UNITED STATES ARMY

CENTER OF MILITARY HISTORY

+ + + + +

INTERVIEW

OF
(b)(3), (b)(6)
CHIEF, PLANS AND POLICY
MULTINATIONAL CORPS - IRAQ
+ + + + +
9 JUNE 2007
BAGHDAD, IRAQ
PK.

(This transcript was produced from tapes provided by the U.S. Army Center of Military History.)

* <u>secre</u>t*

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(b)(6) This is (b)(6) writing a
3	story on Multinational Corps-Iraq and the U.S. Army Center of
4	Military History.
5	(b)(3), (b)(6) This is (b)(3), (b)(6)
6	the MNC-I historian.
7	(b)(6) Today is 7 June 2007, and we are
8	about to interview $(b)(3), (b)(6)$ the C-3 Chief,
9	Plans, Multinational Corps - Iraq, at the Headquarters,
10	Multinational Corps - Iraq, Al Faw Palace, Camp Victory,
11	Baghdad, Iraq.
12	(b)(3),(b)(6) could you briefly take a few
13	minutes to describe your background and experience that
14	prepared you for this position?
15	(b)(3), (b)(6) Background: Simply to the normal
16	progression of schools, with the single exception that I am
17	not a School of Advanced Military Studies graduate.
18	(b)(6) Did you command a brigade?
19	(b)(3),(b)(6) No, I have not commanded a brigade.
20	The last command that I held was commanded three different
21	battalions.
22	(b)(6) Three battalions?

* <mark>s e c r e t</mark> *

* <u>5 E C R E T *</u>

* SECRET*

Yes, sir. 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) What branch are you? 2 (b)(6) I am Infantry, sir. 3 (b)(3), (b)(6) Infantry. Okay. Okay. How long 4 (b)(6) have you been the Chief of Plans for the Corps? 5 One year, sir. 6 (b)(3), (b)(6) So you were at Fort Hood, One year? 7 (b)(6) the then probably participated in preparatorv and you 8 exercises and training exercises before the deployment. Is 9 that correct? 10 sir that's correct. (b)(3), (b)(6) 11 Yes you take few minutes to 12 (b)(6) Can а describe those exercises as you remember them, because I know 13 they were back in June and July of 2006, and describe if you 14 think they were useful for you as the Chief of Plans? 15 I'll say at the outset that they (b)(3), (b)(6) : 16 were very useful. Having just graduated from the U.S. Army 17 War College in June, I made it to Fort Hood to attend the 18 second two weeks of the mission rehearsal exercise. 19 The mission rehearsal exercise for the second 20 half of that was the actual execution, the first week being 21

22 the ramp-up. We were given several things to plan. It was

· s e c r e t *

* SECRET*

then that I met the team. We formed the team at that time. 1 2 (b)(3), (b)(6) had been the senior planner two rotations ago. Ι benefitted from his So 3 experience in drawing the team together. We finished that 4 week, and then there was one other block that week that we 5 had that we brought in several academicians later in the б summer, actually in October right prior to our deployment, 7 that served to sand down all the rough edges, if you will, 8 and put the finishing touches on our training to that point 9 to properly prepare us for this deployment. 10 And did you come over here also on 11 (b)(6) some visits with this corps? 12 Yes. Yes, there was one leader's (b)(3), (b)(6) 13 reconnaissance that we were able to conduct prior to the 14 deployment back in August of last year. 15 And how long was that? (b)(6) 16 It was less than a week. 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) Less than a week? 18 (b)(6) Less than a week, but it was still (b)(3), (b)(6) 19 20 very --Did you meet with your counterpart in 21 (b)(6) 5th Corps? 22

* <u>secret</u>*

At that time? Well, actually, no, 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) I did not meet with my counterpart. He was on EML at the 2 time, but I was -- I'm sorry. 3 Okay. EML, meaning? 4 (b)(6) I beg your pardon, R&R, for sake of 5 (b)(3), (b)(6) a better, more readily recognized term. on R&R. б He was So what that afforded me was an opportunity to get around my 7 soon-to-be area of responsibility within the Corps staff. 8 Were you aware of the plans 9 Okav. (b)(6) that they were making at that time for their Operations Order 10 0603? 11 (b)(3), (b)(6) sir, I was. 12 Yes, Before we get into that part, Oka 13 (b)(6) though, could you tell me a little bit about your section, 14 the Plans Section, how it is organized, how many people, and 15 who are the key planners that you have working for you? 16 (b)(3), (b)(6) Okay. By name or are you talking : 17 about -18

CRE

19 (b)(6) Well, let's take it step by step.
20 How are you organized?
21 (b)(3), (b)(6) Okay. For point of clarification,

22 I am the Chief of Plans and Policy. Therefore, I have three

* secret *

1 different sections under Plans and Policy.

2 One is Plans. One is Force Generation, and the 3 last is the Iraqi Security Forces. All three fall under my 4 office.

RE

The Plans, as I have already stated, is headed up 5 by the Chief of War Plans, (b)(3), (b)(6) 6 We have one campaign planner, a contingency operations planner, 7 a coalition planner, several of the coalition partners, 8 Australian and from the U.K., and they form the core of the 9 Corps Plans team. Then naturally, you have the remainder of 10 the rest of the staff will then plus-up that, the Corps Plans 11 team to be the Plans Team. 12

13 All told, there are -- I'm in charge of and 14 supervise 60 people within Plans and Policy.

Force Generation is a smaller cell, six people, headed up by a colonel --

17 (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6)
18 (b)(6) Yes, (b)(3), (b)(6), and I have a
19 -- He has a deputy. I have then several people who work for
20 the two of them in doing different things within the Force
21 Generation.

22

The last section is the Iraqi Security Forces.

SECRET *

That, too, is headed up by a Colonel, a U.K. Colonel, (b)(3), (b)(6) 1 (b)(3),(b)(6) and he has a small team as well, roughly -- again, 2 only six people, and they are essentially the people who keep 3 track of the database of all of the information that comes 4 from all the different divisions, and the military transition 5 teams feed information into a database called Scoreboard, and 6 That data then they compile that data on a monthly basis. 7 the serves as the basis for a briefing to Transition 8 Readiness Assessment to General Petraeus 9

RE

10

(b)(6) Oh, to General Petraeus?

11 (b)(3),(b)(6) Yes, General Petraeus. We crunch 12 that for him.

13 (b)(6) : You said throughout your whole 14 section, you got 60. So it's not just 60 in the Plans. It 15 would be like 48 in the plans then, I guess. Is that right? 16 You had six in Force Generation and six in Iraqi Security 17 Forces. So Plans and Policy --

18 (b)(3).(b)(6): Roughly, yes. Yes, roughly. But 19 I need to further clarify that, although I'm working here and 20 we are over here as Multinational Corps-Iraq, I still am in 21 charge of the people, the one civilian -- Department of the 22 Army civilian and the 12 or so contractors that I have back at Fort Hood. I still maintain contact with them and direct
actions as well.

 \mathbf{E}

And are they part of the 60? (b)(6) : 3 They are part of the 60, yes. 4 (b)(3), (b)(6) Okay, okay. 5 (b)(6) It's a good question. б (b)(3), (b)(6) What do they do back at Fort Hood? 7 (b)(6) training. Primarily, They (b)(3), (b)(6) 8 naturally are looking -- They've extended the horizon for 9 after we return and we are getting to the unencumbered corps 10 So we are planning for that, and aspect upon our return. 11 then also planning for the training for the next up to three 12 years, so that when we hit the ground when we redeploy, we 13 will be able to do so. 14 will 15 (b)(6) You have all your ranges arranged for and everything? 16 Major training exercises, etcetera. 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) As you prepared for the Multinational 18 (b)(6) Corps-Iraq at Fort Hood last year, in general what were some 19 of the major key plans that you worked on? You mentioned 20 that you had already taken a look at 0603, and I assume that 21 you were working on the Corps plans, your 3rd Corps imprint 22

* secret *

1 to that plan.

2	(b)(3),(b)(6) We thought The team, the Plans
3	team we thought at one point that we were going to be one
4	of the last Before the Multinational Force-Iraq and
5	Multinational Corps-Iraq combined the headquarters, we
6	thought we were going to be the last MNC-I, Multinational
7	Corps-Iraq, headquarters, and we even took that at least I
8	did that we might be putting the finishing touches on our
9	deployment here to Iraq.
10	So when we looked at a normal campaign plan and
11	the different phasing of a normal campaign plan, we had been
12	In my estimation, we had been in Phase 4, which is
13	stabilized. Phase 5 is enable civil authority.
14	So last summer, I had discussed with the rest of
15	the planners how we would go about doing exactly that, and

ECRET *

s

that's exactly what we are doing now with the publishing of 0701, and how you enable Iraqi civil authority and lessen our footprint here and draw down our forces to be able to at some point get to an enduring level here in country, and redeploy from the joint forces.

21 So I know that kind of jumps over 0603, but I 22 would submit to you that 0603 was an interim step. After

* secret *

1 0601 they had been working off of 0601 for a while. They 2 scheduled to publish 0603 in the November time frame, which 3 they did on about the end of the first week. It looked very 4 much like 0601, and then things changed in December.

Right. Right. How much attention, (b)(6) 5 back at Fort Hood now, did you pay to the emerging COIN б strategies -- COIN is counter-insurgency strategies -- during 7 your preparation? And in particular, what I am trying to get 8 a connection with is -- because the FM 3-23, I think -- 24 9 just came out in January, and you probably saw a draft of it. 10 So, you know, what I'm trying to get at is if 11 there was any connection between your planning and the 12 emerging doctrine. 13

Yes, there was, matter of fact. (b)(3), (b)(6) We 14 were one of the recipients of the draft. We were asked to 15 provide comment. So I sat down with several of the planners, 16 (b)(3), (b)(6) and had to pull our 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) thoughts on that together, the III Corps response. 18

19 It became a major effort. It was sort of a month 20 that we had some time to pull our thoughts on that together, 21 and all the while that we are doing this, becoming actually 22 more -- I mean, several of the planners had just come from

* s e c r e t *

the School of Advanced Military Studies, one of them being (b)(3), (b)(6)

ECRET

taken from -- and me coming from the War So 3 College, coming from the schoolhouse, immersed in doctrine, 4 knowing that this is what -- because we had discussed it. We 5 were looking to operate or conduct those operations, counter-6 insurgency operations, providing response to the draft field 7 manual, further ingrained it, if you will, into what we were 8 doing on a regular basis, and we started looking more at --9 less at the offensive operations, knowing full well that we 10 were still going to have to do that, but the counter-11 insurgency operations and, specifically, stability, stability 12 operations. 13 Right. 14 (b)(6) So, yes, having something --15 (b)(3), (b)(6) Providing comment on 3-24 actually did help. 16 Do you recall that month that you 17 (b)(6) looked at the manual, the draft manual, September or October? 18 That sounds -- I was going to say (b)(3), (b)(6) 19 I believe it was after our leadership conference in that. 20 I can't recall for certain. August. So I don't know. 21 From the TOA forward, 14 22 (b)(6) Okay.

* s e c r e t *

December, when you published your initial fragos 1 own 2 (Phonetic) on about the 30th of December -- and I found a briefing that was dated 28 December that enunciates the Corps 3 Commander's mission and strategy for the initial set-up 4 fragos -- were you following the basic strategy of V Corps as 5 outlined in 0603? 6 We were at the time. We were in 7 (b)(3), (b)(6) changes the middle or had just received the in bridging 8 9 strategy --Right. 10 (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) from Corps. Force had just 11 briefed us in the Force conference room, and I would have to 12

CRE

E

13 say, yes, we were. 14 (b)(6) Well, what I was also trying to get 15 at: Where were you anticipating -- There must have been some

16 talk about an increase of troops in December. But I don't 17 know that, and I wondered if --

18 (b)(3),(b)(6) Yes. There was a Request for 19 Information that did come in December that -- very simply, 20 what would you do if you had five additional brigades?

Now I haven't been privy to all the conversations. We had just arrived. (b)(3), (b)(6) had

SECRET

led one of the liaison officer teams over here prior to the
 remainder of -- an advance party prior to the main body of
 III Corps coming.

E

CRE

So he had a better grasp by about 30 days of what was happening here on the ground, but this Request for Information did come in December. It was born out of a conversation at the four-star level that we were not privy to.

So we set about simply answering the RFI. It, 9 for whatever reason, gained some traction and took off, and 10 there was a difference of opinion between Multinational Force 11 Headquarters and Multinational Corps Headquarters as to what 12 to make of this RFI, because it was a departure from what V 13 Corps had been working on, and that is transition over to 14 (Inaudible) and handing this over to the government of Iraq. 15

16 (b)(6) Well, one of the reasons I mention 17 that is because in 0603 they used the word transition quite a 18 bit.

19 (b)(3), (b)(6) : Yes.
20 (b)(6) And I didn't see that in your first
21 mission brief on 28 December that enunciates mission tasks.
22 In fact, 0603 didn't even have tasks in it that I could see.

* SECRET *

You guys -- III Corps always puts -- seems to put tasks in their briefings and their orders, but V Corps didn't. But they used the word transition and V Corps, and all of a sudden, that disappeared from the lexicon in your Corps, in III Corps.

C R

E

I wondered if you recall that. Was there any debate on that?

8 (b)(3),(b)(6) : Yes, I do recall it and, no, there 9 was very little debate. We were told -- We were given 10 specific instructions, and that --

is Here the wording of 0603. Ιt 11 (b)(6) "Mission: No change from Op Order 0601. 12 says: MNC-I conducts operations to restore order using predominantly 13 nonkinetic means to transition security responsibilities to 14 the government of Iraq," and so on and so on. 15

Your initial mission statement doesn't even use that word, transition, at all. Now I think it may mention it farther on down in the brief, but it's certainly out of the mission statement. Seems like an entirely new approach, to me.

21 Would you characterize it as that, or not? 22 (b)(3),(b)(6) You could say so, yes. You could

* S E C R E T *

SECRET *

There were -- Yes. I'll leave it at that. say so, yes. 1 I am going to pause at this time and 2 1: (b)(6) ask questions. let 3 (b)(3), (b)(6) I want to ask in particular 1: 4 (b)(3), (b)(6) about this first kind of tract little piece where there was 5 this request for information about, okay, what would you do 6 with five additional brigades. 7 Would you have in your notes somewhere when 8 specifically that date was or is that something that is still 9 a trackable document that's available out there somewhere? 10 The first thing that comes to mind (b)(3), (b)(6) 11 is on or about the 20th of December, and I believe, because 12 we had done -- We had done -- or we did such a detailed work-13 up to recount that I believe one of the planners, if not 14 , still has that. 15 (b)(3), (b)(6) In the broader sense, Okay. : 16 (b)(3), (b)(6) once this change of direction kind of came into play, I just 17 am curious to know, what did that mean to the Plans Section 18 in particular about -- What was going through your mind in 19 terms of what did that mean to you all in terms of what you 20 were going to need to do to make that happen? What kind of 21 things did that put in motion as it became apparent that that 22

* S E C R E T *

1 was the direction things were going to go?

(b)(3), (b)(6) : It was pretty much opposite. With 2 V Corps and the transition in ramping down of forces and 3 transitioning to the government of Irag, and then to come in 4 to have some conditions on the battlefield change or to at 5 least have a different read, because you now have a different 6 commander, an operational level commander, looking to -- with 7 a different intent, different vision, we then had to think 8 differently, take on an offensive mindset, if we were to 9 secure Baghdad, protect the populous, and then proliferate 10 that throughout the Iraqi theater of operations, and then be 11 able to interdict the accelerants, that we called them, into 12 the Baghdad area. 13

DE

We figured that if we could do that -- Actually, the Commander thought that, if he could do that, we could finish this successfully and turn the thing over to the government of Iraq.

At the point that we took over transfer of authority, it was evident to us that he did not believe that we were at that point.

21 (b)(3), (b)(6) : Who is "he"?
22 (b)(3), (b)(6) : The Commander. I'm sorry.

* <u>s e c r e t</u> *

General Corelli Here. 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) or 2 General Odierno? No, no, General Odierno. : General 3 (b)(3), (b)(6) Odierno. 4 He did not believe that we were 5 (b)(3), (b)(6) at the point to --6 Continue the transition and turn 7 (b)(3), (b)(6) it over as is to the government of Iraq. There were things 8 but speak him, 9 that he Ι can't for it was our understanding that there were things that could be done to 10 get to a different point in time or on the ground where we 11 would be in a better position to do so, and work better with 12 the government of Iraq in helping them, enable them to take 13 control of their own nation. 14]: Was there a pivotal time that 15 (b)(3), (b)(6) you recall in terms of -- If 20th of December is when this 16 RFI came -- you mentioned, interestingly, that there was some 17 disagreement between MNFI-I and MNC-I about what did this 18

19 mean.

How long between that sort of initial "wow, this something different; what do we make of this" -- Was there then a subsequent pivotal point in time where it became

crystal clear, and was it a formal process where the
Commander or someone else in the chain brought key players
together and said, okay, this is where we are going now? Was
that a verbal or was it -- Was there a pivotal moment when
there was a gathering of the key staff, so to speak, to say,
okay, here is what we are doing?

CRE

I don't recall there being : that 7 (b)(3), (b)(6) were several parallel actions that There were moment. 8 ongoing, and we were essentially responding to the RFI, to 9 the request for information, responding to his guidance, and 10 it wasn't in the setting as you have described. 11

12 (b)(3), (b)(6) Chay. So just more a continued 13 evolution of, as you said, parallel actions to the 14 communications that put all this into motion?

15 (b)(3),(b)(6) Yes. 16 (b)(3),(b)(6) Ckay.

Let me follow up on that, on something that you said seemed to indicate -- Now General Odierno and your Corps come in, and you bring with it a different mindset and a different approach, and you said -- I believe you said more aggressive approach.

22 (b)(3), (b)(6) : Offensive mindset.

* <u>SECRET</u>*

(b)(6) : Offensive mindset. That's correct.
 More offensive mindset.

DE

There seemed to be a disconnect between Odierno's offensive mindset and General Casey's transition and General Cherelli's transition strategy and bridging strategy, if you will.

Did that -- Can you talk a little bit about that? 7 From what you saw as the planner -- I mean, I'm not asking 8 you to speculate, but to describe what you saw the as 9 planner. I mean, I could imagine something like General 10 Casey, with a new guy coming in, saying you got it, go take 11 it, even though it against maybe General Casey's 12 was philosophy, or it could have been different than that. I 13 don't know. 14

(b)(3),(b)(6) : It was my sensing that Lieutenant General Corelli was turning the reins over, and he didn't believe that he was done yet. In my mind, I believe he wanted to do more or felt he could do more, but he was still -- transfer authority was going to go on.

General Casey was providing direction to continue to conduct the transition, execute the transition bridging strategy, and that briefing that he provided -- that he and

staff provided toward the end of January gives us about a 30day time frame in which we came in with a different mindset. We received the request for information: What would you do with five additional brigades?

E

CRE

Based on a conversation, again that I wasn't Privy to, and instead of transitioning and reducing our footprint, General Odierno was taking us the other way to prosecute his vision of how he wanted to attack the problem here in-country.

10 Throughout that month time period, there were a 11 couple of instances in which General Odierno wanted to do 12 something or accomplish something along his line of logic 13 that he was informed by Multinational Force-Iraq that that's 14 not -- that wasn't within General Casey's left and right 15 limit, so to speak.

16 (b)(6) General Casey's left and right limit?
17 (b)(3), (b)(6) As the Force Commander, he
18 establishes the left and right limit or he provides guidance
19 to General Odierno, guidance and direction.

There were, as I said, a couple of instances in which General Odierno wanted to do something, and General Casey said that he would either not get an asset, not get a

* SECRET *

resource, whether it be a request for forces, something as we 1 2 were planning over that month-long time period to get five more brigades into the fight, so to speak. 3

ECRE

TP.

General Casey -- It didn't appear that General 4 Casey was wanting to support General Odierno. 5

think I understand what 6 (b)(6) I vou're trying to say. 7

8

15

All right. (b)(3), (b)(6)

coalition MNC-I campaign 9 Your (b)(6) operational concept dated, I believe, 6 March '07 is a very 10 thorough and well written, I think, campaign narrative. Who 11 was the primary author?

- 12
- That's (b)(3), (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) 13 (b)(3), (b)(6) 14 (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) Yes, sir.

I think you've already answered this, (b)(6) 16 but I'm going to go ahead and ask it anyway. 17

Does it represent an iterative evolutionary 18 approach from the MNF-I joint campaign plan, April '06, and 19 the MNF-I 2007 joint campaign action plan draft dated January 20 of '06, which I'm sure you've looked at, or would you 21 characterize it as a new approach? 22

I'm sorry. Which approach? (b)(3), (b)(6) : 1 Would you characterize it as an 2 (b)(6) evolutionary iterative approach would 3 or an or you characterize it as a completely new approach? I'm talking 4 about the March -- the 6 March MNC-I campaign plan, coalition 5 campaign operational concept. I'm sorry. 6 just Did 7 (b)(3), (b)(6) you see it as а continuation of what had come before or was it a totally new 8 Is that what you are 9 direction? 10 (b)(6) Right. I wouldn t see it as an -- I see it 11 (b)(3), (b)(6) as a totally -- a new direction. 12 Right 13 (b)(6) year being the (b)(3), (b)(6) Last year 14 of transition, year of the police. Correct. I'd say it was a 15 new direction. 16 That's what I thought you Okay. 17 (b)(6) would say. 18 in

RE

C

The coalition campaign operational concept in March looks like it might reflect the campaign design chapter, Chapter 4 in FM3-24. What do you say to that? I mean, that's my look at it. I looked at Chapter 4. I looked

* SECRET *

at campaign, the operational concept. They look not exactly
similar, but along the same lines.

3 (b)(3), (b)(6) : No, in that (b)(3), (b)(6) again, 4 did the work that he did last year on the draft of the field 5 manual. It was naturally what he went back to in the 6 promulgation of this order.

7 (b)(6) Now for that plan in March, was there 8 any or what, if any, had been the MNF-1's influence, 9 recognizing that General Petraeus and his crew came in on the 10 10th of February and this plan, this operational concept, 11 comes out on 6 March '07?

12 (b)(3),(b)(6) : And again, your question: What, if 13 any --

14 (b)(6) Yes -- had been MNFI-I's influence on 15 that operational concept?

16 (b)(3),(b)(6) : No, there was a distinct -- It was 17 distinct, because we had read some of the articles that 18 General Petraeus had written.

19I have a copy of his counter-insurgency rules on20my wall in my office.

21 (b)(6) So it would be influenced, but 22 probably kind of indirect influence from Petraeus' thoughts

* s e c r e t *

Declassified by: MG Michael X. Garrett, USCENTCOM Chief of Staff Declassified on: 201505

1 and ideas?

2	(b)(3),(b)(6) Yes, indirectly at the outset.
3	(b)(6) Because I know that General Petraeus
4	has a CAG, an initiatives group, or some smart guys up there.
5	I just wondered if they came down and advised you or
6	(Inaudible) you at all.
7	(b)(3), (b)(6) : No.
8	(b)(3), (b)(6) Can I ask a question along those
9	lines?
10	Was there especially in the Plans decision,
11	can you tell me anything about the relationship with the MNF-
12	I plans? When I say that, I say under General Petraeus, once
13	they did arrive, and at what point did you start receiving
14	their formal planning documents upon which to start
15	developing MNC-I's planning documents, or was that more of an
16	informal process) as you've kind of indicated here? Was it a
17	matter of reading his articles or was there a definitive
18	hand-down, if you will, of their plan to MNC-I?
19	(b)(3),(b)(6) : Well, no, there wasn't, but I will
20	say that the strategic plans, the SPA (b)(3),(b)(6)
21	(Phonetic), very helpful
22	(b)(6) At Multinational?

* secret *

* <u>secret</u>*

Multinational Force. (b)(3), (b)(6) : Yes, at 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) for Plans, very, very supportive. 2 They did provide quite timely -- when they did generate their 3 interim document in February. But because we were steadily 4 planning and generating following General Odierno's vision, 5 what they provided -- and I will say that we had people б sitting in on their process; so that helped facilitate. 7

8 So in a parallel manner, as we did with 9 generating operations order 0701, we continued to march, if 10 you will. So when they did publish, we made certain that we 11 were nested naturally within everything.

They have yet to publish their JCP, their joint campaign plan, but we firmly believe that we are well within because of the parallel planning and the collaborative effort between the two headquarters really assisted in our ability to generate our operations order.

17 So you could say that their effort, their 18 process, their draft document, did in fact help to inform 19 generating ours.

20 (b)(6) And when did they do their draft? 21 (b)(3),(b)(6) : Well, the JCAP, the interim was out 22 -- again, was out -- It was April. I'm sorry I misspoke. I

* s e c r e t *

1 wasn't February. It was April.

2 (b)(3), (b)(6) : But you had already published 3 your --

ECRE

(b)(3),(b)(6) : Well, we had done the operational concept, yes. But again, ours has been almost just a running process since we transferred authority, because we went through 0603 to answer or to build on what we had received from V Corps, and then we had to change, and then we pursued generating 0701 to the way ahead.

form What does that collaborative 10 (b)(6) process take? Do you all actually get in a room together 11 periodically? Is it by BTC? What process seems to be 12 working, since that really seems to be a key nuance to what 13 is working well? 14

7: To a lesser extent, not so much in 15 (b)(3), (b)(6) a room together, the two staffs planning. But again, we 16 would -- I sent either (Phonetic) or (b)(3), (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) over to the International Zone, and he would sit 18 in on the process and, most specifically and most recently, 19 was in -- I would send him down for 20 (b)(3), (b)(6) several days at a time over several weeks, the past several 21 weeks, to sit in on not just generating Annex B to their 22

* S E C R E T *

joint campaign plan, which is the security line of operation. He would also then sit in, naturally, to the generation of the -- you know, the discussion on the base document for the Multinational Force-Iraq joint campaign plan.

E

CRE

So that was our in, so to speak, of their 5 He would then share with us the security line of б process. is General Odierno's operation annex, because that 7 responsibility, the security. 8

9 Then when they published the draft annex, they 10 would share it. It wasn't kept close hold. They would share 11 it with us, and then ask us to provide comment. We did that 12 on several iterations.

13 So therein lies the collaborative effort, if you 14 will, and I would submit to you that it's a -- It has 15 something to do with the fact that we are geographically 16 separate.

We are here, and down they are down at the IZ. So there were a couple of occasions on which we talked across the computer, the information work station, but it was primarily I sent a planner there or two planners there, and then they would share the documents with us.

22

(b)(6) I see in both the new operations

* SECRET *

order that just came out this month and your operational 1 concept really quite a sophisticated and much different 2 approach than had been before, and I've looked at all the 3 before, including the orders one for General Metson 4 (Phonetic), III Corps, when they were over here before. 5

CRE

I'm just wondering, does that represent growth in just experience gained here, because I know all you guys have served multiple tours over here or most of the senior officers have served multiple tours. I just wondered. What do you think about that?

Do you think it's - because we've been fighting this war for five years, but I see your plan as not only much more sophisticated but probably the right approach. But I mean, I'm not judging at all, but --

(b)(3).(b)(6) : No, I'm glad you think so. It is a
function of experience, starting at the very top with General
Odierno, having again (b)(3).(b)(6) as the Chief of
War Plans, this being his second tour, the three -- (b)(3).(b)(6)
(b)(3).(b)(6) having commanded the brigade here.

I've been in theater down at CENTCOM for two years prior to this, and probably the most curious aspect of this is that our campaign planner, (b)(3), (b)(6) -- no

* S E C R E T *

1 previous combat experience. So he's fresh out of the 2 schoolhouse, fresh off of having provided the comments on the 3 field manual 2-24, counter-insurgency operations, and he's 4 the one who wrote that. He's the one who penned the Op 5 Order.

Þ

6 (b)(6) Do you -- Do you or did you ever 7 think you have -- you would have sufficient troops to task 8 ratio, as outlined in the COIN manual, to solve this counter-9 insurgency? Do you think now you have enough or do you ever 10 think it?

11

12

(b)(3), (b)(6) : Having commanded, you can never have enough soldiers.

mean, I saw a planning document 13 (b)(6) from your section - I think it was from your section -- that 14 said, even with the surge, you don't have enough troops as 15 outlined in the new COIN manual. And I think they -- They 16 give the ratios and, if I remember right, it's like 30 or 35 17 to one in the COIN manual; the best we can get, including all 18 the Iraqi security forces and the U.S. forces, is like 20 to 19 Is that right? one. 20

No. The COIN manual says 20 to one, and the best we can get is about 35 to one, something like that. Do you

1 recall that?

2 (b)(3).(b)(6) Yes, I do. We had that discussion, 3 but we tended to steer away from it, because we believed -4 and General Odierno in conversations, discussions, guidance 5 that he provided to us -- that we believed that the number of 6 brigades that we had coming in was about right.

CRE

E

Now I'll follow that up with a statement that he made to us in the Plans the other day, that based on where we're at now, we could use probably one more brigade, three battalions.

If you were to talk to Multinational Division-Baghdad at the outset of planning for this, they had requested three more battalions, one more brigade than the Army or Marines were able to provide us.

So I believe we are doing fine where we're at 15 When we first started and then now that we have right now. 16 the fifth plus-up brigade on the ground and we are getting 17 them to their full operational capability, the one brigade or 18 three more battalions, understandably, would help us get at 19 some of the other problems and help bring this to an end more 20 quickly than if we, naturally, wouldn't have them, because we 21 would be able to dedicate that additional force on those 22

* secret*

problem areas, and it will just take us a little longer given 1 the current set that we have, the 20 brigade combat teams 2 that we have on the ground. But I believe we're doing fine 3 with what we have on the ground now. 4 Even then, I have to bring up the point that that 5 last one just arrived. 6 Right. 7 (b)(6) So it's too early to assess. 8 (b)(3), (b)(6) I still have a couple of nuts : (b)(3), (b)(6) 9 and bolts questions. 10 First of all, are we okay on your time? 11 That's fine. (b)(3), (b)(6) 12 We ended up starting a little (b)(3), (b)(6) 13 later than planned. 14 As far as the operations within Plans, one of the 15 terms I have heard people discuss is effects integration. Is 16 that a concept that comes into play in the Plans Section or 17 how -- I m just kind of interested to know the synergy that 18 happens within the C-3 Section overall. 19 How do you pull together with the Future Ops 20 folks, with Current Ops? What's the process that happens, 21

CRE

E

22 and is that unique to the way III Corps is doing business

* S E C R E T *

1 compared to other units?

(b)(3), (b)(6) : The last part of your question, I 2 can't answer, because I don't know how the other Corps are 3 working the effects aspect of the process. How we attacked 4 this was the objectives that you find in the concept, and 5 then in the order were provided to General McDonald in the 6 Effects Cell upstairs, and then they set about -- after 7 having heard and then read the Operations Order, took the 8 objectives and established minutes of effectiveness, minutes 9 effectiveness performance of measures of aqainst those 10 objectives, and then devised their board, if you will, or 11 presentation or their tracking mechanism to see or to track 12 how well we are getting at on each of the objectives that 13 supports the Commander's plan, and that is briefed then to 14 the Commander and the 3 and the Chief. 15

E

CRE

So it's not something that -- They are on the 16 We are on the first floor. I've got Effects second floor. 17 I have Effects planners in Plans. So some of General quys. 18 McDonald's -- a couple of his folks are -- primarily one, 19 (Phonetic), he's the Effects planner that 20 (b)(3), (b)(6) sits in the Plans shop or on the Plans team. So he is my 21 connectivity to it in the Effects Cell. 22

* <mark>S E C R E T *</mark>

1 (b)(3),(b)(6) How would you describe where the 2 line falls between what Plans handles and what Future Ops 3 handles? Is there a line in the sand there? How do you guys 4 split that out?

a

ECRET

5 (b)(3),(b)(6) : It's actually pretty good that 6 you asked that question, and I'm glad this is on a tape 7 recorder, because I will tell you that the two dozen people 8 that are here from 1st Corps, from Fort Lewis, are a blessing 9 from Fort Lewis.

When I first got to Fort Hood for the second week of the mission exercise, we were still struggling with that exact concept, Plans, FUOPS, Current Ops.

Normally, I would be the C-5. There was a C-5 in III Corps the last time. It was (b)(3),(b)(6). Somebody made a decision prior to my arrival at Fort Hood not to take a C-5 or not to have a C-5 on the staff. So then (b)(3),(b)(6) (b)(3),(b)(6) the C-3, decided to make it 3-3, which is Current 0ps, 3-5 which is Future Ops, and a 3-7 which is Plans.

Because we got that plug of two dozen people --Now, granted, not all 24 sit in C-3. There's a couple in C-4, but the predominant plug -- almost all of them have formed the 3-Ops Cell, and what that did was enable Plans, (b)(3), (b)(6)

(b)(3), (b)(6) , to be able to then extend the horizon and look out 1 if you were 2 further on planning; because to talk to (Phonetic) who was Jeff's 3 (b)(3), (b)(6) predecessor as the Chief of War Plans of V Corps, one of the 4 biggest issues that he had was that he didn't have the 5 benefit of a Future Ops. б

12

RE

7 Therefore, he was always planning the near-end 8 fight. He had trouble extending the horizon. So the 4-Op 9 says it was constituted here on our staff to enable us to do 10 that.

So they look out for about six weeks, and then we 11 take it from six weeks on out, and that is a very arbitrary 12 line, because in the grand scheme and when you read our 13 doctrine, the C-3 is the guy who makes the call as to where 14 that line is -- you know, literally -- and then he looks at, 15 okay, how much of the workload does each 3-3, 3-5 and 3-7 16 And there will be times when I will get -- If our have. 17 workload gets light, I'll get some close-in, near-term issues 18 to solve. 19

If I get bogged down, you might give one to FUOPS if we've got a longer time on it.

22

(b)(6) That's probably why, you know, your

* secret*

order and your operational concept appear so different and, I
think, so much more sophisticated and better than previous
ones. That is, the structural difference between FUOPS and
Plans.

* SECRET*

I bet that contributes to it.
(b)(3),(b)(6) : It does. It does. We get some
real go-getters in the FUOPS, too. $(b)(3), (b)(6)$ and his
crew have (Inaudible).
(b)(3),(b)(6) : Do you ever own the Frago
process?
(b)(3), (b)(6) No. I do not.
So that really all falls to
Current and Future Ops?
(b)(3),(b)(6) : Primarily, Future Ops. I will -
- There will be times when I will provide for lack of a
better description the guts of the order, the tasks, the
overall concept, to Future Ops, and they will then I'll
conduct a handoff with Future Ops. They will generate the
order.
(b)(6) : But you guys wrote this order 0701?
(b)(3),(b)(6) : Yes, we did. Yes, we did.

(b)(6) Not FUOPS?

22

* SECRET*

Right. That's correct. : 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) (b)(6) : Full-fledged technical (Several words 2 inaudible). 3 Yes, Fragos (Phonetic) note, 4 (b)(3), (b)(6) correct. 5 Okay. 6 (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) Ι just want make Ι to sure 7 understood the delineation there, too. 8 jump in here. Let me Operational 9 (b)(6) reserve -- It appears that MNC -and I know you all have 10 wrestled with this. I've seen evidence of it. But it 11 appears that the Corps does not have an operational reserve, 12 number one. Is that true? Is that a true statement? 13 (b)(3), (b)(6) We had one until we committed 14 it. 15 When was that? 16 (b)(6) That was when 32 was committed 1: 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) up north to Baqubah. 3-2 had been, up until that point, what 18 we call above ground. They were over on the west side of 19 Baghdad, not maintaining terrain. They were not holding a 20 piece of terrain and not responsible. They weren't a terrain 21 22 owner.

RE

C
* S E C R E T *

So they were above ground, and that terminology 1 was coined by V Corps. But when we saw, you know, things 2 happening the way they were, we started --3 This was early March? 4 (b)(6) (b)(3), (b)(6) Yes. When we saw AQI, Al Qaeda, 5 start -- As we were achieving success, we'd like to believe, б in Baghdad, they got out -- the enemy got out to that area up 7 in Diyala Province, and the Commander made a decision to 8 dedicate the reserve, mission in reserve, up to Baqubah, and 9 that's where they are at right now. 10 But right now you don't have any. Is 11 (b)(6) that correct? 12 That is (b)(3), (b)(6) That's correct. 13 14 correct. So if a ;problem comes up someplace, 15 (b)(6) if General Mixon, for example, wants more reinforcements, 16 what is the Corps Commander -- What choices does he have? 17 We have attempted to articulate 18 (b)(3), (b)(6) in a fragmentary order to have the Divisions designate a unit 19 that -- a battalion level, a battalion level organization, to 20 be able to disengage and respond -- you know, the company, in 21 the first 36 hours and the remainder -- with attack, and then 22

* SECRET *

the remainder of the battalion within 48 hours. 1 So there is a --Because he committed the 2 reserve, he asked FUOPS to generate this order so that he 3 could have already provided a warning order, so to speak, to 4 each of the Division Commanders to say, okay, because I have 5 committed my reserve, I need you to think through this; and 6 if I should pick up the phone and call you, I need you to be 7 able to execute. 8 So they should have gone through that planning 9 process to have that up and running. 10 That's fairly recent, though, isn't 11 (b)(6) it? 12 It is very recent. Very recent. (b)(3), (b)(6) 13 Incidentally, the COIN manual nowhere (b)(6) 14 in it has the word reserve in it, and you know, from what 15 I've seen here, if there is a hole in that -- It's a great 16 manual, but if there is a hole, it doesn't address, you know, 17 how you conduct those kinds of offensive operations without a 18 And I've seen it play out here with mostly, I reserve. 19 guess, MND-North and General Mixon requesting reinforcement. 20 The borders: How do you wrestle the borders? 21 How do you plan for -- to seal the borders? And this is not 22

E

CRE

* secret*

only your problem, but I meant certainly addressing it as you see it as the planner. But it's really a long term problem, and it's also an MNFI problem.

Π.

CRE

That's how we are approaching 4 (b)(3), (b)(6) it. That is how we are approaching it. In fact, over the 5 weeks, Multinational Force-Iraq has held an 6 last few operational plans team to get at the foreign fighters and 7 facilitators, and their focus has been to the west, because 8 naturally, the -- Well, as we understand it, the foreign 9 fighters and facilitators, terrorists' primary 10 route is coming in from Syria. 11

So that's been their focus at this -- While they have been planning on that and asking for us to sit in and provide comment, our focus, or General Odierno's focus, is to the east.

 16
 (b)(6): Right.

 17
 (b)(3), (b)(6): 1.4b, 1.4d

 18
 1.4b, 1.4d

 19
 1.4b, 1.4d

 20
 21

 21
 So we have maintained since January that our

stance should be non-invasive, but the borders and the ports

* S E C R E T *

1 of entry are primarily Force's responsibility, but the 2 government of Iraq should be the ones on the ground with the 3 actual hands-on.

CRE

I go back to the Prime Minister's emergency measures that he put in place at the beginning of the year. One of those was to secure the borders and ports of entry -well, it's primarily the ports of entry -- for 72 hours; you know, actually, a little longer than that.

9 We were to assist during a time frame -- prior to 10 that time frame, to assist the border element at each one of 11 those ports of entry, but then step back and allow them, 12 meaning the government of Iraq, to enforce the emergency 13 measures, the inspections, etcetera.

Right now, we don't have any -- Other than at the ports of entry, we don't have forces on the border sealing the border, and that OPT for it would be -- Operational Plans Team -- That effort still continues. It hasn't come to a close yet. But that's still where we're at.

19 (b)(6) Right.

20 (b)(3), (b)(6) : Ours is to remain removed from -21 - To help the government of Iraq with the ports of entry, but 22 not be at the ports of entry with weapon in hand blocking or

* secre*

stopping traffic or conducting the inspections, and we are also not patrolling the borders, because our focus, naturally, is inside and on the routes -- right now, as it stands, major routes from those ports of entry down into Baghdad. So our surveillance means from the air are doing the same thing.

RE

7 (b)(6) : Right.
8 (b)(3), (b)(6) I have one last question. You
9 talked about the relationship between yourself and higher
10 headquarters, MNFI, in the planning process.

What is the relationship between the planning process at your level and the Multinational Division troop forces? Is there a collaboration there? What's -- Is there much ongoing connectivity there?

15 (b)(3),(b)(6) : We have plans -- We have 16 elements from each one of the Divisions that are resident 17 right there in our workspace. We share everything with them. 18 They go back --

What's their rank? What's their rank? What's their rank? Primarily Majors, and I have a Lieutenant Colonels, and I've got a DA, a Department of the Army, element as well. But anyway, the

* secret*

planners from each of the Divisions -- they attend everything
that we do. They receive the information. We don't keep
anything close hold. They, naturally, correspond with their
Divisions.

R

T

We talk with the lead planners. For example, We talk with the lead planners. For example, We talk with him regularly; with the Marines our west, at least once a week, if not two, to their LNO.

10 So that we don't have a forum, if you will. We 11 don't sit down with them on a monthly or quarterly basis or 12 anything like that. We get good mileage out of the LNOs.

14 (b)(6) Let me ask a couple of -- I've just 15 got a couple of more questions.

(b)(3), (b)(6)

13

Great.

Center of gravity: Was there a discussion on the change? You had the center of gravity as Baghdad, to secure Baghdad. That was the Corps' center of gravity, and now you've changed -- in 0701 you've changed it to Iraqi populations. Center of gravity is the Iraqi populations.

21 Can you talk a little bit about why that change 22 was made?

* <u>S E C R E T</u> *

1 (b)(3),(b)(6) : We believe that, if we could 2 protect the populous of 7-plus million people, the hub of --3 what I called the hub of all activity in another interview -4 - it would have a way of proliferating throughout the 5 country.

CRE

Π.

- m - 3

6 So that's why we decided to focus on securing and 7 protecting the populous of Baghdad, and not at the expense of 8 the rest of the country either, because they are doing much 9 of the same thing throughout the country up north, west, down 10 southeast, that Multinational Division-Baghdad is doing in 11 Baghdad, with the clear control and (Inaudible) of the major 12 populations centers, etcetera.

(b)(6) : On the MNFI campaign strategy -- and you've basically answered this. But you seem so far ahead of anything that they have put out, because they haven't put out a new campaign strategy.

Are they, in a sense, following what you are already doing? Is their campaign plan that is going to come out -- is it going to change anything in your campaign plan and strategy?

21 (b)(3), (b)(6) : To our knowledge, no, it won't 22 serve to change anything. Once again, it gets back to their

* <mark>S E C R E T *</mark>

sharing their product with us, even though they haven't
 published it yet. And the only reason why they haven't is
 because General Petraeus has yet to brief the Secretary of
 Defense. That's basically it -- all it is.

C D

Recognizing that forward hope is not 5 (b)(6) realistic the planner's lexicon, please qive б in me MNCI planning in order. What's your assessment of the 7 assessment, your assessment on the success of this plan? 8

9 (b)(3).(b)(6) : My assessment is that we, in 10 fact -- There was the function of time, and you read about it 11 in the field manual, and patience and level of force, 12 interaction with the local populous.

Because of the numbers of soldiers, sailors, 13 airmen and marines that we have on the ground, we need time, 14 now that we have the 20th Brigade Combat Team on the ground, 15 to be able to complete the clear/ control/retained tasks that 16 we have that are in the order, primarily through our main 17 effort, the city of Baghdad, to be able to realize -- and I 18 don't like to use -- I'll say success, success as it applies 19 to the operation order. 20

I don't see that happening for a while yet. As we do that, as we are able to control, then retain, and we

* <u>s e c r e t</u>*

can get at the other things in the grand scheme -- that fifth
failure I was talking to you about in the campaign plan about
enabling civil authority, the infrastructure and essential
service needs -- we can get at those things.
So it's much in line with what General Odierno

E

CRE

has been speaking all along, that General Petraeus has been
espousing.

I just thinking about that last year when I was at the War College, and after I found out that I was coming to Fort Hood as the Chief of Plans, that I started thinking about it back then and sketching things and capturing thoughts and that kind of thing.

I believe we are on glide path, but we need time to be able to -- To answer your question, I believe we are on glide path, and I believe we are headed in the right direction.

17 (b)(6) Do you think December of '07, which I 18 believe is written in -- certainly written in the campaign 19 operational concept --

(b)(3), (b)(6)
And the Commander's intent.
(b)(6)
And the Commander's intent.
(b)(3), (b)(6)
That's correct.

* SECRET *

-- is realistic? : 1 (b)(6) : Did you mean December '08? 2 (b)(3), (b)(6) No, December '07. 3 (b)(6) No, December '07. : No, the (b)(3), (b)(6) 4 Commander wrestled with that. We discussed back at Fort Hood 5 last year about being able to effect some kind of change by б - because our original rotation was supposed to be up in 7 November. 8 He was looking for that momentum to be able to 9 achieve something, irreversible momentum, by December; and 10 that -- We talked better than hour at a senior plans meeting 11 one morning just on that alone. Great conversation. 12 Great dialoque. 13 General Odierno still firmly believes that we can 14 from here, and I believe, in answering this get there 15 question and dovetailing off of my previous response to you, 16 I believe so. I believe we can get there from here. I 17 believe, like I said, we are on that glide path to being able 18 to do that by December, even if you were to superimpose 19 provincial elections over the top of that as well, which is 20 here in the offing as well as we continue to enable civil 21 authority. 22

Speaking of -- I'm glad you brought 1 (b)(6) up provincial elections. I had seen in one of the V Corps 2 plans that they -- one of their assumptions was that the 3 provincial elections would have already been held, provincial 4 governments' elections would already be held by this time. 5 Yes, sir. 6 (b)(3), (b)(6) : And they haven't been. 7 (b)(6) Right, sir. 8 (b)(3), (b)(6)

CRE

9 (b)(6) Is there something in the offing, you
10 said? We know it's a GOI, government of Iraq,
11 responsibility.

it is. I've been in 12 (b)(3), (b)(6) Yes, discussions in which we as a Headquarters realized that we 13 have 20 brigade combat teams on the ground. Because we have 14 that amount of forces here on the ground, we foresee a need 15 to talk to -- engage the government of Irag to help them see 16 the goodness in conducting those provincial elections while 17 we have this amount of force on the ground, so that we can 18 assist them, as we have done over the last year or two, but 19 again trying to keep the Iraqi forces, naturally -- the Iraqi 20 Army, naturally, in the lead there; and even more so, the 21 Iraqi police, because we need to keep -- We continue to train 22

* 5 E C R E T *

and build the capacity and capability of the Iraqi Army, but the policing function of a society is what democracy is all about.

RE

As we enable civil authority, the police need to step up. That is why the V Corps -- Last year was the year of the police. They did some yeoman's work in helping getting that together.

8 We need to now get to the graduate level, and I 9 think we are doing that. But we need to keep pressing them 10 and working with the police and working with the government 11 of Iraq to help them see the goodness in conducting these 12 provincial elections between now and spring of next year.

13 (b)(6) A final question, unless (b)(3), (b)(6) 14 (b)(3), (b)(6) has something.

What plans are in the works now? For example, are you working on any contingency planning for downsizing the force or glide pathing to 15 and 12 and 10 brigades, regardless of the success or not of the current plan?

19 (b)(3), (b)(6) : In answering your question, we
20 are responding and attending a Central Command two-week
21 planning time period the 11th through the 21st. I'm sending
22 the Chief of War Plans, (b)(3), (b)(6) , my

* s e c r e t *

* s e c r e t *

contingency operations planner, down to 1 (b)(3), (b)(6) sit in on and provide the Multinational Corps-Iraq 2 perspective on the operational needs of the theater posture. 3 It's a Theater Posture Planning Conference that is being held 4 by Central Command down in Qatar. 5

At that conference, they will get at exactly what you just described, scaling down of the BCTs and the Division Headquarters, the Coalition, to a enduring, set threshold. But it's just knowing that, you know, as we draw down forces, as we further enable civil authority, we know that we have to reduce our footprint.

12 So that's why this planning is taking place.

13 (b)(6) But your section in Plans here at the 14 Corps -- you haven't done any planning on that -- in that 15 regard, have you?

16 (b)(3), (b)(6) : Based on -- I'll go all the way 17 back to the beginning of our conversation. It was what I 18 drew up at the War College last year. So I knew eventually 19 that we would have to do this.

20 (b)(6) : I've actually seen a lot of stuff on 21 V Corps that had planning and basing that was concurrent.

22

(b)(3), (b)(6) Correct. BRAC Order Iraq --

* <u>SECRET*</u>

Declassified by: MG Michael X. Garrett, USCENTCOM Chief of Staff Declassified on: 201505

yes, that terminology. But our look at this -- and you asked 1 2 the question within Plans. Because I more or less broached during the summer of last the subject with [3 (b)(3), (b)(6) year, and how would we go about doing this, and then it was 4 pretty much shelved around the time that we deployed, or 5 right prior to when we deployed, and then we deployed, and 6 then what happened in December/January time frame. 7

CRE

8 Then we got it back out and dusted it off, 9 knowing full well that there are things happening back in the 10 States that are going to eventually drive us to this.

So I guess the answer to your question is yes. (b)(3).(b)(6) : One of the things that came up just yesterday in the battle update assessment was General Petraeus implying that there was a formal plan waiting to be enacted and how that was just about to happen as five additional brigades on the deck.

17 Is there an operational plan that is pending 18 action that is a specific unified piece that's waiting to go 19 into effect now that we have all those elements there?

20 (b)(3), (b)(6) : The answer to your question is 21 no. And the reason why: There was -- He's speaking 22 figuratively about getting the 20th Brigade Combat Team on

* <u>s e c r e t *</u>

the ground with the 3rd Combat Aviation Brigade. 1 Now we have our full complement. What we planned 2 for and started receiving in January with the second brigade 3 of the 82nd Airborne that arrived, which is the 1st Brigade 4 Combat Team, are we have received our full we now --5 complement of what the services said they would provide. 6 His comment yesterday was: Now we have our set, 7 and now we are going to get about what we 8 It was never implied? There is 9 (b)(3), (b)(6) no (Inaudible) operation? 10 Now we have our full (b)(3), (b)(6) 11 No. complement, and now we are ready to get after the enemy in 12 support of the Commander's vision. 13 Well, that's all we have for (b)(3), (b)(6)14 (b)(6) We would like to thank you very much for your time 15 (b)(3), (b)(6) and your answers to these questions. Thank you very much. 16 That completes this interview. : 17 (b)(3), (b)(6) 18

E.

* <u>s e c r e t</u> *