Army Regulation 71–11

Force Development

Total Army Analysis (TAA)

Headquarters
Department of the Army
Washington, DC
29 December 1995

UNCLASSIFIED

SUMMARY of CHANGE

AR 71–11
Total Army Analysis (TAA)

This revision--

- Adds information on the force feasibility review (FFR).

- Updates process descriptions and revises responsibilities.

Headquarters
Department of the Army
Washington, DC
29 December 1995

*Army Regulation 71–11

Effective 29 January 1996

Force Development

Total Army Analysis (TAA)

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

DENNIS J. REIMER
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

YVONNE M. HARRISON
Administrative Assistant to the
Secretary of the Army

History. This is a revision of Army Regulation 71-11, dated 1 November 1982. Because the publication has been extensively revised, the changed portions have not been highlighted. This publication has been reorganized to make it compatible with the Army electronic publishing database. No content has been changed.

Summary. This regulation prescribes objectives, procedures, and responsibilities for total Army analysis (TAA). It includes information on the conduct of TAA to develop the Army's programmed force structure

Applicability. This regulation applies to the Active Army, Army National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve.

Proponent and exception authority. The proponent for this regulation is the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (DCSOPS). The proponent has the authority to approve exceptions to this regulation that are consistent with controlling law and regulations. The DCSOPS may delegate this authority, in writing, to a division chief within the proponent agency in the grade of colonel or the civilian equivalent.

Army management control process. According to guidance in AR 11-2, this regulation does not contain management control provisions.

Supplementation. Supplementation of this regulation is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from HQDA (DAMO-FDF), 400 Army, Pentagon, WASH DC 20310-0400.

Interim changes. Interim changes to this regulation are not official unless they are authenticated by the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. Users will destroy interim changes on their expiration dates unless sooner superseded or rescinded.

Suggested Improvements. Users may send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to HQDA (DAMO-FDF), 400 Army, Pentagon, WASH DC 20310-0400.

Distribution. This publication's distribution is made in accordance with the requirements on DA Form 12-09-E, block number 3824. Intended command levels are C, D, and E for Active Army, Army National Guard, and United States Army Reserve.

Contents (Listed by paragraph and page number)

Chapter 1
Introduction, *page 1*
Purpose • 1–1, *page 1*
References • 1–2, *page 1*
Explanation of abbreviations and terms • 1–3, *page 1*
Objectives • 1–4, *page 1*
Initiation of TAA process • 1–5, *page 1*

Chapter 2
Process, *page 1*
Overview • 2–1, *page 1*
TAA process • 2–2, *page 1*
TAA phases • 2–3, *page 1*
FFR process • 2–4, *page 2*

Chapter 3
Responsibilities, *page 2*
Headquarters Department of the Army (HQDA) staff and support agencies • 3–1, *page 2*
CINCs and MACOM commanders • 3–2, *page 4*

Appendixes

A. References, *page 6*

B. TAA Key Events/Actions, *page 6*

C. Allocation Rule Examples, *page 7*

Glossary

Index

*This regulation supersedes AR 71-11, dated 1 November 1982.

UNCLASSIFIED

RESERVED

Chapter 1
Introduction

1–1. Purpose

This regulation—

a. Prescribes objectives, procedures, and responsibilities for total Army analysis (TAA) and associated force management activities.

b. Defines processes to execute decisions of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Department of Defense (DOD) planning, programming, and budgeting system (PPBS), and the Army planning, programming, budgeting, and execution system (PPBES). The processes are flexible and responsive to the dynamic changes which flow not only from internal Army actions, but also from the national command authority (NCA), Commanders in Chief (CINCs), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), Joint Staff (JS), and OSD inputs.

1–2. References

Required and related publications are listed in appendix A.

1–3. Explanation of abbreviations and terms

Abbreviations and special terms used in this regulation are explained in the glossary.

1–4. Objectives

TAA objectives are to:

a. Develop, analyze, determine, and justify a program objective memorandum (POM) force, aligned with OSD/JS Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) and The Army Plan (TAP). The POM force is that projected to be raised, provisioned, sustained, and maintained within resources available during the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP).

b. Provide analytical underpinnings for the POM force for use in dialogue among Congress, OSD, JS, CINCs, and the Army.

c. Assess the impacts of plans and potential alternatives for materiel acquisition, the production base, and equipment distribution programs on the projected force structure.

d. Ensure continuity of force structure requirements within the PPBS and PPBES.

e. Provide program basis for structuring organizational, materiel, and personnel requirements and projected authorizations.

1–5. Initiation of TAA process

a. The DCSOPS will initiate the formal TAA process upon receipt of OSD/JS DPG, illustrative planning scenarios (IPS), and draft TAP. Based on these data, the routine TAA cycle occurs biennially.

b. Significant unforeseen changes in Army fiscal resources may require the rapid analysis of future requirements and contingencies outside of the normal TAA cycle. On these occasions, compressed TAA and force feasibility review (FFR) excursions may be required. These ensure cogent Army force management positions and recommendations in response to congressional/NCA/OSD/JCS taskers in a highly unstable, ambiguous world environment.

Chapter 2
Process

2–1. Overview

a. Force structuring is an integral part of the OSD PPBS and the Joint Staff's Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS). The force structuring process develops a fiscally constrained force based on national military strategy (NMS) objectives to be achieved, threats, and the dynamics of internal and external constraints. The fiscally constrained force is developed to achieve an affordable and competent force to support national objectives.

b. The POM force, the force recommended and supported by resource requests in the Army POM, is developed during the Army's TAA process. The TAA generates the combat support (CS) and combat service support (CSS), tactical and general purpose, support forces (to include civilians and contractors) to support the divisional and non-divisional combat forces delineated in the DPG/IPS/TAP fiscally constrained force. The resulting force, for each program year, becomes the TAA base force. As part of the process a FFR is conducted during the resourcing phase to review and adjust the base force to assure affordability, supportability, and executability. Contentious unresolved issues are reviewed during a Force Program Review (FPR) and ultimately resolved prior to the approval by the Army leadership. Subsequently, the Secretary of the Army (SA) and Chief of Staff, U.S. Army (CSA) approve the force as the Army's POM force. The POM force is ultimately forwarded by the Army to OSD with recommendation for approval.

2–2. TAA process

The TAA is a phased force structure analysis process. It examines the projected Army force from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. Appendix B describes key TAA events and actions. The product of the TAA is the Army's POM force. This POM force is based on the dynamics of:

a. Both internal and external inputs, including anticipated threats, scenarios, assumptions, and CINC priorities.

b. Complex Army coordination and agreements, such as allocation rules, resource assumptions, warfighting capabilities, and infrastructure priorities.

c. The TAA serves as the bridge between OSD/JS guidance and the Army's planning and program building processes, balancing the Army's force structure requirements against available and planned resources. The TAA, and its FFR, provide the basis for the Army's POM development and establishment of the POM force. The product of the TAA and POM processes is the approved and funded force structure for America's Army. For resourcing purposes, the POM force is apportioned among four components: the Active Army (COMPO 1), the Army National Guard (ARNG) (COMPO 2), the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) (COMPO 3), and unresourced unit equivalents (COMPO 4). COMPO 4 units, part of the Army's required force structure, are deliberately unresourced in order to apply available resources to higher priority force structure initiatives and other Army programs. Resourcing is also considered by direct host nation offsets (COMPO 7), indirect host nation offsets (COMPO 8), and logistical civil augmentation program (LOGCAP) (COMPO 9). The resulting POM force represents the force structure for future POM development. It includes the documented structure for all Army components throughout the POM years.

2–3. TAA phases

The TAA consists of four phases described below.

a. Phase I, force guidance. Force guidance consists of inputs and guidance from various sources. The DPG and Draft TAP provide the NMS objectives, threat data, and resource assumptions and priorities. The IPSs provide DOD-directed scenarios with the quantity and type of combat forces for employment in each scenario. These specified combat forces are often described as "above-the-line" because they constitute the start point for force structuring activities. The Army force planning data and assumptions (AFPDA), published in 3 volumes, is a single-source reference document for planning factors for theater-level studies and modeling. The AFPDA contains theater-specific information concerning logistics and personnel planning, consumption and workload factors, host nation support offsets, support to and from other Services, stockage levels, and other planning factors crucial to force structure development. The AFPDA is updated and revised by U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), other major Army commands (MACOMs), and elements of the Army Staff (ARSTAF), and approved during each TAA cycle, normally for use in the next cycle. Also during this phase, ODCSOPS updates support force unit allocation rules that will be used by the U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (USACAA) during phase II. Allocation rules, developed by TRADOC and the functional area proponents, represent a quantitative statement of each type of CS/CSS unit's capability, mission, and doctrinal employment as applied to specific IPSs. Allocation rules consist of: existence rules, which relate the requirement for

one unit to another; workload rules, which correlate unit requirements to measurable logistical workloads; and direct input (manual entry) rules, which are theater-unique, stand-alone unit requirements. (Appendix C provides examples of allocation rules.) Allocation rules must be reexamined for continued accuracy whenever unit requirements documents (tables of organization and equipment (TOE)) and authorization documents (modification TOEs (MTOEs)/ tables and distribution and allowances (TDAs)), scenarios, assumptions, logistical support plans, or doctrinal employment concepts are changed. Force Structure Conference I (FSC I) is the forum where all allocation rules are reviewed and approved ensuring that they are appropriate and approved for use in the current TAA cycle. During Phase I, CAA makes several model runs (Transportation Model (TRANSMO) and Concepts Evaluation Model (CEM)) to set the stage for phase II. The force guidance phase ends with a General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC I) meeting to address any unresolved FSC I issues and approve all guidance and input data for phase II.

b. Phase II, quantitative analysis. Based on the assumptions and guidance approved at GOSC I, USACAA takes the combat forces identified in the NMS scenarios and determines the echelons above division (EAD)/echelons above corps (EAC) ("below-the-line") CS/ CSS support forces required to support the "above-the-line" force. This quantitative analysis is accomplished through a series of analytical efforts and associated computer simulations. The TRANSMO provides the strategic mobility forces and air/sealift data contained in the AFPDA. The output is port-to-port departure and arrival times of units. Output data from TRANSMO becomes input data for the CEM, the warfighting simulation model. The CEM is a very complex wargaming model where the results of the warfight produce various kinds of data including: combat intensities, forward edge of battle area (FEBA) traces, casualty loss rates, ammunition consumption rates, and loss rates for major items of equipment. The outputs from CEM, along with approved allocation rules and updated logistics data (AFPDA), are used as input data into the Force Analysis Simulation of Theater Administrative and Logistics Support (FASTALS) model that generates CS/CSS support force requirements and a phased force list. FASTALS generates logistics and administrative data apart from the generation of support forces. This data includes a breakdown of consumption of all classes of supply: killed in action (KIA), wounded in action (WIA) and non-battle death and injury (NBDI) rates, water consumption rates, prisoner of war (PW) capture rates and data relating to support to other Services, to name a few. The support forces generated by FASTALS are then compared to the actual force using other models such as Force Builder and MERLIN (MDEP (management decision package) Equation for Resource Linking). This comparison is called a MATCH (not an acronym) report. This difference between the generated requirements and the actual force is a delta that must be resolved during Phase III, the resourcing phase. These computer simulations are run for each scenario and are the product of phase II. The MATCH report and FASTALS-generated required force file are provided to ODCSOPS. CAA provides ODCSOPS computer generated force files, which are then distributed to CINCs and MACOM commanders, appropriate ARSTAF elements and TRADOC for review and issue formulation in preparation for phase III and FSC II.

c. Phase III, qualitative analysis. Qualitative analysis is the development of the initial POM force within given end-strength guidance. FSC II is the forum that reviews and validates the computer-generated requirements from FASTALS and the analysis of those requirements. This forum also provides the opportunity for the CINCs, MACOMs or other staff agencies to present issues focusing on COMPO 4 (unresourced requirements), claimants versus billpayers and priorities versus risks. FASTALS portrays all forces as fully resourced, i.e., authorized level of organization (ALO)–1. The forum must make an analysis that lays out by standard requirements code (SRC) the effects of reduced ALO, units without deployment requirements, unique units, and specific support requirements for all three components (active, ARNG, and USAR). Any issues concerning resourcing that are unresolved from FSC II will be carried to the GOSC II for resolution. Once FSC II is concluded, the DCSOPS and other appropriate ARSTAF take the force initially approved by FSC II and analyze this force via a FFR. The FFR determines whether this force can be afforded, supported, trained, maintained, and is within the limits of personnel and budgetary constraints. GOSC II approves the force that will ultimately go forward for final approval by the CSA.

d. Phase IV, leadership review and POM development. During phase IV, a Force Program Review (FPR) is conducted to resolve remaining issues not resolved by GOSC II. The FPR is chaired by the Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army (VCSA). The VCSA may or may not defer decisions to the CSA. This force that has been scrutinized, reviewed and approved is finally presented to the CSA for final approval as the base force for POM development. The TAA base force includes all components (active, ARNG, USAR, and host nation). It is from this point that the force documentation begins for this POM year (M-Force).

2–4. FFR process

a. The FFR uses results of the TAA qualitative analyses as the input for further analysis of the base force. Conducted at the conclusion of phase III, the FFR provides rapid assessment of the affordability and executability of the proposed force structure. If problems result from this assessment, the FFR provides GOSC II with alternatives to field the most capable force possible within available resources.

b. The FFR examines the TAA force alternatives and determines whether these can be equipped, manned, trained, sustained, mobilized, and provided facilities within the time and resources available. From these alternatives, the SA and CSA select and lock the POM force.

c. The TAA and FFR processes provide and maintain the flexibility to conduct unprogrammed affordability, supportability, and executability analyses of future requirements. In meeting these objectives, the processes provide rapid turn-around excursion capabilities to OSD, the JS, and Army senior leadership during periods of resource or mission turbulence.

Chapter 3
Responsibilities

3–1. Headquarters Department of the Army (HQDA) staff and support agencies

a. Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) (ASA(M&RA)). The ASA (M&RA) provides force structure, personnel, and manpower policy guidance.

b. HQDA staff and support agencies. HQDA staff/agencies will—

(1) Support the TAA/FFR process as required.

(2) Maintain a continuity of relationships between the POM force and the development of force-related programs.

(3) Provide policy and guidance.

(4) Designate a TAA point of contact (POC) and furnish the name and telephone number of the POC to ODCSOPS (DAMO-FDF).

(5) Update and/or revise logistical portions of the AFPDA, including planning factors.

(6) Update and/or revise appropriate CS/CSS unit allocation rules (existence, workload, and direct input). Additions, deletions, or changes must accurately reflect current Army doctrine and policies.

(7) Develop host nation support (HNS) force structure data based on information provided by CINCs.

(8) Participate in all TAA phases, panel reviews, and conferences (as required) to—

(a) Review phase II computer-generated CS/CSS force requirments.

(b) Review HQDA, CINC, and MACOM concerns, proposed changes, and potential issues.

(c) Analyze and determine requirements for additional nondeploying CS/CSS units, risk mitigation (AOL), allocation of resourced units to Total Army components, and general support forces issues.

(d) Participate in FSC II to validate resourcing decisions and integrate general support forces issues.

(9) Assist in performing executability, affordability, and supportability analyses of the base force alternatives, as required.

(10) Assess implications of force structure actions.

c. DCSOPS. The DCSOPS will—

(1) Exercise primary ARSTAF responsibility for all phases of the TAA/FFR process.

(2) Issue force planning guidance.

(3) Coordinate and supervise activities related to the development and management of the force. This will assure availability of personnel, training, equipment, and facilities when unit activations, conversions, or restationing actions are programmed.

(4) Task MACOMs and HQDA agencies for support, as required.

(5) Assure that approved TOEs and basis-of-issue plans (BOIPs) are reviewed, approved, and integrated into force management processes and the Force Management Integrated Database (FMIDB).

(6) Update and control the quality of the FMIDB (current force).

(7) Review DPG, IPS, and TAP guidance that outline combat force structure (fiscally constrained force) supporting initiation of the TAA. Assess unique requirements of operations other than war (OOTW), if appropriate.

(8) Review quantity and types of combat forces employed in each DPG scenario.

(9) Determine specific identification, size, and composition of fiscally constrained combat forces in accordance with TAP force structure guidance.

(10) Conduct FSC I.

(11) Conduct GOSC I.

(12) Coordinate and provide approved GOSC I guidance and required information to USACAA. USACAA will use these items to assess force structure requirements specified in the DPG and TAP for during phase II.

(13) In coordination with elements of the ARSTAF, MACOMs, HQDA staff and support agencies, and functional area proponents—

(a) Update and/or revise and approve the AFPDA factors.

(b) Update and/or revise and approve CS/CSS unit allocation rules (existence, workload, and direct input). Additions, deletions, or changes must accurately reflect current Army doctrine and policies.

(c) Develop and approve HNS force structure data provided by CINCs.

(d) Conduct phase III analysis, panel reviews, and conferences to—

(1) Review phase II computer-generated CS/CSS force requirements.

(2) Review HQDA, CINC, and MACOM concerns, proposed changes, and potential issues.

(3) Analyze requirements for additional nondeploying CS/CSS units, risk mitigation through reduction in ALO, allocation of resourced units to Total Army components, and TOE/MTOE issues.

(e) Provide input to FSC II to validate resourcing decisions and integrate general purpose and general support forces issues.

(f) Conduct the FFR and provide its results and issues, with appropriate recommendations, to GOSC II.

(14) Recommend to GOSC II the proposed force structure for each program year. This recommended program includes priorities for unit activations, inactivations, conversions, and authorized levels of organization for each year.

(15) Conduct GOSC II to approve FSC II decisions and address unresolved issues.

(16) Conduct FPR chaired by the VCSA. Resolve remaining GOSC II issues.

(17) Conduct CSA decision briefing.

(18) Conduct the SA briefing.

(19) In coordination with Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) (ASA(RDA)) and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DCSLOG)—

(a) Provide information on procurement plans and programs for materiel items.

(b) Forecast equipment availability to support required force structure, including unit activations and conversions.

(20) Provide ARSTAF elements, MACOMs, HQDA support agencies, and functional area proponents with the approved force structure for programming, by program year, so that all resource impacts may be assessed, corrected, and executed.

(21) Develop equipment distribution programs for HQDA controlled equipment.

(22) Adjust the program force structure, as required, to incorporate DPG changes, POM decisions, and decisions of the Secretary of Defense as directed in the program decision memorandum (PDM).

d. Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (DCSINT). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–1*b*, the DCSINT will—

(1) Provide threat validation, in coordination with U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM), for TAA use.

(2) Assess and make recommendations concerning U.S. Army intelligence and electronic warfare force structure, in conjunction with ODCSOPS.

e. DCSLOG. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–1*b*, the DCSLOG will—

(1) Develop equipment distribution programs for non-HQDA controlled equipment.

(2) Identify major end-item equipment shortfalls.

(3) Provide data on the distribution of materiel items of all classes, as required.

f. DCSPER. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–1*b*, the DCSPER will—

(1) Provide a personnel supportability analysis for the FFR to include historical data and analysis of projected undermanning with estimated trainees, transients, holdees, and students (TTHS) account projections.

(2) Assess personnel implications of force structure actions.

g. Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–1*b*, the ACSIM will maintain the Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) and assess impacts resulting from unit activations, inactivations, and conversions.

h. Chief of Engineers (COE). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–1*b*, the COE will—

(1) Update and revise engineer data in the AFPDA, in coordination with the U.S. Army Engineer School.

(2) Assess and make recommendations concerning force structure implications of real property policy and acquisition in theaters of operation, encompassing leasing, construction, and contracted engineering and services, including LOGCAP.

i. Director, USACAA. The Director, USACAA will—

(1) Conduct the quantitative analysis (phase II) as directed by ODCSOPS. Phase II consists of a series of analytical efforts and associated computer simulations to derive the EAD/EAC CS/CSS forces required to support the combat forces identified in DPG scenarios.

(2) Provide ODCSOPS phase II (TRANSMO and CEM) modeling output—including CS/CSS support force requirements identification that occurs between phase II and III (phased force list and MATCH report)—for each scenario.

(3) Provide analytical support to ODCSOPS, as required, for other TAA phases.

(4) Publish a TAA study report.

j. Chief, National Guard Bureau (CNGB). The CNGB will—

(1) Recommend, in coordination with ODCSOPS, specific types of units to be activated, inactivated, or converted within the ARNG.

(2) Recommend reallocation of units within the Total Army.

(3) Develop, based on troop program guidance (TPG), the Army National Guard Troop Structure Program (ARNG-TSP) in coordination with the State National Guard Headquarters (NG HQs).

(4) Assess the ARNG capability to meet base force unit requirements.

(5) Assist the ODCSOPS in assuring that the ARNG force structure is systematically and uniformly updated.

k. Chief, Army Reserve (CAR). The CAR will—

(1) Recommend specific types of units to be activated, inactivated, or converted within the USAR, in coordination with the DCSOPS, U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), U.S. Army, Pacific (USARPAC), U.S. Army, Europe (USAREUR), U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC), and the U.S. Army Reserve Command (USARC).

(2) Recommend reallocation of units within the Total Army.

(3) Develop and provide Troop Action Guidance to FORSCOM and other MACOMs with USAR-aligned units. This guidance will support development of the Reserve Component (COMPO 3) Program that contains all organizational actions planned for the USAR in the program years based on current TPG.

(4) Assess USAR capability to meet base force unit requirements.

(5) Assist the ODCSOPS in assuring that the USAR force structure is systematically and uniformly updated.

3–2. CINCs and MACOM commanders

a. All CINCs and MACOM commanders. CINCs and MACOM commanders, in support of ODCSOPS, will—

(1) Update and/or revise AFPDA planning factors.

(2) Develop HNS force structure data (as appropriate).

(3) Develop CINC Integrated Priority Lists (IPLs), as appropriate.

(4) Participate in all phases of analyses, panel reviews, and conferences (as appropriate) to—

(a) Review phase III computer-generated CS/CSS force requirements.

(b) Review HQDA, CINC, and MACOM concerns, proposed changes, and potential issues.

(c) Analyze requirements for additional nondeploying CS/CSS units, risk mitigation through the reduction of ALO, allocation of resourced units to Total Army components, and TOE/MTOE/TDA (general purpose and general support forces) issues.

(d) Participate in FSC II to validate resourcing decisions and integrate TOE/MTOE/TDA issues.

(5) Recommend priority of proposed changes in the Army force structure.

(6) Assist in performing FFR executability, affordability, and supportability analyses of the base force alternatives, as required.

(7) Assess implications of force structure actions in their areas of responsibility.

b. Commanding General (CG), TRADOC. In addition to the responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, TRADOC will—

(1) Provide input supporting update and/or revision of appropriate CS/CSS unit allocation rules (existence, workload, and direct input) and AFPDA items. Recommended additions, deletions, or changes must accurately reflect current Army doctrine and policies.

(2) Provide an analysis of deficiencies in TOE unit structures; develop alternatives to eliminate or reduce deficiencies through the combat developments process for approval during the force design update (FDU) process.

(3) In accordance with AR 700–8, provide support to the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (ODCSLOG) in reviewing and updating logistical portions of the AFPDA.

c. CG, FORSCOM. In addition to the responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, FORSCOM will—

(1) Specify the availability of units by unit identification code (UIC) to satisfy force unit requirements.

(2) Review and comment on the FASTALS unit arrival times in theater.

(3) Assess the readiness status of units by force package.

(4) Assess impact of force structure activations, conversions, and inactivations.

d. CG, USAREUR. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USAREUR will—

(1) Identify theater-unique requirements and infrastructure that affect the force structure.

(2) Review and comment on the FASTALS unit arrival times in theater.

(3) Provide information on in-theater employment of reinforcing units, as appropriate.

(4) Assess the impact of, and provide priorities for, force structure additions, conversions, and inactivations.

(5) Assess the readiness status of units by force package.

e. CG, USARPAC. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USARPAC will—

(1) Identify theater-unique requirements and infrastructure (less Eighth U.S. Army (EUSA)) that affect the force structure.

(2) Review and comment on the FASTALS unit arrival times in theater.

(3) Provide information on in-theater employment of reinforcing units, as appropriate.

(4) Assess the impact of force structure actions.

(5) Assess the readiness status of units by force package.

f. CG, EUSA. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, EUSA will—

(1) Identify requirements and infrastructure unique to EUSA that affect required force structure.

(2) Review and comment on the FASTALS unit arrival times in theater.

(3) Provide data on Combined Defense Improvement Projects, as appropriate.

(4) Assess the readiness status of units by force package.

g. CG, U.S. Army Information Systems Command (USAISC). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USAISC will—

(1) Review and comment on EAC communication unit requirements and priorities.

(2) Identify worldwide communications requirements that must be considered in the force structure requirements analysis.

(3) Provide assessment of EAC communication force structure requirements and the Army's ability to satisfy them.

h. CG, INSCOM. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, INSCOM will—

(1) Provide threat information on DCSINT-approved intelligence requirements.

(2) Provide allied force information.

(3) Provide assessment of, and requirements for, U.S. Army EAC intelligence and electronic warfare force structure.

(4) In coordination with ODCSINT, support validation of threat data.

i. CG, U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, AMC will assess the impact of combat service support force structure actions on the continental United States (CONUS) wholesale logistics base.

j. CG, U.S. Army Medical Command (USAMEDCOM). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USAMEDCOM will—

(1) Update and revise appropriate unit allocation rules for medical TOE and TDA units, COMPOs 1, 2, and 3, through the U.S. Army Medical Department Center and School (AMEDDC&S).

(2) Assess the impact of force structure changes particularly as they relate to medical treatment facilities in the CONUS base providing beneficiary health care and mobilization medical support and conducting CONUS base hospital bed expansion.

(3) Assess the impact of medical unit force structure actions with FORSCOM, developing full impacts on professional officer filler system (PROFIS) availability.

(4) Provide an analysis of deficiencies in TOE and TDA medical structure and recommend alternatives to eliminate or reduce deficiencies through the combat development process via the AMEDDC&S.

(5) Ensure TDA troop program unit (TPU) medical units are included in the phased force list.

(6) Develop casualty estimation rates for disease, non-battle injuries, and battle fatigue through the AMEDDC&S.

k. CG, USASOC. In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USASOC will—

(1) Identify force structure requirements unique to USASOC.

(2) Assess the impact of force structure actions.

l. CG, U.S. Army, South (USARSO). In addition to responsibilities in paragraph 3–2*a*, the CG, USARSO will—

(1) Identify force structure requirements unique to USARSO.

(2) Assess the impact of force structure actions.

Appendix A
References

Section I
Required Publications

AR 700–8
Logistics Planning Factors and Data Management (cited in paragraph 3–2)

Section II
Related Publications

AR 5–5
Army Studies and Analyses

AR 10–5
Organization and Functions, Headquarters, Department of the Army

AR 25–1
The Army Information Resources Management Program

AR 70–1
Army Acquisition Policy

AR 71–2
Basis-of-Issue Plans (BOIPs) and Qualitative and Quantitative Personnel Requirements Information (QQPRI)

AR 71–9
Materiel Objectives and Requirements

AR 220–1
Unit Status Reporting

AR 310–25
Dictionary of United States Army Terms

AR 310–50
Authorized Abbreviations and Brevity Codes

AR 420–17
Real Property and Resource Management

AR 708–1
Cataloging and Supply Management Data

Section III
Prescribed Forms
This section contains no entries.

Section IV
Referenced Forms
This section contains no entries.

Appendix B
TAA Key Events/Actions

B–1. Phase I, force guidance
Actions to be completed during Phase I are shown below:

a. Review DPG, IPS, and draft TAP force-sizing guidance that determines combat force structure (fiscally constrained force).

b. Review quantity and type of "above-the-line" combat forces employed in each IPS.

c. Update and control the quality of the FMIDB (current force).

d. Determine specific identification, size, and composition of "above-the-line" combat forces based on TAP force structure guidance.

e. Update and/or revise the AFPDA planning factors for the next TAA cycle.

f. Update and/or revise CS/CSS unit allocation rules (existence, workload, and direct input). Additions, deletions, or changes must accurately reflect current Army doctrine and policies. This is to ensure that the doctrinal requirement for this unit is represented correctly.

g. Conduct FSC I. This conference, hosted by ODCSOPS, is attended by representatives from the ARSTAF, MACOMs, TRADOC schools and integrating centers, National Guard Bureau (NGB), and Office of the Chief, Army Reserve (OCAR). It includes an opening TAA overview, workgroups conducted by the organization integrator (OI), and culminates with formal briefings to a council of colonels (COC) to present the status of their SRCs and present issues to be resolved.

h. Conduct GOSC I. This conference, hosted by ODCSOPS, approves the analysis and resolves issues from FSC I.

i. Between FSC I and GOSC I, USACAA conduct two computer model simulations using the approved "above-the-line" forces. USACAA will have deployed the force using the TRANSMO and should have finished the warfighting simulation for all scenarios using the CEM.

j. Coordinate and provide approved guidance and required inputs to USACAA for Phase II. With the culmination of GOSC I all the allocation rules, AFPDS updates and SRC updates will have been approved for CAA to begin inputting into the FASTALS model. Once all the data has been input, the FASTALS model can be run.

B–2. Phase II, quantitative analysis
Actions to be completed during Phase II are shown below:

a. Conduct a series of analytical efforts to derive the EAD/EAC CS/CSS forces required to support the combat forces identified in IPS. CS/CSS requirements analysis is conducted using FASTALS. The output is the CS/CSS support force requirements identification and MATCH report for each scenario.

b. Provide ODCSOPS modeling output for dissemination to the field for review.

c. Issue formulation in preparation for FSC II (phase III).

B–3. Phase III, qualitative analysis
Actions to be completed during Phase III are shown below:

a. Conduct analysis, panel reviews, and conferences (as required) to—

(1) Review phase II computer-generated CS/CSS force requirements.

(2) Review HQDA, CINC, and MACOM concerns, proposed changes, and potential issues.

(3) Analyze requirements for additional nondeploying CS/CSS units, risk mitigation in the reduction of ALO in units, allocation of resourced units to Total Army components, and TOE/MTOE/TDA issues.

b. Conduct FSC II. FSC II, hosted by ODCSOPS, is attended by representatives from the CINCs, MACOMs, ARSTAF elements, TRADOC schools and integrating centers, NGB, and OCAR. It begins with an overview of the status thus far. The field will have had an opportunity to analyze the FASTALS computer outputs and will be prepared to present special issues before any of the SRC workshops begin. The culmination of the conference will be a COC who will be addressed by each OI concerning their SRCs for the resourcing phase. Unresolved issues will be recorded for presentation to GOSC II.

c. Conduct FFR. The initial force that emerges from FSC II is reviewed by the ARSTAF to determine if it meets the criteria as defined in the DPG/IPS and fiscal constraints. If the review determines that this force will not meet the constraints, then a rescheduling of an additional FSC will be required. If the force meets the constraints, the results of this review will go forward to GOSC II.

d. Conduct GOSC II. This forum, much like GOSC I, is represented by general officers or their representatives from the CINCs

and MACOMs, ARSTAF, TRADOC schools and integrating centers, NGB, and OCAR. This forum resolves issues from FSC II and approves the initial force to go forward to the VCSA.

B–4. Phase IV, leadership review

Actions to be completed during Phase IV are shown below:

a. Conduct FPR chaired by the VCSA. General review of qualitative and quantitative analyses. Resolve remaining GOSC II issues.

b. Conduct CSA decision briefing. TAA base force (COMPO 1–4) drives development of the Army's POM.

c. Conduct the SA decision briefing.

Appendix C
Allocation Rule Examples

C–1. An allocation rule is machine readable statement of a unit's capability, mission and/or doctrinal employment. Normally, it is an arithmetic statement that incorporates the appropriate planning factors. There are four types of allocation rules:

a. Theater structure.

b. Existence.

c. Workload.

d. Manual (direct input).

C–2. Theater structure variables allocate units as a function of a theater's physical and organizational structure, e.g., one medium helicopter aviation company per corps and one per theater army.

C–3. Existence variables allocate units based on the existence of other units in the theater. Examples are—

a. One military police physical security company per ordnance special ammunition company.

b. One signal battalion (mobile subscriber equipment (MSE)) per division headquarters and headquarters company.

C–4. Workload variables allocate units based on specific logistics or administrative services in proportion to the volume of those services. Each unit's allocation is affected by a set of data items. Some examples are—

a. One heavy equipment general support (GS) maintenance company per 1,000 GS maintenance man-hours required per day.

b. One base post office type O to serve up to 30,000 personnel; one base post office type P to serve from 30,000 to 50,000 personnel.

c. A light truck company could be allocated based on the results of calculating the number of short tons of Class IX and the short tons of general supplies to be transported and subtracting the HNS truck companies available.

C–5. Units may be manually prescribed in the event that the standard allocation methods do not cover a specific case. The example is the assignment of combat units to counter the threat in specific areas of combat activity.

Glossary

Section I
Abbreviations

AFPDA
Army force planning data and assumptions

ALO
authorized level of organization

AMC
U.S. Army Materiel Command

AR
Army regulation

ARNG
Army National Guard

ARSTAF
Army Staff

ASA(M&RA)
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

ASA(RDA)
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development, and Acquisition)

BOIP
basis-of-issue plan

CAR
Chief, Army Reserve

CG
commanding general

CINC
Commander in Chief

CJCS
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

CNGB
Chief, National Guard Bureau

COE
Chief of Engineers

CONUS
continental United States

CS
combat support

CSA
Chief of Staff, U.S. Army

CSS
combat service support

DA
Department of the Army

DCSINT
Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence

DCSLOG
Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics

DCSOPS

DCSPER
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

DOD
Department of Defense

EAC
echelons above corps

EAD
echelons above division

FEBA
forward edge of the battle area

FORSCOM
Forces Command

GS
general support

HNS
host nation support

HQ
headquarters

INSCOM
Intelligence and Security Command

JCS
Joint Chiefs of Staff

KIA
killed in action

LOGCAP
logistical civil augmentation program

MACOM
major Army command

MTOE
modification table(s) of organization and equipment

NCA
National Command Authority

NGB
National Guard Bureau

OCAR
Office of the Chief, Army Reserve

ODCSLOG
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics

ODCSOPS
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans

OSD
Office of the Secretary of Defense

PDM
Program Decision Memorandum

POC
point of contact

POM
program objective memorandum

PPBES
planning, programming, and budgeting system

PW
prisoner of war
Secretary of the Army

SRC
standard requirement code

TAA
total Army analysis

TDA
tables of distribution and allowances

TOE
table(s) of organization and equipment

TPU
troop program unit

TRADOC
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

UIC
unit identification code

USACAA
U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency

USAR
U.S. Army Reserve

USAREUR
U.S. Army, Europe

VCSA
Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army

WIA
wounded in action

Section II
Terms

Above-the-line forces
Combat forces (divisions, separate brigades, armored cavalry regiments, special operations forces groups) including their organic combat support and combat service support, identified for employment in the illustrative planning scenarios in accordance with the Army Plan force structure guidance.

Below-the-line forces
Those echelons above division combat, combat support, and combat service support forces required to support the deployed above-the-line forces.

Basis-of-issue plan
Planning document that lists: the wartime requirements for TOE in which a new or improved item of equipment will be required, the number of items to be included in each organization element, and other equipment and personnel changes required to operate, maintain, or transport the item. The BOIP is a requirements document.

Combat developments
The process of determining doctrinal, training (to include leader development), organizational, and materiel requirements and translating organizational requirements into unit models.

Force management
The process of determining force requirements and alternative means of resourcing requirements by allocating resources and assessing the utilization resources to accomplish Army functions and missions.

ACSIM
Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management

AMEDDC&S
Army Medical Department Center and School

ARNG–TSP
Army National Guard–Troop Structure Program

CEM
Concepts Evaluation Model

COC
Council of colonels

COMPO 1
Active Component

COMPO 2
Army National Guard

COMPO 3
US Army Reserve

COMPO 4
Unresourced unit equivalent

COMPO 7
Direct host nation offset

COMPO 8
Indirect host nation offset

COMPO 9
Logistics civil augmentation program

DPG
Defense Planning Guidance

EUSA
Eighth U.S. Army

FASTALS
Force Analysis Simulation of Theater Administrative and Logistics Support

FDU
force design update

FFR
force feasibility review

FMIDB
Force Management Integrated Database

FPR
force program review

FSC
Force Structure Conference

FYDP
Future Years Defense Program

GOSC
General Officer Steering Committee

IPL
Integrated Priority List

IPS
illustrative planning scenario

JS
Joint Staff

JSPS
Joint Strategic Planning System
management decision package

MERLIN
MDEP Equation for Resource Linking

MSE
mobile subscriber equipment

NBDI
nonbattle death and injury

NMS
National Military Strategy

OI
organization integrator

OOTW
operations other than war

PPBES
planning, programming, budgeting and executing system

PROFIS
professional officer filler system

RPMP
Real Property Master Plan

TAP
Total Army Plan

TPG
troop program guidance

TRANSMO
Transportation Model

TTHS
trainees, transients, holdees, and students

USAISC
U.S. Army Information Systems Command

USAMEDCOM
U.S. Army Medical Command

USARC
U.S. Army Reserve Command

USARPAC
U.S. Army, Pacific

USARSO
U.S. Army, South

USASOC
U.S. Army Special Operations Command

Index

This index is organized alphabetically by topic and by subtopic within a topic. Topics and subtopics are identified by paragraph number.

Army force planning data and assumptions (AFPDA)
Description of, 2–3
ARSTAF revision of, 3–1c
Approval of, 3–1d
Engineer data in, 3–1i
CINC and MACOM revision, 3–2e
CG TRADOC responsibilities, 3–2b
In TAA phase I, B–1
Allocation rules
Description of, 2–3
Examples, C–1, C–2, C–3, C–4, C–5
Updating and revising, 3–1, B–1
For medical TOE/TDA, 3–2j
Types of, C–1

Concepts Evaluation Model (CEM), 2–3, 3–2, B–1

Force Analysis Simulation of Theater Administrative and Logistics Support (FASTALS), 2–3, 3–2c, 3–2d, 3–2e, 3–2f, B–1, B–3, B–3
Force Builder, 2–3
Force feasibility review (FFR), 2–1, 2–2, 2–3, 3–1b, 3–1d, 3–2a, B–3
Compressed, 1–5
Process, 2–4
Personnel supportability analysis for, 3–1g
Force program review (FPR), 2–1, 2–3, 3–1d, B–4
Force Structure Conference I, 2–3, 3–1d, B–1
Force Structure Conference II, 2–3, 3–1c, 3–1d, 3–2a, B–2, B–3

General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), 2–3, 3–1d, B–1, B–3, B–4

Illustrative planning scenarios (IPS), 1–5, 2–1, 2–3, 3–1d, B–1, B–2, B–3

Logistical civil augmentation program (LOGCAP), 2–2, 3–1i

MATCH report, 2–3, 3–1j, B–2
MERLIN, 2–3

Planning, programming, and budgeting system (PPBS), 1–1, 1–4, 2–1
Planning, programming, budgeting, and execution system (PPBES), 1–1, 1–4
Program objective memorandum (POM) force, 1–4, 2–1, 2–2, 2–3, 2–4, 3–1a, B–4

Responsibilities, 3–1, 3–2

The Army Plan (TAP), 1–4, 1–5, 2–1, 3–1d, B–1
TAA
Cycle, 1–5
Phases, 2–3
Process, 2–2
Key events, B–1, B–2, B–3, B–4
Transportation Model (TRANSMO), 2–3, 3–1j, B–1

U. S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (USACAA), 2–3, 3–1d, 3–1j, B–1

U. S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), 2–3, 3–2b, B–3

USAPA

ELECTRONIC PUBLISHING SYSTEM
TEXT FORMATTER ... Version 2.64

PIN:	045241–000
DATE:	12-07-99
TIME:	08:22:03
PAGES SET:	14

DATA FILE:	r71.fil
DOCUMENT:	AR 71–11
DOC STATUS:	NEW PUBLICATION