



Headquarters
Department of the Army
Washington, DC
12 March 2024

***Army Regulation 350–2**

Effective 12 April 2024

Training

Operational Environment and Opposing Force Program

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

RANDY A. GEORGE
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.

Authorities. The authority for this regulation is AR 350–1.

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–2. 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 C).

Suggested improvements. Users are invited to send comments or suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) to usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-2.list.dami-fi-distribution@army.mil.

Distribution. This publication 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 publication supersedes AR 350–2, dated 19 May 2015.

SUMMARY of CHANGE

AR 350–2
Operational Environment and Opposing Force Program

This major revision dated 12 March 2024—

- Eliminates the 21st Cavalry Brigade (inactivated) as an Opposing Force element. (para 1–6).
- Establishes the Decisive Action Training Environment as the primary training Operational Environment for scenario development supporting Large Scale Combat Operations exercises (para 1–6).
- Establishes operational environment fidelity levels for Combat Support Training Exercises and Centers of Excellence (para 1–7).
- Updates responsibilities to support the Operational and Opposing Force Program (paras 2–4, 2–5, 2–6, 2–12).
- Adds responsibilities for the Chief of Public Affairs and Deputy, Chief of Staff, G–8 (paras 2–2, 2–8).
- Establishes the Training and Doctrine Command Proponent Office for the opposing force Systems Program (para 2–10).
- Replaces "develop" with "sustain" the Operational Environment Center Applications and Service Hub as the web-based portal allowing access to Operational Environment and Opposing Force data, information, and knowledge (para 2–10).
- Updates United States Army Europe to United States Army Europe and Africa (para 2–12).
- Adds responsibilities for the Commanding General, U.S. Army Pacific (para 2–13).
- Removes Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command from responsibilities and transfers those responsibilities to Commanding General, U.S. Army Futures Command and updates the name of Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity to United States Army Combat Capabilities Development Command Data and Analyses Center (para 2–15).
- Adds responsibilities for the Commanding General, Army Futures Command (para 2–15).
- Establishes Operational Environment and Opposing Force concepts and requirements determination responsibilities for the Army Futures Command (para 2–15).
- Links operational environment conditions to achieving Standards for Training Proficiency (para 3–2).
- Includes Army Techniques Publications 7–100 series to support the representation of opposing forces (para 3–3).
- Updates requirements for Training General Officer Steering Committee and Counsel of Colonels (para 3–4).
- Eliminates Operational Environment requirements for Regionally Aligned Forces (para 3–5).

- Establishes the requirement for Combat Training Centers to train their Opposing Force (paras 3–5, 3–6).
- Eliminates the Common Framework of Scenarios as a scenario development requirement (para 3–6).
- Updates Training and Doctrine Command, G–2's supporting role in the Army Enterprise Accreditation Standards (para 3–6).
- Updates references (appendix A).
- Articulates guidelines to ensure that U.S. Army scenarios do not damage ongoing diplomatic initiatives or produce undesirable global attention (appendix B).

Contents (Listed by chapter and page number)

Summary of Change

Chapter 1

Introduction, *page 1*

Chapter 2

Responsibilities, *page 2*

Chapter 3

Planning and Management, *page 7*

Appendixes

A. References, *page 15*

B. Use of Opposing Forces in Scenarios, *page 16*

C. Internal Control Evaluation, *page 18*

Glossary of Terms

Chapter 1 Introduction

1–1. Purpose

This regulation prescribes policy and procedures and assigns responsibilities for the Department of the Army (DA) Operational Environment (OE) and Opposing Force (OPFOR) Program. It covers all Army OE and OPFOR activities in live, virtual, constructive, and gaming environments across the operational and institutional domains in support of leader development, training, education (LDTE), and other developmental functions in preparing for large scale combat and joint operations across multiple domains.

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 directory located at <https://armypubs.army.mil/>.

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.

1–6. Operational Environment and Opposing Force Program Elements and Employment

a. Operational environment. An OE is a composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences that affect the employment of capabilities and bear on the decisions of the commander. For Army forces, an OE includes portions of the land, maritime, air, space, and cyberspace domains understood through three dimensions (human, physical, and information). Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) 3–0 describes the OE in terms of eight operational variables: political, military, economic, social, information, infrastructure, physical terrain, and time (PMESII–PT); Army forces use these operational variables to understand and analyze the broad environment in which they are conducting operations. ADP 7–0 established the "complex and uncertain OEs" as a key component in the four Army principles of unit training; integrating the conditions of the expected OE into the training environment provides commanders with the full range of experiences needed to produce trained units and capable leaders. The strategic security environment contains multiple potential OEs, which are defined as any areas in which U.S. forces may operate, from a locale as small as a village to entire regions of the globe. Because the Army cannot always predict where forces will have to deploy, training environments must account for multiple likely OEs. Conditions should represent those expected OEs as much as possible. A training environment can be a representation of anyone expected OE or a composite of multiple OEs. For simplicity, the use of OE and training environment are interchangeable in this regulation.

b. Opposing forces. An OPFOR is a plausible, flexible, and free-thinking mixture of regular forces, irregular forces, and/or criminal elements representing a composite of varying capabilities of actual worldwide forces and capabilities (doctrine, tactics, organization, and equipment). The OPFOR is used in lieu of a specific threat force for training and developing U.S. forces. The OPFOR is tailored to replicate highly capable conventional threats and unconventional threats that combined can replicate hybrid threats and their strategies further described in the Training Circulars (TC) 7–100 series of manuals (Hybrid Threats) and Army Techniques Publications (ATP) 7–100 series of manuals (Foreign Military Tactics). Army units dedicated to professional OPFOR missions are located at Army Combat Training Centers (CTCs), including the National Training Center (NTC), the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC), the Joint

Multinational Readiness Center (JMRC), and the Mission Command Training Program (MCTP). Other OPFOR elements include but are not limited to, elements within Reserve Component (RC) training divisions, the Airborne Ranger Training Brigade, and the Army Cyber Command's cyber OPFOR. While other units and individuals can be tasked to portray OPFOR for use in training events, all OPFOR will operate using doctrine and organizational structures approved by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS), G-2 (herein referred to as the TRADOC, G-2).

c. Operational environment and opposing force in Army training. The OE and OPFOR Program is intended to provide commanders with a realistic training environment that produces combat-like conditions within the operational training domain against an uncompromising 'sparring partner.' The training environment should encompass various and simultaneous operational variable interactions that produce complexities (four or more variables that interact); for example, OPFOR use of urban terrain (infrastructure), population (social), and commercial communications networks (information) such as broadband TVs /radios and social media to create physical and electromagnetic cover and concealment, therefor providing complex challenges for intelligence and targeting training objectives in Large Scale Combat Operations (LSCO). The use of OPFOR in training events is intended to improve realistic training by enabling operations against a non-cooperative, free-thinking, and capability-based adversary or enemy. The OPFOR uses tactics, doctrine, and equipment representative of a composite of forces that could be encountered in expected OEs. The OE and OPFOR Program will be used to develop Decisive Action Training Environment (DATE)-based scenarios for various training activities and units. The OE and OPFOR Program will also be included as part of specific conditions appropriate to mission-rehearsal exercises (MREs) or mission readiness exercises (MRXs). The purpose of using an OPFOR and OE is to provide necessary training conditions to allow task proficiency training on unit mission essential tasks (MET). Units that are task proficient have the flexibility for worldwide deployment. Units that are assigned a defined mission against a specific enemy may also conduct mission-rehearsal training to enhance task proficiency against the known OE conditions and enemy.

d. Other uses of opposing force. The OPFOR may be used in Army experimentation, testing, and other activities. The OPFOR may be one of the dedicated forces described in paragraph 1-6b above or may be created for the specific activity. Use of OPFOR for these activities must be coordinated with the TRADOC, G-2, and approved by the Commanding General (CG), TRADOC, or delegated representative.

1-7. Three Training and Leader Development Operational Environment Fidelity Levels

a. High. Condition-setting training environment capabilities and resources needed to replicate most complexities of the OE; present realistic signatures and effects to stimulate all combined arms LSCO and Joint, interagency, and multinational (JIM) enablers; and produce extremely complex problems for leader development within the context of achieving all multi-echelon unit training tasks and objectives.

b. Medium. Reduced condition-setting training environment capabilities and resources needed to represent the majority of OE complexities to stimulate key combined arms LSCOs and JIM enablers and present partial signatures and effects needed to stimulate primary multi-echelon tasks and training objectives.

c. Low. Minimal requirements and resources needed to represent OE conditions that drive single-echelon collective training tasks and objectives.

d. Fidelity level implementation. CTCs will implement high-fidelity OE training conditions, while Regional Collective Training Capability (RCTC) and RC Combat Support Training Exercises implement medium-fidelity conditions, and Centers of Excellence (COE) and home station training (HST) exercises implement low/medium-fidelity OE training conditions.

Chapter 2 Responsibilities

2-1. Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology)

ASA (ALT) will—

a. Oversee research, development, test, and evaluation (RDTE) and plan, program, and budget to acquire OE, OPFOR, and OE and OPFOR components of system training aids, devices, simulators, and simulations (TADSS).

b. Ensure program executive officers (PEOs) and/or project managers (PMs) plan, program, and budget appropriate levels of RDTE and procurement dollars within their programs for the development,

acquisition, and fielding of OE and OPFOR system or subsystem training packages, including required TADSS. Planning considerations include OE and OPFOR system TADSS applications for training and instrumentation system interface.

c. Provide points of contact (POCs) to monitor system TADSS Programs as part of the overall TADSS Program and serve as the management decision package (MDEP) POC for RDTE, procurement, and funding requirements for OE and OPFOR system TADSS.

d. Direct the acquisition of directed requirements, approved by the DCS, G-3/5/7, for OE and OPFOR TADSS that fulfill an urgent training need.

e. Ensure PEOs and PMs—

(1) Review and coordinate with TRADOC, G-2 the application or requirement of OE and OPFOR system TADSS within doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, and education, personnel, facilities, and policy (DOTMLPF-P) assessments, in all system concept formulation, development, growth, and funding.

(2) Fund, develop, acquire, and field OE and OPFOR training subsystem materiel (to include foreign materiel) within the OE, OPFOR, and Army materiel system.

(3) Program and budget funds to support changes and updates to fielded TADSS with OE and OPFOR application resulting from changes or modifications to the supported system.

(4) Provide system performance data and funding to CG, U.S. Army Futures Command, (AFC) for the development of OPFOR system training performance data.

2-2. Chief of Public Affairs

CPA will—

a. Serve as the release authority for OE and OPFOR information.

b. Inform U.S. Soldiers about the OE and OPFOR Program and how it enhances collective training.

c. Address public inquiries about OE and OPFOR equities within collective training in the U.S. Army.

2-3. Chief, National Guard Bureau

Chief, National Guard Bureau will—

a. Program funds to support procurement of Army Requirements Review Board-approved OE and OPFOR TADSS to support approved ARNG combined arms training strategy initiatives and programs.

b. Provide resources to support ARNG participation in training exercises as OPFOR augmentation.

c. Ensure that the ARNG is represented at appropriate OE and OPFOR forums.

d. Support and adhere to established accreditation guidelines as prescribed in paragraph 3-6 (OE and OPFOR accreditation and validation).

2-4. Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1

DCS, G-1 will—

a. Integrate the OE and OPFOR Program into Armywide personnel management, including the ARNG, U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), and Army held Joint Service billets.

b. Develop policies, objectives, and guidelines that support Armywide personnel management, Soldier professional development, and low-density military occupational specialty sustainment in support of units supporting the OE and OPFOR Program.

c. In coordination with the DCS, G-2, provide guidance to the Chief of Public Affairs (CPA) regarding public inquiries and public information releases on all OE and OPFOR Program aspects.

2-5. Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2

DCS, G-2 will—

a. Function as the Army OE and OPFOR Program proponent and Army Staff focal point for all Army OPFOR actions.

b. Exercise OE and OPFOR Program oversight through the TRADOC-appointed responsible official.

c. Oversee the development, coordination, and management of OPFOR requirements that direct the acquisition of simulations, simulators, surrogates, instrumentation, and foreign materiel for training (FMT) to support OPFOR Program objectives in coordination with DCS, G-3/5/7 (DA Management Office-Training Simulations (DAMO-TRS)).

d. Serve as the POC for matters requiring the initial acquisition of foreign materiel in support of the OE and OPFOR Program and coordinate these needs with the ASA (ALT) and the DCS, G-8.

- e. Identify foreign materiel in the Army inventory that could be used by the OE and OPFOR Program and assist in the transfer of materiel when applicable.
- f. Provide funding through subordinate elements for the development of OPFOR classified and unclassified system training performance data.
- g. In coordination with the CPA, provide guidance regarding public inquiries and public information release on all OE and OPFOR Program aspects.
- h. Through the CG, U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command—
 - (1) Provide intelligence and threat support to the OPFOR Program.
 - (2) Uses contracting procedures upon receipt of funding, and in coordination with DCS, G–2 (DAMI–FI) and DCS, G–8, in conjunction with normal funding channels to acquire foreign materiel in support of the OPFOR Program in accordance with AR 381–26.
 - (3) Assist TRADOC, G–2 in integrating FMT into the OPFOR Program.
 - (4) Arrange for transportation of OPFOR FMT from U.S. port of entry to holding units or installations.
 - (5) Provide safety, technical, maintenance, and operator training on OPFOR FMT.
 - (6) Provides technical advice and assistance to OPFOR FMT users on all maintenance levels. Provide foreign system performance data to AFC for the development of OPFOR system training performance data.

2–6. Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7

DCS, G–3/5/7 will—

- a. Ensure that Army guidance on training objectives and developmental activities provides a basis for precise and measurable standards within the OE and OPFOR Program supporting Armywide leader development, training, education, and other developmental functions.
- b. Integrate the OE and OPFOR Program into Armywide training as required.
- c. Establish OE and OPFOR Program priorities and resource requirements within the CTC and HST Programs and RCTC sites.
- d. Ensure that centers, institutions, and/or installations with primary LDTE missions employing OE and OPFOR to shape conditions adhere to established accreditation guidelines prescribed in paragraph 3–6 (OE and OPFOR accreditation and validation).
- e. Exercise Army Staff supervision over maintenance and logistic policies and procedures for OE and OPFOR non-system TADSS and equipment.
- f. Develop integrated logistics support policy and guidance for the development and/or procurement of OE and/or OPFOR non-system TADSS and equipment.

2–7. Deputy Chief of Staff, G–4

DCS, G–4 will—

- a. Integrate the OE and OPFOR Program into Armywide logistics, including ARNG, USAR, and Joint Services logistics as required.
- b. Assist DCS, G–2 in developing OE and OPFOR Program policies, objectives, and guidelines that support Army logistics, research, and development, materiel acquisition, sustainment, instrumentation, digitization, and maintenance.

2–8. Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8

DCS, G–8 will—

- a. Coordinate with the ASA (ALT) on all proposed programming and process recommendations related to ongoing and future acquisition programs and must coordinate with CG, AFC for programming funding for all elements of the future force materiel modernization.
- b. Serve as is the principal ARSTAF advisor to the CSA on all materiel requirements and programming of Army and joint materiel for integration into the overall prioritization of capabilities by the DCS, G–3/5/7. See AGO 2020–01, para. 34a.
- c. Uses contracting procedures upon receipt of funding, and in coordination with DCS, G–2 (DAMI–FI) in conjunction with normal funding channels to acquire foreign materiel in support of the OPFOR Program in accordance with AR 381–26.

2–9. Chief, Army Reserve

CAR will—

- a. Establish and integrate a USAR OPFOR Program for training.
- b. Provide resources to support USAR participation in training exercises as OPFOR augmentation.
- c. Ensure that the Office of the Chief of the Army Reserve is represented at appropriate OE and OPFOR conferences and forums.
- d. Support and adhere to established accreditation guidelines as prescribed in paragraph 3–6 (OE and OPFOR accreditation and validation).
- e. Ensure USAR units conduct training at all levels using doctrinally correct OE and OPFOR.
- f. Ensure OPFOR lessons and best practices are captured and shared within the Army Lessons Learned Program (ALLP) in accordance with AR 11–33.

2–10. Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

CG, TRADOC will—

- a. Designate the TRADOC, G–2 as the responsible official for the development, management, administration, integration, and approval functions of the OE and OPFOR Program across the Army.
- b. Establish the development, verification, validation, accreditation, and provision of the OE to support LDTE efforts as a TRADOC core function.
- c. Establish priorities for allocating TRADOC resources identified to support the OE and OPFOR Program.
- d. Serve as the approval authority for OE, the OE master plan, and OPFOR doctrine, organization, equipment, and compliance within all scenarios used or derived from the DATE for LDTE and other developmental functions.
- e. Designate a TRADOC Proponent Office (TPO) for the OPFOR Systems Program to conduct DOTMLPF–P analysis and provide a dedicated structure that manages the acquisition, fields, and sustains OPFOR Training Aids, Devices, Simulations, and Simulators (TADSS), and surrogates.
- f. Ensure Combined Arms Center-Training (CAC–T) coordinates with TRADOC G–2 for inclusion of TPOs for the Integrated Training Environment, which includes TPO-Live, TPO Force on Force (FoF), TPO-Ranges, TPO-Synthetic Training Environment, TPO-Virtual and Gaming, and TPO-Constructive, to develop, staff, and coordinate OE and OPFOR requirements documentation in accordance with JCIDS for TRADOC and HQ DA approval.
- g. Ensure that the following functions and support requirements of the OE and OPFOR Program are met:
 - (1) Develop, implement, evaluate, and update standardized Armywide individual and collective training programs, models, and simulations to incorporate a range of complex operational variables and a plausible and flexible OPFOR representing varying capabilities of actual and projected worldwide conventional and irregular threats.
 - (2) Develop OE and OPFOR directive and informational products in the form of Training Circulars (TCs), TRADOC pamphlets, and associated instructional materials for Armywide use.
 - (3) Establish procedures for all TRADOC principal and special staff support to the OE and OPFOR Program.
 - (4) Develop and manage Armywide procedures in coordination with the U.S. Center for Army Lessons Learned for discovering, validating, and integrating lessons and best practices gleaned regarding Army capabilities, tactics, and operations against thinking, adaptive, opportunities based OPFORs.
 - (5) Ensure OPFOR lessons learned, and best practices are captured within the ALLP in accordance with AR 11–33.
 - (6) Provide resources for validation of OE and OPFOR portrayal in Armywide institutional and collective training and live, virtual, constructive, and gaming environments.
 - (7) Sustain the OE Center Applications and Service Hub, enabling access for trainers and training developers to OE and OPFOR data, information, knowledge, OE, and OPFOR Web-accessible tools and applications.
 - (8) Provide relevant and tailored OE data that stimulates the accomplishment of training objectives. The OE data may include information rendered in classified and unclassified formats and other data that shape the training environment, exercise design, and other associated requirements.
 - (9) Assist the training materiel developers in OPFOR TADSS concept formulation.
 - (10) In coordination with U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) and U.S. Army Europe and Africa (USAREUR–AF), develop, staff, and coordinate OE and OPFOR requirements for training and other applications.

- (11) Act as the approval authority for proposals and validate the use of OE and OPFOR training resources for developmental activities other than training.
- (12) Provide a dedicated and professional OPFOR at the MCTP.
- (13) Coordinate ARNG, USAR, and other U.S. Army OPFOR participation with Joint Services in the OE and OPFOR Program.
- (14) Determine the most effective method to hold forums that share OE/OPFOR lessons learned, review, and deliberate areas of common interest, and establish program way ahead efforts.
- (15) Conduct OE and OPFOR training courses as required to present evolving concepts and maintain currency among the training centers and the OPFOR community.
- (16) Develop OE and OPFOR portrayal within modeling and simulation across the operational (PMESII–PT) variables.
- (17) Assign threat managers, per AR 381–11, to coordinate with the TRADOC, G–2, and serve as staff focal point for managing all OE and OPFOR actions at their respective COE.

2–11. Commanding General, U.S. Army Forces Command
CG, FORSCOM will—

- a. Will provide required support to the doctrinal OPFOR mission at the NTC, the JRTC, the 84th Training Command, and other FORSCOM installations and units tasked to support or perform OPFOR missions.
- b. Provide OPFOR augmentation of personnel and/or units to supplement OPFOR units at the NTC and JRTC as required to meet large LSCO rotational training objectives.
- c. Provide required materiel to replicate OE and OPFOR conditions supporting training events, less fixed instrumentation, and other TADSS provided by AFC at NTC, JRTC, 84th Training Command, and HST sites.
- d. Direct the use of personnel and units to portray OPFOR during HST. Units tasked to portray OPFOR at HST will replicate maneuver capabilities up to battalion level to provide low to medium-level fidelity of training conditions to the training audience.
- e. For LSCO readiness training exercises, direct the development of training scenarios that use DATE products as the baseline to ensure that OE complexities are captured in training events.

2–12. Commanding General, U.S. Army Europe and Africa
CG, USAREUR–AF will—

- a. Will provide required support to the doctrinal OPFOR mission at the JMRC and other USAREUR–AF installations and units tasked to support or perform OPFOR missions.
- b. Provide required materiel for representation of OE and OPFOR conditions supporting training events, less fixed instrumentation, and other TADSS provided by AMC at the 7th Army Training Command, JMRC, other USAREUR–AF installations and units tasked to support or perform OE and OPFOR missions.
- c. Provide OPFOR augmentation of personnel and/or units to supplement OPFOR units at the JMRC as required to meet LSCO-based rotational training objectives.
- d. Ensure OPFOR lessons and best practices are captured and shared within the ALLP in accordance with AR 11–33.
- e. For LSCO readiness training exercises, direct the development of training scenarios that use DATE products as the baseline to ensure that OE complexities are captured in training events.

2–13. Commanding General, U.S. Army Pacific
CG, USARPAC will—

- a. Will provide required support to the doctrinal OPFOR mission for the regionally modified Joint Pacific Multinational Training Center (JPMRC). See AR 350–50.
- b. Provide required materiel for representation of OE and OPFOR conditions supporting training events for instrumentation and TADSS provided by CG, AMC for JPMRC usage in Hawaii, Alaska, and other USARPAC installations and units tasked to support or perform OE and OPFOR missions.
- c. Ensure OPFOR lessons and best practices are captured and shared within the ALLP in accordance with AR 11–33.
- d. For LSCO readiness training exercises, direct the development of training scenarios that use DATE products as the baseline to ensure that OE complexities are captured in training events.

2–14. Commanding General, U.S. Army Cyber Command

CG, Army Cyber Command will—

- a. Provide cyber network operations expertise to the TRADOC, G–2 for the integration of OPFOR cyber capabilities and assist in the development of training strategies that describe required cyber conditions.
- b. Establish a dedicated cyber OPFOR to operate within the cyberspace domain and information environment during LDTE events in order to train Army forces to operate in a degraded or compromised cyberspace domain.
- c. Coordinate with the National Security Agency, other Service adversary/OPFOR/Red Teams, and other interested commands and organizations in order to expand the cyber OPFOR community, ensure interoperability, and capture best practices and lessons learned from similar units and organizations.
- d. Advise and assist TRADOC G–2, and designated training programs or OPFOR units in work-around methods to replicate the effects of threat computer network operations.
- e. Ensure OPFOR lessons and best practices are captured and shared within the ALLP in accordance with AR 11–33.

2–15. Commanding General, U.S. Army Futures Command

CG, AFC will—

- a. Assist the training materiel developers in OPFOR TADSS future concepts.
- b. Coordinate OE and OPFOR requirements documentation in accordance with JCIDS with CG, TRADOC for ASA(ALT) approval.
- c. Ensure the Synthetic Training Environment concept and capability development/production efforts comply with current and emerging OE/OPFOR required representations per this regulation and TRADOC G–2 as the responsible official.
- d. Ensure Capability Development Integration Directorates coordinate with TRADOC G–2 and through the Combined Arms Center (CAC) for inclusion of Army capability managers (ACMs) to develop, staff, and coordinate OE and OPFOR requirements documentation in accordance with JCIDS for TRADOC or Headquarters, DA approval.
- e. Ensure OPFOR system training performance data development within elements of AFC.
- f. Direct the Director, US Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity Combat Capabilities Development Command Data and Analyses Center to provide classified and unclassified threat vulnerability and lethality performance data for use in OPFOR live, virtual, constructive, and gaming environments based upon data provided by PMs and the intelligence community.

2–16. Commanding General, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command

CG, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command will—

- a. Ensure necessary operational testing and evaluation of all OPFOR TADSS.
- b. As appropriate, develop, coordinate, and execute support agreements with TRADOC, G–2, to provide threat simulators and other materiel for OPFOR and/or other development activities.

Chapter 3

Planning and Management

This chapter describes planning and management policies and procedures applicable to the OE and OPFOR Program. Included are OE and OPFOR Program policies, doctrinal, and organizational guidelines, management, the CTC OE and OPFOR sustainment Program, procedures regarding OE and OPFOR accreditations, requests for OE and OPFOR services and support, and public affairs.

3–1. Program Policies

- a. Army training consists of tasks, conditions, and standards. The conditions for Army training events are realistic, relevant, and challenging OE and OPFOR influences that must be present to develop leaders and achieve unit training objectives.
- b. Representation of the OE in Army training environments will include the OPFOR (tailored to provide appropriate capabilities and effects) as well as civilians on the battlefield and other personnel or entities that could be encountered in an expected OE. This may include JIM partners that add to the realism and

complexity of the OE; however, the responsibility for planning, coordinating, or managing the participation of JIM partners within Army training does not fall under the purview of the responsible official for the OE and OPFOR Program.

c. Scenarios for Army training will include the concept of a 'level playing field,' an equal chance at exercise start for either side, OPFOR, or blue forces (BLUFOR), to achieve victory. Training events will be structured for maximum free play, including an opportunity for the OPFOR to 'win' the fight. Free play is a condition where OPFOR execute their assigned mission by assessing the OE and adversary(ies), then undertake tasks that shape conditions to meet their tactical or operational objectives. Both forces execute their mission with the least possible constraints, allowing events to move along their natural course, enabling commanders to realize the full consequences of their decisions within the bounds of the scenario and exercise the director's guidance to meet training objectives.

d. Use of a force other than OPFOR, such as outsourcing, for Army training must be coordinated and approved through the TRADOC, G-2.

e. All use of OPFOR in Army training and portrayal of the OE will be in accordance with OE and OPFOR operations and organizations as presented in the TC 7-100 series manuals, ADP 3-0, Field Manuals, ATPs, and related OE instructional materials produced or approved by TRADOC, G-2.

f. TRADOC, G-2 will be informed regarding the use of OPFOR for purposes other than training (for example, experimentation, or testing).

g. Changes to present-day OPFOR tactics, equipment, and organization must be coordinated with and approved by TRADOC, G-2.

h. Army personnel or units may augment the OPFOR. Augmentees will receive appropriate orientation training. Use of foreign (multinational) personnel or units as OPFOR augmentees within the CTC Program must be coordinated and approved in accordance with AR 350-50. Use of contract personnel as OPFOR augmentees is regulated by individual contractual provisions. Use of Joint services personnel as OPFOR augmentees must be approved by respective military departments.

i. All data used to represent OE and OPFOR in training, simulation, and/or other activities, including training scenarios, must be reviewed and validated by TRADOC, G-2.

3-2. Operational environment representation guidelines

a. TRADOC, G-2 assesses and captures OE complexities within the DATE and other documents available on the Operational Environment Data Integration Network (ODIN) (<https://odin.tradoc.army.mil>) and should be the cornerstone for developing training environments.

b. Scenarios representing real-world OE complexities may be either classified or unclassified; however, scenarios that use real-world countries set in present-day (now to the foreseeable future) with portrayed State or non-State actors as the 'enemy,' with which the United States is not in conflict may only be used for training and developmental activities at the classified level. Countries or non-State actors portrayed as the "enemy" (OPFOR) in an unclassified scenario should be fictitious. For unclassified training scenarios, the OPFOR will portray the forces of a fictitious country or organization unless prescribed in appendix B.

c. To achieve Standards for Training Proficiency, OE conditions must represent complexities commensurate with the desired training objectives. Training environments must represent the complex interactive nature of operational variables as defined and supported by the following publications:

(1) Task-appropriate Training and Evaluation Outline (TEO) as prescribed in the Army Training Network.

(2) TC 7-101.

(3) Operation Environment Master Plan (OEMP). The OEMP is available by contacting the TRADOC DCS, G-2. Once revised the OEMP will be available on the OE Data Integration Network (ODIN): <https://odin.tradoc.army.mil>.

d. The TEO for Brigade Combat Team METs include the requirement for a complex and dynamic environment that can support a conventional and hybrid threat. Deviation from or reduction in the OE requirements can only be approved by Army Service Component Commanders or Corps Commanders. The branch proponent must approve changes to actual TEOs.

3-3. Opposing force operational and organizational guidelines

a. The TC 7-100 series manuals present OPFOR concepts ranging from the strategic to the tactical level. When combined with other critical environment variables that could be encountered in a given

situation, these concepts offer the capability to portray the qualities of a full range of threat conditions in Army training environments. The TC 7–100 series consists of—

- (1) TC 7–100.
- (2) TC 7–100.2.
- (3) TC 7–100.3.
- (4) TC 7–100.4.
- (5) TC 7–102.

b. The ATP 7–100 series manuals provide the Army assessments of how regional near-peer foreign militaries would potentially execute tactics and techniques if the U.S. was their enemy. Commanders should use the ATP series of manuals to direct OPFOR actions when—

- (1) Training is focused against specific threat tactics and techniques.
- (2) Distinct model of best practices of specific actors is desired to create tailored and particular conditions.
- (3) Training objectives are adversary focused and require threat familiarity.
- (4) Best suited for regionally focused or MREs to achieve directed readiness.

c. Scenarios may dictate OPFORs to portray threats against Army forces ranging from platoon to echelons above division level. Although the dedicated OPFOR at each CTC is optimized to present threat conditions unique to their training environment and the predominance of types of units it will train, all OPFORs must maintain the ability to present themselves as a hybrid threat capable of setting training conditions for any U.S. combat brigade within LSCO operations. The current dedicated Army OPFORs are located at—

(1) *National Training Center*. Live and constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with an armor and/or mechanized OPFOR brigade-sized unit that is capable of representing a threat Brigade Tactical Group (BTG) conducting operations against a U.S. armor brigade, Stryker brigade, or lower echelon units.

(2) *Joint Readiness Training Center*. Live and constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with a modified light infantry OPFOR battalion capable of representing a reduced BTG-sized unit that is capable of conducting operations against a U.S. Stryker brigade, infantry brigade, or lower echelon units.

(3) *Joint Multinational Readiness Center*. Live and constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with an armor and/or mechanized OPFOR battalion capable of representing a reduced BTG-sized unit that is capable of conducting operations against a U.S. Stryker brigade, infantry brigade or lower echelon units; with armored augmentation, the OPFOR could also train armored brigades.

(4) *Joint Pacific Multinational Readiness Capability*. Live and constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with an augmented light infantry OPFOR battalion capable of representing a reduced BTG-sized unit for operations against a U.S. infantry brigade in a jungle or arctic environments, which is capable of also replicating armored vehicles and systems.

(5) *Mission Command Training Program opposing force*. Constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with an OPFOR capable of representing threat formations from national to brigade level, capable of conducting operations against U.S. brigades, divisions, and corps.

(6) *U.S. Army Reserve Training Command and training divisions*. Live and constructive training capability supporting decisive action tasks for LSCO with an augmented OPFOR from platoon through battalion level, capable of supporting live training up to battalion maneuver and live/constructive up to brigade and division-slice elements.

(7) *Home station training*. Live/constructive training capability supporting tasks for LSCO with a borrowed military manpower OPFOR from platoon through battalion level, capable of supporting live training for company proficiency up to battalion maneuver, and live/constructive up to brigade and division elements.

(8) *1st Information Operations Command*. Live/constructive capability supporting tasks for LSCO with a cyber OPFOR capable of replicating information warfare threats against U.S. battalions, brigades, divisions, and corps; this includes enduring support to CTC Programs (NTC, JRTC, JMRC, MCTP) and USARPAC's JPMRC.

3–4. Program management

a. *Oversight*. The DCS, G–2 is responsible for oversight of the Army OE and OPFOR Program and is assisted through the responsible DA official (TRADOC, G–2) designated by the CG, TRADOC.

b. Responsible official. TRADOC, G-2, as the Army OE and OPFOR Program responsible official, performs ongoing development, management, administration, integration, and approval functions of the program via the OE enterprise (OEE). As the responsible official, TRADOC, G-2 represents the program on deliberative bodies and often leads OE and OPFOR pillar efforts on behalf of Army training programs or enduring working groups (WGs), including the CTC, HST, and Army Joint National Training Capability programs, and the JIM and training support WG.

c. Training General Officer Steering Committee.

(1) Army training programs, including the CTC and HST Programs, as well as the JIM and training support systems WGs, operate under the auspices of the Training General Officer Steering Committee (TGOSC). DCS, G-3 (DAMO-TR) chairs the TGOSC semiannually. There is no OEE voting member on the TGOSC; however, the TRADOC, G-2 is an invited attendee to address OE and OPFOR equities. Additional information on the TGOSC and voting memberships can be found in the committee charter located in AR 350-1.

(2) TGOSC-related OE and OPFOR equities and issues as related to the various TT-PEG Portfolios are addressed through the forum of the combined Council of Colonels (COC) and its subordinate WGs for:

(a) Recommending priorities for Army-level OE and OPFOR development and resourcing.

(b) Reviewing and recommending approval of priority requirements as forwarded by the combined COC.

(3) TGOSC makes recommendations to TRADOC, G-2 and DCS, G-2 based on consensus recommendations of the combined COC.

d. Combined Council of Colonels and other forums. The combined COC meets semiannually to monitor, review, screen, and refine issues, initiatives, and topics for validation purposes or presentation to the TGOSC. It consists of numerous COC forums aligned to the various TT-PEG portfolios, of which TRADOC, G-2 represents OE and OPFOR equities as a non-voting member within the Operational, Institutional, Mission, Network, and training support system (TSS) Portfolios/COCs.

(1) Within the Operational COC, the TRADOC G-2 provides lead representation for the OE/OPFOR Pillars of the CTC Program and the Joint National Training Capability and provides subject matter expertise for required OE/OPFOR training conditions per Army directives and Standards for Training Proficiency.

(2) Within the TSS COC, TRADOC, G-2, in collaboration with TPO-OPFOR Systems, provides lead representation for OE/OPFOR specific TADSS supporting training, education, and leader development across the Army.

3-5. Sustainment

a. Program sustainment. The OE and OPFOR Program must present operational and threat conditions that are representative of real-world problems and military capabilities existing in the present and/or future. In order to achieve this representation, OPFOR doctrine must be continuously refined and updated, while OE conditions and OPFOR equipment must be sustained and modernized over time in order to provide required counter-task training to Army and other forces. The OE and OPFOR sustainment process involves intelligence research and requirements determination for applicability to live, virtual, constructive, and gaming training environments and other activities.

b. Intelligence research. TRADOC, G-2 conducts extensive all-source research to compile data on worldwide OEs and military capabilities. TRADOC incorporates the results of this research into the ATP and TC 7-100 series manuals and the DATE, which portray a range of unclassified capabilities, parameters, and variables that represent a composite of potential conditions and adversaries to provide stressful, realistic training for Army forces. The OPFOR capabilities presented in the TCs are the basis for OPFOR replication and fidelity in all training and other events for which they are used, and for requirements documentation, resourcing, and fielding of equipment and personnel. It also supports data development used to drive simulations and stimulate mission command systems for collective training venues. The research process is continuous and results in changing capabilities and requirements over time. The TC 7-100 series manuals serve as the genesis for development of the OEMP, which provides the foundation of resource requirements for OE and OPFOR portrayal at each of the major collective training venues.

c. Operational environment and opposing force sustainment procedures. The portrayal of training environments and OPFOR operations, organizations, equipment, and associated parameters are outlined in the TC 7-100 series manuals and the OEMP. Specific procedures for sustainment of portrayal are—

(1) *Combat training center opposing force.* Each CTC presents OE training conditions and fields an OPFOR based upon their mission requirement for training specified rotational training units, and within established guidelines of AR 350–50, the CTC Master Plan, the TC or ATP 7–100 series manuals, and the OEMP.

(a) TRADOC, in coordination with FORSCOM, USAREUR–AF, U.S. Army Pacific (USARPAC), and the CTCs, conducts an OE and OPFOR DOTMLPF–P analysis to determine shortfalls in OEMP presented requirements.

(b) A CTC may independently identify OE shortfalls requiring doctrinal or materiel solutions. These shortfalls should be forwarded through command channels to TRADOC, G–2 for validation.

(c) TRADOC, G–2 submits identified DOTMLPF–P OE shortfalls to the appropriate TPO for development or inclusion of such within appropriate requirements documentation.

(d) CAC–T reviews and assign a lead element or agency (TPO) to review, develop, and staff OPFOR TADSS requirements documentation for validation and approval.

(e) TRADOC, G–2 assists the CTC Directorate, DCS, G–3/5/7 (DAMO–TRS), and CTC MDEP managers to prioritize OE and OPFOR DOTMLPF–P shortfalls through the semiannual program management review (PMR) to fund requirements within the program objective memorandum.

(f) TRADOC, G–2 integrates near and long-term OE and OPFOR goals and objectives, as outlined in the OEMP, into the CTC Master Plan.

(g) TRADOC, G–2, in collaboration with ACMS, submits new CTC OE and OPFOR initiatives to the CTC Program as PMRs, which identify critical, required, and/or desired, requirements to maintain the capability and quality of CTC OPFOR training.

(h) The CTC COC, the semiannual CTC commanders' conference, and, as required, the TGOSC, will validate, consolidate, and prioritize requirements.

(i) CTCs may develop or sustain certain low volume, low-cost OE and OPFOR TADSS at the installation level; however, the need for a capability must still be validated by TRADOC, G–2.

(j) Sustainment actions regarding doctrinal and capabilities interpretation are submitted to TRADOC, G–2 for resolution.

(k) Sustainment actions regarding procurement and use of FMT are forwarded through command channels to TRADOC, G–2 for coordination.

(l) CTCs and JPMRC are responsible for establishing and maintaining a training program for their OPFOR to ensure OPFOR doctrine and tactics outlined in the ATP or TC 7–100 series are adhered to.

(2) *Other opposing forces.* Non-CTC OPFOR organizations will adhere to the following sustainment procedures:

(a) TRADOC, in coordination with FORSCOM, USAREUR–AF, and USARPAC, conducts an OE and OPFOR DOTMLPF–P analysis to determine shortfalls in OEMP presented requirements for non-CTC Programs to include HST and COEs.

(b) Non-CTC Programs and local commanders that identify shortfalls requiring doctrinal or materiel solutions will forward these findings with recommendations through command channels to TRADOC, G–2 for validation.

(c) For material shortfalls not included within an established program of record, TRADOC, G–2 will submit identified shortfalls along with DOTMLPF–P change recommendations of TADSS to the CAC–T for development or inclusion of such within appropriate requirements documentation.

(d) The sponsoring command or TRADOC, G–2 will present shortfalls requiring RDTE or other procurement Army (OPA) funding to the HST COC, and, as required, to the TGOSC, for funding validation, consolidation, and prioritization.

(e) Submit sustainment actions regarding doctrinal and capabilities interpretation to TRADOC, G–2 for resolution.

(f) Submit sustainment actions regarding procurement and use of FMT through command channels to TRADOC, G–2 for coordination.

(3) *Regional Collective Training Capability.* RCTCs supporting or resourcing the portrayal of training environments and OPFOR operations, organizations, equipment, and associated parameters for HST, must comply with directives outlined in this regulation.

(a) RCTCs that identify shortfalls requiring doctrinal or materiel solutions will forward these findings with recommendations through command channels to TRADOC, G–2 for validation.

(b) For material shortfalls not included within an established program of record, TRADOC, G-2 will submit identified shortfalls along with DOTMLPF-P change recommendations of TADSS to the CAC-T for development or inclusion of such within appropriate requirements documentation.

(c) The TRADOC, G-2 or CAC-T will present shortfalls requiring RDTE or OPA funding to the HST COC, and, as required, to the TGOSC, for funding validation, consolidation, and prioritization.

(4) *Regionally aligned forces and mission-rehearsal exercises and/or Mission Readiness Exercises.* TRADOC, G-2 all-source research, as established in paragraph 3-5b, also applies to regionally aligned forces (RAF) and MREs and/or MRXs.

(a) RAF research support focuses on unified combatant command-specific regions through the publishing of OE assessments, which provide the foundation for OE conditions within RAF exercises.

(b) MRE and/or MRX research support responds to specific customer requests only. These are operationally focused for specific target environments.

(c) Available OE and OPFOR TADSS should suffice to support RAF and MRE or MRX training events. Commanders or programs that identify shortfalls requiring materiel solutions will forward these findings with recommendations through command channels to TRADOC, G-2 for validation, who will further coordinate requirements through the CAC-T.

3-6. Operational environment and opposing force accreditation and validation

a. *Concept.* In order to ensure that the OE and OPFOR Program for Army collective training provides appropriate training conditions, maintains credibility as a training aid, and achieves desired objectives and outcomes, TRADOC, G-2 conducts an accreditation program. Important to the credibility of the OE and OPFOR Program is the perception that it fairly and accurately portrays potential conditions and an enemy within the context of the expected OE, while meeting unit training objectives and affecting desired leader development outcomes. Consequently, it is critical that OE and OPFOR complexities set the right conditions within the task-condition-standard framework, and that they provide the relevant and realistic stimulation to drive training unit actions.

b. *Accreditation concept for collective training.* Collective training accreditations occur at the CTCs, USAR training divisions, JPMRC, and ARNG collective training program(s) and other training organizations or programs using an OE and/or OPFOR for training purposes. TRADOC, G-2 will assemble an interdisciplinary accreditation team of subject matter experts on OE and OPFOR training, and leader development from throughout the Army and Joint community and may include OPFOR representatives from other activities. The accreditation team visits the training site(s), makes observations, prepares a written report with observations, discussions, and recommendations for the observed commander, either accrediting or not accrediting the observed operational variable portrayal, as well as the extent to which the replication helped the training unit to achieve training objectives and desired training outcomes. For a failed standard, the responsible official for that training program will submit a suitable mitigation program objection and milestone list within 120 days, endorsed by TRADOC G-2 and approved by CAC CG to that program's higher command. TRADOC, G-2 will also use observations and input from training units as a feedback mechanism into the OE and OPFOR doctrinal, training, and training materiel development process. The use of OE and OPFOR standards within collective training venues is accredited to ensure—

(1) The OPFOR is adequately resourced to replicate the OE and other-directed training.

(2) Leaders, Planners, Observer, Controller, Trainers, OPFOR & role players are trained and knowledgeable about the OE and its impact on military operations.

(3) Training venues plan, implement, and resource replication of complex and interrelated Operational Variables for the type of exercise and in accordance with senior Army leader directives, exercise director's guidance & rotational training unit commander's training objectives.

(4) The training venue replicates/executes complexities of the OE within Live, Virtual, Constructive domains for LSCO training exercises or other-directed training.

c. *Operational environment and opposing force accreditation concept for combat training centers, Joint Pacific Multinational Readiness Capability, and Reserve Component training programs.* The accreditation process may cover the entire period of an exercise, with potential team representation at the initial planning conference and subsequent events as necessary prior to the actual rotation. Reviewing the BLUFOR training objectives, and ongoing scenario development (including operational variable selection), as well as the organizational and operational structure of the OPFOR and other condition-setting elements (for example, role players, host nation security forces, lessons learned, prior accreditation reports, and so on) the accreditation team will provide advice and validate the scenario and its execution. The team will also

look at OPFOR and observer, controller, and trainer training programs and rotational unit leader development programs, and training seminars as appropriate. TRADOC, G-2 will submit the accreditation report to the CG responsible of each training program and the commander of each operational unit and furnish a copy to the Deputy CG (DCG), CAC-T for inclusion in a biennial CTC Program accreditation report in accordance with AR 350-50.

d. Operational environment and opposing force accreditation concept for institutional training and education. TRADOC, G-2 participates as an Army Enterprise Accreditation Standards supporting member of TRADOC Quality Assurance Office (QAO) accreditations for Army and TRADOC COEs and schools. As the OE governance evaluator, the TRADOC, G-2 reviews the integration of OE and OPFOR equities and complexities within programs of instruction and classroom instruction and/or observes exercises. Using the results of these events, the TRADOC, G-2 evaluates the inclusion of doctrinal OE and OPFOR training in lesson plans and scenarios, reviews instructor certification programs, and validates demonstrated student competency in OE and OPFOR characteristics during student exercises. TRADOC, G-2 will present OE and OPFOR findings to the COE or school commandant as part of the overall QAO accreditation report, which is also forwarded to the TRADOC DCG and Chief of Staff.

e. Operational environment and opposing force validation concept for home station. In collaboration with FORSCOM, USAREUR-AF (7th ATC), and USARPAC, TRADOC, G-2 validates OE and OPFOR integration efforts and effectiveness within collective training events at home station sites (non-CTC hosted exercises). These validations will mimic the accreditation process but are not accreditations due to the multi-faceted variations in expected training objectives, anticipated outcomes, and limited resources that make it implausible for establishing common standards. Rather, TRADOC, G-2 will provide a written assessment of observations, discussions, and recommendations to training unit commanders, senior trainers, and the FORSCOM G-3/5/7 and DCG, and furnish a copy to the DCG, CAC-T.

f. Scheduling.

(1) Due to the dynamic changes of the OE, CTCs receive annual assessments, of which every other year's assessment will account for the biannual requirement per AR 350-50. They are coordinated through FORSCOM for NTC and JRTC, the 7th ATC for JMRC, and the MCTP; while not recognized within AR 350-50 as a CTC, JPMRC accreditations are coordinated via USARPAC.

(2) USAR division (training divisions) accreditations occur biennially. They are coordinated with the 84th Training Command and the 78th, 86th, and 91st Training Divisions.

(3) TRADOC, G-2 will conduct two to three OE and OPFOR validation assessments annually of HST exercises to measure the levels of effectiveness of OE/OPFOR portrayal and associated TADSS to stimulate MET and meet training objectives. TRADOC, G-2 selects events based on nominations by FORSCOM, USAREUR-AF (7th ATC), and USARPAC.

(4) Institutional accreditations of COEs and school will be scheduled triennially for COEs, and schools as designated by the QAO.

(5) Assistance in validation/accreditation of OE/OPFOR portrayal in joint or combined training or other events will be coordinated through the responsible headquarters.

3-7. Training restrictions

OE and OPFOR Program restrictions will be minimized and reviewed at least annually by TRADOC DCS, G-2 to ensure the OE and OPFOR—

- a.* Conduct safe training activities while providing training that meets BLUFOR training requirements.
- b.* Use only OPFOR uniforms, equipment, and training aids authorized by TRADOC DCS, G-2.
- c.* Integrate foreign military units or elements for use as an OPFOR only as approved through the TRADOC DCS, G-2.

3-8. Public affairs coordinating instructions

a. Objectives. The objectives of the public affairs program for OE and OPFOR are—

- (1) To inform U.S. Soldiers about the OE and OPFOR Program and how it enhances collective training.
- (2) To address public inquiries about OE and OPFOR in Army collective training.

b. Public affairs release authority.

- (1) *Public information.* Commanders responsible for the OE and OPFOR may release unclassified information to the news media about the OE and OPFOR Program if the information is within the mission

and scope of the command. Commanders will follow AR 360–1 to identify OE and OPFOR information that must be submitted to the Office of the Chief of Public Affairs for clearance to release.

(2) *Inquiries.* Inquiries outside the mission and scope of a given command will be referred to the next higher headquarters. Inquiries about all aspects of the OE and OPFOR Program also will be sent to: Office of the DCS, G–2 (DAMI–FIT) usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-2.list.dami-fit-distribution@army.mil, with information copies to: Chief of Public Affairs (SAPA–MRD) usarmy.pentagon.hqda-ocpa.mbx.mrd-press-desk@army.mil, and TRADOC, G–2 (ATIN–O) usarmy.jble.tradoc.list.hq-tradoc-g-2-ops@army.mil.

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>.

AR 11–33

Army Lessons Learned Program (ALLP) (Cited in para 2–9*f*.)

AR 350–1

Army Training and Leader Development (Cited in title page.)

AR 350–50

Combat Training Center Program (Cited in para 2–13*a*.)

AR 381–11

Intelligence Support to Capability Development (Cited in para 2–10*g*(17).)

AR 381–26

Army Foreign Materiel Program (U) (Cited in para 2–5*h*(2).)

TC 7–100

Hybrid Threat (Cited in para 1–6*b*.)

TC 7–100.2

Opposing Force Tactics (Cited in para 3–3*a*(2).)

TC 7–100.3

Irregular Opposing Forces (Cited in para 3–3*a*(3).)

TC 7–100.4

Hybrid Threat Force Structure Organization Guide (Cited in para 3–3*a*(4).)

TC 7–101

Exercise Design (Cited in para 3–2*c*(2) .)

TC 7–102

Operational Environment and Army Learning (Cited in para 3–3*a*(5).)

Section II

Prescribed Forms

This section contains no entries.

Appendix B

Use of Opposing Forces in Scenarios

B-1. Issues

The introduction of expected OEs as the model for Army training environments has improved the complexity of training scenarios and subsequently made them more closely aligned with current events. While this may provide some increased fidelity in training events it risks damage to U.S. National interests or potentially undesirable public attention. Unclassified training scenarios must be developed recognizing the potential political, diplomatic, and security ramifications of national or international media publication. US Army choices of training scenarios are viewed by many countries as diplomatic signals of US interests or as a warning. Even if that is not the intent, the guidelines below ensure that US Army choices do not damage ongoing diplomatic initiatives or produce undesirable global attention, as discussed previously in paragraph 3-8a. Training scenario developers should also consider foreign student and trainee sensitivity to exposure.

B-2. Policy and Guidelines

a. Unclassified training scenarios must not be directly traceable to any real-world countries, Government policies or agendas, actual military orders of battle or governmental structures when actual country names are used. For example, if a training scenario uses the real-world country of X, then the scenario may not use Country X's actual government policy, national, and international agenda, orders of battle or governmental structure. Scenarios using real-world country names must comply with the following provisions:

(1) The scenario may use derivatives of the foregoing (government policies or agendas, actual military orders of battle or governmental structures) provided they cannot be mistaken for real-world activities or structures.

(2) In all cases, information related to any country must be drawn from unclassified sources.

(3) Scenario developers must ensure that the aggregation of unclassified data does not at some point cause the scenario to become sensitive or even classified.

(4) If the training objectives or leadership development outcomes require that real country names be used and that actual current events must drive the training, the scenario may use actual foreign government national policies drawn from open-source documents. However, governmental structure and military orders of battle must remain fictitious, and the TRADOC, G-2 must approve this deviation.

b. Fictitious country names and regional constructs can be used in training scenarios. Use of fictitious countries and regional constructs allows closer matching of current international relationships and military forces. Scenarios using fictitious country names must comply with the following provisions:

(1) When fictitious country names are used, training scenarios may use actual governmental structures provided that names of real-world government officials are not used. In most cases, however, governmental structures of a fictitious country whose forces comprise OPFOR should follow the model of the fictitious "State" as outlined in TC 7-100.

(2) The fictitious countries' national interests may parallel real-world interests but cannot be identical.

(3) Military orders of battle that may engage U.S. or U.S.-led coalition forces must be fictitious, based on the organizations found in the OPFOR administrative force structure as outlined and task-organized in accordance with TC 7-100 series of manuals.

(4) Fictitious country and regional relationships must not compromise U.S. foreign policies or allow reasonable inferences to be drawn relative to U.S. relationships to a foreign government.

c. Under no circumstance will actual U.S. contingency plans or operations be used as part of an unclassified training scenario.

d. In all cases, actual demographics, terrain features, cities, towns, landmarks, and infrastructure may be used for training scenarios. Changing of geographical names is required only if the application of U.S. military power in the scenario could result in damage to U.S. national interests or lead to undesirable public attention. For example, destruction of a nation's capital city as a part of a campaign would require the use of a fictitious name.

e. MREs are an exception to these guidelines when US intent to apply military force has been made public through authorized channels. MRE exercise directors must determine the classified or unclassified nature of the event, based upon political sensitivity and/or security ramifications.

B-3. Critical elements

a. The key operational security elements to be considered in developing all unclassified training scenarios are as follows: If the answer is yes to any of these questions, then the scenario developer must consider rewriting the scenario, classifying it, or seeking further guidance from the TRADOC, G-2.

(1) Will public exposure of this scenario embarrass the United States or potentially damage U.S. foreign relationships?

(2) Does this scenario reveal U.S. contingency plans or operations, or can a reasonable inference of U.S. contingency plans be drawn from this scenario?

(3) Does this scenario expose actual U.S. relationships with foreign governments?

(4) Does the scenario provide information on the agenda or operation of a foreign government that discloses potentially sensitive detail on U.S. knowledge or interest?

(5) Will the military order of battle in the scenario compromise U.S. plans, weapons systems, or operations against a potential adversary?

b. Other than the use of a real country name for the 'enemy' (OPFOR), the following are examples of possible diplomatic or political sensitivities:

(1) Use of real-world countries as supporters or indirect participants backing or favoring the 'enemy' (OPFOR).

(2) Portraying a particular real-world country as a failed state in which U.S. forces must conduct stability operations and support operations.

(3) Portraying a real-world country as having been invaded or defeated by a traditional rival or an emerging threat in its region.

(4) Portraying the overthrow of the current regime or the death of the current head of state in a real-world country, even when placed in a future time frame.

(5) Use of real-world countries as U.S. allies or coalition partners in scenarios involving certain other countries or regions such as a regional rival or recent enemy of an ally/partner.

(6) Portraying real-world allied countries and third-party actors as neutral or non-combatants in a scenario where their existing national policy might result in active participation in hostilities.

Appendix C

Internal Control Evaluation

C-1. Function

The function covered by this checklist is the administration of the OE and OPFOR Program.

C-2. Purpose

The purpose of this checklist is to assist Army commands, Army service component commands, and the proponent in evaluating the key internal controls outlined below. It is not intended to cover all controls.

C-3. Instructions

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

C-4. Test questions

- a. Does TRADOC integrate lessons learned from OE and OPFOR portrayal during training into the doctrinal development process (TRADOC)?
- b. Has TRADOC conducted an annual OPFOR forum (G-2)?
- c. Has TRADOC implemented an annual accreditation process for OE and OPFOR portrayal in all aspects of Army training (G-2)?
- d. Are CTC OPFORs properly resourced with personnel and equipment to conduct doctrinal, meaningful training (Army commands and Army service component commands)?

C-5. Supersession

This evaluation replaces the evaluation for the Operational Environment and Opposing Force Program previously published in AR 350-2, dated 19 May 2015.

C-6. Comments

Help make this a better tool for evaluation of internal controls. Submit comments to usarmy.pentagon.hqda-dcs-g-2.list.dami-fi-distribution@army.mil

Glossary of Terms

Adversary

A party acknowledged as potentially hostile to a friendly party and against which the use of force may be envisaged.

Conditions

Established parameters in which training is achieved. Conditions explain what to provide, withhold, and/or modify. Conditions describe the characteristics under which the objective is measured and include the environment, safety considerations, resources and constraints.

Decisive action

The continuous, simultaneous combinations of offensive, defensive, and stability or defense support of civil authorities tasks.

Enemy

A party identified as hostile against which the use of force is authorized.

Home station training

Where the majority of Active Army training takes place; where individual skills are honed and unit readiness developed. For the Reserve Component (RC), it is any pre-mobilization training conducted at a unit's home station/location, local training area, or military installation other than a CTC.

Home station training capabilities

A capability to train Active Component brigades on LSCO training environment mission essential tasks (less live fire) and RC companies (with live fire)

Large scale combat operations

Extensive joint combat operations in terms of scope and size of forces committed, conducted as a campaign aimed at achieving operational and strategic objectives.

Leader development

The deliberate, continuous, and progressive process-founded in Army values-that grows Soldiers and Army Civilians into competent, committed professional leaders of character. Leader development is achieved through the career-long synthesis of the training, education, and experiences acquired through opportunities in the institutional, operational, and self-development domains, supported by peer and developmental relationships.

Non-system training device

A training device designed and intended to support general military training and non-system specific training requirements.

Operational environment

A composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences that affect the employment of capabilities and bear on the decisions of the commander.

Opposing force

A plausible, flexible, and free-thinking mixture of regular forces, irregular forces, and/or criminal elements representing a composite of varying capabilities of actual worldwide forces and capabilities (doctrine, tactics, organization, and equipment).

Regional collective training capability

The Army's enterprise approach to focus Training Support System capability to enable collective training.

System training device

Training devices designed and intended to train individual and/or collective tasks associated with a specific system, family of systems, or system of systems.

Threat

Any combination of actors, entities, or forces that have the capability and intent to harm United States forces, United States national interests, or the homeland.

Training aids, devices, simulators, and simulations

Training equipment that supports training in the live, virtual, and constructive environments. Justified, developed, and acquired to support designated tasks. Examples include, but are not limited to, battle simulations, targetry, training-unique ammunition, flight and/or driving simulators, gunnery trainers, and maintenance trainers. The TADSS are categorized as system or non-system.

UNCLASSIFIED

PIN 031863-000