

Fiscal Year 2018 Report of June 6, 2018 Closed Meeting
of the Office of the Secretary of Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board
Under Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act

1. The Reserve Forces Policy Board (RFPB) held a quarterly meeting in the Pentagon, Washington, DC on June 6, 2018 in Room 3E863.
2. A portion of the meeting was closed to the public from 8:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The meeting was closed in accordance with provisions outlined by the Government in the Sunshine Act, as amended by 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (1) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended by 5 U.S.C. Appendix (Executive Order 13526 – Classified National Security Information). The agenda items covered during this period were the presentations from the Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense Personnel & Readiness, Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Secretary of the Army, and Director, Air National Guard, and an update brief on the U.S. Cyber Command’s training and certification program of the Air National Guard’s Cyber Mission Force Teams. Secret level discussions are likely as they address military operations; readiness, availability, use, and performance of the National Guard and Reserve; and the future strategies for their use. The unclassified summary of each of the presentations is provided below:

**a. Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
– Ms. Stephanie A. Barna**

- Ms. Barna informed the Board that she was currently filling the role of Senior Advisor to Mr. Wilkie. She began her discussion with an update on some of the major initiatives within OUSD P&R that relate to Secretary Mattis’ priorities for DoD, and that OUSD P&R is working on two prongs (1 and 3) of the Secretary’s National Defense Strategy, which has the Department focused on three lines of effort:
 1. Build readiness for a more lethal force.
 2. Strengthen alliances and attract new partners.
 3. Bring business reforms to the Department.
- She briefed that Secretary Mattis’ definition of readiness and lethality is very expansive and includes many components, to include family readiness and medical readiness.
- She said that he tasked OUSD P&R to document the number of non-deployable service members across the force, and that this effort took many months to do because each Service had different criteria for what made a Service member non-deployable. After analysis, the main reasons for non-deployability were in three categories:
 1. Medical issues
 2. Legal issues
 3. Administrative issues
- Ms. Barna stated that in regards to medical issues, that Service members were identified as being permanently non-deployable or temporarily non-deployable. She said that for those in the permanent category, Commanders have been directed not to delay out-processing as members with permanent medical issues are not likely to improve. She stated that a 230 day or less

timeframe has been set as the milestone for the Active Component, with the exception that those wounded in combat would be taken care of, and that anyone remaining in a non-deployable status after twelve months must be approved by the Service Secretary.

- Ms. Barna then briefed that SECDEF directed OUSD P&R to serve as the lead for a close combat force lethality study. She remarked that SECDEF believes that there are too many mandated and required training events that take time away from core mission training, and that many of these requirements should be pushed down to senior NCOs. She said that while some are mandated by law, many requirements were self-inflicted by Services and Geographic Combatant Commanders, and that these are now being reduced.
- In the area of business operations, she briefed that all Medical Treatment Facilities will now fall under the Defense Health Agency. She stated that this consolidation should free up billets which will then go back to the Services to be utilized elsewhere, and that the medical requirements will become standardized.
- She also remarked that management of commissaries is under review, with the goal of eliminating a \$1.4 billion appropriation for overhead as they strive to become financially self-sufficient.

b. Vice Chief, National Guard Bureau

– Lieutenant General Daniel R. Hokanson, USA

- LTG Hokanson updated the Board on the current status of National Guard (NG) support to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) operations in securing the U.S. border with Mexico (the Southwest Border (SWB) Mission).
- He started by placing the SWB Mission in the context of overall NG OPTEMPO. Approximately 100,000 Guardsmen are affected by current operations and missions, of a total strength of about 450,000: There are currently 40,500 Guardsmen deployed, with about 30,000 preparing for missions and 30,000 recovering from missions. As of 29 May 18, 1,630 Guardsmen were deployed or preparing to deploy in support of CBP operations on the SWB; the majority of these are ARNG.
- He briefed that the majority of NG support is being provided by the border states (AZ, CA, NM, and TX), with some selected specialties, especially intelligence related, requiring nationwide sourcing.
- When asked how border deployments were affecting unit readiness, LTG Hokanson explained that all NG personnel currently are volunteers. He further stated that while the governors of the border states could involuntarily direct their Guardsmen to support the CBP mission, volunteerism currently satisfies all requirements. He stated that most of the requested aviation support (24 of 26 aircraft) is being satisfied, primarily by LUH rotary wing aircraft equipped with FLIR and night vision capabilities.
- LTG Hokanson believes that the CBP mission practice of requesting specific numbers of NG personnel, instead of the requirement(s) for which they are needed, likely is/will result in inefficient utilization of NG support and activation of personnel excess to requirements.
- He noted that the activation of NG personnel pursuant to Title 32 US Code sec 502f(2) also is problematic in that the benefits differ from those for personnel mobilized pursuant to Title 10. He explained that these inequities include no post 9/11 GI Bill benefits, no mobilization and dwell credit (for Title 10 mobilization), no early or post activation access to Tricare benefits, and no credit for reduced age eligibility to receive retirement benefits. He further noted that this benefit inequity is creating some (as yet unmeasured) resistance to volunteerism for the SWB Mission, with the assumption that this resistance could grow.

- He then briefed that there are some CBP policy obstacles to sourcing NG support for certain requirements, and that military clearance requirements for TSC (Top Secret-Compartmentalized) do not correspond to CBP classification, and require additional vetting. Also, he noted that any applicant rejected by CBP for a position is not allowed to subsequently be hired or otherwise utilized in any capacity to satisfy the requirements of the same position.

c. Chief, Cyber Warfare Branch, National Guard Bureau

- **Maj Gen (Ret) Sheila Zuehlke**
- **Lt Col James A. Pokorski**

- Maj Gen (Ret) Sheila Zuehlke, RFPB Homeland Security Subcommittee and Lt Col James Pokorski, Chief of the National Guard bureau Cyber Warfare Branch presented the "Department of Defense Cyber Approach brief: Use of the National Guard and Reserve in the Cyber Mission Force Part 3: Employment Update."
- They briefed that RFPB 2013 Cyber Task Force was assigned to examine DoD's cyber approach and provide an objective assessment of the Department's current path in developing organizations, policies, doctrine and practices for conducting defensive and offensive cyber ops and directed to comment on force mix between active, reserve, and civilian personnel and RC organization needed to meet DoD strategy.
- They also stated that in August 2014 the RFPB provided to the Secretary of Defense the "DoD Cyber Approach: Use of the National Guard and Reserve in the Cyber Mission Force" report for consideration. In this presentation, they updated the issues during the Air National Guard Cyber Mission Force Team (CMFT) employment to include the Manning, Rotation and Dwell for Cyber units.
- they said that all the Air Force Cyber Mission Force Teams declared Full Operational Capability (FOC) by May 2018 enabling teams from 13 of 15 ANG squadrons to be mobilized to date, and a final rotation of the first cycle will begin in the Fall of 2018, 2 years ahead of schedule after standup.
- They stated that the ANG CMFTs' battle rhythm developed with the Air Force emphasis of centralized command and decentralized execution and that the teams organization is evolving with experience with the team leads employing 2-3 task-oriented teams, and that the teams were able to take on two to three missions simultaneously.
- They noted that the Air National Guard refined the ability to conduct CMFTs' remote operations from home stations, which addressed the cost and quality of life vs. long-term TDY, manpower efficiency, dynamic re-tasking of operators, more effective use of equipment and reporting structures, and the shift to protect missions requiring forward deployment (24 hour operations).
- They concluded by discussing the ANG CMFT's challenges with: hiring support levels, depth of experience, and the hiring of qualified candidates who can meet operator standards requirements, CMFT's dwell capacity and rotations, training pipeline scheduling, and weapon system equipment used to make CMFTs functional and deployable.

d. Secretary of the Army

- **The Honorable Dr. Mark T. Esper**

- Secretary of the Army Esper began his remarks to the RFPB by summarizing his personal observations of the Army. He noted that the Army is functioning as one entity with regular and reserve components that are indistinguishable from one another and the RC has emerged as a fully operational force. He is leading the Army to a 2028 vision using three lines of effort:

1. Doctrinal Modernization
2. Transform the Personnel System into a Talent Management-based System
3. Modernize the Force

- Secretary Esper stated the Army will be organized and trained for the high end fight for peer and near-peer competitors and will achieve significant overmatch in lethality. He briefed that Army Divisions and Corps will be structured to support more robust and fully capable Army units which in turn will be more capable with autonomous and robotic capabilities, and that the Army will equip using six Modernization Priorities:

1. Next Generation Combat Vehicle
2. Long Range Fires
3. Future Vertical Lift
4. Mobile Army Network
5. Missile Defense
6. Soldier Lethality

- Secretary Esper then drew on his own military career in the regular and reserve components to form his opinions on needed improvements for personnel management. He wants soldiers to be able to move seamlessly from regular to reserve and back to regular status. He said the Army is building a talent management system that may no longer use year groups but instead uses event based management such as command assignments. He is also concerned over the inequities in pay and allowances and wants all soldiers performing the same mission to receive identical benefits.
- RFPB Board member Dr. Charlotte Warren informed Secretary Esper of the benefit of using the community college system to leverage recruiting and training. RFPB Board member MajGen Wilson, USMCR (Ret) asked if there was an intent to seek a Base Realignment and Closure authority as a method for budget savings.
- Secretary Esper remarked that no BRAC would be requested by the Army but he observed that the Army will certainly pursue savings in individual buildings and facilities life cycle management.
- Secretary Esper remarked that the Army is overcommitted around the world with deployments by all components to Europe, Africa, Middle East, and Afghanistan which is being met with additional RC units.
- Gen (Ret) McKinley, Chairman of the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, responded by saying that the Department of Defense needs a messaging campaign for employers so they understand why their employees are deploying, otherwise employers may not hire Guard and Reserve members in the numbers seen before.
- LTG (Ret) Barno remarked that the Army might consider keeping the RC committed on a predictable basis which would allow the regular forces more space and time to concentrate on training for the high end fight.

e. Director, Air National Guard

– **Lieutenant General Scott Rice, USAF**

- Lt Gen Rice discussed the priorities of the Air Guard, the Air Force Reserve Commission initiatives, and the Air Guard's challenges to balance force structure, pilot shortages, readiness and modernization while supporting the new National Defense Strategy.

- He began his discussion with the Board by speaking about where the Air National Guard (ANG) is today. He stated there are 90 ANG Wings and 10 Centers across the country and that they have members deployed throughout the world supporting operations at any given time 24/7.
- As Director of the Air National Guard, he said that his focus is on supporting the National Defense Strategy, with a specific focus on readiness and lethality. He also said that his three objectives include building readiness, taking care of Airmen, and building capability for tomorrow.
- In terms of airframes, Lt Gen Rice briefed that the ANG is placing significant effort in fielding the F-35 and KC-46.
- He then discussed Air Force associated units by describing the differences between Classic Associations and Active Associations. He said that the ANG is examining ways to find the right mix and right missions for associated units.
- Lt Gen Rice also discussed some challenges that the ANG faces.
 - First, he said that the ANG members struggle with Joint Travel Rules (JTR) rules regarding PCS for long duration schools (greater than 139 days). He stated that the JTR has not kept up with the demands of an Operational Reserve.
 - Next, Lt Gen Rice discussed challenges recruiting and retaining pilots, maintainers, and some Battlefield Airmen. He briefed that most units show good manning overall, but as you dig deeper, there is a disparity between full time manning and part time manning. He stated that In general, part time manning is good, while full time manning is abysmal, specifically in the areas mentioned. He also discussed plans to find the right mix between Active Guard and Reserve and Air Reserve Technicians.
 - He then briefed that the final challenge is regarding Airman's time. He mentioned adding administrative support to the squadrons and giving authority to commanders when appropriate to dictate training necessity and delivery methods for additional training.
- Lt Gen Rice finished his remarks by addressing questions from the Board.



Arnold L. Punaro
Major General, USMCR (Ret)
Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board