

CLAMO Report

Center for Law and Military Operations (CLAMO), The Judge Advocate General's School

The Battle Command Training Program

Mission and Organization

The mission of the combat training centers (CTCs) is to conduct realistic, stressful training for units, commanders, and staffs. The Battle Command Training Program (BCTP) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas is the Army's capstone CTC, and it concentrates its training on the "command and staff" element of the CTC mission. The BCTP trains commanders and their staffs from all levels by providing battle staff training through computer simulated exercises, known as War Fighter exercises (WFXs). The BCTP training features a "free thinking" world-class opposing force (OPFOR), certified observer controllers (OCs) and observer trainers (OTs), and senior observers who act as mentors and coaches.

The BCTP's mission is an ambitious one. While it is a "CTC"—an elaborate training apparatus that occupies a crucial role in the Army training system—it is unlike the other CTCs. The Combat Maneuver Training Center (CMTTC) in Hohenfels, Germany; the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) in Fort Polk, Louisiana; and the National Training Center (NTC) in Fort Irwin, California, are known as the "maneuver" CTCs, a label that does not apply to the BCTP. All of the CTCs test battlefield operating systems (commonly referred to as "BOS" elements), but the maneuver CTCs require the actual movement of forces in relation to the enemy. The BCTP does not test tactical units on skills such as fire and maneuver. True to its title, it tests the battle-command system—the art of battle, decision-making, leading, and motivating soldiers and organizations into action to accomplish missions. The art is more commonly known as "command and control" or "C2."

The BCTP also differs from the maneuver CTCs because, although it is a "center" in the sense that it concentrates expertise and experience, it cannot be identified with any particular place. The OPFOR and the operations group personnel (who actually run the training) are permanently stationed at Fort Leavenworth, but most of each rotation occurs at the training unit's home installation. For example, the fictional attack by Kim Chong Il's North Korean forces on the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), the subject of CLAMO's *In the Operations Center: A Judge Advocate's Guide to the Battle Command Training Program*,¹ took place completely on Fort Campbell, and the "battle" was simulated on computers. This is not to say, though, that no one "goes to the field;" many head-

quarters elements get cold and muddy in field command posts. There are not, however, any real OPFOR paratroopers wearing multiple integrated laser engagement system (MILES) gear and landing in drop zones.

Providing training for organizations of this size is a daunting task. The BCTP has a strength of approximately 500 officers, enlisted soldiers, civilians, and contractor personnel. The organization consists of a headquarters, four operations groups, and the OPFOR. The four operations groups (called teams) have primary training responsibility for all exercises/rotations and consist of support personnel, civilian contractors, and OCs or OTs.² The OTs and OCs are branch-qualified officers who have completed a successful company-level command and NCOs who have completed a rigorous certification course. In addition, the chief of staff of the Army appoints retired senior general officers as senior observers (SRO) to coach and to mentor a unit's senior leadership and to watch over doctrinal standardization.

The four operations groups train units of different sizes and compositions. Operations groups A and B conduct corps and division WFXs. They are organized identically and can execute division WFXs independently, but they must combine to perform corps WFXs. Operations group C conducts brigade WFXs for Army National Guard brigades and select active component (AC) brigades. Operations group C also trains AC observer controllers.

Operations group D observes, trains, and assists Army level commanders and their staffs in conducting joint and combined operations at the Joint Task Force (JTF) and the Army Force level. They also work with the Joint Training Analysis and Simulation Center (JTASC), a United States Atlantic Command organization located in Suffolk, Virginia, as part of the Unified Endeavor exercises.

Operations group D's training helps prepare Army organizations to operate in a joint combined or multi-agency environment as either the Army component or as the nucleus for a JTF headquarters. They also provide staff assistance for contingency operations involving U.S. Army units (such as Desert Storm, Somalia, and Bosnia). As post-Desert Storm experiences have demonstrated, modern operations are likely to be joint (involving more than one United States service component) and combined (involving other countries). Training to

1. CENTER FOR LAW AND MILITARY OPERATIONS, *IN THE OPERATIONS CENTER: A JUDGE ADVOCATE'S GUIDE TO THE BATTLE COMMAND TRAINING PROGRAM* (1996) [hereinafter *IN THE OPERATIONS CENTER*].

2. Personnel in teams A, B, and C are referred to as OCs, while team D personnel are referred to as OTs. This is because of the different roles they have in the BCTP exercises.

operate in these joint and combined environments is, therefore, of increasing importance.

The BCTP also serves as a data source for improvements on United States joint doctrine and Army doctrine, training, leader development, organizations, material, and soldiers (DTLOMS, referred to as “Det-loms” or “Dee-tee-loms”). The Army has been applauded for its use of “lessons learned,” and the CTCs are key vehicles by which to gain, to analyze, and to disseminate these lessons. The CTCs test doctrine, leaders, organizational techniques, and equipment, and then recommend refinements to doctrine as necessary.

Warfighter Exercise

The judge advocates who support the training unit go well beyond strictly “legal” skills or activities. They help to develop staff estimates, assist in drafting operations plans and reviewing orders, and perform myriad other functions at the division’s main and rear command posts. Judge advocates are, in every sense, fully functional staff members. While legal issues are important and may have strategic consequences in a deployment, legal issues do not arise during a WFX as often as many judge advocates would like. They must remember, however, that judge advocates perform a supporting (and very important) role, rather than a central role, in training. The BCTP process—a program that forges generals and staffs that are adaptive, creative, and militarily competent—is longer than nine months in duration. The legal issues that arise, though perhaps complicated and of great consequence, may be but one of many challenges that arise for the commander and for each of the staff sections during the short, compact, and very intense week-long WFX. There is no need to worry—enough legal issues will arise during a WFX to keep the legal staff fully employed.

The WFXs are conducted frequently and worldwide. The BCTP conducts more than forty training exercises per year—fourteen division WFXs, fourteen brigade rotations, and ten operational level war exercises, in addition to seminars and contingencies.

The first step in which judge advocates are likely to be involved is the Battle Command Seminar. The seminar is used in operations group A, B, and C exercises and takes place 100 days prior to the start of the WFX. It is likely the first time that the training unit judge advocate and the judge advocate OC or OT will meet. It is imperative that judge advocates, especially the training unit’s operational law attorney, are involved in the exercises which take place during the seminar. In fact, *FORSCOM/TRADOC Training Regulation 350-50-3 (Draft)* requires the staff judge advocate and the operational law judge advocate to attend the seminar.

The operations group plans and executes the week-long seminar, the purpose of which is to provide the commanding general with an opportunity to build his battle command team. The battle staff support cell, a reduced staff from the training unit, deploys to the BCTP headquarters at Fort Leavenworth, where they focus on doctrine and tactics. The battle staff support cell should include judge advocates, who must ensure their participation long in advance. The commanding general chooses which members of his staff will participate, and he then acts as trainer and coach during the seminar.

Judge advocates should be involved in all of the seminar activities, because this is when the staff comes together as an integrated team. The involvement of judge advocates is especially important in targeting cell activities. The targeting cell is a coordinating group within the staff that plans and controls the execution of the division’s deep fires operations (such as artillery fires) and its command and control communications countermeasures.³ The deep battle targets enemy forces that are not yet in contact, and it typically focuses on enemy regiments or other priority targets two to three days away.

In the targeting cell, a judge advocate can be expected to provide guidance on the rules of engagement (ROE), particularly the legal ramifications of engaging nominated targets. This role requires judge advocates to be familiar with: weapons systems and capabilities; all division materials on ROE; and, at the very least, the basic principles of public international law. A common question regarding ROE, for example, is the use of “unobserved fires into populated areas.” What are the requirements of “observed” fires? Are electronic eyes good enough? Must human eyes be watching? What is a populated area? The judge advocate must consider all of these questions; indeed, all of these may be directed at the judge advocate.

Following the week-long seminar, the battle staff support cell returns to its home station to continue training for the BCTP WFX. As the WFX approaches, judge advocates will have more contact with the judge advocate OC or OT and the rest of the operations group, the main body of which arrives approximately five days prior to the start of the WFX. Communication allows the judge advocate OC or OT to meet with the staff judge advocate and his staff; to read and to crosswalk the unit’s operation order and that of the higher headquarters; to see where the unit is set up; and to gain a complete understanding of the plan.

The battle itself—though a computer-driven exercise—must be seen to be believed. From the training unit perspective, the WFX appears to be simple and, at times, magical. Only after looking behind the curtain and seeing all of the moving pieces can one gain an appreciation for how much work goes into the exercise.

3. Command and control communications countermeasures, also known as C2W, are “the warfighting application of [information warfare] in military operations.” U.S. DEP’T OF ARMY, FIELD MANUAL 100-6, INFORMATION OPERATIONS 2-4 (Aug. 1996).

The battle is controlled by three elements: the operations center, the work stations, and the exercise control cell (EXCON). The operations center, run by the operations officer, is responsible for tracking everything that happens during a WFX. It sets up and maintains the computer hardware, adjusts unit strengths (based on casualties and other factors) and supply levels, maintains communications, and coordinates briefings for the BCTP commander and the chief, operations group (COG).

The work stations are controlled by members of battalion staffs from the training division or corps who are playing their real world roles. These people input guidance from the training unit (BLUEFOR) chain of command into the corps battle simulation (CBS), the computer that controls the exercise, as if they were carrying out maneuver or movement orders from above. The COG, meanwhile, focuses on providing guidance to the OCs and the civilian contract analysts, with a view toward assembling material for the after action review (AAR).

The EXCON is located in the battle simulation center. Its mission is to facilitate conduct of the WFX by representing higher echelons, adjacent units, combat multipliers, and intelligence systems. In essence, the EXCON is responsible for filling gaps in the CBS. While the CBS can do much to replicate all of the factors that impact on the command and control of a unit during a real fight, it cannot recreate all of these factors, including legal issues. The EXCON defines the environment in which the battle is fought—it writes orders and messages that would normally originate from higher, flank, rear, and deep units and provides intelligence collection and reporting data for both friendly forces and the OPFOR. It executes the scripting and role-playing events it has drafted and inserted into the training scenario, always careful to ensure that these “scripted” events are transparent to the training unit. The EXCON contains the workers who actually “run” the exercise.

The battle is computer driven and is based on the unit mission, the mission essential task list (METL),⁴ and the commander’s stated training objectives. Little happens during the battle that the operations group has not anticipated or coordinated. Due to the basic warfighting nature of the exercise, the scenario does not usually give rise to the same type of spontaneous legal issues that arise at the other CTCs. This is not to say, however, that such issues will not arise. While the OC or OT inserts a majority of legal issues, there are still a large number of legal issues that arise through the normal course of the exercise.

Legal issues, such as weapons utilization and targeting, will occur in the normal course of the exercise, especially when sharp judge advocates crosswalk the various BOS annexes and identify prospective issues. A judge advocate may, for example, discover that the commander contemplates laying down scatterable mines in an area where a large number of displaced

civilians are expected. He may discover this, and might be the only staff member who does, by over-laying all of the annexes and appendices upon each other.

Although rotations differ based on the commander’s intent and the unit METL, certain legal issues will undoubtedly arise. Personnel issues are an example. In an effort to promote realism, the “box” is used to strictly control the flow of logistical and other support into the area of operations (AO). When casualties are suffered, “replacements” must be introduced, and those “replacements” may claim conscientious objector status, see their family care plans fall apart, and commit crimes. When the unit conducts combat operations, the appropriateness and use of weapons systems will become an issue. The unit will acquire prisoners of war and encounter civilians on the battlefield. Special Forces and Psychological Operations assets often generate legal issues.

Such events might not arise, or additional issues might be needed. The OT or OC can insert issues into the training scenario through the master events list (MEL). Even though the BCTP is a simulated exercise, realism is the standard. To retain realism while increasing the quality of training, all inserted events must be precise, factual, and consistent with the scenario. Most legal issues will enter the exercise through MELs and should appear seamless and transparent to the training unit. Prior to the WFX, judge advocates from the training unit will have an opportunity to provide the OT or OC with training objectives. Legal issues will be scripted to ensure that training occurs on those objectives.

The first step in this elaborate and painstaking process is the scripting itself—what will be said and who will be the role-players. A “solution” to the problem must also be drafted and must address two perspectives: (1) from a staff coordination point of view, who should be involved and what should they do? and (2) from a legal perspective, what substantive laws and rules apply, and what advice should be given to the command? The event must then be coordinated with the EXCON and the work cell, through which the MEL will be inserted.

Role players are necessary to act out the event. Unlike the maneuver CTCs, which have civilian and military personnel traversing the battlefield in garb, the BCTP does not have a “cast.” The agreements at the start of the exercise (which clarify responsibilities during the course of the WFX) now require the training unit’s staff judge advocate section to provide two legal NCOs (E-6 or above) to work in the special operations force (SOF) cell during a WFX. They provide twenty-four hour coverage in the cell and serve as role players for inserted events.

The next step is to determine where in the scenario the event should be inserted. A thorough review of the operation plan and operation order is a must. The event must occur at a logical time within the exercise, but it must also be consistent with the

4. Collective tasks in which an organization must be proficient to accomplish some portion of its wartime mission.

mission being performed. Suppose, for example, that the commander wishes to employ FASCAM (family of scatterable mines) to channel enemy forces into an engagement area. This point in the scenario might be an excellent opportunity for adding civilians to the exercise by inserting an event that suggests that displaced civilians may use the same area as their avenue of egress. After deciding where the event will occur, the OT or OC begins the extensive process of coordinating with the scenario developers to get the event approved and actually inserted into the battle.

The positioning and placement of OCs mirrors the training unit; each functional element of command receives individual attention and feedback on performance. Each rotation requires forty-four OCs, and "augmentee OCs" (AOCs) are often needed from the training unit or other areas on the installation. During each exercise, there is only one operational law OC, and he often relies on judge advocate AOCs. They usually work a swing shift to maintain twenty-four-hour coverage of training.

To train augmentees, the BCTP and CLAMO have instituted a judge advocate augmentee OC training and certification program.⁵ Under this program, staff judge advocates nominate officers who have operational law experience or exceptional leadership and teaching skills. Upon selection, these officers receive training at home station via distance learning and attend a week-long training program with the operations group at Fort Leavenworth. The training concludes with attendance at, and participation in, an actual WFX at Fort Leavenworth.

The operational law OC and AOC observe the training unit's judge advocate's responses to events as they arise and provide training based on those responses. They also observe the integration and synchronization between the commander's staff and the staff judge advocate section. Additionally, they may consider such things as:

(1) How does the ROE process, especially as it relates to supplementation and dissemination, occur? Have changes been noted with the date/time group (DTG) so that everyone knows which ROE are now in effect? Is the G3 taking the lead on ROE issues with input from judge advocates? Have the ROE been "cross-walked" through the various staff sections to ensure that the different battlefield operating system sections have knowledge and input?

(2) Are judge advocates familiar with the operation order, not just the legal and ROE annexes?

(3) Are judge advocates aware of what is happening in the G3 plans section and G3 current operations?

(4) When acting as part of a JTF, do judge advocates ensure coordination with naval, marine, and air forces? Do they know what is happening on the battlefield?

(5) Have judge advocates brought the appropriate legal references to assist the command in resolving legal issues? Are they coordinating properly with the chain of command to resolve such issues? Are they utilizing the Rucksack Deployable Law Office?

(6) Are judge advocates manning the TOC and keeping logs? Are the log entries standardized so that everyone can understand them? Does the log contain a clear statement of the issue and how it was resolved?

(7) Are unit claims officers trained on adjudication of claims under the Foreign Claims Act? Does the staff judge advocate section have a standing operating procedure for processing foreign claims?

(8) Are judge advocates fully integrated into the targeting cell and other staff sections where they can address issues and interact with appropriate staff members?

(9) Are judge advocates familiar with the tactical standing operating procedure (TACSOP)? Does the TACSOP provide for workspace, living space, and transportation for the legal element?

(10) Are trial counsel deployed with their brigades during the exercise?

This is certainly not an exhaustive list of all of the issues⁶ that may arise during a WFX, but it highlights some general areas in which issues frequently occur. The secret to success in most of these areas is integration. Judge advocates must become part of the staff so that staff members know where and from whom to seek answers to legal questions as they arise.

The training process ends, or, if you prefer, begins anew, with the end of the exercise (ENDEX) and the AAR process. Army training doctrine requires leaders to conduct their own AARs during all collective training. Every BCTP rotation fea-

5. The next augmentee OC training program will begin in late July 1998. Staff judge advocates who would like to nominate officers to receive this exceptional training should contact CLAMO immediately.

6. See generally IN THE OPERATIONS CENTER, *supra* note 1.

tures at least two formal, COG-led AARs. These typically last about two hours. Individual OCs conduct informal AARs for their respective units. These informal AARs usually last one hour. After action reviews are also conducted during the WFX, usually during pauses in the exercise (or PAUSEX), which are timed to coincide with the change of mission.

According to the BCTP's internal guidance, an AAR is a structured review process that allows training units to discover for themselves what happened, why it happened, and how it can be done better. A specific agenda provides structure for the videotaped, tailored review. The operations group regards the AARs as the most important events of a rotation. Here are their guidelines:

- (1) Focus directly on key METL-driven training objectives.
- (2) Emphasize meeting Army standards rather than pronouncing judgment of success or failure.

- (3) Use leading questions to encourage participants to self-discover important lessons from the training event.

- (4) To maximize the training value and sharing of lessons learned, allow a large number of people to participate.

Conclusion

The overview of the BCTP in this note will assist judge advocates in preparing for WFXs. Judge advocates should get involved early and integrate into the staff. Although the primary role of judge advocates in WFXs is to address legal issues that arise, their role goes beyond strictly "legal" issues. Judge advocates must be fully functional staff members to contribute to the success of the training. Captain DeWoskin and Major Kantwill.