

Joint Force Headquarters State National Working Group
Video Teleconference
McGhee Tyson, ANGB TN
22 July 2003

Question 1

California: There has been lots of work done by ARNG in preparation for the scrub for us at PEC. I need to hear from the HQ ANG, what scrub activity has been going on towards really flushing out the jointness connection between the Army and Air so that we can have a better insight at the state level of what the Air Guard is looking at for structural readjustment?

NGB (ANG/XP): In working with the Army, we have started a couple of years ago to define which positions and which functions could be either/or Army and Air. The biggest constraint for us has been the number of resources that we have, but I think we've been in line over the past couple of years to define those positions, and as we go over those at PEC, if there are additional ones or functions you don't think we've looked at we would need to that.

California : The issue for us is that we know on the Army component side there is a dead set of numbers that we cannot exceed for spaces, yet on the Air side, it is unclear of what the number of spaces and people that we have to work against in making our own scrub.

NGB (ANG/XP): Our understanding of that sir is that we are constrained by the current number of resources that we have allocated to the State Headquarters today, so there will be no growth in the number of authorizations that you have at the State Headquarters. How you align them, you will have flexibility in.

California: Thank you, that puts a little more clarity to it.

Question 2

California: What happens to the State Headquarters Air UMD? We have 24 positions in California, what happens to them?

NGB (ANG/XP): The answer to that question is: You will still have 24 positions; it's just the alignment of them. We are not looking at drawing down the Air Guard presence in the State Headquarters.

California: Well, the TDA you put out on the web does not have any State Headquarters. What's left of us, I think there is one or two Air positions in the Headquarters function. I'm just curious, the information coming out of the joint structure isn't clear.

NGB (ARZ-ARF): We're going to have to convert the Army and Air Headquarters into elements that feed the Joint Table of Distribution. When you say what is going to happen to it, to be determined is the actual--what you said the function for blue only to be determined how we are going to do that, we are going to need to talk about that at PEC.

NGB (J-5/7): I believe the general plan is the UMD as it exists today is what you will operate under until we receive blessing for the JMD that we end up putting together on our CONOPS which will eventually become a JTD - Joint Table of Distribution. I believe in FY06 where if and when we are successful with all this, that document becomes blessed by the Joint Staff and

CJCS and at that time your UMD would go away. Then I believe you would then be a functioning organization as the Air Component Command, which will be formally known now as the Air National Guard Headquarters. Did that answer your question?

California: Yes you did, thanks a lot.

Question 3:

Iowa: I have two questions, one on the slide that you showed, that had the 2 joint task forces-- the ground commander and the air commander and then the CONUS in the middle and you have Title 10 on both sides. What kind of status are all of those forces that are CONUS? And the second question is, as we look at the TDA and you talk about the Navy, the Coast Guard and the Marines; at what point are we going to get guidance as to positions that they will hold within that Joint Headquarters, or do we just leave some slots open for those folks, and how many?

NGB (J-5/7): Ok, to your first question for the center category for the Federal CONUS Missions, Homeland Defense, Homeland Security, as you know way better than I do is either state active duty Title 32 or Title 10. There is a majority of that mission will always be done, I believe in state active duty and Title 32. There are some scenarios you can go through where Commander NORTHCOM, Commander PACOM, Commander SOCOM would probably after a declaration of national emergency or disaster might have some interest in activating that joint force headquarters. There are lots of different scenarios there, a lot of ways that we haven't thought of to do this. I think what is important to know is that the hard boundaries depicted on that slide are not hard; that's conceptual just to get people moving in a joint direction. The second part of your question again, if I answered the first.

Question 4:

Iowa: Yes, as we look in terms of the spaces for the Joint Headquarters and we talked about the Navy and Marines and the Coast Guard providing people at this headquarters, at what point are we going to receive guidance as to what positions you believe they will fill and at what point the number of people that will fill those positions?

NGB (J-5/7): As we move forward with the provisional joint organization at the Bureau, I will tell you that Gen Blum has already arranged for some interservice representation there at the bureau. He is working the assignment piece of that right now. The formal agreement that will cover all 54 states and territories has not been worked yet. That will probably end up on my plate as we go to the Coast Guard and try to find out the best way to ingrain the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserves and the Marine Reserves where appropriate in our state headquarters. I would also tell you that that decision is up to the individual state and TAGs. There is obviously a nexus between that level of jointness at your individual state headquarters and the overall case that the National Guard builds for jointness. It's a whole lot better several months from now when Gen Blum's arguing the fact that we are joint, we are undeniably joint and here are 54 states with Coast Guard LNOs, FEMA LNOs, Marine Corp Reserve LNOs, that's a lot stronger case. I've even got two states that have Coast Guard guys that come by 2 days out of the year; extreme example, again but what we are asking you to keep in mind is that you develop the specific requirements in your state, each one of these 54 pieces is what helps build the overall argument, it help to build the argument for Joint PME for our people, for career development purposes, it helps to build the capability that combatant commanders need.

NGB (J-5/7): Did I answer your question?

Iowa: Yes, thank you.

NGB (J-5/7): OK, next call is from New Jersey

Question 5

New Jersey: Going back to the Air Guard Headquarters, we keep getting conflicting guidance from the Army and the Air side on how we should function. What's the difference between an Air Component Headquarters and an Air National Guard Headquarters?

NGB (J/5-7): Simple answer, one's joint and one is not. We know there will be varying degrees of jointness implemented by 1 October. The shallow answer will be a re-labeling, I'm not exactly sure if this is where the boss intends to go with this. The other answer is there are a lot of different ways to actually organize at a headquarters level jointly and the reason there is no clear guidance is because Gen Blum absolutely does not want us dictating how that is done in your state. In one sense that is probably unfair to you, we can make recommendations. But on the other end of it we have to leave it up to you guys to tell us the smart way of doing this. Did that answer your question? If it didn't, I'll let someone else take a stab at it.

New Jersey: Yes it did, thank you.

NGB (J-5/7): Thank you sir, ok Florida is up next.

Question 6:

Florida: The questions concerning the progress on the legal questions regarding the migration of USPFO functions and of course that involves the issue of NGR 130-6. Where are we with that particular issue?

NGB (J-5/7): In the Bureau, I am going to defer to you if I can on this, Spence if you could eyeball somebody there around the table at the National Guard Bureau, point them out and ask them to respond.

NGB (J-5/7): There was a discussion at this level about the USP&FOs and the instructions that were given to us were to document the USP&FOs as a separate entity. What I understand that to mean is that you can't pull a PARC USPFO as it had been recommended by some of the advisory committees, but that it had to be held in place. It is our stance at this level is that we don't have any intentions of pulling the USPFO apart if that is your question.

NGB (J-5/7): Did that answer your question?

Florida: Absolutely, thank you.

NGB (J-5/7): The next caller is from Delaware.

Question 7

Delaware: I have a couple of questions. One of the things we were looking for from guidance last week was the breakdown of small, medium, and large states, can you address that?

NGB (J-5/7): I will let Colonel Mason and Capt Grist address that specifically if they need to. I will tell you that the answer at the Bureau, the joint staffs answer to that was that it is a matter of scalability more than it is specific size models in one of those three categories that you mentioned. Again, to try and give the states maximum flexibility, we think any provisional J-staff model can be scaled and improvised to make it fit the needs of the state. If we continue to get feedback that we really need a small, medium, large model there, I think the two officers to my right can accommodate, but the agreed solution to date has been to keep that answer scalable. In other words, we are not going to tell you how big any individual joint shop should be, you decide what works best in your state. Captain Grist, Colonel Mason?

NGB (ARZ-ARF): Colonel Constantine, the COSAC Chair had discussed with me the possibility of his working group taking on a small, medium and large if that is what the 54 want to do at PEC. I don't know how far they are going to get along with that, but he did mention that to me, so it hasn't been forgotten.

NGB (Col Turner, J-5/7): Number one, did we answer your question and number two is there something we can do differently to better serve you?

Question 8

Delaware: No, I think that answers that question. The other concern was the initial guidance broke down a listing of J-1 through J-8 positions and with the boxes marked the appropriate color the most recent guidance pointed more towards a joint headquarters that has a separate Army and Air piece and it's a little more different than what the J's across the board called for. Are we to believe that all these positions, outlined in the position template such as Installation Management, all the J-series now fall just under joint with the Army and Air broken down separately?

NGB (J-5/7): We are intentionally not answering that from the Guard Bureau. The answer to that is there will be some things that are Air National Guard that will always be pure Air National Guard. There are functions in your organization that are Army green and will always be Army green. Now at the end of the day one of the boss's statements, and it's a leap, but one of the boss's statements is, he is going to fund Joint Force Headquarters State, which kind of ties us to organizationally all the moving parts now have to fit within that monitor. If it's a Joint Force land component and a Joint Force Air component at that point, barely, we have met the boss's intent. Dr Spencer from the Guard Bureau, can you guys clarify that and keep me out of trouble here?

NGB (J-5/7): I understand what you're asking-- you're asking how to structure the Joint Force Headquarters so that you can have an Army component and an Air component. To answer the question, the original tape that you saw shows the Chief's perspective as we have 162 headquarters in the states and those need to be crunched down to 54. He also made an agreement with the TAGs in Ohio that they would have the maximum latitude to do what they needed to do but what he wanted done at the end of the day was one headquarters, no kidding, with Air and Army Guard together. Does that help at all?

Delaware: Yes, it's quite fair, thank you.

NGB (J-5/7): The next caller is from Illinois.

Question 9

Illinois: My question has to do with the slides or the graphics that were put out as part of the COSAC and we downloaded those and on the first chart where it talks about a command group, it shows a color coding with a chief of staff position identified in green to represent that the chief of staff obviously is in the Army. But when we back go to the 4th chart, where it shows the Joint Force Headquarters, it shows the chief of staff position as a purple position. Are you envisioning that as the same person or is that two different people?

NGB (J-5/7): The consensus here, is that can only be one person and if there has been somebody who has decided that it is going to be an Army slot, then its been done outside the vision of the Bureau

Illinois: I don't imply that, I'm just saying on the Command Group slide that we downloaded off of your website, it shows the chief of staff in green as part of the command group and I didn't know if the command group was considered separate from the joint forces headquarters group.

NGB (ARZ-ARF): That's a draft model; it's meant to be written on, part of the plan is to write on that when we go to PEC in August. So that sounds like an issue that you would want to bring up or through your people.

Question 10

Illinois: Ok, one more question. As I read through, I understand the requirement to submit the provisional plan and I was glad to see that the date was changed to the 27th of August rather than the 15th, and I understand that the 54 then will write the provisional plans and then it is my understanding that it will really be the 5th of October, 2005 both the Army and Air Guard STARC TDAs and Air Guard UMDS from my understanding are now drop dead on the 6th of October, the JTD stands up. My question is at that point on 6 October 2006, or 1 Oct 2006, I should say, are we going to then at that point have a JTD that applies to all states? Is it going to be a JTD that is different for different states and will the concept plan that has to be submitted for approval by the services be a concept plan that has all of the states looking alike, or is it going to show 54 different models?

NGB (J-5/7): The work that lies before us at the Bureau is to take the common pieces of the 54 individual and probably drastically different plans and build a concept plan that supports joint positions embedded at each on of those 54 state headquarters, but that also doesn't in any way misrepresent how different that they are. Again that's kind of what's driven the deadline if you would, to get the initial plans back in so we can start moving in that direction. We don't yet what that common subset is going to be between all the states. It will change, we believe as we build the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, FEMA piece even some of those things that we do in Homeland Security and disaster response that start to build the jointness, the interagency aspect of your joint headquarters. We will see as we start to get these plans in and as we share them, we are going to see a lot of good ideas surface from a lot of different areas and we intend to build our concept plan at the Bureau based on the very best of that and those things that we can make a valid argument for or at least in the majority of our state headquarters.

Illinois: So as I understand it there will be one concept plan that goes forward or one model.

NGB: Yes.

Illinois: Ok, that is all I have.

NGB (J-5/7): Next call is from Wyoming.

Question 11

Wyoming: The question I have today deals with the models that were provided by NGB in the transformation package also. They show the functions of Military Support or DOMs, Counterdrug, and Homeland Security in the J-3, the J-5/7 or as a separate entity not under a J-staff. Where do these functions or capabilities reside in NGB?

NGB (J-5/7): I will address the first part of that; the current structure at National Guard Bureau is that we put a lot of brain bytes into whether or not to call our J-3 shop a J-3 or a Homeland Defense/JDOMS shop. There is no hard fence in what you can do in your respective states. Most joint staffs have a J-3. If you go to the CJCS web site, the J-3 is actually described as the hub of the wheel if you would. We have tried to stay, just to keep from quite honestly from changing too many processes too quick in the Homeland Defense/ Homeland Security arena. We have tried to specifically stay in that for the purposes of the Joint Staff in the Homeland Defense/Homeland Security and totally stay out of Army National Guard and Air National Guard mobilization processes, those Title 10 concerns that are outside of the definitions of Homeland Defense/Homeland Security. So right now at the National Guard Bureau, we do not have a J-3 directorate. We again are a provisional organization; if we decide that was not a good thing to do, that can be changed. Again we are going to recommend you do what's best for your state and we'll look at it nationally and try to best pair and tailor the National Guard Bureau to do what the states are doing. So some of this is going to be give and take, and model and respond. Did that answer your question?

Wyoming: Some of it did, where the intention of the active component is where to look or we look like them. Having it as a separate stand-alone makes us different still again from the active components. I guess I'm wondering if are we going to mirror the active component in that area or if we are going to do something different again?

NGB (J-5/7): I want to carefully label this as my opinion. I absolutely agree with you, there are some other people who disagree. There is more than one right way to do this; I believe the J-3 is the more easily understood label. I think as "3"shops all across the Nation call in, or as the Bureau calls the states, or as the states deal with other organizations, you're going to get a lot of calls asking for a "3" shop as you profess that you are a joint organization. I will also tell you that in the Homeland Security side of the house that DOMs is very well understood that in fact under the J-3 at the Joint Staff, JDOMs has now stood up. The Department of the Army is no longer the executive agent for DOMs, it's now Joint Staff as the executive agent and JDOMs as the Joint Directorate of Military Support that handles those requests for federal capabilities that are handed to the military. Again, I guess to go back to my roots a little bit, there is more than one way to skin that cat and there is certainly more than one opinion out there on the right way to do it. The goal again for all of us is to be more easily understood. That is probably all that I can give you on that, if I didn't answer your question, then I apologize.

Wyoming: Thank you.

Question 12

NGB (J-5/7): Next caller is from New Jersey.

New Jersey: My question has to do with identifying the NORTHCOM mission and our role as reflected by NORTHCOM. I guess if we are going to fight for NORTHCOM, shouldn't we look at NORTHCOM...this goes back to the J-3 question. Is there an availability of a NORTHCOM site that we can look at for flowchart, wire diagram, etc so that we can use that as a starting point?

NGB (J-5/7): Sir, if I'm not mistaken, NORTHCOM has a good website. I know the Joint Staff has a good website. If you can't get that information, you can call me back at the Bureau at DSN 327-2262, I will get the information for you. Again, I agree with you on the J-3 argument, but there are some people who outrank me quite a bit who disagree and they want to keep us in the HD/JDOMs lane at the Bureau right now, so that's what we are doing. I believe we may readdress that issue in the future, I'm not sure. Did that answer your question?

New Jersey: Yes, thank you.

Question 13

NGB (J-5/7): We have an email question from Arkansas.

"In Arkansas they have 251 authorized on the TDA and 26 authorized on the UMD. What does that mean at the end?"

What that means is you have 277 spaces to play with or the authorizations to play with as you move into this new structure. Some of those will end up being on the Army or land component piece, some of those will end up on the Air component, and some in the joint structure and how you distribute those is up to you. Hopefully this answers Arkansas's question.

Question 14

NGB (J-5/7): Next call is from New Hampshire.

New Hampshire: I have a question in how the NGB is working their Joint Staff because there will be big implications in the States. How will the NGB Joint Staff interface with the States--in a ceremonial role, in a common communications, or as a common communications node, or in a Joint policy and funding role?

NGB (J-5/7): My belief is that it will be in the Joint policy and funding role. Let's go to the National Guard Bureau.

NGB (J-5/7): Ok, I will take a stab at this, but like so many other things in this process it will evolve, it is evolving as we speak, and it will evolve further. We are doing a concept plan for the Guard Bureau that we will be submitting to the Joint Staff and the services in about 60 days or so. As we draft that plan, we will be getting some guidance from General Blum and determining the art of the possible from the service headquarters, OSD, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs. The way that we lay out the role of the Guard Bureau will be a function of what we learned while we were drafting this concept plan. I expect that the answer you gave is about right; the Guard Bureau will function as a joint policy and funding role. I expect, but don't know, that the Guard Bureau will be documented as a single entity as opposed to a Joint Bureau with two independent pillars under it or something like that. Given that, the question you are asking sort of goes away once it is documented as a single entity in its own right. So, I think we are going to be working from that assumption until it is proven false and I would suggest that the

States make the same assumption we are and we will adapt later. Does that come anywhere close to answering your question?

Question 15

New Hampshire: Yes, I have one more question. My second question is if a state were to adopt the most aggressive model to include that joint policy and funding that you talked about, what would it look like?

NGB (J-5/7): I think what you have is a direct parallel from the Joint Staff at the Pentagon. You have a J-1, a J-2, a 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and you would have nothing and I guess at an extreme case you wouldn't have anything populated in your Air Component Command or your Land Component Command if you wanted to take it that far and you would just assign Air specific and Army specific, MOB issues, and things like that within that Joint Staff, but I really don't think there are many states headed in that direction. Does that answer your question?

New Hampshire: Yes it does and it helps me see the spectrum.

Question 16

NGB (J-5/7): Washington DC is the next caller.

Washington DC: My question is related to the HRO on the IDT status on drill weekends. As you know, we have no staffing during drill days. Is there some plan to authorize the TDA to accommodate the HRO office when we are in a drill status?

NGB (J-1): I think that's going to be up to each state and territory and what they want to put in the HRO office, and I assume you are speaking of the Air Guard positions?

Washington DC: I'm speaking of both the Air and the Army.

NGB (J-1): Has DC chosen not to put anything in the HRO shop today?

Washington DC: Well, we have authorizations for two positions, but for example, myself as an AGR Colonel, there's no slot for me in the HRO during drill weekend.

NGB (J-5/7): In the past, that has happened in both the HRO and the USP&FO arena. I think as we move forward with this whole process, you need to look at the full-time spaces that you have out there and how you have them aligned on your UMD and TDA and how you want them portrayed as we move into the future. Realizing of course, if you have an individual that currently does not have a TDA or UMD space, that their drill weekend space is with the wing or with the unit, then you are going to have to use something to place them against it. As we move forward in this process, the full-time spaces should be aligned with the TDA and UMD and thus the JTD so that everyone has a space to fill. Has that helped?

Washington DC: I don't really think so honestly; we'll try to look at it when we start looking at the TDA.

NGB (J-5/7): If that is not a sufficient answer, why don't you put that in an email and contact NGB-HR, that way you can write up your specific issue and we will make sure that NGB-HR addresses that.

Washington DC: OK, I can do that, thank you.

Question 17

NGB (J-5/7): Colonel Constantine in Massachusetts, tell us what we've done right and what we've done wrong sir.

Massachusetts: Good afternoon folks, you're right on target. I'm really proud of everything to date and I've heard a lot of good things. I think we're on track. We need to look forward at our visit to PEC, 11-15 August, where we are going to break down into work groups. It is imperative that every state send some folks who are really ready to roll up their sleeves and come with open minds so that we can put the best models together. I think you are going to be pleasantly surprised that there will be a lot of plagiarism, and I think that's a good thing. There is a lot of expertise in the MILPEC, the HORAC, the FORTAC and all those other advisory committees. The COSAC and the ESSO have the lead no doubt and we are up to the task. I will tell you that when we built the original concept plan, we didn't want to slight anyone. That was done in a couple of hours to get people to start thinking about a new direction and we will bring a couple of other models with us. That slide you put up that has the Land Component and the Air Component is right on. That gives the Adjutants General the greatest degree of flexibility to allow them put as many or as few shades of purple into every state headquarters. There are still some folks that do not want to enter into this arena but I'm sure they will come as we work this issue and work this process. The J-Staff, when we talked about small, medium, and large may not be the way to go, it may perhaps as Colonel Turner discussed it a degree where make a pile of blocks and make other blocks based on smaller numbers in smaller states. You may combine the J-2, 5 and 7 under the J-3 perhaps. I heard the JDOMS question and I fully support the J-3 concept along with many of my other brethren out there, especially those of us who have done desk OPs so we know how to play some of those block games. We can truly be a purple organization, we can truly be one headquarters with the Adjutant General as the officer in charge and he or she will have the full flexibility to staff those positions as they see fit. I also noted your comment about the other Reserve Components and that is going to take time and we are going to have to invite them each individually to come play in our sandboxes, and that's not going to happen overnight. Some of that dialogue is already taking place at the local and national level, so I'm confident that we are going to get there. We have the deliverables on or about the 27th of August, we're going to meet that timeline. This is a work in progress probably not to be done in my lifetime because it is going to evolve from a provisional document over the next couple of years and there are a lot of smart people doing a lot of great things to try to get this thing right. I want to commend each and every one at your level for the leadership that you have taken charge of this process, and I will tell you that we will roll up our sleeves as a group and be happy to do whatever is necessary to give us a National Guard of the 21st Century.

NGB (J-5/7): Thank you sir, and we do appreciate all the work that you and Colonel King have done. That slide came from Colonel Adam King and I took his exact words and put it on there and I think it is clarifying for us. We now have a call from Utah.

Question 18

Utah: We have tried to do a lot of things with the Joint Staff in our state and some of the largest obstacles we have found toward establishing any kind of full jointness is in the incapability that exists between the service components, in the computer systems, in the personnel systems, in the pay system. Is there any effort at the Guard level to create more compatible systems or

unified systems in these areas or other areas? For instance, to do away with the Air State Headquarters and fold it into a Joint Headquarters makes it difficult for us to handle things like orders, awards and decorations, promotions...things that are unique to the Air Force that are not done the same way in the Army system. We encounter problems with pay, the incompatibility of computer systems; we have worked to try to create such compatibilities as we could, but it definitely creates obstacles to a true Joint Force. Can you comment on what has been done at the Bureau level?

NGB (J-5/7): I will comment and then I will go to the Bureau to let them comment. The correct answer is I absolutely agree with everything you just said sir; there are obstacles between us and deep purple state headquarter operations. I think it will happen in varying shades, I believe there's a mindset change that needs to occur at the Bureau as well as the state headquarters for us to really embrace General Blum's vision. I do know that the J-6 shop under Major General Spooner and Mr Lischke have already made and established good communications with NORTHCOM so in that sense, there have already been some efforts in the J-6 arena. Pay, probably some real hurdles there and I don't think we will get there before the rest of the world. I think we will be stuck with those individual systems. As we move forward in this, I believe you will see some prioritizations changes from service specific within the Army and Air National Guard systems to Joint systems. With that said, I am going to let the Bureau respond.

NGB (J-8): The short answer to the National Guard Bureau coming up with a single system for Army and Air payroll and personnel is no. There is a system that is being developed, it's called DIMERs and that is supposed to bring Department of Defense under one system for both Personnel Management and Payroll. That is supposed to be scheduled between FY07 and FY09 depending on the optimist that you speak with. Now we are attempting to as apart of our joint process here at the Bureau to develop an ability to collect and transmit those business practices and to deal with some regulatory conflicts that are within our control to better harmonize our personnel policies and our pay systems but that is something we will deal with as we move closer to FOC; we're not quite ready or staffed to do that today.

NGB (J-5/7): Thank you. Did we answer your question?

Utah: You answered the question that it isn't going to happen in the near future. I know what we have done in our state is addressed it on two levels. We have established a coordinating staff to coordinate those things that are common between the service components and we have established a different staff, a Joint Emergency Operations Staff to spin up and become rather elastic, either small or large, to respond to individual incidents. We will submit a plan I think that will be along those lines. It's very difficult to set up a joint staff, the J-functions and have them sit and twiddle their thumbs to accomplish day-to-day activities when they really can't do them jointly, they have to do them as individual service components.

NGB (J-5/7): I agree and if our recommendations end up driving you in that direction, then we are wrong and we need to re-look them. Bored airmen and bored soldiers are the worst thing we can do for any of our people and if they don't have meaningful work, then we have done something wrong. If you have working models, the next phase with the information sharing in my vision is it will start to post the state plans and in fact highlight those things that show brilliance and things that we haven't been to. I really think that the comment Colonel Constantine made that plagiarism is encouraged; it will be one of those areas, General, if you guys see that already, then we certainly don't need to continue down that road and we need to find a better solution.

Utah: We expect to learn from others as well as participate in the process ourselves. Thank you.

Question 19

NGB (J-5/7): Let me address an email question from a Chaplain, in Missouri.

“Missouri is one of the few states with a full-time chaplain. Under the Command Group, there are slots for personal staff. Is my full-time position within Missouri aligned with the new JFHQ-ST TDA and is it a purple slot? “

Yes, it probably should be, but again, that is your state’s call.

Question 20

NGB (J-1): I will address an email question from the Georgia HRO office.

“What guidance will NGB provide to states/HROs on compatibility for full-time technicians in regards to the new Joint TDA document? Secondly, will the states have authority to waive compatibility for a period of time based on TDA grade/MOS structure?”

We are not going to provide specific guidance on compatibility beyond what we have that compatibility cannot be unilaterally waived; it is part of the Technician Act. We are encouraging states simultaneously when they are building those new documents to also be building a full-time document and looking at those issues of compatibility. In every case they are not going to line up but I think because of the flexibility that the TAGs have in building those documents that hopefully compatibility will not be a big issue. Certainly we will work with the states to ensure that the TAGs have as much flexibility in building the military document and the full-time document. We encourage states to be building both and if you send them in we would greatly appreciate it; I would certainly love to look at them while military documents are being built. Regarding whether states will have authority to waive compatibility based on TDA grades and MOS structure. There was a letter put out about a year and a half ago that there is some flexibility on compatibility and what the TAG can and cannot waive because of reorganizations. Certainly, we will continue to abide by that but compatibility in and of itself cannot be waived unilaterally. I hope that answers your question.

Other Comments to Questions while waiting for calls

NGB (J-5/7): I do have one technical comment to add to the Chaplain’s question. It is part of Joint Duty Assignment Doctrine that chaplains, lawyers and doctors are by definition not joint-duty assignments. It’s true, the position can be of any service to be the Chaplain of the State but joint-duty assignment and joint-duty credit are not applicable to chaplains, doctors, and lawyers.

NGB (J-1): I would just like to reiterate what was said earlier. We have one shot to get it right when you submit your manning requirements, your document to bear that up with a full-time manning document. Again, looking at the 11-15 timeframe at PEC, I agree with, we would love to see some of those proposals the states bring in with them for the full-time manning as well. Thank you.

End of comments from NGB.

Question 21

NGB (J-1): I have an email question from Nebraska that is hard to read but I will do my best.

“What affect does the new document have on our non-dual status technicians? Will there still be a separate full-time support voucher and a TDA document? “The last part I really can’t read ...”If there is only a TDA document”... and I don’t know what the rest says.

Yes, there will continue to be a full-time support voucher as far as I know. It may or may not coincide with this TDA document that’s why as it is today, it’s critical that you consciously make some decisions on where that full-time support is going to reside on this traditional document. That’s one of the reasons I will reiterate that we would like to see both of them at the same time. I know on behalf of Mr Crowley that the TAGs will continue to have maximum flexibility with the assignment of dual and non-dual technicians into those positions. So I don’t think it’s going to have any affect on your non-dual status technicians; I think those positions will be defined as dual or non-dual in the PDs, so I really don’t see a change there. I hope that answers the question for you.

NGB (J-5/7): We now have a caller on the line from Oregon.

Question 22

Oregon: Is the joint initiative going to have any impact on pending PD releases such as the DISUM DPI package?

NGB (J-1): I do have PD packages that I have asked the classifiers to go back and ensure that they at a minimum they can be supported by blue or green incumbents. Traditionally the DISUM package and I think everyone knows that we are working on those and the DPI right now; that right now they are considered army positions. We are going back and rewording some those positions so that they will support a joint organization and we are including in that a J-6 position that had not previously been considered. As a division, we are looking at building very generic PDs for all of the principle staff positions and once we start getting those full-time documents in, it will give us a better idea of what the states need and what we need to do to support that. So, yes there are some PDs that I have right now that I am looking at to ensure that they support a joint organization. Does that answer your question?

Oregon: Yes it does, thank you.

Question 23

NGB (J-5/7): We will now go to a call from New Jersey.

New Jersey: Yes, regarding the conference at PEC 11-15 August; who is the intended audience for that?

NGB (J-5/7): There will be two or three designated individuals from each state. There is a physical limit at the PEC as far as accommodations; I think the target is around 200 and if you do the simple math 3 or 4 will get you there will quick. The ESSOs and the Chiefs of Staff are probably the lead in that, if not one of the actual attendees from both sides of the house and other than that, I am not sure. Colonel Mason, can you answer that?

NGB (ARZ-ARF): The guidance will be that the primary functional chairs will head up the work groups and then as far as those individuals want to head up their work groups, they will need to invite those folks. I appreciate your point about the physical capacity at PEC; the classrooms only hold around 45 people, so it is important that we keep that in mind. The chairs of the work groups will be the primary functionals and I would recommend that representatives from the sub-committee advisory councils be invited per whatever the pleasure of the COSAC and ESSO chairs and we'll probably hit the 200-300 point when we go to that many. Out of the general 54 population, one of those needs to be a logistics representative to work the equipment; we are also going to invite recorders. Those recorders will be working for the primary functionals to keep track of what's going on. We are going to train those folks too and the LOIs who are coming our Thursday. Did that answer your question?

New Jersey: Yes, thank you.

Question 24

NGB (J-5/7): Here is an email question from Minnesota:

“Could you tell us again how the use of a JFHQ along with a JFLCC and JFACC meets the Chief's intent of reducing the number of HQs in each state? We still have three in this case.”

Keep in mind that on that original slide, that is one organization. That's not Army National Guard Headquarters, Air National Guard Headquarters and a Joint Headquarters. This intent with this again is at the Bureau and at the states that we move towards a single organization. Nobody is pretending that there are not individual functions that are not going to change a lot in the first few months of that operation. There will be blue functions that will remain blue and green functions what will remain green; the difference will be that they will fall under a Joint Force Headquarters State. They will not be within an Air National Guard Headquarters and an Army National Guard Headquarters within the state. Again, I will go a step further and say that Lieutenant General Blum's intent at the Guard Bureau is that we eventually realize manpower savings out of this and that we flow to the states either to the headquarters or to the units. I would think that at the state level, the intent would be the same. As we get into this and learn to do business jointly and find economies of scale and efficiencies that we put more people out of the headquarters and into the war-fighting business. That was the intent when the service components did it and it is our goal here. Is it going to take us awhile to get there? Yes. Is anybody's job going to be eliminated October the first? No.

So I hope that answers your question. Since there are no comments from NGB we will take our next caller.

Question 25

NGB (J-5/7): We will now go to a question from Iowa.

Iowa: This is a comment regarding the people attending the conference in August and I concur with you on the FROs being there. The TDAs, MPOEs force structure has always been a desk ops issue and I ask that you not leave the desk ops out of this. I know that the chiefs have been working this and it is a very important part of the process but please include in those numbers some desk ops personnel.

NGB (ARZ-ARF): The two to three includes the general population; the ESSO and COSAC are outside of that. I think there is plenty of room for everyone. Just keep in mind that if everyone signs up to work the J-3, J-5/7 functions that there is only room for 45 people per classroom. We will have 8 signup sheets with the functions for the personnel and then we will have an equipment list and then a general staff list to assist the functions. How's that.

Iowa: Appreciate it.

Question 26

NGB (J-5/7): We an email fax from Pennsylvania, which I will read and attempt to answer.

“Is there an intent to create a paragraph 300 labeled as the ANG Headquarters?”

No, not necessarily. I assume when you are saying paragraph 300, you are talking about the TDA. The Air Headquarters wouldn't appear on the TDA, it would just be on a JTD and UMD.

“Can we move sections within the document to fit our version of “Joint” (i.e. Strategic Plans from Command Group to JHQ)?”

Yes, you can move things around. What works in your state is what we want to see and what the Chief wants to see.

“Explain the “two sets of authorization documents” issue.

This has me at a loss. I don't know what Pennsylvania is talking about in regards to this. Anyone else? *(no one else had a comment or understood meaning of question)*

NGB (J-5/7): I will tell you the directorate numbering system for the J-staff again parallels what is being done. This question is worded to say why aren't we calling this the “G series”? The G-series is green and the A-1, A-2, A-3 shops on the Air is blue. This specific question asks “Why aren't we calling the directorates G-1, G-2, J-3, J4, etc”

Again no rules here, but it's hard to say you're doing joint business and that you're moving toward joint goals if you're still individually labeling directorate level as Army specific and Air specific. Again, within the Land Component Command and the Air Component Command there will be those pure green and pure blue lanes. If you wanted to at that point to label those directorates or divisions, that's up to you. We are not making those rules for you.

Question 27

NGB (J-5/7): Next caller is from Virginia.

Virginia: I have a question regarding the Logistics piece of the TDA scrub down at PEC. We're not aware of any equipment requirements for the J-staff, I'm not sure why you need a Log rep down there. Could you clarify that a little bit?

NGB (ARZ-ARF): The reason why we need to have those reps there is because there is still some equipment in the J STARC document that needs to be identified, removed, and placed to separate UICs. Part of the history, and Mr Armstrong you can help me explain this, is that we have moved along the way a lot elements out of STARC to make a core STARC to get to the

point where we are now. Some of those elements were in the R&R detachments, etc and when we did that, some of the equipment that should have gone with that stayed within the core STARC document and needs to come out of there. That's the reason why we are requesting that we work that separately and ensure that we clean that up. It may not take a whole day, it may take 2 days, but there is in fact a work group that has been headed by our office to do that and this is a continuation of that work.

Virginia: I understand what you want, we have been working that off-line with some of your folks and we will continue to look at that. Is there a document that you can send us that we can look at or just use the STARC TDAs that are out there now?

NGB (ARZ-ARF): You can go ahead and look at you current approved document, that's where the equipment is. Colonel Adams was on the overall work group that scrubbed the STARC document last year and maybe he should come to the meeting.

Virginia: Ok, I'll talk to Colonel Adams, thank you.

Question 28

NGB (J-5/7): We will now go to Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania: Yes the question (email) I had asked that you had a problem answering regarding the two documents. I understand that under the current TDAs that Pennsylvania is authorized for the state headquarters will continue to go through the document approval process, yet we will have this provisional TDA. I was trying to understand the issue of dealing with two documents at the same time; this provisional joint headquarters document, yet we will still continue to go through the normal force structure process with the documents that are still in the queue.

NGB (J-5/7): I agree with you, the devil will be in the details as we move through the next 2 years trying to operate off our old document and at the same time move forward toward the JMD and eventually a JTD. There are some challenges that the J-1 at the Bureau will have to work the other branches and HRO on and we don't even know what those hurdles are going to be yet. I don't think we are that far into it.

NGB (J-5/7): It's going to be a struggle as we move forward and it is going to create some OERs and SIDPERs type problems and I think I heard Colonel Mason wanted to make a quick comment on this.

NGB (ARZ-ARF): We have to maintain those documents because they are actually documented into the POM. If we were to inactivate the Air National Guard Headquarters and the STARC today, the flow of funding for the personnel and equipment authorizations would go away and we don't want that to happen. So once we get permission to actually get the JTD resourced through the service elements, that's when we will do the conversion and get into the POM process. That is what is so great about taking 36 months for us to properly resource this through the system and that's why we need to maintain those documents.