	Special Operations Command Forward
SOF	Special Operations Forces
TCP	Theater Campaign Plan
TSOC	Theater Special Operations Command
UCP	Unified Command Plan
USG	United States Government
USSOCOM	United States Special Operations Command

Appendix C: Glossary

Global Special Operations Force Network (GSN): An agile, responsive, and adaptive network of like-minded interagency, allies and partners who proactively anticipate threats and are prepared to operate toward cooperative security solutions in cost-effective ways, through complete human and technical connectivity. The U.S. portion of the network consists of SOF elements established to support a GCC or joint force commander as the single control agency for the management and direction of special operations.

Combatant Command (command authority). Nontransferable command authority established by Title 10 ("Armed Forces"), United States Code, Section 164, exercised only by commanders of unified or specified CCMDs unless otherwise directed by the President or the Secretary of Defense. Combatant Command (command authority) cannot be delegated and is the authority of a combatant commander to perform those functions of command over assigned forces involving organizing and employing commands and forces, assigning tasks, designating objectives, and giving authoritative direction over all aspects of military operations, joint training, and logistics necessary to accomplish the missions assigned to the command. Combatant command (command authority) should be exercised through the commanders of subordinate organizations. Normally this authority is exercised through subordinate joint force commanders and Service and/or functional component commanders. Combatant command (command authority) provides full authority to organize and employ commands and forces as the combatant commander considers necessary to accomplish assigned missions. Operational control is inherent in combatant command (command authority). Also called COCOM. (JP -1)

Geographic Combatant Command (GCC). A unified or specified command with specific geographic responsibilities, GCC is responsible for a broad continuing mission under a single commander established and so designated by the President, through the Secretary of Defense and with the advice and assistance of the CJCS. See also combatant command; unified command. (JP -1)

Interagency. Of or pertaining to United States Government agencies and departments, including the Department of Defense. See also interagency coordination. (JP 1-02)

Operational Control (OPCON). Command authority that may be exercised by commanders at any echelon at or below the level of combatant command. Operational control is inherent in combatant command (command authority) and may be delegated within the command. Operational control is the authority to perform those functions of command over subordinate forces involving organizing and employing commands and forces, assigning tasks, designating objectives, and giving authoritative direction necessary to accomplish the mission. Operational control includes authoritative direction over all aspects of military operations and joint training necessary to accomplish missions assigned to the command. (JP -1)

Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOCs). TSOCs are subordinate unified commands, created to plan, conduct, and command and control joint special operations in their respective AORS. As of 11 Feb 2013, they are assigned to and under the Combatant Command (Command

Authority) of CDRUSSOCOM, and are under the operational control of their respective Geographic Combatant Commanders. (Derived from JP 1)

Rehearsal of Concept (ROC) Drills: Well known in the military as a means for defining roles and stream-lining processes. A series of deliberate events designed to identify how SOF should be organized and postured to best meet GCC requirements by 2020.

Theater Special Operations Commands Realignment

19th ICCRTS

17 June 2014

Paper ID 005

Mr. Michael D. Tisdell

Mr. Ken D. Teske

Mr. William C. Fleiser

Agenda

- *Problem Statement*
- *Continuum of Military Operations*
- *Required Capabilities*
- *Project Required Capabilities Table with Links to JCAs*
- *TSOC C2 Capability Gap*
- *Required Capability and Capability Gap Correlation*
- *Questions*

Problem Statement

- The capability requirements and capability gaps resulting from 25 years of uneven and non-standard TSOC development leave the military several problems.
- To optimize and standardize the TSOCs a required capability and gap based analysis was conducted.

CONTINIUM OF MILITARY OPERATIONS

Phase 0	Shape the Environment	Activities performed to dissuade or deter potential adversaries and to assure or solidify relationships with friends and allies
Phase 1	Deter the Enemy	Deter adversary action by demonstrating the capabilities and resolve of the joint force
Phase 2	Seize the Initiative	Operations to gain access to theater infrastructure and to expand friendly freedom of action and degrade adversary capabilities
Phase 3	Dominate the Enemy	Exploitation, pursuit, and destruction of the enemy in order to break the opponent's will for organized resistance
Phase 4	Stabilize the Environment	Stability operations, the reconstitution of infrastructure, and the restoration of services
Phase 5	Enable Civil Authorities	Legitimate civil authorities are enabled in their efforts to provide essential services to the populace

Required Capabilities (RC)

- RC-1 An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations that supports GCC requirements as envisioned in the Chairman's Global SOF Campaign Plan.
- RC-2 Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force (JTF) Headquarters (HQ).
- RC-3 Ability to C2 distributed SOF and integrates with partners and General Purpose Force (GPF) from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.
- RC-4 Enhanced ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding.
- RC-5 Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners

Tier 1 & Tier 2 JCAs	Capability Requirements and Attributes	Metrics	Minimum Value
Tier 1: Force Support/ Force Application Tier 2: Force Management	RC-1: An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations Timeliness Completeness Operational Trust	Personnel available to fill core organizational structure to support TSOC operations by 2020	Core – 100% Theater specific – 90% Mission specific – 90%
Tier 1: Command and Control Tier 2: Organize, Understand, Plan, Decide, Direct and Monitor	RC-2: Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force Headquarters Interoperability Completeness Robustness	TSOC CDRS and Staffs have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF by 2020	95% of JTF capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive within the TSOCs
Tier 1: Command and Control Tier 2: Organize, Understand, Plan, Decide, Direct and Monitor	RC-3: Ability to Command and Control (C2) distributed SOF and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD. Understanding Agility Accuracy Completeness	TSOC have RCs and training to C2 numerous, concurrent “named” SOF, partner nation, and GPF activities and distributed operations by 2020	TSOCs have all required capabilities and training completed to C2 activities and distributed operations 95% of the time
Tier 1: Battle Space Awareness / Command and Control Tier 2: Understand Planning, Direction, Collection, Processing, Analysis, Prediction, Production, and Data Dissemination	RC-4: Ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding Comprehensive Integrated Accuracy Timeliness Completeness Accessibility Security	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure robust situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	98% accuracy of translation
Tier 1: Building Partnerships Tier 2: Shape	RC-5: Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners Understanding Accessibility Operational Trust	Rapidly identify, establish and facilitate appropriate relationships, collaboration and communications with mission partners and interagency	95% of critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react; 85% of mission partner capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive IAW commander’s risk assessment

Required Capabilities and Gaps		Future Capabilities		Current Capabilities	
Required Capabilities	Capability Gaps	Metrics	Minimum Value	Metrics	Minimum Value
RC-1: An optimized core organizational structure to support core, theater, and mission-specific operations	GAP 1: TSOC current org structure limits their ability to support GCC requirements	Capabilities available to fulfill core organizational structure to support TSOC operations by 2020	Core – 100% Theater – 90% Mission – 90%	Capabilities are available to fulfill current TSOC requirements	Current capability average across TSOCS is ~57.3% High ~78.0 Low ~ 21.7
RC-2: Ability to form the core of a Joint Task Force Headquarters	GAP 2: TSOCs either do not possess or have limited ability to form the core of a JTF Headquarters.	TSOC CDRS and Staffs have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF by 2020	95% of JTF capabilities are integrated, synchronized and mutually supportive within the TSOCs	Not a current requirement: TSOCs do not have the required capabilities and training to establish and perform the functions required of a JTF	~50% capability available to form the core of a JTF if tasked.
RC-3: Ability to Command and Control (C2) distributed SOF and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.	GAP 3: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to C2 distributed SOF, and integrate with partners and GPF from the TSOC proper or a SOCFWD.	TSOC have required capabilities and training to C2 numerous, concurrent “named” SOF, partner nation, and GPF activities and distributed operations by 2020	TSOCs have all required capabilities and training completed to C2 activities and distributed operations 95% of the time	Not a current requirement: TSOC CDRS and Staffs do not have the required capabilities and training to perform the C2 and integration functions required	~50% required capabilities and training completed and available to C2 activities and distributed operations
RC-4: Ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness and understanding	GAP 4: TSOCs do not possess or have limited ability to develop and maintain shared situational awareness	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	98% accuracy of translation	Leaders and users have access to relevant [need to know] information at all times in the operational environment to support situational awareness. The ability to develop intelligence requirements, coordinate and position the appropriate collection assets, to ensure situational awareness and knowledge of intended domains	~50% availability to conduct develop and maintain shared situational awareness in TSOCs
RC-5: Enhanced ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners	GAP 5: TSOCs currently do not possess or have limited ability to coordinate and collaborate with interagency and mission partners	Rapidly identify, establish and facilitate appropriate relationships, collaboration and communications with mission partners and interagency	95% of critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react	Mission partner capabilities are integrated, synchronized IAW commander’s risk assessment	~50% availability to process critical information available to individual responsible for action within time to react

Gap and Required Capability Analysis

Capability to Gap Relationship for TSOC C2	GAP 1: TSOC organization structure	GAP 2: Limited ability to form the core of a JTF Headquarters.	GAP 3:Limited ability to C2 distributed SOF,	GAP 4: Limited shared situational awareness	GAP 5: Limited ability to collaborate with interagency and mission partners
RC-1: Org Structure	X	X	X		X
RC-2 Form JTFHQ	X	X	X		X
RC-3 C2 SOF	X	X	X	X	X
RC-4 shared SA	X	X		X	X
RC-5: collaborate with partners	X	X		X	X
Derived Priorities	High	High	Med	Med	High

Questions