



Headquarters  
Department of the Army  
Washington, DC  
13 June 2023

**\*Army Regulation 5–22**

**Effective 13 July 2023**

## **Management**

# **The Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System**

---

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

**JAMES C. MCCONVILLE**  
*General, United States Army*  
*Chief of Staff*

Official:

**MARK F. AVERILL**  
*Administrative Assistant to the*  
*Secretary of the Army*

---

**History.** This publication is a major revision. The portions affected by this major revision are listed in the summary of change.

**Authorities.** This regulation implements authorities outlined in 10 USC.

**Applicability.** This regulation applies to the Regular Army, the Army National Guard/Army National Guard of the United States, and the U.S. Army Reserve, unless otherwise stated.

**Proponent and exception authority.** The proponent of this regulation is the Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7. The proponent has the authority to approve exceptions or waivers to this regulation that are consistent with controlling law and regulations. The proponent may delegate this approval authority, in writing, to a division chief within the proponent agency or its direct reporting unit or field operating agency, in the grade of colonel or the civilian equivalent. Activities may request a waiver to this regulation by providing justification that includes a full analysis of the expected benefits and must include formal review by the activity's senior legal officer. All waiver requests will be endorsed by the commander or senior leader of the requesting activity and forwarded through their higher headquarters to the policy proponent. Refer to AR 25–30 for specific requirements.

**Army internal control process.** This regulation contains internal control provisions in accordance with AR 11–2 and identifies key internal controls that must be evaluated (see appendix B).

**Suggested improvements.** Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to the Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7 inbox at [usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-3-5-7.mbx.ssp@army.mil](mailto:usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-3-5-7.mbx.ssp@army.mil).

**Distribution.** This regulation is available in electronic media only and is intended for the Regular Army, the Army National Guard/Army National Guard of the United States, and the U.S. Army Reserve.

---

\*This regulation supersedes AR 5–22, dated 28 October 2015 and rescinds Army Directive 2019–25, dated 1 August 2019.

---

**Contents** (Listed by chapter and page number)

**Chapter 1**

**Introduction**, *page 1*

**Chapter 2**

**Responsibilities**, *page 2*

**Chapter 3**

**Army Force Modernization Proponents**, *page 6*

**Chapter 4**

**Headquarters Department of the Army Process Managers**, *page 10*

**Appendixes**

**A.** References, *page 11*

**B.** Internal Control Evaluation, *page 12*

**Table List**

Table 3–1: Center of Excellence Force Modernization proponents, *page 6*

Table 3–2: Branch proponents, *page 6*

Table 3–3: Specified proponents, *page 7*

Table 4–1: Process managers, *page 10*

**Glossary of Terms**

**Summary of Change**

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

#### **1–1. Purpose**

This regulation establishes the Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System (see Army Directive 2022–07). The Secretary of the Army (SECARMY) identifies Army force modernization proponents for the purpose of determining solutions to gaps in the Army’s ability to provide joint and Army-specific capabilities required to conduct military operations. The Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System is a strategic-level process for assigning responsibility for integrating doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, and policy (DOTMLPF–P) solutions to transform the Army into the desired future force. AR 5–22 establishes policy, responsibilities, relationships, and procedures necessary to execute the Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System, to include determining DOTMLPF–P requirements with regards to a particular Center of Excellence, branch, or specific proponent. The Army manages modernization over the time horizons and functions of force design, force development, force employment, force sustainment, and strategic divestiture. Force design is the design of operational and functional concepts that addresses the conditions of a future operational environment and its anticipated threats, and generally focuses 5–15 years into the future. Force development is the maturation of operational and functional concepts into force design updates that seeks to fully integrate DOTMLPF–P, and generally focuses 2–7 years into the future. U.S. Army Futures Command (AFC) is the supported command for force design and delivers future concepts, requirements, and conceptual organizational designs based on its assessment of the future operating environment. AFC is the supported command for force development. U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) supports AFC force development by conducting DOTMLPF–P integration to provide capabilities to the operational force. Force employment is the generation of ready forces to meet the needs of the Joint force, and generally focuses 0–3 years into the future. U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) trains and prepares combat ready, globally responsive forces. FORSCOM is the supported command for force employment. Force sustainment is the management and care of materiel equipment after a capability transitions to sustainment, and before the Army divests the capability. U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) is the supported command for force sustainment. AMC is the supported command for strategic divestiture. Various Army processes manage force modernization across the time horizons outlined above. Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS), G–3/5/7 is the Army’s lead integrator and synchronizer, and captures modernization activities and decisions in the Army Campaign Plan (ACP) and then tracks these activities and decisions in execution through the Army Synchronization Meeting. AFC, TRADOC, FORSCOM, U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC), and U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (USASMDC), along with other Army force modernization proponents work together on required capabilities for presentation to the Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) process managers for review, integration, and funding.

#### **1–2. References, forms, and explanation of abbreviations**

See appendix A. The abbreviations, brevity codes, and acronyms (ABCAs) used in this electronic publication are defined when you hover over them. All ABCAs are listed in the ABCA database located at <https://armypubs.army.mil/abca/>.

#### **1–3. Associated publications**

This section contains no entries.

#### **1–4. Responsibilities**

Responsibilities are listed in chapter 2.

#### **1–5. Records management (recordkeeping) requirements**

The records management requirement for all record numbers, associated forms, and reports required by this publication are addressed in the Records Retention Schedule–Army (RRS–A). Detailed information for all related record numbers, forms, and reports are located in Army Records Information Management

System (ARIMS)/RRS–A at <https://www.arims.army.mil>. If any record numbers, forms, and reports are not current, addressed, and/or published correctly in ARIMS/RRS–A, see DA Pam 25–403 for guidance.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Responsibilities**

#### **2–1. The Secretary of the Army**

The SECARMY approves and authenticates departmental policy, unless otherwise delegated to the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (AASA).

a. SECARMY designates the HQDA principal officials process managers responsible for managing one or more of the DOTMLPF–P processes within the Army.

b. Pursuant to 10 USC 7013, SECARMY is responsible for, among other matters, the modernization and the equipping function of the Department of the Army (DA).

#### **2–2. The Chief of Staff, Army**

a. The CSA assists the SECARMY in developing requirements for equipping the Army, balancing resources and priorities, and ensuring that associated trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance are made on major defense acquisition programs.

b. The CSA is responsible for all performance requirements for the Army, except for performance requirements specified in 10 USC 181. Such performance requirements do not need to be validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

#### **2–3. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology)**

a. The ASA (ALT) is responsible, under 10 USC, for the overall supervision of Army acquisition, logistics, sustainment, and technology matters, and the management of the Army Acquisition System. This responsibility includes the oversight of Army research and development, including science and technology efforts and associated resourcing decisions.

b. The ASA (ALT), as the Army Acquisition Executive, carries out all authorities, functions, and duties of SECARMY with respect to the acquisition workforce. This responsibility includes the direction, assignment, and supervision of the Army's acquisition workforce.

#### **2–4. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Energy and Environment)**

The ASA (IE&E) is the proponent for installation modernization and will set the strategic direction, providing the overall supervision for installation facilities, programs, and services across the Army.

#### **2–5. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)**

The ASA (M&RA) will set the strategic direction, providing the overall supervision for manpower, personnel, and Reserve affairs across the Army.

#### **2–6. The Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army**

The AASA acts for the SECARMY in authenticating departmental policy, with few exceptions. AASA also advises SECARMY on policy and management matters affecting the civilian workforce.

#### **2–7. The Deputy Chief of Staff, G–1**

The DCS, G–1 is responsible for planning and supervising the execution of manpower policies and programs. Prescribes duties and responsibilities for personnel life cycle of Army officer branches and functional areas, warrant officer branches, enlisted career management fields, and Civilian career fields under their respective personnel management systems, except as otherwise set forth in this regulation. The DCS, G–1 is the HQDA process manager for personnel (see table 4–1).

#### **2–8. The Deputy Chief of Staff, G–2**

The DCS, G–2 is responsible for Army staff (ARSTAF) modernization oversight of intelligence requirements and approval of processes, strategies, program development, and DOTMLPF–P implementation. DCS, G–2, in coordination with DCS, G–1 and ASA (M&RA), develops, implements, manages, and evaluates the DA Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System.

## **2-9. The Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7**

### *a. The DCS, G-3/5/7.*

(1) The DCS, G-3/5/7 is the Army's lead integrator and synchronizer across force modernization time horizons. The DCS, G-3/5/7 captures and manages force modernization activities and decisions in the ACP and tracks these activities and decisions in execution through the Army Synchronization Meeting.

(2) As the proponent for AR 5-22, the DCS, G-3/5/7 manages the Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System and is delegated authority by SECARMY to designate Army force modernization proponents.

(3) As HQDA organizational process manager, responsible for developing and implementing policies for ARSTAF management structuring, documenting, and accounting of Army organizational changes within the force development and force integration processes (see table 4-1).

(4) As the HQDA training process manager, establishes policy and resource priorities for mission command training center operations, training support center operations, range operations, training support systems, and training area management (see table 4-1). DCS, G-3/5/7 also establishes policy and resource priorities for the Training Support System that includes training information infrastructure, mission training complex operations, Training Support Center operations, range operations, and integrated training area management.

(5) Coordinates Army force modernization proponent designations with AFC, TRADOC, FORSCOM, and other Army organizations with force management and DOTMLPF-P integration responsibilities.

(6) Resolves DOTMLPF-P issues affecting Army force modernization proponents.

(7) Validates operational needs associated with Army modernization requirements and DOTMLPF-P solutions.

### *b. The Director, U.S. Army Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Agency.*

(1) The Director, USANCA (DCS, G-3/5/7) provides oversight, advice, and guidance on countering weapons of mass destruction, biodefense, and nuclear operations strategy, plans, policy, readiness, and operational issues across the Army. Identifies and support DOTMLPF-P integration for biodefense, countering weapons of mass destruction functions, and nuclear operations (conventional nuclear integration, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) survivability, and the Army Reactor Program) in close coordination with the U.S. Army Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear School (USACBRNS), Maneuver Support Center of Excellence, and the U.S. Army Medical Center of Excellence (MEDCoE).

(2) The Director, USANCA is the Army force modernization proponent for Functional Area, FA52, Nuclear, and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction.

### *c. The Commander, U.S. Army Aeronautical Services Agency.*

(1) The Commander, U.S. Army Aeronautical Services Agency is lead for Army airfields and heliports, and develops policy, procedures, and oversight for Army airfield and heliport operations.

(2) The Commander, U.S. Army Aeronautical Services Agency will approve and establish priorities, validate requirements, manage resource allocations, and resolve Army airfield and heliport DOTMLPF-P issues with affected force modernization proponents.

## **2-10. The Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8**

The DCS, G-8 develops Army policy and procedural guidance for materiel capabilities developments programs. This includes the capability requirements, determination process, and its staffing timelines, prioritization, resourcing, and integration of materiel and non-materiel warfighting capabilities. Integrates supporting Army processes, specifically the Army Requirements Oversight Council and the Strategic Portfolio Analysis Review, and associated Army Senior Leader decisions into the ACP and the Army Synchronization Meeting.

## **2-11. The Deputy Chief of Staff, G-9**

The DCS, G-9 is responsible for ARSTAF integration and synchronization of facilities and installation infrastructure processes and requirements in support of Army modernization. In coordination with ASA (IE&E), responsible for ARSTAF management of facilities as part of DOTMLPF-P analysis. Provides facility related advice and analysis to the capability and materiel developer and assists with the identification of supporting infrastructure requirements to support materiel solutions and the associated lifecycle costs to support modernization efforts. DCS, G-9 is the HQDA process manager for facilities (see table 4-1).

## **2-12. The Chief of Chaplains**

The CCH develops and coordinates DOTMLPF-P requirements associated with the Chaplain Corps and its capabilities to provide religious support and advice on religion, morals, ethics, and morale. On behalf of the CCH, the Commandant, U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School develops and coordinates with AFC and TRADOC DOTMLPF-P requirements associated with the Chaplain Corps and branch. In turn, the CCH approves doctrinal and training publications and policies pertaining to personnel, chaplain ministrations, distinctive faith requirements, professional qualifications, Chaplain Corps-specific equipment requirements, and all religious support functions. The CCH certifies for approval all changes in force structure for chaplains, religious affairs specialists, directors of religious education, and required equipment. The CCH supervises all organizational changes within the force development, force management, and force integration processes within the CCH purview. The CCH forwards Chaplain Corps table of organization and equipment (TOE) and table of distribution and allowances force structure to DCS, G-3/5/7 for inclusion in the force management process.

## **2-13. The Commanding General, The Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School**

The CG, The Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School develops, coordinates, and integrates DOTMLPF-P requirements associated with The Judge Advocate General's Corps (JAGC) and branch with TRADOC and AFC on behalf of The Judge Advocate General (TJAG). In turn, TJAG approves Army doctrinal and training products and policies pertaining to JAGC professional qualifications, personnel policy, and JAGC-specific equipment requirements. TJAG further certifies for approval of the JAGC TOE for force management requirements. TJAG forwards the JAGC TOE and force structure to the DCS, G-3/5/7 for inclusion in the force management process.

## **2-14. The Director, Army Public Affairs Center**

The Director, Army Public Affairs Center develops and coordinates DOTMLPF-P requirements related to the public affairs function with AFC and TRADOC on behalf of the Office of Chief Public Affairs (OCPA). In turn, OCPA approves doctrinal and training products and policies pertaining to public affairs professional qualifications, recommends specific equipment requirements, and operations policy. The OCPA provides supervision for all organizational changes within the force development, force management, and force integration processes within the OCPA's purview. The OCPA forwards public affairs TOE and force structure determinations through the force management process to the DCS, G-3/5/7.

## **2-15. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Futures Command**

The AFC is an enduring command and the CG, AFC is responsible for force design and force development, and is the capabilities developer and operational architect for the future Army. AFC assesses and integrates the future operational environment, emerging threats, and technologies to provide warfighters with the concepts and future force designs needed to dominate a future battlefield. CG, AFC is responsible for operation of the laboratories and centers in the U.S. Army Combat Capabilities Development Command, the Army Artificial Intelligence Integration Center, the Army Applications Laboratory, the U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine, and the U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Lab.

## **2-16. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command**

The CG, AMC is responsible for ensuring that sustainment and logistics issues related to acquisition programs are addressed throughout the acquisition lifecycle. CG, AMC is responsible for operating a portion of the Army's organic industrial base.

## **2-17. The Commanding General, U.S. Forces Command**

The CG, FORSCOM is responsible for training, mobilizing, and deploying combat ready Total Army forces to build and sustain readiness and support combatant command requirements. FORSCOM helps to identify the evolving training, equipment, and other support needs required by Army forces. FORSCOM also helps to facilitate Soldier and unit feedback throughout the acquisition process, ensuring that requirements and capabilities are informed by the user.

## **2–18. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command**

The CG, TRADOC is responsible for recruiting, developing, educating, and training Army forces, and developing new operational doctrine as the Army modernizes its formations. The Combined Arms Center and Centers of Excellence, within TRADOC, support AFC in force development.

### *a. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Recruiting Command.*

(1) The CG, USAREC develops and coordinates selected DOTMLPF–P requirements for recruiting for CG, TRADOC, and with the Chief, U.S. Army Reserve and Chief, National Guard Bureau. In turn, CG, USAREC approves command level publications, training products, and policies pertaining to recruiting professional qualifications, and recruiting material requirements.

(2) CG, USAREC certifies for approval all changes in force structure for recruiting and forwards actions through TRADOC to DCS, G–3/5/7 for approval. CG, USAREC supervises all organizational changes within the force development, force management, and force integration processes within the recruiting purview.

### *b. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Medical Center of Excellence.*

(1) The CG, MEDCoE develops and coordinates DOTMLPF–P requirements for AFC and TRADOC Combined Arms Center, on behalf of Army Medicine. CG, MEDCoE has the responsibility and coordination authority to assist the U.S. Army Medical Department (AMEDD) branch and other functional proponents in determining and integrating DOTMLPF–P requirements and solutions. CG, MEDCoE, through TRADOC, AFC, and the Office of the Surgeon General approves Army doctrinal, qualification, personnel policy, policies pertaining to AMEDD professional qualifications, and AMEDD-specific equipment requirements. The CG, MEDCoE forwards AMEDD TOE and force structure determinations to the CG, Combined Arms Center, for inclusion in the force management process.

(2) The CG, MEDCoE is the Army lead for all medical countermeasures, medical treatment, medical diagnostic capabilities, and medical equipment for CBRN related actions. CG, MEDCoE is responsible for medical force development and medical force integration for all medical CBRN activities.

*c. The Commandant, U.S. Army Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear School.* The Commandant, USACBRNS is the lead for CBRN operations by enabling the Army's posture to fight and win in CBRN environments. The Commandant, USACBRNS develops, coordinates, and integrates CBRN DOTMLPF–P requirements with TRADOC Combined Arms Center, Maneuver Support Center of Excellence, MEDCoE, and AFC. The Commandant, USACBRNS is responsible for force development and force integration for all CBRN activities, except medical.

### *d. The Executive Director, Center for Military History.*

(1) The Executive Director, CMH develops and coordinates DOTMLPF–P requirements associated with Military History Detachments with TRADOC and AFC. Executive Director, CMH approves doctrinal and training support packages, training, and policies pertaining to field history collection, professional qualifications, personnel policy, and Military History Detachments specific equipment requirements.

(2) The Executive Director, CMH certifies for approval all changes in force structure for Military History Detachments positions and required equipment. Executive Director, CMH supervises all organizational changes within force development, force management, and force integration processes within CMH's purview, and forwards TOE force structure to the designated authorities for inclusion in the force management process.

## **2–19. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Special Operations Command**

The CG, USASOC, as the Force Modernization Proponent for Army Special Operations, and conventional force Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Branches, has primary duties and responsibility relative to DOTMLPF–P requirements development and integration. CG, USASOC will collaborate with AFC and TRADOC to facilitate conventional force–special operations interoperability and coordinate service common DOTMLPF–P requirements. CG, U.S. Special Operations Center of Excellence, through CG, USASOC, has primary duties and responsibilities for Army special operations forces doctrine, training, leader development and personnel, and will submit service common requirements through TRADOC Combined Arms Center. The USASOC Force Modernization Center, thru CG, USASOC, has primary duties and responsibilities for Army special operations forces modernization, and submission of service common requirements through AFC Futures and Concepts Center.

## 2–20. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command

The CG, USASMDC develops and integrates space, high altitude, and global missile defense DOTMLPF–P requirements. USASMDC collaborates and coordinates requirements with AFC and TRADOC. CG, USASMDC also serves as the Army operational integrator for global missile defense and conducts mission-related research and development in support of Army strategic, operational, and tactical missions.

## Chapter 3 Army Force Modernization Proponents

### 3–1. Types of proponents

Army force modernization proponents are commanders, directors, and chiefs of Army Centers of Excellence, branches, and specified functions designated as advocates with primary responsibility for specified Army functions.

*a. Center of Excellence proponent.* Center of Excellence Army force modernization proponents, have primary duties and responsibilities to provide and integrate DOTMLPF–P requirements for a particular function (see table 3–1). Branch and specified Army force modernization proponents normally provide their requirements and support to Center of Excellence proponents and AFC for capability development efforts guided by the Army Modernization Strategy (see table 3–1 for relationships of Center of Excellence Force Modernization proponents).

**Table 3–1**  
**Center of Excellence Force Modernization proponents**

Designated area	Army Force Modernization proponent
Command and Control	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Aviation	CG, U.S. Army Aviation Center of Excellence
Maneuver (Brigade and below)	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence
Intelligence	CG, U.S. Army Intelligence Center of Excellence
Fires	CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence
Protection	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Sustainment	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Medical	CG, MEDCoE
Cyber/Signal	CG, U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence
Space/High Altitude Capabilities	CG, USASMDC
Special Operations	CG, USASOC

*b. Branch proponent.* The commandant of an Army branch school or the chief of the Army branch is an Army force modernization proponent responsible for DOTMLPF–P and supports materiel capability development within their designated branch (see table 3–2). Some branches (for example, aviation and intelligence) are also a Center of Excellence proponent. Branches typically do not have full Capability Development and Integration Directorate (CDID) capabilities and require assistance in determining DOTMLPF–P requirements (see table 3–2).

**Table 3–2**  
**Branch proponents**

Designated area	Army Force Modernization proponent
Adjutant General	Commandant, U.S. Army Adjutant General School
Aviation	CG, U.S. Army Aviation Center of Excellence



**Table 3–2**  
**Branch proponents—Continued**

Air Defense	Commandant, U.S. Army Air Defense School
Armor	Commandant, U.S. Army Armor School
Chemical	Commandant, USACBRNS
Chaplain	Commandant, U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School
Civil Affairs	CG, U.S. Army Special Operations Center of Excellence
Cyber (to include electronic warfare)	Commandant, U.S. Army Cyber School
Engineer	Commandant, U.S. Army Engineer School
Field Artillery	Commandant, U.S. Army Field Artillery School
Finance	Commandant, U.S. Army Finance and Comptroller School
Infantry	Commandant, U.S. Army Infantry School
Judge Advocate General Medical	Commandant, Judge Advocate General Legal Center and School
Medical	CG, MEDCoE
Military Intelligence	CG, U.S. Army Intelligence Center of Excellence
Military Police	Commandant, U.S. Army Military Police School
Ordnance	Commandant, U.S. Army Ordnance School
Psychological Operations	CG, U.S. Army Special Operations Center of Excellence
Quartermaster	Commandant, U.S. Army Quartermaster School
Signal	Commandant, U.S. Army Signal School
Special Forces	CG, U.S. Army Special Operations Center of Excellence
Transportation	Commandant, U.S. Army Transportation School

*c. Specified proponent.* The Army recognizes there are functional overlaps between the Centers of Excellence and branch proponents. As such, the Army may designate specified proponents for functions or missions where requirements may exist between Centers of Excellence and branch proponents. These specified proponents are responsible for identifying and integrating requirements across the Army. For example, targeting is an intelligence function closely related to the fires warfighting function, and as such, the Army has designated the CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence, as a specified proponent for the targeting function (see table 3–3). Like Army branches, these specified proponents typically do not have exclusively dedicated CDID capabilities and require the establishment of supported/supporting relationships and assistance from other Army modernization proponents and AFC in executing their DOTMLPF–P responsibilities. In some cases, specified force proponents may be assigned to an Army capability manager that enables DOTMLPF–P integration of their specific functional responsibility (see table 3–3 for relationships of specified proponents).

**Table 3–3**  
**Specified proponents**

Designated area	Army Force Modernization proponent
Adjutant General/Human Resource Management	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Aerial Delivery	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Airborne Operations (Military Free Fall)	CG, USASOC
Airborne Operations (Static Line)	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence

**Table 3–3**  
**Specified proponents —Continued**

Air Defense and Theater Missile Defense	CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence
Army Acquisition	ASA (ALT)
Army Airfields and Heliports	Commander, U.S. Army Aeronautical Service Agency
Army SHARP Program	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Army Base Camps/Engineering Operations	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Army Profession, the Army Ethic, and Character Development	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Airspace Command and Control	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Army Knowledge Management	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Biological Defense	Director, U.S. Army Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Agency
Biometrics	CG, U.S. Army Intelligence Center of Excellence
Biosurveillance	The Surgeon General of the United States Army
CBRN Defense	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Civil Works	Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction	Director, U.S. Army Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Agency
Combined Arms Operations (echelons above brigade)	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Communications Networks and Data Services	CG, U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence
Counter Unmanned Aircraft System	CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence
Counter Small Unmanned Aircraft System	CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence
Cyberspace Operations	CG, U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence
Data and Analytics	CG, U.S. Army Mission Command Center of Excellence
Electronic Warfare	CG, U.S. Army Cyber Center of Excellence
Explosive Ordnance Disposal	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Finance and Comptroller Operations	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Foreign Languages	DCS, G–2
Foreign Disclosure	DCS, G–2
Forensics	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Health Services	CG, MEDCoE
History, Heritage, Museums, and Historical Collection	Executive Director, CMH
Holistic Health and Fitness	CG, U.S. Army Center for Initial Military Training
Geospatial Information and Service	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Global Ballistic Missile Defense	CG, USASMDC
Information Advantage	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Inspector General	The Inspector General
Irregular Warfare	CG, USASOC

**Table 3–3**  
**Specified proponents — Continued**

Integrated Joint Special Technical Operations	DCS, G–3/5/7
Joint Matters, Strategic Plans, and Policy	DCS, G–3/5/7
Military Construction	Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Military Deception	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Mission Command	CG, U. S. Army Combined Arms Center
Mission Partner Environment	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Mortuary Affairs	CG, U.S. Army Sustainment Center of Excellence
Multidomain Operations	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Multidomain Task Force	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Nonlethal Weapons (minus cyber operations, electronic warfare, military deception, and military information support operations)	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction	Director, U.S. Army Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Agency
Nuclear Operations	Director, U.S. Army Nuclear and Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Agency
Obscuration	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Support Center of Excellence
Operations Security	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Operational Contract Support	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Support Command
Operational Research and Systems Analysis	DCS, G–8 (DAPR–PAE)
Personnel Recovery	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Prevention of Harmful Behaviors	CG, U.S. Army Center for Initial Military Training
Public Affairs	Chief, Public Affairs
Robotics	CG, U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence
Recruiting	CG, U.S. Army Recruiting Command
Safety & System Safety Engineering Management	CG, U.S. Army Combat Readiness Center
Security Force Assistance	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Simulation Operations	DCS, G–3/5/7
Space/High Altitude Capabilities	CG, USASMDC
Targeting	CG, U.S. Army Fires Center of Excellence
Unified Land Operations	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Unified Action Partner-Interoperability	CG, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
U.S. Military Academy	Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy

### **3–2. Supporting relationships that ensure Army modernization efforts**

a. Army proponents may lack the full range of capabilities, development organizations, and personnel to independently perform their DOTMLPF–P integration responsibilities.

b. Therefore, supporting relationships exist among AFC, AMC, FORSCOM, and TRADOC to ensure Army modernization efforts and DOTMLPF–P integration are synchronized in support of the Army Modernization Strategy.

## Chapter 4

### Headquarters Department of the Army Process Managers

#### 4-1. Managers of doctrine, organizations, training, materiel, leadership, education, personnel, facilities, and policy processes

HQDA principal officials with primary responsibility for managing and integrating one or more of the DOTMLPF-P functional processes are designated in table 4-1. Although DCS, G-3/5/7 is the lead integrator and synchronizer across the force management time horizons, the entire HQDA staff participates in coordinating and integrating DOTMLPF-P processes (see table 4-1 for a list of HQDA DOTMLPF-P process managers).

#### 4-2. Process Managers

See process managers in table 4-1.

**Table 4-1**

**Process managers**

Functional processes	Process Managers
Doctrine	DCS, G-3/5/7
Organization	DCS, G-3/5/7
Training	DCS, G-3/5/7
Materiel	ASA (ALT)
Leadership and Education	DCS, G-3/5/7
Personnel	DCS, G-1
Facilities	DCS, G-9
Policy	SECARMY and Principal HQDA Officials (in accordance with AR 25-30)

## **Appendix A**

### **References**

#### **Section I**

##### **Required Publications**

Unless otherwise indicated, all Army publications are available on the Army Publishing Directorate website at <https://armypubs.army.mil>.

##### **Army Directive 2022–07**

Army Modernization Roles and Responsibilities (Cited in para 1–1.)

#### **Section II**

##### **Prescribed Forms**

This section contains no entries.

## **Appendix B**

### **Internal Control Evaluation**

#### **B-1. Function**

The function covered by this regulation is the management of Army force modernization proponents.

#### **B-2. Purpose**

The purpose of this regulation is to designate Army force modernization proponents. The regulation contains internal control provisions and identifies key internal controls for designating Army force modernization proponents.

#### **B-3. Instructions**

Answers to the questions below should be based on the actual testing of key internal controls (for example, document analysis, direct observation, sampling, and simulation). Answers that indicate deficiencies should be explained and corrective action indicated in supporting documentation. These key management controls must be formally evaluated at least once every 5 years. Certification that this evaluation has been conducted should be accomplished on DA Form 11-2 (Internal Control Evaluation Certification).

#### **B-4. Test questions**

The following questions assist in determining whether to designate an Army force modernization proponent for a particular function. Army force modernization proponent designations are not funding mandates:

- a. Does the Army require an advocate to propose and integrate changes (DOTMLPF-P) capabilities related to a specific modernization function across the Army?
- b. How many DOTMLPF-P processes are required by the function?
- c. Does the proposed proponent possess the capabilities development resources to support force proponent DOTMLPF-P development responsibilities?
- d. Are there unique overlapping relationships between the designated Army force modernization proponent and other Army force modernization proponents? If so, do they need to be outlined in AR 5-22?
- e. Does the new area being proposed for force modernization proponent designation truly lie outside the advocacy of a current force modernization proponent? If yes, explain why no other Army force modernization proponent can provide advocacy for this proposed area?
- f. Do all current force modernization proponents concur with the proposal to designate another Army force modernization proponent? If not, why not?

#### **B-5. Supersession**

This evaluation replaces the evaluation previously published in AR 5-22, dated 28 October 2015.

#### **B-6. Comments**

Help to make this a better tool for evaluating internal controls. Submit comments to the DCS, G-3/5/7 inbox at [usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-3-5-7.mbx.ssp@army.mil](mailto:usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-3-5-7.mbx.ssp@army.mil).

## **Glossary of Terms**

### **Branch proponent**

The commandant of a branch school or the chief of a branch of the Army with assigned responsibilities for that branch.

### **Capabilities development**

Capability developers identify, assess, and document capability requirements related to functions, roles, missions, and operations, and then determine if there are any capability gaps which present an unacceptable risk and warrant further action in the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System. Identification of capability requirements and associated capability gaps begins with the proponent's organizational functions, roles, missions, and operations, in the context of a framework of strategic guidance documents, and if applicable, overarching plans. These changes occur in DOTMLPF–P areas that collectively produce the force capabilities and attributes prescribed in approved concepts, concept of operations, or other authoritative sources.

### **Center of Excellence**

Designated by HQDA, a Center of Excellence is a organization that creates the highest standards of achievement in an assigned sphere of expertise by generating synergy through effective and efficient combination and integration of functions while reinforcing unique requirements and capabilities.

### **Force design**

The design of operational and functional concepts that address the conditions of a future operational environment and its anticipated threats, and generally focuses 5–15 years into the future.

### **Force development**

The maturation of operational and functional concepts into Force Design Updates that fully integrate DOTMLPF–P and generally focuses 2–7 years into the future.

### **Force employment**

The generation of ready forces to meet the needs of the Joint force, and generally focuses 0–3 years into the future.

### **Force integration**

The synchronized, resource-constrained execution of an approved force development program to achieve systematic management of change, including the introduction, incorporation, and sustainment of doctrine, organizations, and equipment in the Army, coordination and integration of operational and managerial systems collectively designed to improve the effectiveness and capability of the Army, and the knowledge and consideration of the potential implications of decisions and actions taken within the execution process (see AR 71–32).

### **Force management**

The capstone process to establish and field mission-ready Army organizations. The process involves organization, integration, decision making, and execution of the spectrum of activities encompassing requirements definition, force development, force integration, force structuring, capability developments, materiel developments, training developments, resourcing, and all elements of the Army Organizational Life Cycle Model.

### **Force modernization proponent**

The HQDA principal official or the commander, commandant, director, or chief of a center, school, institution, or agency with primary duties and responsibilities to provide and integrate DOTMLPF–P requirements for a particular function (TRADOC Critical).

### **Force sustainment**

The management and care of materiel equipment after a capability transitions to sustainment, and before the Army divests the capability. It includes the maintenance, targeted modernization, and recapitalization of enduring platform capabilities the Army must retain.

### **Materiel**

All items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, and so forth, and related spares, repair parts, and support equipment, but excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip,

operate, maintain, and support military activities without distinction as to its application for administrative or combat purposes.

**Specified Proponent**

Proponents responsible for identifying and integrating requirements for a specified function across the Army.

**Strategic divestiture**

The elimination of legacy platform capabilities the Army no longer requires to accomplish its mission through a variety of programs (for example, foreign military sales or destruction).



# ***SUMMARY of CHANGE***

AR 5–22

The Army Force Modernization Proponent and Integration System

This major revision, dated 13 June 2023—

- Adds U.S. Army Futures Command roles and responsibilities (para 2–15).
- Adds a table of Center of Excellence Force Modernization proponents (table 3–1).
- Adds a list of specified proponents (table 3–3).
- Incorporates and rescinds Army Directive 2019–25 (Establishment of the Office of the Chief Army Enterprise Marketing), dated 1 August 2019 (throughout).
- Incorporates Army Directive 2020–15 (Achieving Persistent Modernization), dated 16 November 2020 (throughout).
- Incorporates Army Directive 2021–08 (Implementation and Sustainment of Army Medical Department Individual Critical Task Lists), dated 19 March 2021 (throughout).
- Incorporates Army Directive 2022–07 (Army Modernization Roles and Responsibilities), dated 3 May 2022 (throughout).

**UNCLASSIFIED**

PIN 060844-000