

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR



NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION
ORGANISATION DU TRAITÉ DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
HEADQUARTERS, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER TRANSFORMATION
7857 BLANDY ROAD, SUITE 100
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA, 23551-2490



5000 TSC FET 0100/TT-10856/Ser: NU 050502

TO: See Distribution

SUBJECT: Minutes of the NATO Lessons Learned Workshop, 8-9 April 2014

DATE: 27 May 2014

REFERENCE(S): A. ACOS CEI calling letter 5000 TSC FET-0100/TT-10401Ser:
NU 0150, 25 Feb. 2014.

1. Following the NATO LL Workshop held in Lisbon from 8-9 May 2014, attached are the minutes of the meeting with a summary of the discussions.

2. Key topics include:

- a. Allied Joint Doctrine Campaign Plan.
- b. Policy and Directives: Status and need for update.
- c. NATO LL Working Group: Current Status, Way Ahead.
- d. NATO LL Portal.
- e. Presentation of the "Extra" COI Portal.
- f. How do we see COEs as a part of NATO LL Process?

3. Should there be any questions, our point of contact is LTC Paolo BARTOLINI, IDLL Branch, NCN 555-3670, e-mail paolo.bartolini@act.nato.int.

FOR THE SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER TRANSFORMATION:

Henrik Sommer
Brigadier General Danish Army
Assistant Chief of Staff
Capability Engineering & Innovation Division

JOINT ANALYSIS AND LESSONS LEARNED CENTER

REGISTRY - INCOMING MAIL

Date in: 28 / May / 2014

Mail-Log-No in: 3400 / 14

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

ENCLOSURE:

1. Minutes of the NATO LL Workshop held in Lisbon on 8-9 May 2014.

DISTRIBUTION:

External –

Action:

NATO HQ, IMS Plans and Policy Division
STRE NATO
HQ SHAPE
HQ JFCB
HQ JFCN
HQ AIRCOM
HQ LANDCOM
HQ MARCOM

Information:

NATO HQ (LLPOC)
HQ ISAF
HQ KFOR
Commander, Centre for Analysis & Simulation for the Preparation of Air Operations
(CASPOA)

Internal –

Action:

COS JALLC
COS JWC
COS JFTC

Information:

COS ACT
DCOS CAPDEV
TN Branch for COEs

ENCLOSURE 1 TO:
 5000 TSC FET 0100/TT-10856/Ser: NU0502
 DATED: 27 MAY 2014

**MINUTES OF THE
 NATO LESSONS LEARNED WORKING GROUP (LLWG) Workshop
 8-9 April 2014**

List of Attendees:

Organization	WG Member
HQ SACT	COL Dariusz ROZEK, POL-F (Chairman) LTC Paolo BARTOLINI, ITA-A LTC Erik BALLE, DNK-F WG CDR Andrew Lloyd, GBR-F
SACT STRE	COL Mircea GOLOGAN, ROU-A
SHAPE	COL Antonio SAMPAIO, PRT-F CDR Manuel GONZALEZ SERRANO, ESP-N LTC Paolo VIVA, ITA-A
JALLC	COL Santiago SAN ANTONIO, ESP-A Gp Capt Adrian HILL, GBR-F CDR Mike KLEIBAUM, DEU-N Mr. Andrew EDEN, GBR-C LTC Javier CORROCHANO, ESP-F MAJ Srecko GOGIC, HRV-A Mr. John REDMAYNE, GBR-C LTC Vasileios TSAMIS, GRC-A LTC Nerijus STANKEVICIUS, LTU A LTC KORSGARD Bjarne, A-NOR LTC James JOHNSON, USA-A MAJ Remy GUILLIN, FRA-A LTC Zsolt HORNYÁK, HUN-A
JWC	Mr. Paul SEWELL, GBR-C
JFC Brunssum	LTC Francisco MARTINEZ LOZANO, ESP-A CDR Jörg SACH, DEU-N MAJ Stuart SIMPSON, GBR
JFC Naples	COL Rumen RUSSINOV, BGR-A CDR Carlos FERRERE, ESP-N LTC Frederic BERTOLOZZI, FRA-F LTC Philip ROBINSON, GBR-A
LANDCOM	LTC Steffen RÖCHOW, DEU-F
MARCOM	CDR Andrius SIRVYS, LTU-N

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

AIRCOM	WG CDR Suzanne HINTON, GBR-F MAJ Tomas RADA, CZE-F
CASPOA	LTC Jean-Pierre ALBIOL, FRA-F CAPT Alexandra JARRY, FRA-F

1. **Place, date and aim.**

a. The event, organized by HQ SACT and hosted by JALLC, took place in Oeiras, Lisbon (Portugal) at JALLC's conference facilities in the STRIKFORNATO compound from 8 to 9 April 2014.

b. Aim: To provide grounds for further improvement of the NATO LL process within the NATO LL Community and to identify how to strengthen the collaboration with other NATO and Non-NATO Entities, in particular with the COEs.

2. **Day 1, 8 April 2014.**

a. **Opening remarks.**

Col. Dariusz Rozek (Branch Head Innovation, Doctrine and Lessons Learned Branch - IDLL - in HQ SACT) welcomed participants to the NATO LL Working Group Workshop. He reminded the audience of the scope of this WS (see paragraph above) and that the solution has to be found through the collaboration of all the attendees, as the word *workshop* specifies.

b. **Allied Joint Doctrine Campaign Plan (WG CDR Andrew Lloyd, GBR-F).**

(1) WG CDR Andrew Lloyd was the first speaker and introduced the Allied Joint Doctrine Campaign plan. The aim of this presentation was to:

(a) Detail the developments within ACT to deliver Allied Joint Doctrine through the presentation delivered to the MC 27 Mar. 2014.

(b) Emphasize the vital nature of lessons to support the Allied Joint Doctrine Campaign Plan and doctrine Custodians to keep doctrine relevant.

(c) Detail the Data Fusion Process within the Campaign Plan and how it was reliant upon inputs from the LL community, notably the JFCs, ACO, JWC and JALLC.

(d) Detail the senior intent within ACT to coordinate activities of JALLC, JWC and the wider lessons community to assist doctrine development.

(2) Main subjects:

(a) Background.

(b) Allied Joint Doctrine & ACT.

(c) Where Does NATO Stand?

(d) AJP Development.

(e) Re-energizing of ACT Strategic Role In Doctrine Development.

(f) Proposed Campaign Plan.

(g) Data Fusion.

(h) Decision Support Tool.

(i) Request to the MC.

(j) Vision.

(3) Conclusion, way ahead. Real success depends upon:

(a) All nations to actively support the Campaign Plan and the custodians in the writing process.

(b) National contributions to the LI process.

(c) NCS contributions to the LI process.

(d) National aid to conducting the data fusion task.

(e) ACT maintaining its momentum in Doctrine development as part of Force Development.

(4) Vision: To make Doctrine and Standardization timely, up-to-date and relevant to operations, and through the optimization of the Force Development Cycle to provide the foundation for Smart Defence and the Connected Forces Initiative.

c. Policy and Directives: Status and need for update (LTC Paolo Bartolini).

(1) Aim of this presentation: To introduce the main LL Directives and their status in light of the subjects to be discussed in the Workshop.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

- (2) Main subjects:
- (a) NATO LL Policy.
 - (b) BI-SC DIR 080-006: Lessons Learned.
 - (c) ACT DIR 80-12: Handling and management of analysis reports within ACT.
 - (d) Problems in drafting a new Directive concerning Analysis.
- (3) Conclusion:
- (a) NATO LL Policy allows NATO Command Structure bodies to deeper involve COEs in the NATO LL Process.
 - (b) NATO LL Portal (NLLP) - former NATO LL Database - is widely recognized as main NATO LL sharing tool.
 - (c) The new 2013 BI-SC Directive 080-006:
 - 1/ Does not implement the NATO LL Policy concerning the COEs involvement and still continues to consider them as "non-NATO organizations".
 - 2/ Does implement the NATO LL Policy concerning the NATO Portal role in the NATO context.
 - 3/ Introduces the NATO LL Working Group (WG), leaving open the issue concerning the Terms of References.
 - (d) The introduction of a new Directive concerning not only the staffing of PARL but also the endorsement phase of the Analysis Reports, conflicts with the already existing ACT, SHAPE and ACO directives on the endorsement process. The work on this new Analysis Directives, thus, is for the moment suspended in order to re-address the issue in light of this new scenario.
- (4) Message:
- 1/ NATO LL Working Group members have to consider COEs as part of the wide NATO framework, as per the "Military Committee Concept for Centres of Excellence" (4 December 2003); furthermore, the NATO LL policy has created the premise for their further involvement in the NATO LL process.
 - 2/ NATO LL Portal has to become the common sharing tool within the LL community. This should be particularly true especially when we deal with operations,

even if non-NATO nations joint the operations. This fact does not have to discourage the NATO members, forming the alliance, to use the NLLP. Thus, in the case of Afghanistan, JFCBS has to consider uploading the data to the NLLP instead of CIDNE (in theatre for RSM).

3/ The NATO LL Working Group, one year after its creation, has to be re-thought, to better use its potential.

d. **NATO LL Working Group: Current Status, Way Ahead (break out session).**

(1) The audience was split into three syndicates. The main topic of the discussion concerned the Working Group VTC as a tool for cooperation and coordination within the Group. Does this tool need to be re-thought? Furthermore, is there any need for the WG members to meet each other in person almost once a year?

(2) First syndicate's conclusions:

(a) Purpose: The LL WG should be aimed at solving the enduring issues within NATO LL, for example, a resistance to share lessons, lack of endorsement from leadership, below average use of the NATO LL portal, etc. Each year a topic is chosen and then the NATO LL WG spends that year working on solving that issue. The NATO LL WG then becomes a group which is working on the issues and solving them. On a smaller scale, this process could run similar to our AR process, whereby ideas are put forward, SHAPE and HQ SACT then decide on the topic for the year and then the WG spends the year on the issue to find possible actions for implementation.

(b) Means: VTCs together with meetings, the NATO LL Portal and the e-mails should form the framework with which the NATO LL Working Group members work in order to improve the value of the LL in NATO and in the NATO Nations. The NATO LL WG currently has an ongoing VTC, but should consider all possible means to solve the annual issue. For example:

1/ Email: For initial proposal of ideas and group work on the topic chosen.

2/ VTC: Main coordination meetings to discuss the status of the project.

3/ Two face-to-face meetings: Either in Europe (JALLC, SHAPE, etc.) or US (HQ SACT) to come together for initial brainstorming when focusing on the issue. The second face-to-face meeting could be for the final production of the report/paper. The face-to-face meetings should also be used for maintaining the

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

community and raising other issues (as we have in the past).

4/ Workspace: Perhaps a closed site on the JALLC-hosted NLLP could be created for the WG to upload and work on files, as the JALLC already does for their Analysis projects.

(c) Membership: Predominantly, members of the NATO LL WG, but draw expertise from other Subject Matter Experts across NATO.

(3) Second syndicate's conclusions:

(a) Need for meeting in person within the LLWG Community twice in a year. If possible in occasion of other events like the NATO LL Conference.

(b) Discussion during VTC should occur on topics made available well in advance.

(c) Look more ahead.

(d) Define in advance the output of the VTC.

(e) The minutes should include the action list and a record of decisions.

(f) Focus on a specific annual issue.

(g) Use of the NATO LL Portal through the creation of a specific LLWG Community of Interest.

(h) Use of e-mail for information purposes.

(i) Meetings and VTCs are just tools: the real focus are the problems.

(4) Third syndicate's conclusions:

(a) VTCs have to have clear purposes. No generic VTCs but specific VTCs.

(b) Specific standard agenda items in which are identified the key issues, the points to address per key issue, and the speakers with allotted times.

(c) The minutes have to contain the status of the issue(s) addressed, the actions taken and the record of decisions.

(d) There is a need for the LL WG community to meet each other in person twice a year; the best place would be Lisbon.

e. **NATO LL Portal (first part).**

This subject was divided in four topics, the first, "Status in the NATO LL Portal (NLLP) development", was introduced by JALLC with the aim to update the audience on the last status of the portal and the developments in progress. The other three points were introduced by HQ SACT in order to set the premise for the following discussion aimed to give the opportunity to all NATO LLWG Members together to contribute directly to the development of the NLLP and to prepare the ground for the next Workshop with COEs. In particular:

(1) **Status NLLP development (LTC Javier Corrochano).**

(a) Aim of this presentation: see paragraph above.

(b) Main subjects:

1/ The NLLP on the Secret WAN.

2/ The NLLP on the internet.

3/ Ongoing Developments.

(c) Conclusion and message: Even if the Portal needs some refinements, it is already operative and its utilization should be encouraged at every level within and outside NATO. The NATO LL Portal was deployed summer 2013. Since then, the JALLC has had very little feedback from users. Some improvements will be implemented in the near future, but the key message is the need to encourage every NATO entity to use the Portal as the single sharing tool for LL related NATO-wide issues, providing feedback to the JALLC in order to improve the NLLP capabilities in the future.

(2) **Integration of Community of Interests (COIs) and the NLLP (LTC Erik BALLE).**

(a) Aim of this presentation:

1/ Highlight the importance of the NLLP as a place to host and to manage the COIs.

2/ Facilitate the discussion on how to build a COI, how to do the common features, how to have them work and what the COEs' task should be.

(b) Main subjects:

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

- 1/ Subject Matter Experts as main natural actors to create COIs.
- 2/ Example of Action Plan.
- 3/ Aim of this week with COEs.
- 4/ COIs and the NLLP.
- 5/ Different Layout of COIs.
- 6/ Procedure for submitting documents in the existing COIs.
- 7/ Finding Lessons in NLLP.
- 8/ Repositories.
- 9/ Where we want to go? How COEs should be linked to NLLP.

(c) Conclusion, HQ SACT's requirements to be discussed together:

- 1/ COIs should be part of the NLLP.
- 2/ Clear "ownership" (content manager), which should be the COEs' where possible.
- 3/ Standardized layout provided by JALLC.
- 4/ Share library with the NLLP.
- 5/ Lessons and documents accessible from both the COI and the main library.
- 6/ Easy upload, similar to the NLLP.

(3) Tracking/Staffing tool. Current use and expectations (LTC Erik BALLE).

(a) Aim of this presentation: To facilitate a discussion about the staffing/tracking tool in the NLLP.

(b) Main subjects:

- 1/ Copy a system = Copy the problem.
- 2/ Facts concerning the new NLLP.

(c) Points discussed together:

- 1/ Should we build a new Portal?

- 2/ Is it realistic to expect every LI to be staffed through the staffing tool?
- 3/ Should we kill the staffing tool?
- 4/ Should we change the way we use it?
- 5/ Why do we want to see every LI turn into a LL?
- 6/ What does it take to make it attractive to use?

(d) Conclusion:

1/ It has been recognized that the portal used as staffing/tracking tool is not of great usefulness for the stakeholders. In any case, before deciding to dismiss it, it has been agreed to further test it. Therefore, IDLL Branch will follow the Skolkan analysis report, utilizing the staffing/tracking tool on the NATO LL portal.

(4) **Data transfer from LLDdb to NLLP. (LTC Erik BALLE).**

- (a) Aim of this presentation: To come up to a solution and a final decision about the process of data migration from the current NS LL database to new NLLP.
- (b) Main subjects: Current dispositions and how to better implement them.
- (c) Conclusion, main points from the discussion: We will adopt a silence procedure with an expiration date in order to allow the stakeholders to update any documents before they are transferred to the new portal

f. **NATO LL Portal (part 2, break out session). Discussion on sharing. How can we encourage sharing? (LTC Erik BALLE).**

- (1) The audience was split into three syndicates. The main topic of the discussion concerned what we can do to further encourage sharing, considering both NATO and Nations.
- (2) First syndicate's conclusion: There is a need to share not only observations, LI and LL but also the NATO LL process. If we really want to enhance sharing, everyone has to know the NATO LL process and not only the LL members.
- (3) Second syndicate's conclusion: Sharing with the right people at the right moment. Better involvement of the leadership.
- (4) Third syndicate conclusion: Sharing is an important aspect of the NATO LL process. It should always be pursued. It is a question of mind-set.

3. **Day 2, 9 April 2014.**

a. **LL and exercises (by JALLC).**

(1) Aim of this presentation: To illustrate the issue concerning the need for a clarification about the roles that HQ SACT JFT and JALLC play during the exercises and the implementation of the LIAP.

(2) Main subject: Chapter 6 of the BI-SCD 075-003 "Collective Training and Exercise" ed. 2013.

(3) Conclusion: The need for clarification is still open. HQ SACT IDLL has to clarify this aspect with JFT.

b. **Presentation of the "Extra" COI Portal. (LTC Nerijus STANKEVICIUS).**

(1) Aim of this presentation: To illustrate to the audience the "Extra" Portal, its features and potentialities as a practical example of COI hosted in the NLLP.

(2) Main Subject: The "Extra" Portal, its main features and how it works.

c. **How do we see COEs as a part of NATO LL Process? (Break out session).**

(1) Aim of this breakout session: To set a common view and a common way of action within the NATO LL Working Group concerning a deeper involvement of the COEs in the NATO LL Process. The audience was split into three syndicates.

(2) Results: All syndicates agreed that the cooperation with COEs has to be researched involving COEs in staffing ARs and or supporting JALLC in its staffing process (naturally this is for those COEs that possess a LL capability).

4. **Outcomes and Way Ahead.**

a. **NATO LL Working Group:**

(1) Use of physical meeting(s) in addition to less VTCs (LLWG Chairman).

(2) Action list and record of decisions (LLWG SEC).

(3) Create COI for LLWG on NLLP (JALLC).

(4) Revise LLWG TORs and include in the Directive 080-006 (SCs).

(5) Discuss how to change the mindset of leadership and staff at next LLWG WS.

(6) LLWG WS should focus on one main topic.

b. **NATO LL Portal:**

(1) Letter from HQ SACT to all NATO entities requesting them to review all entries in the NLLDb under their responsibility and update their status. This will be the step before initiating the transfer of data from LLDdb to NLLP. Silence procedure will apply, deadline 31 August 2014.

(2) ODCR format should always be used for Lessons Identified included in Analysis reports (JALLC)

(3) The JALLC is currently working in the NLLP upgrade, as requested by HQ SACT. For this purpose, user's involvement is paramount (JALLC).

(4) JFCBS has to consider using the NLLP instead of CIDNE (in theatre for RSM).

(5) The NLLP tracking functionalities should continue to be tested (HQ SACT).

(6) LLWG members should be involved in the NLLP future upgrades by providing their feedback and comments.

(7) Update the list of users with special rights (POC and Power Users) in the NLLP (WG members to compile list and report by next LLWG meeting).

(8) Strategic Marketing to be added to agenda for next LLWG WS.

c. **Sharing:**

(1) NATO Commands are to upload LL from their internal Databases to NLLP before next LLWG VTC (All).

(2) LLWG members are encouraged to promote the importance and correct use of the NATO LL process, policy and tools (All).

d. **Exercises:**

(1) IDLL will meet JFT and clarify JFT role in the exercise LL process and the tracking of LIAP implementation.

(2) Inputs from commands involved in EX regarding LL process at future LLWG meeting.

e. **COEs and the NATO LL Process:**

(1) Request for support from a COE must go through TNB in HQ SACT for inclusion in the COE PoW (All).

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
RELEASABLE TO ISAF/KFOR

- (2) Develop a procedure for offering our ARs to COEs and supporting COEs' Analysis Requirements. Originator of an AR should indicate if the AR can be addressed to a COE (HQ SACT).
- (3) The COE's access to NS network should be emphasized/improved/increased. Incorporate in (re-) accreditation (HQ SACT).
- (4) Ask COEs what support they can offer. Information can be found in PDF on TRANSNET.
- (5) ACT will take into consideration the need for filling the existing gap in the NATO LL Process through, for example, COEs, NATO Agencies,...

5. **Closing Remarks.**

COL Dariusz Rozek thanked the attendees for their participation and for their precious contribution with which many open issues have finally found a solution. COL Rozek also thanked JALLC for the support that it has given to HQ SACT in order to make this event possible.

Prepared by: LTC Bartolini, Lessons Learned Implementation Section Head, IDLL Branch.

Approved by: COL Dariusz Rozek, Branch Head, IDLL Branch.