

Joint Air and Space Power Conference 2006

PANEL 4

"National roadmaps and NATO Flight Plan"

Q&A

Q – We should focus to gain immediate results, on what NATO is famous for – an Interoperability Machine. That is the main thing we should achieve. The missing link is a CONOPS to deal with interoperability issues.

No response.

Q – JUAS was created in US as a matter of urgency, in response to a crisis in Iraq. Bottom Line – the collection management piece needs to be squared away. Maybe Afghanistan is the crisis situation that NATO needs to create momentum on the UAS issues. USN has 2 programmes; one is Firescout, an integral of ship combat systems that presents a cultural problem for Navy. Similar problem for ground commander exists. But we're looking for Joint effectiveness, so there is a need for a way ahead. Navies have cultural and institutional inhibition against UAVs, for example no JSOR from Maritime for UAVs. We have to think carefully about taking UAVs out of a combat system and putting it into a Joint environment.

A – Perhaps the DARS Board would force standardization of the data stream. On the issue of control, the CJFACC should not control these assets, it's more an issue of coordination, and regardless he needs to know that as the Navy and Army operate with their integrated systems, airman need to know that they are there. We should be able to enter systems into the ATO for coordination, not necessarily for control.

Comment: Not just C2 but tasking and dissemination is important. UK is trying to get the Predator B product to the frontline and HQ by the middle of next year. Our priority is to get it to the frontline.

Follow-up comment: I don't think you can deliver exactly what the platoon level needs in time that he needs it.

A – I would like to address the cultural difference, as far as the future is concerned, info gained by micro vehicle can be the pre-condition for an aircraft to deliver a weapon. All the info gained from UAS enhances the global picture.

Q – We are experienced in developing roadmaps. I got the feeling yesterday of dissatisfaction from audience with the roadmap and this is nothing new. We are currently in the phase of defining scope. What is the plan to proceed? To make a suggestion to proceed by everyone here, write one to three sentences to provide inputs to JAPCC Flight Plan, so called Wikipedia effect.

A – Yes we are in time pressure. Look at it as a spiral development effort. May I suggest a questionnaire to solicit interest in joining JAPCC to work on this?

Joint Air and Space Power Conference 2006

Q – We see the same questions over and over – can you share that with us, how much can you share, etc. Has there been, and could there be a discussion about releasing your documents?

A – Yes we can talk about it, yes we can release documents. There is a paper that discusses the roadmap.

Q – Cash is the nub of the problem. Focus the mind and the question. If you want an organic capability, you must talk to industry. Network is critical. They want to know what NATO wants. You must articulate your requirements to industry, and secure cash.

A – We will look into the network issue.

Comment: I disagree that every piece of information from every UAV must be available to higher command. Let them work with the forces that are there. That is problematic. Over information could be problematic. Also, disagrees, that C2 and decisions should not be taken from the Air Force works. Army should have capability to have its own assets at a (lower) level.

No Reply.

Q – Why do we not put UAV capabilities in the well known capability categories?

A – UAVs need to be part of the overall ISR mix. Who makes decision to take UAV off one task for another? Who makes apportionment/allotment decisions? Need to go to C2 doctrine now; proliferation will make it worse.

Comment: Doctrines and exercises. STANAG is necessary, roadmap and flight plan also, but we must put in allied joint procedures, that countries without UAVs can join as observers.

A – We have to scrutinize, adjust, and amend allied publications.

Comment: There are UAVs that should be jointly addressed, but disagree to be jointly. Recognize difference between joint and systems integrated into a surface combat system.

Comment: We have to consider all levels, soldier and Joint Force Commander. They are part of a combat service including also smaller UAVs.

Comment: Nobody wants to take UAVs away from components; however we need that information for Joint Fire Coordination. Joint means everyone contributes what he can contribute best.

Joint Air and Space Power Conference 2006

A - Wrap-up comes up with simple solutions to a complex problem. Call on everyone to better synchronize work of the nations with what we are doing. Finally we should agree on C2 interoperability. We have an urgent problem to solve. Ask nations to consider seriously their willingness to assign assets to NATO, so NATO can exercise and become familiar.