5510
Ser N00A
29 Jun 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

From: Executive Assistant, Chief of Naval Operations

Ref: (a) SECNAV M-5510.36, DON INFOSEC Programs

Encl: (1) CPF ltr 5720 Ser 01J/1634 of 24 Jun 16
(2) COMTHIRDFLT ltr 5720 Ser N00/215 of 28 Jun 16
(3) COMNECC ltr 5510 Ser N00/383 of 29 Jun 16
(4) Executive Summary (Breckenridge Supplement) to DESRON FIVE-ZERO ltr 5830 Ser N00/034 of 28 Feb 16
(5) VCNO ltr 5830 Ser N09D/16U112919 of 31 Mar 16
(6) CPF ltr 5830 Ser N01/084 of 31 Mar 16
(7) COMNECCPAC ltr 5830 Ser N00/026 of 11 Apr 16
(8) COMTHIRDFLT ltr 5830 Ser N00/S003 of 15 Apr 16
(9) CPF ltr 5830 Ser N00/0100 of 20 Apr 16
(10) VCNO ltr 5830 Ser N09/16U100522 of 31 May 16

1. Enclosures (1) through (3) defer declassification authority of enclosures (6) through (9). NAVCENT and DNS-36 conducted a declassification review for Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) proactive release of enclosures (4) through (10). As a result, information was redacted for those sections unable to be declassified and released in accordance with reference (a).

2. All other information is determined to be "UNCLASSIFIED."

3. The points of contact for this matter are (b) (6) [redacted] (b) (6) [redacted] NAVCENT, and (b) (6) [redacted] DNS-36. (b) (6) [redacted] can be reached at (b) (6) [redacted] or email: (b) (6) [redacted], and (b) (6) [redacted] can be reached at (b) (6) [redacted] or email: (b) (6) [redacted]

M. A. MCCARTNEY

Copy to:
NAVCENT
DNS-36

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER U.S. THIRD FLEET
53690 TOMAHAWK DR STE 338
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92147-5004

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5830
Ser N00/S003
15 Apr 16

FIFTH ENDORSEMENT on CAPT (b)(6) USN ltr 5830 Ser N00/034 of 28 Feb 16

From: Commander, U.S. THIRD Fleet
To: Vice Chief of Naval Operations
Via: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION TO INQUIRE INTO THE INCIDENT IN THE VICINITY OF FARSI ISLAND INVOLVING TWO RIVERINE COMMAND BOATS (RCB 802 AND RCB 805) ON OR ABOUT 12 JANUARY 2016

Encl: (Appendix J) COMTHIRDFLT List of Additional References and Enclosures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. (U//~~FOUO~~) Per direction of Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet's THIRD ENDORSEMENT, the review herein is limited in scope and addresses those opinions and recommendations contained within the subject investigation that concern matters within the purview and responsibility of Commander, U.S. THIRD Fleet (COMTHIRDFLT). Specifically, I focused my review only to those opinions and recommendations relating to the pre-deployment training and certification of Coastal Riverine Squadron THREE (CRS-3), including Riverine Command Boat (RCB) 802 and RCB 805 crewmembers. My review also considered the FIRST ENDORSEMENT by Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command and the FOURTH ENDORSEMENT by Commander, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command Pacific (NECCPAC).

2. (U//~~FOUO~~) In this endorsement, I assess the existing pre-deployment training and certification process to be sufficient and non-concur with the investigating officer's (IO) opinion that COMTHIRDFLT's pre-deployment certification "standard" did not adequately meet all of the FIFTH Fleet operational requirements (VI.A.18). I further non-concur with the IO that mission tasking from COMTHIRDFLT during the training continuum negatively impacted the ability of CRS-3 personnel to complete required individual skills training (VI.A.7). Finally, I non-concur with the opinion that RCB 802's and RCB 805's pre-deployment training (including the advanced phase) was inadequate (VI.A.9).

3. (U//~~FOUO~~) Although the current certification process is sufficient, I am recommending additional measures to augment certification review. Specifically, COMTHIRDFLT should be added to the distribution for Force Tracking Numbers (FTNs) and pre-deployment orders for units I am certifying.

4. (U/~~FOUO~~) Of note, the IO did not consult COMTHIRDFLT during the course of the inquiry. Similar to the NECCPAC Commander's assessment in his FOURTH ENDORSEMENT, the absence of input resulted in incomplete or inaccurate findings and opinions of the certification process and training standards. As such, in addition to a more extensive review of opinions and recommendations under COMTHIRDFLT's purview, a brief explanation of the pre-deployment certification process and COMTHIRDFLT's role in that process is required and therefore also described herein.

COMTHIRDFLT DEPLOYMENT CERTIFICATION PROCESS

1. (U) COMUSFLTFORCOM/COMPACFLTINST 3501.3D (Ref (bg)), CH-1, Fleet Training Continuum, establishes the policy and articulates requirements for all aspects of fleet training and certification, defining the roles and responsibilities of Fleet Commanders, Numbered Fleet Commanders, and Type Commanders (TYCOM) (Ref (bg)). Per Ref (bg), COMTHIRDFLT (C3F) serves as Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (CPF) Executive Agent (EA) for deployment certifications for Navy forces trained within THIRD Fleet's Area of Responsibility that ultimately deploy forward to every Combatant Command. United States Fleet Forces Command (USFF) provides the same training for forces that are trained in their AOR. A difference between how CPF and USFF train and certify forces is that CPF has an EA for training (C3F) while USFF executes this training function within their headquarters. Upon Integrated/Advanced Fleet Response Training Plan (FRTP) completion, the TYCOMs, Carrier Strike Group (CSG)/Expeditionary Strike Group (ESG)/Amphibious Ready Group (ARG) Commanders, etc., in coordination with Immediate Superior in Command (ISIC) and CSG-15, as applicable, provide Certification Recommendation messages to C3F IAW mandated template formats outlined in Ref (bg).

2. (U) C3F deployment certifications are based on three primary inputs: (1) the TYCOM/CSG/ESG or CSG-15 certification recommendations, as applicable, (2) verification that all Defense Readiness Reporting System-Navy (DRRS-N) Navy Mission Essential Task List (NMETL) requirements were met, and (3) recurring reports to the C3F Commander throughout the entire FRTP Cycle. DRRS-N identifies the mandated mission areas required for every naval unit assigned by Unit Identification Code (UIC) in order to achieve unit deployment readiness. Embedded beneath the mission areas of DRRS-N (Ref (bm)) are the associated NMETLs and tasks to support full deployment certification as assigned to each UIC. C3F verifies DRRS-N completion of NMETL training by assessing the deployment certification recommendation from the TYCOM/CSG/ESG or CSG-15 and spot checking within the DRRS-N program itself. If deficiencies are noted early in the integrated/advanced training cycle, they are identified via the recurring reports to the C3F Commander and corrective action is taken to ensure the TYCOM/CSG/ESG has the proper resources to achieve full certification. If deficiencies are noted in the certification recommendation from the TYCOM/CSG/ESG or CSG-15, the C3F Commander attempts to provide last minute resources to correct those deficiencies prior to deployment or while the unit is en route to deployment. Either way, any remaining deficiencies are reflected in the certification message to the receiving Fleet Commander along with a detailed explanation of why the training was not completed.

3. (U) As mentioned above, in addition to the specific certification process established in the Fleet Training Continuum (Ref (bg)), C3F maintains a deliberate and periodic reporting process for training readiness through a series of touch points. This process requires each Direct Reporting Unit (DRU), in this case, Coastal Riverine Group (CRG-1), to apprise C3F leadership on readiness throughout the training continuum via periodic in-person Commander's Update Briefings (CUB) and bi-weekly written updates. The briefings and bi-weekly updates cover deployment readiness for units and identify any concerns with achieving final certification requirements. [Ref (bm); Encls (335-53)]. Integral to the interaction between the DRU and the Fleet Commander is a presumption of competence and forthrightness in the DRU's assessment of their training unit.

OPINIONS

VI.A. (U) Pre-deployment Readiness

(U) Operational Tasking During Training

VI.A.7. (U) During the individual skills training period, operational commitments prohibited crewmembers from RCB 802 and 805 from attending the required schools necessary to begin the unit training phase. [FF (II.E.1), (II.E.3), (II.E.4)]

Reply to IV.A.7. (U//~~FOUO~~) Non-concur. Periodic but routine operational tasking during CRS-3's Basic Phase did not prevent the RCB 802 or RCB 805 crewmembers from participating in individual skills training or required schools necessary to begin the unit training phase. Per NECCPAC's FOURTH ENDORSEMENT, at no point did real-world mission tasking create risk to CRS-3 pre-deployment training, certification, or preparedness. CRS-3 entered the Basic Phase on 23 October 2014. [Encl (336)]. Over the course of CRS-3's deployment training cycle, CRG-1's leadership routinely reported that its effort was "focused on keeping CONUS missions to a minimum so [CRS-3] can focus on FRTP items while in the Basic Phase." [Encl (335-37)]. While CRS-3's schedule indicates that it was identified to support four operational missions between 23 October 2014 and December 2014, CRS-3 was in fact only tasked with two operational missions, and those missions were assigned to two different companies. Two previously scheduled missions listed in enclosure 220 of the IO's report were actually canceled (15-25 Nov 14 and 18-23 Dec 15). CRS-3's operational tasking between October and December 2014 is average for a unit during the deployment training cycle and did not interrupt or negatively impact its pre-deployment training. [Encls (220), (335-39)]

(U) Preparedness for Executing Full Spectrum of Missions

VI.A.9. (U) RCB 802 and 805 crewmembers were not prepared to execute the full spectrum of missions expected by CTF-56. [FF (II.F.5)-(II.F.7), (II.F.9), (II.F.12)-(II.F.14), (II.G.1)-(II.G.5), (II.H.2)-(II.H.5), (II.J.1), (II.J.2), (II.J.12), (II.K.4), (II.K.6)-(II.K.10), (III.D.3)-(III.D.8), (III.F.1), (III.F.2), (III.F.7), (III.G.3), (III.G.4), (III.G.17), (III.G.21)]

Reply to VI.A.9. (U//~~FOUO~~) Non-concur. COMTHIRDFLT's deployment certification message correctly certified CRS-3 in accordance with Force Tracking Numbers (FTN) 1150C063552, 1150C050930, and 1150C055313. [Encl (133)]

(~~S//NF~~) The specific missions listed in CTF 56's pre-deployment order ((b)(1)1.5g (b)(1)1.5g (b)(1)1.5g [Encl (142)] are materially accounted for in the FTNs themselves, the DRRS-N capability mission areas, or the Naval Component Command specified capabilities listed in the C3F deployment message. FTN 1150C063552 specifically identifies (b)(1)1.5g (b)(1)1.5g [Encl (353)]. The DRRS-N report for CRS-3 dated 1 Aug 2015 lists (b)(1)1.5g (b)(1)1.5g Encl (349)]. Further, the IO utilized an outdated FTN to assess mission areas. FTN 1130C050930 [Encl (146)] is not the correct FTN listed in enclosure 133. The correct FTN, FTN 1150C050930, has been added as enclosure 352. [Encl (352)]. Enclosure 352 includes the mission areas of (b)(1)1.5g
Further, CRS-3's readiness in training at time of deployment was (b)(1)1.5g [Encls (349-50)]

(U) COMTHIRDFLT Certification Standard

VI.A.18. (U) Commander, U.S. THIRD Fleet's standard for deployment certification of CRS-3 did not adequately meet all the operational requirements for the RCB platform and associated crews in the FIFTH Fleet area of operations. [FF (II.K.5)-(II.K.7), (II.K.9), (II.K.10)]

Reply to VI.A.18. (U//~~FOUO~~) Non-concur. The C3F certification "standard" is the standard established in Ref (bg) which applies equally to West and East coast deployments. In this case, the deployment certification of CRS-3 was consistent with all certification requirements of Ref (bg), to include the operational requirements for RCB platforms in the FIFTH Fleet area of operations as defined by Force Tracking Numbers 1150C063552, 1150C050930, and 1150C055313. [Encl (133)]

(U//~~FOUO~~) The Ref (bg) certification standard does not require a specific listing of the specific mission areas in the FTN. Additionally, readiness for the FTN mission sets was addressed in the TYCOM (NECCPAC) certification message recommendation to C3F. [Encl (351)]. That the C3F certification message does not explicitly list the mission sets in the FTNs does not indicate CRS-3 failed to train to those requirements. Rather, the TYCOM certification recommendation required by Ref (bg) was properly submitted to C3F by NECCPAC and indicated that CRS-3 was ready for deployment and at standards for the applicable USFF approved NMETLs. As discussed in the reply to opinion VI.A.9 above, the CTF 56 pre-deployment mission requirements were addressed in the three FTNs, the DRRS-N capability mission areas, and the Naval Component Command specified capabilities listed in the C3F deployment message.

(U//~~FOUO~~) In this case, the Fleet Training Continuum and additional C3F processes were followed throughout the unit's integrated/advanced training cycle. There were no training deficiencies noted at any time during the recurring reporting process to the C3F Commander and there were no training deficiencies reported in either the TYCOM certification recommendation or in the DRRS-N program itself. [Encls (340-348)]

RECOMMENDATIONS

(U) VI.M. Training and Readiness Recommendation

Add new recommendation VI.M.12. (U//~~FOUO~~) COMTHIRDFLT should be included as an addressee or recipient on all pre-deployment orders and FTNs for units that will be certified by COMTHIRDFLT in order to address any mission areas not already covered by DRRS-N.

CONCLUSION

(U/~~FOUO~~) This endorsement provides additional detail on the CPF/USFF approved certification process as well as the results of a deliberate review of the specific elements of that process leading up to the certification and deployment of CRS-3. I assess the CPF/USFF standard to be fundamentally sound in ensuring forces are trained and ready for deployment. Upon review and consideration of the investigation, Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command's FIRST ENDORSEMENT, and Commander, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command Pacific's FOURTH ENDORSEMENT, I find that both the conduct and documentation of the training in this case was in compliance with the guidance provided by higher headquarters. Further, I do not concur with the opinions asserting that the certification process was either ineffective or improperly documented. In making this determination I also considered in part, the informative summary and documentation from the FOURTH ENDORSEMENT concerning CRS-3's performance during their initial employment during Exercise CARAT. Finally, I endorse NECCPAC's identified TYCOM training improvements highlighted in the FOURTH ENDORSEMENT.

N.W. TYSON

Copy to:
NECCPAC