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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This was the thirteenth year the annual conference was held and cosponsored by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) [Headquarters Supreme Allied Command Transformation (HQ SACT)] and the United States [Joint Staff (JS) J7]. The Netherlands, with the Netherlands Defence Staff as executive agent, hosted this year’s event. A total of 197 delegates attended, representing 26 nations, NATO and the European Union.

The conference theme was “Connected Force Development in an Uncertain World;” with the following objectives:

- Obtain international perspectives on ideas, discuss relevant problems and challenges, and explore potential solutions in workshops to provide a return on investment.
- Create an environment conducive to information sharing and relationship building while highlighting the benefits of CD&E methodologies and practical applications to include collaborative experimentation tools.

Dr. H. G. Geveke, Managing Director Defence, Safety and Security, The Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research, gave the keynote address. His theme throughout his presentation stressed innovation through tools such as CD&E and lessons learned. He concluded that innovation must significantly contribute to NATO’s Connected Forces Initiative (CFI) for it to be successful.

Following the keynote, panelists addressed questions related to the Benefits, Value, and Practical Applications of Multinational Non-materiel Capability Development. The panelists’ answers provided examples of transitioned products, best practices, cost effectiveness, and conditions for success in the future.

The early afternoon of the first day featured two breakouts: Introduction to CD&E and URBAN WARRIOR 5 Best Practices. The latter part of the afternoon included a presentation by four NATO Centres of Excellence on their capabilities, program of work highlights and collaborative opportunities.

During the last two days of the conference, attendees selected one of three workshops to participate in. Attendees provided international perspectives on potential tools, solutions and conceptual ideas in the following three areas:

- Combined Operational Fires – led by Joint Staff J6 and J7:
  - Documented attendees’ impressions of solution value and appropriateness.

- Soldier of the Future – led by the Netherlands Army Land Warfare Centre:
  - Sought to define what may be expected of soldiers 15-20 years from now.
  - Increased the understanding of the technological, sociological, and informational challenges our next generation of warriors will face.

- Unified Security Force Assistance - led by HQ SACT:
  - Informed and built a community of interest focused on how NATO might accomplish a Security Force Assistance (SFA) mission.
  - Through shared lessons learned, provided recommendations for NATO SFA capability development with a specific focus on doctrine development.
  - Demonstrated the NATO SFA conceptual framework, and how analysis and experimentation supported the concept development process.
WELCOME REMARKS

Rear Admiral Rob Bauer, Royal NLD Navy, Director, Operational Policy, Plans and Requirements, Netherlands Defence Staff, gave opening remarks on behalf of the host nation, the Netherlands. Noting the worldwide economic constraints and fiscal responsibility, budget and manning reductions are a common problem in militaries today.

Brigadier General Jon “Ty” Thomas, USA Air Force, Deputy Director, Future Joint Force Development, Joint Staff J7, presented the first of the co-sponsors’ opening remarks. Finding non-materiel solutions is now the key to success. Before today’s austere financial environment, if there was a problem, we would buy a solution. Today with tighter budgets, we need to find new ways to use existing tools leading to solutions that benefit our forces on the battlefield.

Captain Jim Byerly, USA Navy, Acting Assistant Chief of Staff, Capability Engineering and Innovation Division, HQ SACT, provided the second of the co-sponsors’ opening remarks. He stated there is a lot of broad experience at the conference that can contribute to its success. CAPT Byerly introduced a welcome video by Vice Admiral Bruce Grooms, USA Navy, Deputy Chief of Staff Capability Development, HQ SACT. Admiral Grooms emphasized interoperability as the key to NATO’s CFI success.
KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Mr. Drs. H. G. Geveke, NLD Civilian, Managing Director Defence, Safety and Security, Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), gave the keynote address emphasizing innovation. Defense matters as a means to protect our populations and our cultures, as well as the economies which support those. Defense requires constant innovation to maintain dominance over threats; innovations like building a virtual training system to develop new tactics and test new systems that better connect our forces. There are three things that will shape the next decade of NATO’s military: The European economy, a changing US defense posture, and the withdrawal of NATO from Afghanistan. Innovation is creating new solutions for existing and future problems; not invention alone, not research alone, but a combination of all of them. There are some elements of CFI that are missing or lacking. First, scanning the future; what is the future nature of conflict? What technologies will be game changers? Second, systematic organizational needs are defined. Capturing and analyzing lessons learned from the last war will prepare us for the next.

How do we measure improvement and effectiveness? We need a standardized system to evaluate these innovations, such as comparing a unit with traditional training tools versus those with virtual training tools. Just because one method of training looks better using new technologies does not mean it fights better. These efforts also need to be uniform across NATO to effectively collect information and to minimize the cost of redundancy resulting in a larger benefit to NATO countries. In the end, more innovation is needed to enhance readiness and he hopes other NATO countries benefit from the Dutch efforts.

Following the keynote address, questions were asked about a proposed concept. Similar to what the Test Readiness Review does for new technology development, a tool to measure new concepts is needed. Sharing information on concept innovation should be shared on a common tool; perhaps most suitably it would be hosted by NATO. An idea to test the new concepts would be to provide them to forward deployed forces to use and assess. The soldiers should be trained and test the concept throughout the entire tour. One of the key elements during concept development is maintaining stability of the system during the time of innovation.
THE BENEFITS, VALUES AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF MULTINATIONAL NON-MATERIEL CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT PANEL

- Air Commodore Paddy Teakle, GBR Royal Air Force, Head Doctrine, Air and Space, United Kingdom Development Concepts and Doctrine Centre (DCDC)
- Captain Christian Madsen, SWE Navy, Head Capabilities Support Unit, European Defence Agency
- Lieutenant Colonel Erik Liebert, CAN Army, Director Plans and Policy, Canadian Warfare Centre
- Ms. Siw Tynes Johnsen, NOR Civ, Research Fellow, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI)

What examples do you have of transitioning multinationally-developed, non-materiel capabilities to your operating forces?

• Doctrine (Teakle)
• Counter Improvised Explosive Devices (C-IED) laboratory in Afghanistan to evaluate IED forensics; helicopter training program in response to Afghanistan man-portable air-defense systems (MANPAD) threat (280 crews, 100+ personnel trained). (Madsen)
• Space and Cyber Handbooks from Multi-National Experimentation Series. (Liebert)
• Focus on education when transitioning, e.g. threats to cyber defense. (Johnsen)

What best practices did you glean from your organization’s experience with multinational non-materiel capability development?

• Real-world feedback; champion use of a product in the transition phase; create a need for the product at a high level. (Johnsen)
• You must have a clear understanding of national requirements. (Liebert)
• Need a lead nation large enough to gain adequate support and funding; member states with same objectives; geography matters; and a common platform. (Madsen)
• Evolution not revolution, identify quick wins. (Teakle)

Has multinational non-materiel capability development been cost effective for your organization? All Panel members stated it is cost effective

What are some specific examples?

• Understand the requirements and plan to leverage the costs. (Liebert)
• The use of satellites, training, and airworthiness has all been cost effective. (Madsen)
• Expand Staff College opportunities for multinational participants; virtual collaboration; national doctrine based on NATO doctrine; crowd sourcing; and big data harvesting. (Teakle)
• Multinational Experiment Series and the Multinational Capability Development Campaign where a wide range of products was or is produced. The use of smaller teams in multinational capability development proved to be more cost effective. (Johnsen)

How do you set the conditions for the success of multinational non-materiel capability development in the future?

• Establish collective requirements; determine national interests that overlap; defragment regulatory context in Europe. (Madsen)
• Use lessons learned to establish operational and strategic requirements. (Teakle)
• Focus on products, desired outcomes, and utility; scale down processes for smaller headquarters; lessons learned need to be identified. (Johnsen)
• Use rigorous based methodology; write with a specific audience in mind – the users; good facilitation in meetings, workshops, etc.; consulting with industry. (Liebert)
BREAKOUT – INTRODUCTION TO CD&E

- Wing Commander Gordon Pendleton, GBR Air Force, Deputy Branch Head for Concept Development, HQ SACT
- Mr. Han de Nijs, NATO Civilian, Branch Head Operational Analysis, HQ SACT
- Mr. Krist Zimmerman, Civilian, Project Manager Operational Experimentation Branch, HQ SACT

HQ SACT presented a brief introduction to CD&E using a series of historical events to provide a contextual explanation for how CD&E has developed, been utilized, and improved over time. The ACT team extrapolated CD&E activities from: Genghis Kahn’s creation of the Mongolian Empire; the Roman Punic Wars with Carthage and the need for a Roman Navy; British Air Defence systems at the start of WWII; the building, sailing, and sinking of the Titanic; and the Zulu wars involving the British Army. Each historical event presented a different aspect of the CD&E process whereby the HQ SACT team interjected the basic elements of the current process.

The HQ SACT team presented the purpose of the NATO CD&E process and how NATO and Nations use CD&E as a transformational tool to produce results for improving capability development, reducing risk, and increasing interoperability through the 24 multinational Smart Defence projects. Additionally, the team showed how CD&E activities feed the NATO Defence Planning Process (NDPP), from capturing and refining requirements to developing solutions for capability shortfalls. The team then presented the various aspects and definitions of concept development across the three main NATO concept types (capstone, operating, and functional). The presentation included the usefulness and necessity of operational analysis within concept development projects to provide added rigor to experimentation. Lastly, the team presented the three main types of experiments (hypothesis, validation, and discovery), the benefits of experimentation, and what an experiment is and what it is not. The presentation concluded with a brief description of the Cost-Benefit Analysis for CD&E activities and how CD&E practitioners should build metrics to identify subjective and objective benefits.
BREAKOUT – URBAN WARRIOR 5 BEST PRACTICES

- Lieutenant Colonel Peter Rowell MBE, GBR Army, SO1 Concept Development, LAND Capability Management Branch (Concepts), Director General Capability
- Lieutenant Colonel Jonny Ormerod, GBR Army, SO1 Concepts International, LAND Capability Management Branch (Concepts), Director General Capability

The speakers office (in the United Kingdom) owns conceptual thinking and develops capability requirements. Visions are lofty and policy requirement are always lower due to fiscal realities, but the Ministry of Defence views of capability tend to be higher than those seen by the Army. We need evidence to expose gaps between both views. Additionally, actual capability changes with a time lag create capability gaps. An enduring set of questions that can be used over multi-year periods to answer what are the gaps and what are the solutions must be developed.

Some suggested guidance for future Force Development Experimentation are: there needs to be a clear evidence framework to support land capability development; the experiment design and control must be right and there is a need to control campaigns of activity; human variability of experience, capability and capacity is inevitable and this must be taken into account for both the experiment and analysis of the results; use data form collective training; modeling and simulation needs to be incorporated into experimentation and can identify important variables; and statistical analysis is a key element in the evidence gathering process.
NATO CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE CAPABILITIES, PROGRAM OF WORK HIGHLIGHTS AND COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES

- Lieutenant Colonel Remus Lacatus, ROU Air Force, Plans, Concepts, Development and Vision/Assessment, Coordination and Engagement Branch, Joint Air Power Competence Centre (JAPCC)
- Lieutenant Colonel Josef "Sepp" Greipl, DEU Army, Concepts Chief, Defence Against Terrorism Centre of Excellence (COE)
- Lieutenant Colonel Siegfried Heinz, DEU Army, Branch Chief, Concepts, Interoperability and Capabilities, Civil Military Cooperation COE
- Commander Ingo Eilts, DEU Navy, Staff Officer Experimentation and Validation, Operations in Confined and Shallow Water COE (also presenting for Combined Joint Operations from the Sea COE)

The NATO COEs were invited to present their programs of work, their particular capabilities, and to identify potential collaborative opportunities. Five COEs were represented within the four presentations, which covered the major topic areas at varying levels of detail. They presented an interesting perspective on National sharing of lessons identified (LIs) and lessons learned (LLs) where Nations routinely maintain control of National LIs/LLs and rarely share them with NATO or the COEs. For this reason, the COEs reported that they seek to establish a good relationship and link with the Joint Lessons Learned and Analysis Centre (JALLC) based in Monsanto, Portugal.

One of the main takeaways from this session focused on the future of the COEs, which will likely incorporate more: doctrine development and maintenance; training programs for NATO and National requirements; identification of LI and LL; and the addition of other customers such as the United Nations and the European Union. This future will likely stretch existing personnel without any substantial increase in total staff numbers. However, this will help the COEs fulfill their role of looking toward the future since the NATO Command and Force Structures (NCS/NFS) remains focused on current operations and associated challenges.

The audience asked how many National versus NATO tasks exist in the COEs’ Programs of Work? The majority of the COEs concluded that ACT provides a majority of the work requests making it a primary customer. Very few national projects exist within the COEs. However, it was noted the COEs have specific subject matter expertise that NATO and Nations should leverage for specific projects, including CD&E activities. The COE communities of interest will increase their relevance in the future and should be seen as a good source of information and knowledge to employ in all aspects of capability development.

Note: The Fall 2013 edition of ACT’s flagship publication, The Transformer, featured the existence and relevance of the COEs within NATO and Nations as its main theme.
COMBINED OPERATIONAL FIRES (COF) WORKSHOP

- Mr. Lou Durkac, USA Civilian, COF Project Sponsor, Joint Fires Division, Directorate for Command, Control, Communications and Computers, The USA Joint Staff (JS J6)
- Mr. Jim Clark, USA Civilian, COF Project Lead, Multinational Capability Development Branch, JS J7

Workshop Overview: COF is an 18-month collaborative project that is part of the Multinational Capability Development Campaign, led by the United States Joint Staff J7. The COF team is comprised of 8 nations: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland, and the United States. The team also benefits from introduction into a larger fire support community through the 23 member Joint Fire Support Executive Steering Committee, a multinational body chaired by the USA Joint Staff J6.

Different from the traditional CD&E Conference workshop, the COF workshop was a User Discovery Event (UDE) and part of the continuum of assessment to be used throughout the COF project lifecycle.

Problem Statement: Multinational partners with varying rules of engagement and technical capabilities are limited in their ability to swiftly combine forces in a crisis situation, and to collaboratively plan, synchronize, execute and assess combined joint fires.

Proposed Solution: A framework of standardized repeatable processes, tools and a lexicon for multinational mission partners to:

- Perform national self-assessments of long lead-time issues;
- Present that information to a multinational working group in a standardized format; and
- Integrate the information with other nations of the multinational force to quickly develop a coalition joint fire support capability.

The project’s deliverable is the Combined Operational Fires Guidebook, composed of three tools designed to compress the planning time required when forming a Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF):

- Fire Support (FS) Command & Control (C2) Systems Integration Tool – This tool is used by a nation to perform a self-assessment of fire support C2 systems; present that information to a multinational working group in a standardized format; and integrate the information with other nations of the coalition in a fire support C2 integration and interoperability plan.
- Command and Control Organization Planning Tool – This tool is used by a nation to perform a self-assessment of joint fire support C2 organization capabilities and requirements; present that information to a multinational working group in a standardized format; and integrate the information with other nations of the coalition to quickly develop a coalition joint fire support C2 organizational structure.
- Rules of Engagement (ROE) Self-Assessment Tool – This tool is used by a nation to perform a self-assessment of Standing ROE and national caveats; present that information to a multinational working group in a standardized format; and integrate the information with other nations of the coalition to quickly develop a coalition ROE matrix of authorized actions and limitations.

Workshop Objectives & Organization: The workshop was designed to obtain independent user feedback, in a structured environment, on tools developed thus far in the project’s lifecycle. Users were defined as the ultimate consumers of the project’s results and included: operational headquarters; joint staffs; joint fires elements; joint fires centers;
multinational exercise developers; curriculum developers; and doctrine centers. The workshop accomplished its objectives to:

- Document user’s impressions as to solution value and appropriateness, and
- Add rigor to the solution development process aimed at documenting user perspectives and accumulating validity with the combined operational fires user community.

The workshop was divided into two groups, each led by an experienced moderator with support from analysts and note takers. A variety of methods were employed to gather data: affinity diagramming, electronic polling, interviews and group discussions. Sixteen subject matter experts from ten nations, along with a number of CD&E practitioners, provided: extensive and detailed feedback on the COF tools; recommendations for refinement; and implications for transition and exploitation.

Main Takeaways:

**Fire Support C2 Systems** – Discussed the proposal for a working group, during the initial forming of a multinational force, to submit and integrate digital fire support C2 systems from participating national forces to synchronize and optimize fire support capabilities.
- **Recommendations:** Continue to improve the template, to include tasks, roles and responsibilities of the proposed FS C2 system integration working group.

**C2 Requirements** – Tool is rough – needs refinement in the area of liaison requirements; supported/supporting relationships; and reachback.
- **Recommendations:** Continue to improve the template, to include weapon system roles/missions; add a section for amphibious forces; include a section on liaison expertise, roles and responsibilities.

**ROE Self-Assessment** – Tool would benefit from additional considerations such as current and anticipated national restrictions/limitations. National self-assessment should be focused on Phase 2/3/4 when it is easier to diverge from a position.
- **Recommendation:** Include Collateral Damage Estimation (CDE) thresholds, restrictions and implications.

**Way Ahead:** The project team is incorporating the feedback and recommendations received from the workshop into the next iteration of tool refinement in preparation for evaluation and assessment during Bold Quest 14.2. Specifically:
- Solution Developers will discuss/implement (as appropriate) SME recommendations.
- Submit tools to appropriate SMEs for each sub-topic for review and comment (e.g. network design, operations, and legal).
- Continue to identify potential transition paths for products.
THE SOLDIER OF THE FUTURE WORKSHOP

- Lieutenant Colonel Hans van Dalen EMSD, NLD Army, Netherlands Army Land Warfare Center

Workshop Overview: The workshop provided an opportunity to obtain international buy-in on definitions and a conceptual framework. Results of this workshop will lay the foundation for all future work on this subject.

Planners designed this as an interactive workshop to frame the problem and identify tangible solutions or identify knowledge areas requiring more study. Shock methodology, giving two controversial presentations, was used to generate ideas and discussions. The first presentation was on the unimaginable transformation of warriorship and warfare from ancient times to the present while suggesting that the same unrecognizable transformation will happen from the present to the future. The second presentation centered on current technological developments around humans and the implications of those developments for soldiership.

Breakout sessions were used and each group was given a set of taskers to discuss. Facilitated discussion in smaller groups, led by instructed moderators, stimulated in-depth discussion and broadened the participation of the workshop attendees. Following this exercise, the workshop re-formed in plenary and both breakout groups provided their findings.

Problem Statement: The main theme of the Soldier of the Future workshop was the realization that soldiers are no longer capable of “holding their own” in the future. The future operating environment will be highly demanding for our militaries. Therefore, we need to better understand the implications of the future operating environment and what will be needed to ensure our soldiers can operate effectively, both individually and as team member. Future challenges and needs have to be analyzed in a wider context since our soldiers are part of a system of systems. For framing purposes, the context was set as a sociological, technological and information-dominated.

Objectives and Taskers: The objectives and taskers were:
- Understanding of the future operating environment for our soldiers.
- Insight into needed enhancement for the operational effectiveness of our soldiers.
- Understanding of challenges our soldiers face as part of a system of systems (technological, sociological and information).
- Creation of Allied Command Transformation led community of interest for sharing knowledge and expertise.

The taskers, energized by teasers for the Soldier of the Future workshop breakouts were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Energizing Primer</th>
<th>Tasker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>The contemporary military does not produce the soldier future land operations need.</td>
<td>Identify types of soldiers, not based on traditional male-chauvinistic warriorship, but on needed human skills in dealing with future conflicts. Identify and explore the current physical, mental and cognitive borders of the individual soldier system. Look for trends and developments to cross, shift, move or eliminate those human borders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1B The soldier is not only part of the military system; he is continuously “connected” and part of a wider sociological network that is influenced by wider sociological changes in humankind. Explore the effects sociological changes have on our Individual Soldier System (ISS). How does this affect our ISS based influence mechanism?

2C The soldier is no longer part of a human-only squad, but part of a technological enhanced, robotized dispersed network. Other humans are no longer within Line of Site. Explore the effects technology enhancement and robotization have on the ISS. How does this change the ISS as the most adaptive part of the network?

2D Explore the effects technology enhancement and robotization have on the ISS. How does this change the ISS as most adaptive part of the network? Explore the effects of the information driven society on the ISS. Identify required coordination mechanisms and Force Development Implication.

During the breakout sessions, affinity diagramming proved to be a valued, excellent support tool. The breakout sessions were well received and they promoted intense interactions in a small group setting and created a low-barrier approach.

**Conclusions:** Participants made this workshop a success with energetic and interactive discussions, from which all benefited. A concise document of the findings is posted on the ACT website, [http://www.act.nato.int/cde-conf](http://www.act.nato.int/cde-conf). We invite concept developers to use this work as a starting point. This document can be used for continued work in the area of Soldier of the Future. All nations are encouraged to share their plans and intentions on this subject, and actively share the results and findings with the Netherlands Army Land Warfare Center and the community of interest at large. This will ensure our nations will be able to develop the right types of Soldier(s) of the Future.

**Main Takeaways:**

- Individual Soldier System (ISS) as a human centered system of systems is a valid conceptual approach.
- The power in the ISS resides in its diversity. In the future we will not have one unique ISS, but several ISSs.
- The social and cognitive skills of a human as part of ISS are more important than his or her physical or mental skills. The latter can be enhanced by training; the former only to a limited extent.
- With regards to his or her sociological skills, relations with other actors at home or within the operational environment are important. The requirements for the ISS in this area are significant, illustrated by calling them “sophistication of the heart” and “emotional intellect.”
- The ISS will have some form of (unmanned, robotized) support that will follow the ISS, and provide the ISS with gear, food, accessories. The ISS will be provided with fire power and is able to flexibly change between various types of smart ammunition and weaponry. The ISS will have integrated situational awareness visualization tools and sensors. Sensors will be attached to the ISS and also self-sustaining, unmanned, beyond line of sight; yet connected to the ISS.
• It is not to be expected that extensively robotized, self-sustaining killer-bots will be deployed within the next 15 years.
• The main game-changers for the ISS are not expected to be in the realm of improving the physical skills, e.g. through (gene) doping, chemicals, or dehumanizing robotization (replacing limbs with technology).
• In the future, some decision making will be delegated to machines. But the decisions over life and death will continue to remain in human minds within the next 15 years. ‘Killer-bots” will not be the prevailing deployed ISS on the battlefield for the next 15 years.
• In the future the ISS has access to the Cloud anywhere, anytime. The Cloud is an intelligent Cloud: It answers questions with a probability indicator; it automatically speaks to the ISS when sensors indicate a possible threat; it provides information the ISS may need depending on the location, direction and status the ISS has; it helps to make decisions during the mission and helps to assess the situation constantly. In the case of information about the lethality of applying military force, the ISS is assumed to rely more on verified, more pulled information.
• All technological and information developments that will influence the ISS will be applied mostly to specialized, team-size (8-15 pax) groups. But they will make self-sustainability of soldiers (as part of their team) better. The ISS (teams) will be well informed and be able to make better decisions relying on that information they know how to deal with. This will influence the span of control as well; there may not be a need for company or even battalion level staffs in the future since squads currently do tasks assigned to platoons.
• The ISS of the future is completely networked; fully and constantly connected; self-sustaining in executing its mission; has full-time access to all information; and is receiving (rather than providing) sensor information as needed – depending on time, location and direction.
UNIFIED SECURITY FORCE ASSISTANCE WORKSHOP

- Major Evgeniy Ivanov, PhD, BGR Army, Concept Development Branch, HQ SACT

Problem Statement: Whilst NATO is currently providing assistance to local security forces (e.g. Kosovo, Afghanistan), there is no doctrine to guide and unify Allied efforts.

Workshop Objectives:
- Inform on the NATO Security Force Assistance (SFA) capability development;
- Demonstrate the GO-TEAM conceptual framework for NATO SFA;
- Share lessons learned and provide recommendations to support NATO SFA capability development.

Workshop Overview: The workshop design was divided into three panels. The first provided a general overview on the SFA Concept and experiences related to SFA. In a second panel, participants were invited to take part in an interactive game in order to explore and discover the idea of the concept. This gave the participants the chance to share their personal experiences. The third panel was intended to raise further awareness of the relations and linkages to other NATO documents in the broad field of Crisis Management.

In the beginning of panel one, the framework for discussions on the SFA Concept was explained by the workshop lead. An up to date project overview was provided that outlined the requirement, concept, conceptual study and framework. One of the challenges in developing the concept is different national approaches; each has different conceptual models, which were consolidated into one approach known as the GO-TEAM Model designed to Generate, Organize, Train, Enable, Advise and Mentor Security Forces. The focus is purposely defined in a broad manner to security forces overall because the SFA Concept is intended to be strategic in nature.

Initial polling demonstrated most attendees did not have either practical experience or institutional knowledge about SFA, and hoped to gain a better understanding of the subject whilst contributing personal experiences to recommendations derived during the workshop. In addition, a presentation was provided on the NATO Standardization Agency’s (NSA) support to the conceptual development of the SFA Concept. NSA’s primary focus is to enhance the Alliance’s operational effectiveness through the attainment of interoperability among forces. This is done by initiating, coordinating and administering standardization activities that are implemented by the Military Committee for Standardization Board.

A comprehensive presentation was given on Russia’s lessons identified regarding SFA in Afghanistan in the 1980s. After providing an overview on Russia’s engagement, attendees’ focus was drawn to detailed SFA related actions and a comparison to International Security Assistance Force SFA methods and engagement during past years. The lecture was completed with a very active plenary discussion on the comprehensive assistance Russia provided to the Afghan administration as well as security forces, whether they were Military or Police Forces.

Three presentations followed, which provided a summary of how SFA has practical application to current operations in Kosovo and Afghanistan, and could support the development of the SFA Concept in the future. For example, the need for Aviation Advisors, which plays an important role in SFA; they not only impact military power, but also the capability to support logistics, humanitarian aid and surveillance operations. Common understanding exists that there has to be a standardized process within NATO concerning the application of SFA best practices, whilst demonstrating a certain level of flexibility within the individual operation.
In panel two, a war game was executed with two groups where the teams applied the concept of SFA and GO-TEAM framework. The game started by covering the Defining to Planning to Assessment phases of the operational process leading to practical implications. A positive discussion was generated about the GO-TEAM framework.

On day two of the SFA workshop, the third panel included a sequence of lectures outlining the relations and linkages between a number of NATO documents and the NATO SFA Concept. Presentations highlighted the complexity in the Allied Joint Doctrine Architecture. Significant effort has to be devoted to harmonize these many levels of doctrine and revitalizing the doctrine development process.

Part of the doctrine development process addressed the inclusion of lessons learned. This is a two phase process: Analysis phase and Remediation Action phase. Lessons learned must be validated so the refined actions have the desired effect and can be implemented into new doctrine.

Comments from the group identified a concern that NATO HQ’s SFA development guidance is too narrow and should be expanded beyond the military component to encompass a comprehensive approach by incorporating governance, diplomacy, development and economic components. SFA doctrine should address NATO Security Force Assistance (NSFA) more comprehensively while focusing on military tasks.

**Conclusions:**

- There must be positive efforts made to harmonize doctrine across doctrine custodians.
- NSFA should address all components of the comprehensive approach, not just the military component.
- The SFA workshop’s objectives were achieved by informing the participants about the SFA Concept; demonstrating its application; and identifying areas of improvement needed during doctrine development.
ELECTRONIC POLLING RESULTS

HQ SACT conducted an electronic poll on the first and last days of the conference during the general sessions with the following results:

• What is your assessment of the pre-registration process & information requested?
  83% stated ‘Excellent’ or ‘Good’
  14% were neutral
  1% stated ‘Not useful’
  2% stated ‘Needs improvement’

• What is your assessment of the CD&E Conference Website?
  74% stated ‘Excellent’ or ‘Good’
  21% were neutral
  5% stated ‘Needs improvement’

• Do you feel that you have improved your knowledge of CD&E today?
  68% agreed
  22% were neutral
  10% disagreed

• What is your assessment of the overall value from today’s information sessions (Day 1)?
  93% stated ‘Average value or better’

• 87% of the attendees rated the Hotel as ‘Good or better’

• 83% of the attendees rated the collaborative tools (Affinity Diagramming & e-polling) as ‘Good or better’.

• 51% of the attendees rated the Opportunity Wall as ‘Good or better.’

• Was the length of the conference adequate?
  85% stated Yes
  15% stated No

• What should the length of the conference be in future?
  67% stated 3 days
  20% stated 2 days
  13% stated 4 or 5+ days

• Did you gain personal and/or professional benefits from the conference?
  90% stated Yes
  2% stated No
  8% were indifferent

• What is your overall assessment of the 2013 International CD&E Conference?
  89% stated Outstanding, Excellent, or Good
  9% stated Fair
  2% stated Poor