Teams of Leaders:
The Next Multiplier

by

Zeb B. Bradford, Jr. and Frederic J. Brown

Introduction

Effective communications have been a critical component of command and control throughout the ages of conflict. Recently there has been national focus on ensuring ability to communicate among complex systems across all Department of Defense (DoD) operations—the Defense Enterprise. Now with the demands of waging and winning the complex Long War, effective communications and derivative new national security decision-supporting capabilities need to be extended fully to joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational (JIIM) operations.

The overarching military vision has been the enabling of joint net-centric operations as an important part of the U.S. Revolution in Military Affairs—force transformation. Soon after the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the U.S. homeland, confirming tactical success achieved by vastly improved communications was demonstrated in operations in Afghanistan—the horse-mounted Special Forces Soldier employing strategic airpower tactically and successfully. This was a powerful example of an unprecedented capability to collaborate across jurisdictions with decisive effects.

There has been an enormous and generally successful effort to extend this capability across various functional areas of both the generating and the operating forces of America's Army. From the top down, ubiquitous information technology (IT) in both classified and unclassified domains extends globally from the corps joint task force level and above to the squad level with the emerging Land Warrior system. The wholly correct and successful focus has been to provide leaders at all echelons with timely data and information with appropriate security.

But data and its translation to usable information—the staples of information management (IM)—while necessary, are not sufficient to prevail across an inordinately complex spectrum of operations. Data and information need to be converted into usable knowledge. Knowledge is information that has been analyzed for meaning and value or evaluated for implications; then,

hopefully, that knowledge becomes actionable understanding. Understanding is synthesized knowledge with judgment applied in a specific situation to understand the situation's inner relationships.[1] Actionable understanding directly supports accomplishing the mission for the individual leader and leader teams across the full Defense Enterprise.

The purpose of now-maturing knowledge management (KM) is to complement IM to cause the conversion from data and information to knowledge and actionable understanding. This conversion should occur effectively, efficiently and routinely. That requires much more than support of an important technical process of communication. KM process stimulates social learning through collaboration, both for individual leaders and for teams of leaders now grouped globally by enormous improvements in information technologies. New opportunities for collaboration emerge in KM, inviting and then supporting building teams of leaders.

In fact, it seems highly likely that KM developed to generate intense human collaboration to build and sustain battle-effective teams of leaders, then multiplied by effective global communications enabled by IT, will serve to define the processes of command and control for battle command of the future. In that context, expanding KM completes the larger command and control vision associated for years with IM programs.

Battle command will become "IM x KM," not "IM + KM." A multiplier effect of increasing social sharing or collaboration among leaders expands the impact of shared actionable understanding achieved through net-centric operations. With expanded collaboration comes intensified development of commander leader teams (CLTs), many of whom become high-performing. CLTs become another performance multiplier. The interactive combination of IM, KM and high-performing commander leader teams (HP CLTs) is what we (the authors) describe as Teams of Leaders (ToL).

Such social as well as technical transformation is vitally important to success in each of the four strategies of the Army Plan because understanding permits second and third order insights and implementation initiatives that capitalize on the quality of deeply experienced Soldiers.[2]

When CLTs supported by IM and KM are added, opportunities for exponential improvement in America's Army and national JIIM programs emerge. The combination seems sufficiently powerful that ToL can be considered a new joint force multiplier.

Information Management

Effective information technology is the lifeblood of information management. IT tools range from telephone and telegraph to television, the Internet and top-down net-centric Battle Command command and control systems. IT provides the capabilities of Army Knowledge Online (AKO), now with well over a million users across the Army family. AKO provides the practices and tools that generate shared information. From the shared information of IM, again with supporting practices and tools, come the knowledge and understanding characteristic of knowledge management. Global KM will be only as good as the supporting IM.

The impact of IM is even deeper. With omnipresent communications at every level, rarely, if ever, are decisions taken alone by individuals. Teams make decisions. Teams of peers—and in a military organization, hierarchical teams such as the chain of command—decide. Satisfaction of individual IM needs is rarely sufficient. Teams decide.

IT has also developed tools that reinforce expectations of and capabilities for sharing data, information, knowledge and understanding applied to team building. More and more social

networking practices and tools appear. Blogging, wikis,[3] visual blogging, Second Life (avatars living in a digital virtual world), BlackBerries, even iPods with expectations of ubiquitous hand-held visual (movies) or oral (podcasts) communication. IT tools for social networking multiply.

The avalanche of social networking tools experienced almost from birth has created youth accustomed to incessant communication. Youth—Generation Y Soldiers and other young adults below the age of 30—can multitask, monitoring and acquiring information, knowledge and understanding from multiple sources simultaneously and at will. This ability is a considerable national advantage. However, there is a substantial difference between these young people ("digital natives") born in the age of IT and their elders ("digital immigrants") who may be resistant to, if not suspicious of, IT multitasking.

There is another, more complex relationship. IT (AKO) is to KM as *yin* is to *yang*. Top-down IT (net-centric) interfaces uneasily with bottom-up KM. Neither can be fully successful without the other. With mutually complementary support, each becomes better, stimulated by inevitable tensions of top-down "science" supporting and competing with bottom-up "art" expressed by highly experienced young leaders. All too often, however, there can be competition, not cooperation, when top-down IT meets bottom-up KM. The need for effective collaboration grows.

IM supplies both complex advantages and challenges to KM.

Knowledge Management

The overarching challenge knowledge management addresses is rapid conversion of data and information to knowledge and understanding "actionable" in the Long War. To generate both grouped and virtual conversion to actionable understanding, the Army needs both widespread collaboration practices and appropriate supporting tools. Both suitable KM practices and usable KM tools are equally necessary to support successful daily operations. In fact, the need to have both KM practices and KM tools is comparable to the necessity of having fully available pure water and consistent usable electricity for extended military operations. Neither is inexpensive, and both must be ubiquitous for success.

KM has two important characteristics. First is the development of actionable understanding. The second, of equal and perhaps greater importance, is the collaboration that is enabled—peer and hierarchical—from the bottom up as well as from the top down. The extent of each is increasingly determined not by IM (science) but by cross-cultural willingness and ability to collaborate (art). From increased collaboration can come shared skills, knowledge and attitudes that develop team leadership.[4]

Collaboration practices are just ways to share, now using mostly Internet tools. Most Soldiers are accustomed to threads of discussion of e-mail. Increasingly that becomes "video phone"-type discussion. In time there will be increasing sharing by the use of avatars—the digital representation of individuals meeting around a digital table in a digital world. But these IM tools merely apply IT to permit people to "get together" globally and synchronously. There are also various asynchronous ways to collaborate: requests for information (RFI) or searches of a database such as the Warrior Knowledge Base or the various data and information resources of the Center for Army Lessons Learned (CALL).

Army KM today is grounded in the Army Knowledge Management (AKM) Plan. The AKM vision is a "transformed Army, with agile capabilities and adaptive processes, powered by

world-class, secure, network-centric access to knowledge, systems and services, interoperable with the Joint environment."[5] Five subordinate goals extend across the Army Enterprise: Governance (Enterprise Portfolio Management), Best Practices (The Battle Command Knowledge System, or BCKS), Infostructure (LandWarNet), Army Knowledge Online (AKO) and Human Capital (E-Learning).

While attaining each of these goals is central to achieving the Army vision, BCKS enabled by AKO seems to be most important to reshaping America's Army because BCKS is an established multiplier in the acquisition of knowledge and understanding. Established in 2004, BCKS has already grown from tens to hundreds of Army Professional Forums, functionally-oriented Knowledge Nets and *ad hoc* Action Teams. Each expands as leaders discover better ways to share information and generate shared knowledge and actionable understanding by mission function (such as logistics or fires), by echelon of command or by some combination of the two.[6] Practically, the intensive sharing of data and information characteristic of KM/BCKS is the lubricant facilitating the balancing of the imperatives of Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leader Development and Education, Personnel and Facilities (DOTMLPF) in building the modular brigade-based force. KM represented by BCKS directly supports leader and leader team preparation across the breadth of America's Army.

Security is an ever-present concern. Three company commanders in Iraq may have an excellent conversation about company administration that is unclassified yet protected from eavesdropping by al Qaeda because the thread of discussion is inside AKO, with a security-credible changing password. But the moment they compare notes on the tactics techniques and procedures of their operations in Iraq, the content becomes classified and needs to be moved to secure AKO (AKO-S). A facilitator is routinely present to coach such transfers.

It would be naive to think that America's Army is the sole possessor of digital natives. Al Qaeda has many, as well as increasingly sophisticated Information Technology support. The title of a recent article in *Armor* magazine says it all: "The Poor Man's FBCB2: R U READY 4 the 3G Celfone?"[7] Enemy imagination and competence in the use of cellular phones in the improvised explosive device (IED) fight must be assumed to exist in al Qaeda knowledge management.

In sum,

The Battle Command Knowledge System (BCKS) supports online *generation*, *application*, *management* and *exploitation* of Army knowledge to *foster* collaboration among Soldiers and units in order to share expertise and experience; *facilitate* leader development and intuitive decisionmaking; and *support* the development of organizations and teams. BCKS enhances professional education, facilitates exchange of knowledge, fosters leader development, supports doctrine development, supports lessons learned, supports training and enhances battle command.[8]

While each of these missions is clearly important, each develops at a unique pace largely determined by the perceived degree of immediate support to existing mission performance, i.e., support to better, faster current mission accomplishment. Thus, with the Army at war, enhanced battle command has become the current major KM/BCKS focus.

To accomplish these various missions, BCKS connects Soldiers, supporting their conversations and developing professional content in a mission context. It connects individuals, teams and organizations within the larger Army team based on expertise, interest, location and assignment. BCKS

supports asynchronous, online and facilitated discussions designed to help Soldiers share ideas and seek solutions. These discussions often result in improved shared knowledge from the bottom up for all members. It also manages content. The Warrior Knowledge Base (WKB) is the repository for all knowledge created within BCKS. The WKB also links throughout the DoD knowledge nodes. BCKS works to put knowledge within context so that common solutions can be applied to a common problem. Within BCKS various unit networks have been created, such as 1st Cavalry Division's CAVNET, 3d Infantry Division's MarneNet and 4th Infantry Division's IRONHORSE Net.

The centerpieces of BCKS are various Professional Forums for groups of leaders, e.g., Command Net (brigade and battalion commanders), S3-XO Net, Company Command, Platoon Leader, Warrant Officer Net and NCO Net. Staff members have S-1 Net, MI Net, S3-XO Net, LOGNet, SAMS, LandWarNet, Information Ops, Fires Net, Maneuver Support Net, Medical Knowledge Net, SimOps Net, KMO Net, Civil Affairs Net and Spiritual Leaders Net. Currently expanding functional nets include Counterinsurgency, Foreign Security Force, Domestic Operations, Financial Management, Lessons Learned Integration (L2I) and Recruiting ProNet. All are in varying stages of maturation.

The secret of all of these forums is that they foster bottom-up sharing of data and information, developing shared knowledge and actionable understanding. They make things happen. Leaders connect and collaborate with friends, co-workers and peers around the Army—those known and those who should be known. Sharing can be rank- and duty-specific discussions, developing common areas of interest and concerns or sharing experiences and discussing various successful solutions.

Special topics networks can connect and collaborate with subject matter experts (SMEs) wherever they may be in the world. The online social networks at BCKS essentially provide a means for Army personnel to solve their problems in an environment free of past constraints (geographical separation, organizational stovepipes or functional area focus). Peer groups, hierarchical groups and leader teams are formed as Soldiers share. Most important, KM/BCKS functions essentially from the bottom up, drawing on the great Long War experience of junior leaders in America's Army.

As KM/BCKS proliferates, new applications multiply. For example, current and emerging Army preparations of units for deployment now include opportunities for leaders to team (either on the ground or virtually) with leaders whom they will replace to become familiar with the situation on the ground by conducting "right-seat rides."[9] Units at home station conduct individual, team or collective training or staff exercises based on "in AOR [area of responsibility]" intelligence, thus improving situational understanding. The deployed unit conducts combat missions or civil-military operations and transfers tacit and explicit knowledge to the incoming unit.

Emerging draft doctrine for KM proposes a two-officer/two-noncommissioned officer Battle Command KM cell for each brigade combat team (BCT) assigned the following functions and responsibilities:

- providing battle command KM capabilities to the commander and staff through the integration/management of information and Army Battle Command System (ABCS) data systems that have been designed for situational understanding;

- developing and managing knowledge systems architectures in support of the operational mission and strategies;

- applying in-depth knowledge and understanding of current and future operations by leveraging the operational and Knowledge Systems Architectures processes/products to enable timely knowledge transfer;

- incorporating and managing a set of integrated applications, processes and services that provide the capability for command-post operations;

- supporting 24-hour operations for unitary command post (main + tactical combined);

- developing a KM plan in accordance with the commander's guidance, to include the commander's critical information requirements (CCIR), priority intelligence requirements (PIR) and friendly-force information requirements (FFIR);

  ◦ tailoring the KM plan to support command-post standard operating procedures;

  ◦ assisting in organizing a Common Operational Picture for the command;

  ◦ continuously monitoring the external information environment and recommending changes in the information management plan;

  ◦ developing file and data management procedures.[10]

Thus KM enhances battle command. Other KM missions develop as leaders address current issues and adapt KM/BCKS—providing a better way.

So the essence of successful and growing KM/BCKS is near-continuous collaboration exemplified by multi-echelon, multifunction peer and hierarchical sharing from the bottom up by "passionate professionals"—led by Generation Y "digital natives" enthusiastically teaming and sharing in selfless service to America's Army, i.e., leaders at all levels wanting to improve themselves and to support their teammates also engaged in the Long War.

Commander Leader Teams

The third leg of the three-legged Teams of Leaders stool is the teams of leaders, often commanders in the military services.[11] Due to IM, leader teams can function grouped or distributed globally, connected by the Internet, unclassified or secure. Teams may consist of peers—leaders grouped in a unit staff, leaders who are action officers in various departments or agencies of the U.S. government working a common problem such as HIV/AIDS in Africa, or platoon leaders in a rifle company. Other leader teams are hierarchical—the chain of command, e.g., brigade commander to battalion commander to company commander, or combatant commander to combined joint task force commander to brigade combat team commander, or various chains of functional support or joint chains of coordination.[12] Leader teams cross service and JIIM jurisdictions. Now, in the Long War, most teams cross multiple cultures, so CLTs are everywhere, linked by IM and collaborating through KM practices and tools to generate shared knowledge and actionable understanding.

As they collaborate they may (and hopefully will) create the shared skills, knowledge and attitudes (SKAs) characteristic of team leadership. Aided by team-building tools provided by KM, the CLTs develop shared trust, shared vision (or CLT mission) and/or shared competence (in mission tasks), and they share confidence (in ability to accomplish the mission). When these four SKAs are shared by all members of the CLT, that CLT becomes high-performing at least in assigned mission and hopefully in broadening areas of responsibilities.[13]

The most effective HP CLTs (particularly virtual) are those generated from the bottom up through KM, since they are generally spontaneous and self-reinforcing. As a result, shared trust becomes the single most important SKA. This relative importance is accentuated for JIIM due to a common widely varying cultural lens of each IIM leader in those commander leader teams. The capabilities of IM can be combined with the tools and practices of KM to generate and sustain JIIM HP CLTs. That combination of IM, KM and CLT programs is ToL.

ToL may seem new, but it isn't. At the Stryker Center at I Corps, Fort Lewis, Washington, ToL has been implemented "reaching forward" and "reaching back" between deployed and deploying Stryker BCTs for years. ToL practices have been embedded in all SBCTs to varying degrees. Now the challenge is to extend ToL to Infantry BCTs (IBCTs) and Heavy BCTs (HBCTs) and translate these "best practices" to address Long War cross-cultural JIIM challenges.

Teams of Leaders

The potential of Teams of Leaders seems very high both within America's Army and in the broader Long War JIIM environment. ToL futures should be nurtured, for they appear highly promising. For example:

- Support of intensive hierarchical and peer collaboration generating self-correcting "work-arounds" can be exceedingly useful at friction points of competing, occasionally conflicting, time-sensitive Army, DoD or ongoing Department of State transformation programs. BCKS collaboration can be encouraged to provide action-enabling lubrication or "workarounds." In effect, ToL/KM collaboration is molded to lubricate improved management practices.

- Intensive collaboration such as extensive coaching and mentoring of subordinates inculcated within a branch culture can provide intense training and learning in an operating as well as a generating force environment. Perhaps leader preparation, after Initial Entry Training (IET) socialization, could be entirely conducted by coaching and mentoring in the unit or organizational environment up to the platoon sergeant level and for all company-grade officers. Shaped branch cultures combined with warrior values can become a powerful ToL/KM engine. An example of a new opportunity provided by ToL/IM could be availability of "on demand" mentoring and coaching, whenever and wherever, for individuals and leader teams. Institutionalized, this could portend revolutionary changes in Army training and learning. Exported to JIIM CLTs, comparable coaching and mentoring could coalesce and generate high-performing leader teams more rapidly in various interagency organizational combinations.

Collaboration, collaboration, collaboration! Lest we appear overly biased as to its importance, recently the Director of National Intelligence released his "100-Day Plan for INTEGRATION and COLLABORATION"—his emphasis. The number one program goal is to "create a culture of collaboration." "Teams of Leaders" is at heart intensive collaboration stimulated to override frequent individual and team reluctance to share information and improve decisionmaking. Power is sharing—not hoarding—information!

ToL reshapes the normal dimensions of time and space to support interagency collaboration:

- The Internet Protocol (IP) compresses distance such that when enabled with social networking software, peer or hierarchical teams of leaders can confer "across the table" globally and routinely. The physical locations of decisionmakers and staff at any level, particularly the operational (regional) level, become irrelevant.

- Time can be manipulated. The past can influence as experienced former leaders provide longitudinal expertise. They can explain why the situation is as it is, as they support their successors. This spring, five former Assistant Secretaries of State (1977 to 1997) met at the Council on Foreign Relations to discuss Africa policy. Such concentration of expertise and experience, or perhaps timely counsel of the past five ambassadors to Country X, could be available to contemporary decisionmakers routinely. The future can be shaped also as those likely to assume future responsibilities are "brought forward" to participate in current interagency leader teams. Taking advantage of the "best practice" precedents of Stryker BCTs that routinely "reach forward" and "reach back" from deployed leader teams to those scheduled to replace them will facilitate seamless transfers of authority and responsibility. With intensive collaboration, sequential processes can become near-simultaneous.

- World-class expertise can be made available to support policy collaboration. SMEs can become available across traditional program stovepipes enabled by Information Management and Knowledge Management tools. Tools—e.g., proven collaboration software, leader-encouraged Professional Forums, functional Knowledge Nets and Action Teams of leaders, multilevel and multifunctional as assembled across JIIM jurisdictions—can be available. These ToL/IM and ToL/KM tools permit extraordinary pooling of expertise within ToL/HP CLTs.

    Why search databases when relatively small pools of SMEs (6,500 Foreign Service officers, comparable numbers of military service functional experts) know one another through past or present service? There are, at most, two degrees of separation. One knows who knows or who has an associate who knows who to contact "in person." One may be able to circumvent the cognitive hierarchy by going directly from data to understanding, coached by *the* expert who can be reached through a mutual contact. Accelerated conversion of data and information to shared knowledge and shared understanding by expert intervention is a likely Long War breakthrough.

- Through intensive collaboration—appropriately molded to stimulate shared trust, shared vision, shared competence and shared confidence—powerful, effective cross-cultural communication is developed. Sharing establishes or enables cross-cultural, high-performing team-building across the JIIM environment.

These four ToL characteristics, stimulating intensive collaboration, promise startling change in joint and interagency program formulation and implementation. They should apply equally to intergovernmental and multinational collaboration.

We suggest that ToLs can be shaped to support the collaboration culture of individual commands and agencies as a central supporting capability that could be provided to all leaders and leader teams in a combatant command joint and interagency community. ToL could manifest itself generally as described in the following example of "a way" ToL could support fighting HIV/AIDS within a combatant command. "The way" would be determined by the particular command, department or agency.

An Africa Command ToL could support the President's Emergency Plan for HIV/AIDS Relief (PEPFAR, administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development, or USAID) as a contribution to the success of an important, complex, public and private multinational effort. Multiple knowledge nets and forums (communities of practice) could be encouraged among leaders and teams of leaders across the various concerned U.S. government departments and agencies

and then across the Global Fund, the World Bank, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), private organizations, various medical communities, multinational contributors and both governance and health systems in African countries. These IM communication tools and complementary KM social bonding and shared understanding development processes could generate continuous discussion of multiple topics among and between the various leaders routinely grouped into multilevel Action Teams addressing specific issues, teaming and then regrouping as circumstances require. Some of these Action Teams are small, private and secure—conducting ongoing actual policymaking. Other teams are huge—leaders brought together globally, virtually and across jurisdictions, responding to shared concerns and generating shared actionable knowledge and understanding.

Lest the above appear unlikely, exactly these sorts of collaborations have developed in the Army logistics community. From a handful of concerned visionaries several years ago, LOGNet, a typical Knowledge Net, has grown to include more than 17,000 active participants collaborating to generate shared knowledge and actionable understanding across logistics functions and organizations of the Department of Defense. Deliberate Knowledge Net growth planning became growth by spontaneous combustion as leaders recognized significant value added to routine job performance. Now logistics decision processes modify to benefit extensive collaboration. Decision centers of gravity for department-wide logistics policies and programs seem likely to shift.

ToL enables continuous collaboration among peers and within decision hierarchies. For specific policy planning and execution, broad collaboration congeals into collaboration within command, agency or interagency Action Teams of selected leaders supporting established decision processes. But all have collaborated informally beforehand as peer or hierarchical leader teams at and between country team, regional and national strategic levels. As virtual teams—high-performing as they develop shared trust, shared vision, shared competence and shared confidence—their locale on the ground becomes irrelevant at any level of governance. And sequential decision processes may become truncated as continuing collaboration permits near-continuous decisionmaking.

These potentials seem equally applicable and attractive at strategic, operational and tactical levels as various combinations of Civil-Military Operations Centers (CMOCs) and Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACGs) become HP CLTs by taking advantage of ToLs.[14] Strategic benefits can be enormous. Consider the quantity and quality of the U.S. response to the earthquake in Pakistan and the tsunami in Indonesia—both "front line" states in the Long War. That timely, effective humanitarian assistance generated effective, nationally important, strategic communications. The absence of strategic collaboration among and between teams of leaders is equally stark as seen in inadequate Green Zone governance of Iraq or uncoordinated Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) support during Hurricane Katrina in the Gulf of Mexico.[15]

At the operational level, ToL is currently engaged in support of Commander, U.S. European Command as U.S. AFRICOM is formed during Fiscal Years 2007 and 2008.[16] Developing an organizational framework to improve interagency collaboration is explicit in conceptual guidance from General John Craddock, Commander, U.S. European Command:

Africa Command must be interagency from the start, because of the challenges on the continent. . . . **The problem is there are so many different (agency) stovepipes. We've got to get these stovepipes connected horizontally. . . . I think AFRICOM**

may be the spearhead—the pioneer here . . . but I think there will be spin-offs and best practices we can use in re-crafting the combatant commands. . . . We'd like to populate the interagency group with decisional authority rather than having them reach back to Washington for a decision. . . . It would enable greater opportunities for fast decisions and be able to do things on a higher-tempo basis. [emphasis added][17]

ToL is charged to support AFRICOM design and activation in this important national interagency effort to improve national security policy formulation and execution. Clearly ToL must evolve to be responsive to important joint and interagency decision processes at every level.

Tactical-level applicability has been demonstrated with the various Stryker BCTs. Team formation and sustainment is well addressed in Army leader development doctrine for tactical application.[18] HP CLT generation is a central objective of the Army Force Generation Road to Deployment formulated in 2006 for divisions and brigade combat teams by then Lieutenant General David Petraeus at U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command's Combined Arms Center.

Now ToL provides important opportunities for near-continuous virtual collaboration leading to improved national policy decisionmaking and program execution between strategic (federal departments), operational (geographic combatant commands) and tactical (U.S. Embassy country teams) across varying joint and interagency cultural practices and eventually across substantially differing intergovernmental and multinational cultures.

Teams of Leaders (ToL) is launched both within America's Army and in the larger JIIM arena. Think ToL—it enables one to move beyond past constrictions of time and space and cultural reticence to collaborate in seriously addressing a new and necessary framework for distributed cross-cultural decisionmaking for the Long War.

Endnotes

1 Army Field Manual (FM) 6.0, *Mission Command: Command and Control of Army Forces*, August 2003, p. B-02.

2 Provide relevant and ready landpower, train and equip Soldiers, sustain the All-Volunteer Force and provide infrastructure and support. *2006 Game Plan*, United States Army, Office of the Chief of Staff, Army, Executive Office of the Headquarters Staff Group, 31 May 2006, EOHStaffGroup@hqda.army.mil.

3 A wiki is a website that allows visitors to add, remove, edit and change content, typically without the need for registration. It also allows for linking among any number of pages. This ease of interaction and operation makes a wiki an effective tool for mass collaborative authoring. For more information, go to http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki.

4 Team leadership, in turn, generates high-performing leader team-based decisionmaking and program execution; see examples on pages 6, 8 and 9.

5 Gary Winkler, "Army Knowledge Management Initiatives," PowerPoint Presentation, GO Workshop: Enabling Battle Command, 25 February 2006, slide 2.

[6] The best current examples are CompanyCommand.army.mil for company commanders, LogNet for Army and increasingly joint logisticans, and FiresNet for joint fires supporters.

[7] Captain Daniel Helmer, "The Poor Man's FBCB2: R U READY 4 the 3G Celfone?" *Armor*, November-December 2006, pp. 7–10.

[8] Frederic J. Brown, BCKS Presentation, Eighth Army Commanding General and Primary Staff, 29 November 2006.

[9] A common analogy used to explain this leader teaming is both old and new leaders conducting a joint reconnaissance of the operational area, the current leader "driving" with the replacement leader in the passenger seat—"the right seat"—learning by discussion and observation.

[10] Brown, BCKS Presentation, slide 31 draft.

[11] "Leaders" is a broad description of those in positions of authority and responsibility, be they chief executive officers or subordinates in business, ambassadors or subordinates in the Foreign Service or another agency of governance—usages well beyond the military.

[12] For extended discussion of these teams, see Frederic J. Brown, *Vertical Command Teams*, (Unclassified) IDA Doc D-2728, June 2002.

[13] See Frederic J. Brown, *Building High-Performing Commander Leader Teams: Intensive Collaboration Enabled by Information Technology and Knowledge Management*, (Unclassified) IDA Doc D-3348, December 2006.

[14] Excellent references are the Joint Forces Command *Commander's Handbook for the Joint Interagency Coordination Group*, 1 March 2007, and Joint Publication 3-08, *Interagency, Intergovernmental Organization, and Nongovernmental Organization Coordination During Joint Operations,* vol. 1, 17 March 2006.

[15] As explained in Zeb B. Bradford, Jr. and Frederic J. Brown, "America's Army as First Responder," Landpower Essay 06-1 (Arlington, Va.: Association of the United States Army, April 2006).

[16] *Establishing High Performing Commander Leader Teams (HP CLT) in European Command (EUCOM) and African Command (AFRICOM) using the "Team of Leaders (ToL)" Program*, IDA Task Order CB-8-2822, 19 March 2007.

[17] General B. J. Craddock, Commander, U.S. European Command, Press Remarks, American Forces Press Service, 2 March 2007.

[18] Army Field Manual 6.22, *Army Leadership*, 19 January 2006, Chapter 3, pp. 3–8ff.

Zeb B. Bradford, Jr., Brigadier General, U.S. Army Retired, was a Woodrow Wilson Fellow and Senior Military Fellow at The Council on Foreign Relations in New York, and the Chief of Force Planning at NATO Headquarters in Belgium.

Frederic J. Brown, Lieutenant General, U.S. Army Retired, was Chief of Armor and Cavalry. He was Senior Mentor for the establishment of the Battle Command Knowledge System, 2003–2006. He is currently the Senior Mentor supporting Teams of Leaders institutionalization within U.S. European Command (EUCOM) and U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) as it is established.

General Bradford and General Brown are coauthors of *The United States Army in Transition* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1973). They both taught at the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, and have been members of the Council on Foreign Relations since 1973.