

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

Releasable to PFP, Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and New Zealand

20 October 2015

DOCUMENT
AC/225(IF)D(2015)0001

Copy NSO

NATO ARMY ARMAMENTS GROUP (NAAG)

INTEGRATED CAPABILITY GROUP INDIRECT FIRE

The ICGIF Appraisal of the Merger of MCLSB ARTY WG and NAAG LCG/3

Note by IS Staff Advisor to ICGIF

- Ref.1: AC/225(IF)DS(2015)0001 (PFP), ICGIF Spring 2015 Meeting Decision Sheet
Ref.2: AC/225(IF)DS(2015)0002 (PFP), ICGIF Fall 2015 Meeting Decision Sheet
Ref.3: NSO(ARMY)1303(2015)1/ICGIF, MCLSB Guidance to the ICGIF

1. The Integrated Capability Group Indirect Fire (ICGIF), under lead of the ICGIF Vice-Chairman, developed and documented its appraisal of the merger of MCLSB Artillery WG and NAAG LCG/3 on Indirect Fire, on the fifth year of the merger decision. The draft of this document was discussed at the ICGIF March 2015 meeting, and comments were collected (Ref.1).
2. The Appraisal Document has been finalized, with comments received and necessary updates to the content. Per Ref.2, it is published for reference.
3. The NSO staff is requested to forward this document to MCLSB, in accordance with Ref.3.

(Signed) O. TASMAN

1 Annex

Action Officer: O. TASMAN, x4300
Email: tasman.osman@hq.nato.int
Original: English

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

-1-



NATO UNCLASSIFIED

Releasable to PFP, Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and New Zealand

ANNEX 1
AC/225(IF)D(2015)0001

Merger of the ARTY WG and LCG/3

From the beginning the TORs and name of the group were prepared by the ARTY WG and LCG/3 (Land Capability Group 3) in separate meetings. When the two groups finally met together with Co-Chairmen, it was quite a challenge to merge roughly 28 days-worth of plenary meetings/effort into 8 days, combining most of the panels meetings in the same venue. This excludes the Panel and Sub-Group meetings held outside this scheme and still are taken as needed. Things would have to be streamlined, other things dropped, several things as we learned later became over looked. Only through the professionalism and dedication of the individual members has the ICGIF become the effective, close-knit team that it currently is.

There was a significant cost to this transformation. Approximately the initial 3 years-worth of meetings made little progress to the merged group's objectives as TORs were written, panels re-established, meeting dynamics identified, agenda's effectively streamlined and trust between the merged groups achieved.

There are some real and perceived efficiencies that have arisen from the merger. Firstly, it is obviously more cost effective to NATO which is basically supporting half as many plenary session (with meeting room space and secretarial support etc.) as it did previously. It also provides a potential for individual nations to send less representatives (but this is not only a good thing as will be discussed later). Secondly, by combining the 'operators' with the 'technologists' an effective synergy has developed which is beneficial to extending harmonization and standardization across the participants.

Several of the shortcomings of the merger were the loss of effectiveness of the group for almost three full years while panels, agendas, TORs and objectives were ironed out. AARTY-P1, 2, 3 and the LCG/3 IFCAD (Indirect Fire Capability Analysis Document) document were overlooked almost completely during that time. But AARTY-P1 and 5 are now submitted for ratification and the Future Capabilities Panel under lead of Spain has started a new look on the IFCAD. Finally, during initial 3 years of the merger experience, LCG/3's Sub Group 2, was obviously not properly interfaced/guided. This caused some problems from the ICGIF point of view in that SG/2 continued to do good work, but may have took on too much work because of their success, which has now led to thinning resources.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

Releasable to PFP, Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and New Zealand

ANNEX 1
AC/225(IF)D(2015)0001

The group has stabilized at approximately 27 attendees per meeting. I feel this is low for a combined group whose pre-merger totals would have been about 50 people combined. I do notice that some countries have cut back and do not send both an 'operator' and a 'technologist' to the meeting. This could be a result of the merger or only a result of budget constraints. This could lead to a lack of effective competence, should the balance of the group continue to shift-at the latest meeting the group was made up of 25% technologists and 75% operators. But, then again, perhaps this is also a function of the new merged TOR's. And perhaps this is a representation of the proper balance for this group after all.

Whereas the merger of the two main groups has been managed and can be called successful, the main risk for the future is still in the ability of the ICGIF to manage the work of its sub-groups and panels and continue to have the proper competencies (amongst its panel participants) to effectively perform the work required of them.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED