

Designing a Block Assessment of Training Transformation

Annie Patenaude
Office of the Secretary of Defense (USD(P&R))
Washington, DC
Annie.Patenaude@osd.mil

Fred Hartman
Office of the Secretary of Defense (USD(P&R))
Washington, DC
Fred.Hartman@osd.mil

ABSTRACT

The DoD Training Transformation (T2) program, as outlined in the “Training Transformation Strategic Plan (March 1, 2002),” has two major, interrelated missions: The first is to transform training to better enable joint operations in the future. The second is to function as the key enabler to achieving the operational goals of the overarching transformation of the Department of Defense. In the T2 Strategic Plan, DoD leadership and stakeholders recognized the requirement for the assessment and reporting of joint training readiness, joint and interoperability training performance, and overall T2 program performance. Training Transformation’s impact on training, and training’s impact on joint operations, as aspects of force readiness, must be assessed and reported in order to provide effective feedback mechanisms for programmatic decisions and lessons learned. The impact of training and T2 on the emerging training needs of DoD Force Transformation also must be assessed and reported. The T2 Implementation Plan established biennial Joint Assessment Enabling Capability (JAEC)-led Block Assessments as the primary mechanism for assessing joint training capabilities and T2 integration and management. The first of these Block Assessments will occur in FY 2005. The 2005 Block Assessment will examine and leverage the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives, the DoD Balanced Score Card, the Defense Readiness Reporting System and the Individual Training Readiness Report to provide consistent measures of merit for Training Transformation. This paper and presentation will address approach and metrics development for the Block Assessment.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Annie Patenaude, a GS-15 and retired Army officer, is currently the Deputy Director, Training Transformation Joint Assessment and Enabling Capability for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Readiness and Training). Ms Patenaude began her career in the US Army Field Artillery. She has a background in mathematics, modeling & simulation, and weapon systems acquisition and testing. She is on the 2005 Program Committee for Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference (IITSEC) and is on the Board of Directors for the Military Operations Research Society (MORS). Ms Patenaude has bachelors and masters degrees in Mathematics and taught in the Mathematics Department at West Point. She served on the Army staff as a military personnel analyst and as executive military assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for Operations Research. Following her Army career, Ms Patenaude was a division manager in Science Applications International Corporation and later with Northrop Grumman Corporation as a Strategic Planner and Executive Account Manager. In 2004, Ms Patenaude returned to Government in her current position.

Fred Hartman is Director, Training Transformation, Joint Assessment and Enabling Capability (JAEC) and Associate Director for Modeling and Simulations in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, (Personnel and Readiness), Readiness and Training Division. He graduated from the United States Military Academy and earned a Master of Science degree in Operations Analysis from the Naval Postgraduate School. Mr. Hartman left active duty and joined CACI, Inc in 1981 and progressively grew to Executive Vice President by building an analysis group with annual revenues in excess of \$25 million. Mr. Hartman was chief operating officer and co-founder for Applied Solutions International, Inc from 1992 to 1995. In 1995 Mr. Hartman joined the Institute for Defense Analyses as a modeling and simulation consultant to the DUSD (Readiness), responsible for oversight and coordination of the JSIMS program. In early 2000 Mr. Hartman was appointed Technical Director for JSIMS and led the architecture group for the program transition team. In 2003 Mr. Hartman returned to DUSD (R) as Associate Director for Modeling and Simulation and initially to lead the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives.

Designing a Block Assessment of Training Transformation

Annie Patenaude
Office of the Secretary of Defense (USD(P&R))
Washington, DC
Annie.Patenaude@osd.mil

Fred Hartman
Office of the Secretary of Defense (USD(P&R))
Washington, DC
Fred.Hartman@osd.mil

BLOCK ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND

When Training Transformation (T2) was initiated after the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, the Department of Defense (DoD) leadership created a hook to maintain spiral development of joint training. In the Strategic Plan, leadership and stakeholders recognized the need for assessment and reporting of joint training readiness, joint and interoperability training performance, and overall T2 program performance. Training Transformation's impact on training, and training's impact on joint operations, as aspects of force readiness, must be assessed and reported in order to provide effective feedback mechanisms for programmatic decisions and lessons learned. The impact of training and T2 on DoD Force Transformation also must be assessed and reported through the Block Assessment. The Joint Assessment and Enabling Capability (JAEC) was established under the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Readiness) to assess joint training capabilities and T2 integration and management.

The first of these Block Assessments will occur in 2005. The JAEC-led Block Assessment will give the T2 leadership and community feedback by conducting a coordinated analysis. They will also recommend strategic and programmatic changes to management and execution of joint training.

Individual and collective training contribute to the readiness of the force in their ability to execute joint operations. This Block Assessment will identify performance metrics and observations of the individual and collective aspects of joint training and conduct an assessment and performance trend analysis on these metrics and observations. This will result in multiple levels of feedback: observations of training effectiveness, 'tactical' lessons learned, and operational indications of mission effectiveness. The feedback to the T2 leadership and training community is expected to result in actionable knowledge and milestones in November 2005.

In 2004, the Department codified the Training Transformation vision and many of the Strategic and

Implementation Plans' concepts into policy through DoD Directive 1322.18, *Military Training*. Among the policies within this Directive is the overarching requirement to train all personnel and DoD components on their Mission Essential Tasks to established standards so they are able to provide the capabilities that support the combatant commanders and the Joint Operations Concepts across all phases of joint campaigns and throughout the spectrum of service, joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational operations.

The revised missions and the introduction of new department training policies demand a revised understanding of the key objectives from the Training Transformation Implementation Plan. Five objectives support the mission to better enable joint operations:

- Strengthen joint operations by preparing forces for new warfighting concepts
- Continuously improve joint force readiness by aligning joint education and training capabilities and resources with combatant command needs
- Develop individuals and organizations that think joint intuitively
- Develop individuals and organizations that improvise and adapt to emerging crises
- Achieve unity of effort from a diversity of means

Achieving these objectives requires timely and effective training on Mission Essential Tasks so that individuals, staffs, and organizations are capable of performing to standard during operations. It also requires training that is responsive to the combatant commanders' needs across the full spectrum of operations.

Two key objectives support the mission to function as key enabler for achieving the operational goals of the continuous, capabilities-based transformation of the Department of Defense:

- Prepare forces for new war fighting concepts and capabilities
- Develop individuals and organizations that improvise and adapt to emerging challenges

Training on emerging capabilities for future operations is required for achieving these objectives. It also requires preparing the DoD Components to learn, improvise, and adapt to constantly changing threats and conditions in addition to executing doctrine to standards. As part of the joint learning continuum, joint education, training, and experience of personnel will be tracked and this information used to assist in force management processes to support joint requirements. Assessing the state and the progress of the training in the context of the learning continuum will help in establishing a baseline for examining how we can achieve the objectives detailed above.

Ultimately, the Block Assessment will:

- Examine and provide feedback on the impact T2 is having on effectively enabling
 - The readiness of our joint forces to meet operational requirements;
 - The continuous capabilities-based transformation of DoD.
- Recommend modifications that will focus T2 on better enabling joint forces to meet operational requirements.

The assessment team will draw on existing information on training accomplishment and readiness, completed studies, and additional data gathering and analysis to begin to assess the impact of the T2 program. The desired outcome of the Block Assessment is feedback to the T2 leadership on the state of Training Transformation. These spirals of periodic Block Assessments are expected to also provide verification or modification of the direction and magnitude of changes envisioned in T2, and validation of the program's underlying missions.

BLOCK ASSESSMENT APPROACH

The Block Assessment is a collaborative effort between Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Joint Staff, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), the Services and other interested offices and agencies. The organization of the assessment is divided into training assessment and management assessment, considering both individual and collective training. This breakout enabled the team to focus metric development on specific target areas with the realization that some of these metrics might overlap.

As we progress through the 2005 Block Assessment the assessment team will refocus its efforts to view the metrics in the bigger picture. Are we doing Training

Transformation right? Are we doing the right things in Training Transformation?

To get to a baseline assessment for joint training, the assessment team will examine the processes and procedures, as well as the tools and technologies, used by the Joint Knowledge Development and Distribution Center (JKDDC), the Joint National Training Capability (JNTC), the Services and the Combatant Commands (COCOMs) in joint training endeavors. They will determine if training shortfalls and gaps documented in the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives can be mitigated by leveraging some of the procedures and tools currently in use by others in the community. Additionally the team will identify areas in which it determined synergy could be created by linking and leveraging current practices in other areas.

Metrics Design

In order to examine and provide feedback on the impact T2 is having on the force in the area of joint training, the assessment team focused on gathering information and developing metrics in several key areas: the readiness of our joint forces to meet operational requirements, continuous capabilities-based transformation, and recommendations to better meet operational requirements.

Developing metrics required review of program goals, objectives, and progress toward meeting goals. The team also reviewed the T2 Implementation Plan and the Services' training objectives and plans in joint training. The most interesting aspect of the preparation of metrics is considering the processes to fill training needs. The team examined the various processes by which requirements are determined, socialized, and prioritized. One of the first discussion points was the many and varied requirements processes for training, both individual and collective, which will be a consideration for the management panel in the final report.

Another area of metrics determination in filling training needs is investigating the extent to which training gaps identified by COCOMs are identified and filled. Metrics are focused on the framework identified for meeting the training requirements. This includes examining not only how training is identified and provided, but also how training is assessed for effectiveness. A natural extension of this investigation is the follow up of incorporating lessons learned from both training and operations into improved joint training. The training assessment team is considering

the tactical and operational lessons learned programs in JFCOM and the Services to determine how well lessons learned are incorporated into collective and individual training programs, and if they can recommend ways to increase the communication and synergy between these efforts where it makes sense.

Related Activities and Supporting Initiatives

There are a number of related reporting processes that are considered with T2 Block Assessments. Among these are the DoD Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives (TC AoA), DoD Balanced Score Card (BSC), Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS), the Reengineered Joint Training System, and the Institutional Training Readiness Report (ITRR). These processes shall be examined and leveraged to provide consistent measures of merit for T2.

Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives

The purpose of the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives (TC AoA) was to:

- Compare current training capabilities with training requirements in order to identify gaps in our current joint training capability,
- Address training enhancement alternatives for removing those gaps, and
- Assess the cost and effectiveness of these alternatives.

The DoD Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives (TC AoA) was led by Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD (P&R)) and Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) and completed on July 30, 2004. It provided, as part of the analysis, a detailed baseline assessment of existing training modeling and simulation (M&S) systems, and a validated list of 35 training gaps identified by the COCOMs and Services. The TC AoA will be used as a framing document in the Block Assessment for input on COCOM needs and gaps in training capabilities.

DoD Balanced Scorecard

In the 2002 Management Initiative Decision 901, the Deputy Secretary of Defense approved the Balanced Scorecard process as the framework for establishing performance outcomes and tracking performance results for the Department of Defense. The intent is to “balance” the trade-off among various types of risks over time. Each of the four risk perspectives below defines a performance goal for the DoD scorecard. Each goal is then parsed into objectives and the objectives provide one or more performance measures.

This top-down process ensures that performance measures are consistent with DoD’s mission and vision.

- *Force Management Risk:* The ability to recruit, retain, train, and equip sufficient numbers of quality personnel and sustain the readiness of the force while accomplishing its many operational tasks.
- *Operational Risk:* The ability to achieve military objectives in a near-term conflict or other contingency.
- *Future Challenges Risk:* The ability to invest in new capabilities and develop new operational concepts needed to dissuade or defeat mid-to long-term military challenges.
- *Institutional Risk:* The ability to develop management practices and controls that use resources efficiently and promote the effective operation of the Defense establishment.

The Balanced Scorecard and Block Assessment will be mutually supportive; metrics used for each can support the other. In addition, the quarterly-updated Balanced Scorecard will provide a core of metrics that each Block Assessment can use as jumping-off point to illuminate issues that bear further inspection.

Defense Readiness Reporting System

DOD Directive 7730.65 establishes a new Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) significantly different from previous readiness reporting mechanisms. It directs the expansion of the number of reporting entities in the former Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS) in a new Enhanced Status of Resources and Training System (ESORTS). Most importantly, it stipulates that the basis of readiness assessment and reporting be centered on the ability to accomplish assigned missions, as described through the construct of Mission Essential Tasks (METs). Information from DRRS will support one of the primary focuses of the Block Assessment in examining how joint collective training prepares forces to better accomplish mission objectives.

This new ESORTS focuses on output-oriented information on force capabilities, as well as encompassing appropriate outcome and process measures. It records each commander’s assessment of his or her organization’s ability to conduct assigned mission(s) and the essential tasks associated with those missions in accordance with established standards and conditions. Commanders will continue, however, to consider the resource information available that may

influence the conduct of these missions and tasks, and their own experience when making assessments.

CONDUCTING AN ASSESSMENT

Ultimately the team will attempt to determine, through metrics development and subsequent analysis, how the T2 capabilities measure effectiveness in meeting training needs. In addition to executing tasks required by the strategic and implementation plans, are training organizations anticipating and developing the way ahead to continually focus on providing usable, focused joint context? The question for the assessment team is how effectiveness is being measured, and can we provide feedback on how to better conduct these measures.

Since the Services, OSD, the Joint Staff, and the COCOMs embarked on enabling joint training several programs and initiatives have been created and revised to better the way we do our business. The task for the assessment team is to evaluate how well joint training is meeting the needs of the COCOMs and the extent to which planned initiatives will improve the training readiness support provided to the COCOMs. The team must also consider the T2 initiatives' ability to enable joint training (and therefore joint force operations).

Individual Training Assessment

The training assessment will focus on distributed learning and knowledge sharing for individual training. Initial information is being gathered from the internal assessment efforts of the Services, the COCOMs, and the Joint Knowledge Development and Distribution Capability (JKDDC). In addition to the efforts within these organizations, the assessment team will seek areas of potential synergy between current and planned efforts.

The emphasis of the Block Assessment will be on efforts and accomplishments in the joint individual training area. The team will also consider the impact of the Services' and COCOMs' T2 and educational efforts as well as research community initiatives on achieving overall T2 goals and objectives. The team will look for synergy among these various programs. Source data for this aspect will include studies that focus on interagency coordination for training, and training in the new operational environments.

One of the most important discussion points is for the individual training agencies to articulate their vision and goals in the context of joint training and education

specifically and transformation in general. One specific area of interest is the attributes of learning material and how they are being developed to support the goals of individualized learning that is adaptive and flexible.

For this particular aspect of the assessment, the team will examine the requirements processes for joint training and education content development by the Services, the COCOMs, and JKDDC. The team will use current Mission Essential Tasks and results of the AoA gap analysis to assess how priorities are being established and if requirements are being satisfied in a timely manner. The team plans to discuss individual training process effectiveness with COCOM representatives. In addition, the team will use the information from recent surveys and studies of the Services and COCOMs that include training assessments.

The team expects to examine such programs as Navy Knowledge Online, Army Knowledge Online, Air Force Knowledge Now, the Advanced Distributed Learning initiative, the National Guard's Distributive Training Technology Product, the Army Battle Command Knowledge System and other Service knowledge management systems. An aspect of the assessment will be how lessons learned from operations are incorporated into individual training. This will include discussions with Service organizations responsible for the collection and distribution of lessons learned such as the Army's CALL program. If time allows, the team will extend this aspect of the Assessment to include the Services' educational organizations such as Air University.

For the Block Assessment, the Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Co-Labs and DARPA will be the primary research organizations with which the team will coordinate on state of the art trends and technologies. In addition, the team will review current literature on other potential training technologies, such as light simulations and gaming, to assess if these technologies are being evaluated and planned for incorporation into future training developments. As part of the Joint Distributed Learning Initiative identified in the I-Plan, ADL was tasked to support JKDDC on the integration of web-based learning and operational applications, personnel competency, certification and skill-level tracking, collaborative environments, and learning management tools. The team will meet with ADL and JKDDC to identify the development of these programs and initiatives. The team will also look for examples of these programs in the products and services JKDDC is providing and will look at the feedback process to see how JKDDC

activities are incorporated into ADL program goals, and what mechanisms are in place to monitor progress on these goals.

DARPA has established a Training Superiority Program (DARWARS) that seeks to transform military training. Individuals from DARPA, ADL and JKDDC will be interviewed to determine how they plan on incorporating this capability into individual training products.

Related Initiatives for Individual Training

There are a number of significant OSD, joint, and Service initiatives that relate, either directly or indirectly, to individual training. The assessment approach will be to identify these initiatives, describe their goals and determine the extent to which they either overlap or complement T2 individual training goals and objectives. The assessment will include, but not be limited to, the following organizations and systems:

Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS). DIMHRS is an integrated military personnel and pay system that provides each Service member with a single, comprehensive record-of-service. This evolving system is reported to track training records. These records could be used by Service members to determine individual needs or aggregated across individuals to determine current competencies at the force level. Assessors will review DIMHRS documents and interview key individuals associated with DIMHRS; the objective is to determine whether aspects of individual training histories are actually or will be captured. Given this information, the assessment will address whether DIMHRS data can or should be used to individualize joint training. The findings have implications for managing the data flow from and to the JKDDC.

Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL). ADL represents a collaborative effort among government, industry and academia to establish a new distributed learning environment that supports interoperability of learning tools and course content on a global scale. ADL concepts provide the technical underpinnings of the JKDDC. Assessors will interview key individuals in the ADL Co-Laboratory to determine the degree to which JKDDC incorporates ADL concepts and whether JKDDC keeps apprised of developments in this evolving initiative. This will measure how JKDDC is keeping pace with evolving distributed learning capabilities.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). DARPA manages and directs high-risk/payoff research and development projects for the Department of Defense. Within DARPA, the Training Superiority Program (DARWARS) seeks to transform military training by providing a new kind of cognitive training experience for units and individuals based on continuously available, simulated wars. As such, DARWARS represents the cutting edge in training technologies. Interviews will determine which new training technologies from DARPA have been incorporated into the JKDDC.

Service T2 Programs. Each of the Services maintains an organization that promotes transformation within Service training. Service contacts within the T2 Joint Integrated Process Team (JIPT) will be used to identify appropriate Service agencies pursuing T2 objectives. A fundamental issue to be addressed is the extent to which Service T2 systems and/or courseware have incorporated joint content and context. If so, assessors will want to know how feedback from these courses relates, if at all, to JKDDC systems and/or courseware. A related issue is whether Service individual training systems are capable of addressing joint training needs, and, if so, which needs.

Most joint individual training and education activities are currently being conducted as part of the Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) program. The JPME program is divided into two phases, with Phase I provided by intermediate Service education and Phase II provided by the National Defense University. Individuals in Joint Staff will be interviewed to determine the content, accessibility, and availability of these courses. The study team will also consider whether the content of JPME courses could be or should be converted to formats that allow them to be distributed via Web-based or related technology. Although the Block Assessment will focus on potential areas of overlap between the JPME and JKDDC, redundancy is not necessarily a negative aspect of joint training given the increasing turbulence in joint assignments.

The assessment will also concentrate on flow of training effectiveness and performance data feedback. The question to be answered by assessors is whether the feedback is captured, returned to, and understood by the appropriate recipients and the whether this occurs in a timely fashion. Feedback will be considered at several levels, including:

- Immediacy of feedback to individual warfighters to promote learning,

- Feedback to training management systems to monitor and sequence individual progress,
- Feedback to JKDDC to monitor the success of individual products and services, and
- Feedback to T2 leadership to assess joint individual training as a key component of training transformation.

Information for this aspect of the assessment will be garnered from the Services, COCOMs, T2 leadership, and JKDDC and be coordinated with the management team.

Knowledge Management (KM) systems currently under development by the Services hold promise as effective and transformational methods for promoting rapid development, distribution, and sharing of actionable information. As such, KM is recognized as a fundamental asset in Network Centric Warfare. Most of the impact of KM systems will likely be on individual performance and is thus a logical topic relative to Individual Training and Education; however, KM collaborative capabilities are also relevant to collective performance.

Through interviews with Service, COCOM, and JKDDC representatives and reviews of ongoing research, the assessors will describe the state of the art with respect to KM systems. This review will focus on aspects of the KM system that address T2 goals. Assessors will be particularly interested in identifying and interpreting any extant data that addresses the utility and effectiveness of current KM systems. With regard to Individual Training, the assessment team will address specific questions such as:

- Is there a need to develop joint-specific KM capabilities, and if so, should JKDDC be the developing organization?
- How does JKDDC enable development, integration, and implementation of Service KM systems?
 - Through development of common portals?
 - Through development of interoperability standards?
 - Through determination of a common set of metrics?

Collective Training Assessment

The training assessment team will consider all collective training activities with particular focus on JNTC as T2's primary joint collective training capability. The team will assess JNTC's planning goals and objectives to consider training content,

methods of delivering training, and development of the Live, Virtual, and Constructive (LVC) environment. The team will consider the relationship between JNTC and other collective training initiatives to determine whether the degree of integration is appropriate. It will also consider whether innovative technologies, such as those identified in the TC AoA study, are being effectively pursued. The ability to quickly incorporate lessons learned and feedback from operational and training efforts will also be examined.

The processes JNTC, the COCOMs, and the Services use to identify, prioritize, and choose joint collective training activities are a key component of this assessment. The team will look at areas such as: improving training in areas that have been identified as having particular shortcomings; and developing the ability to provide timely training to units that need it. Another area of interest to the team is the ability to assure that processes are in place so lessons learned from both training and operations are promptly incorporated into improved joint training. The team will give particular attention to the experience of deploying and returning units, including evidence from studies and surveys.

The team will specifically examine the metrics JNTC uses to guide and prioritize its efforts. These metrics will be compared to traditional assessment structures. The assessment will also examine how the data are collected to support use of the metrics, how the information is used, and the feedback mechanisms to revise the metrics and impact collective training. In particular, the team will consider JNTC's approach toward measuring the effectiveness of specific program areas such as accreditation and certification initiatives, design and management of LVC environment, and research and development programs. It will examine the actual lessons learned and how they have impacted the T2 collective training effort. It will also identify modifications in these areas that could improve the direction and execution of collective, and integrated, training.

Proposed avenues for improving the efficiency of joint training have been identified in several recent studies, including the Training Capabilities Analysis of Alternatives. The Block Assessment will consider these as a baseline in determining recommendations to improve efficiency of collective training in T2.

Many organizations, including the Services, other DoD organizations (such as DARPA and the intelligence community), as well as industry and academia use or develop collective training tools. The team will

examine how collective training is appropriately leveraging such innovations, technologies, and tools. Modern technology may provide the opportunity to train parts of the training audience both better and more efficiently than has been possible in the past.

Recent examinations of the Joint Training System (JTS), for example, have identified significant shortcomings. The team will follow up with the updates to these examinations and consider how the planned improvements to the JTS could further enhance collective training events and improve the efficiency of T2.

Integrated Training Assessment

Subsequent to the training assessment team's initial efforts, it will evaluate the metrics and findings to determine means of integrating collective and individual joint training where indicated. The assessment will address to what extent metrics and assessments can be linked across a continuum of learning tasks. This will include addressing how individual and collective training are integrating requirements across the full spectrum of Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational operations.

In order to achieve full Training Transformation benefits, individual and collective training activities need to be coordinated. This requires that program requirements, metrics, and other information be shared across initiatives. The assessment will consider if metrics and other data from individual training is being used to support collective training decisions in terms of training method and training audience selection. It will consider if information gathered from collective training is being used to shape individual training programs. The integration assessment will also evaluate how alternative training technologies (e.g., games, light simulations, etc.) as called out in the TC AoA are filling gaps and if they are effective in providing a bridge from individual training to collective exercises.

FEEDBACK TO THE T2 LEADERSHIP

The Block Assessment will be a means to provide the T2 Leadership and the training community with a rigorous set of metrics and an initial feedback on the state of joint training. The leadership agree that the most important part of the assessment is getting the right metrics—and getting the metrics right. The second most important part is getting the team right.

We have been fortunate in our initial efforts to get ambitious, quality individuals putting some muscle into the concept and metrics development.

The first Block Assessment will be completed in October 2005 and briefed to the T2 leadership in November. The lessons learned will be feedback to the Services, the COCOMs, JNTC, JKDDC, and the JAEC offices for incorporation into their current joint training efforts and their future assessments.

REFERENCES

- Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff instruction 3010.02B, Joint Future Concepts Employment Plan, under review
- Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3500.01C, Joint Training Policy and Guidance for the Armed Forces of the United States, under review
- Department of Defense directive 1322.18, Military Training, September 3, 2004
- Department of Defense directive 7730.65, DoD Readiness Reporting System (DRRS), June 3, 2002
- Department of Defense Management Initiative Decision 910, Budget and Performance Integration initiative, December 20, 2002
- Department of Defense Training Transformation Implementation Plan, June 9, 2004
- Department of Defense Training Transformation Program Plan, October 1, 2004
- DSB Task Force, Training for Future Concepts, June 2003
- DSB Task Force, Training Superiority and Training Surprise, January 2001
- Joint Assessment and Enabling Capability Program Plan (Appendix 3 to Department of Defense Training Transformation Program Plan), October 1, 2004
- Joint Knowledge Development and Distribution Capability Program Plan (Appendix 2 to Department of Defense Training Transformation Program Plan), October 1, 2004
- Joint National Training Capability Accreditation Concept of Operations, December 3, 2004
- Joint National Training Capability Certification Concept of operations, December 3, 2004
- Joint National Training Capability Program Plan FY 06-11 (Appendix 1 to Department of Defense Training Transformation Program Plan), October 1, 2004
- The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America 2005, March 2005

National Military Strategy of the United States of America 2004, 2004

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America 2002, September 2002

Strategic Plan for Transforming DoD Training, March 1, 2002

Training Transformation Investment Framework FY06-13, undated

Transformation Planning Guidance, April 2003