

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------



0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
1.		J-3	M	0			The term “CBRN” (chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear) should be replaced by “WMD” (Weapons of mass destruction) throughout the document.	The September 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States and the December 2002 National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction defines and uses the term WMD.	A – After discussion with the Joint Staff WMD will be used vice CBRN. Individual comments will change these.
2.		USA	M	0			Weapons of mass destruction (WMD) should be utilized throughout the publication rather than chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN).	WMD is used and defined in the September 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States and the December 2002 National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction.	A – After discussion with the Joint Staff WMD will be used vice CBRN. Individual comments will change these.
3.		STRATCOM	S	0			Change all instances of CBRN or CBRNE to WMD.	Per discussion with JS.	A
4.		STRATCOM	S	0			General: Change all instances of CBRN and CBRNE to WMD and define the first instance of WMD as Weapons of Mass Destruction.	Per conversation with the Joint Staff, JP 3-12 and 3-12.1 will use WMD vs. CBRN(E).	A
5.	1.	USJFCOM	S	0.00			General comment: Other than the Glossary and a comment on Pg 2.08, lines 28 – 30, this pub addresses only “strategic” nuclear assets and gives the impression that these are the only assets to include in US nuclear doctrine. Several US fighter squadrons (ACC and USAFE) of dual capable aircraft (DCA) maintain various readiness levels to provide nuclear employment support to geographic combatant commanders, however the publication does not address these vital assets. Numerous references are cited below to help stress the need to include all US nuclear assets in the Joint Pub. Also, the unique European theater relationship between Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) and US is not adequately addressed. USSTRATCOM’s C2 support role in that theater is different than other theaters e.g., PACOM, CENTCOM. Is there another joint pub that addresses DCA assets and their place in US nuclear doctrine?		A – A section has been added into chapter 3 that addresses theater assets (including DCA), their advantages and disadvantages. Additionally clarification has been made for EUCOM’s unique relationship.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
6.		USMC	S	0			<p>General comment: It is not grammatically expedient to globally replace of WMD with CBRN. While this may work in cases where CBRN an adjective, it does not work in every instance. For example, chapter III, paragraph 1.a., first sentence now reads as follows: a. Proliferation and US Vulnerabilities. While the end of the Cold War has lowered concerns for strategic nuclear war, proliferation of CBRN raises the danger of nuclear weapons use. In the sentence above, what is being proliferated? Was the intent to globally replace WMD with CBRNE???</p> <p>Globally search CBRN to determine and ensure proper usage.</p>	CBRN cannot be used arbitrarily as a replacement for WMD.	A – After discussion with the Joint Staff WMD will be used vice CBRN. Individual comments will change these.
7.		USN	S	0			<p>GENERAL COMMENT: Per CJCS message 201655Z FEB 03 the correct abbreviation for Commander, US strategic Command should be CDRUSSTRATCOM. This acronym should be established on the first use of Commander, US Strategic Command and then used throughout the remainder of the text.</p> <p>NOTE - a global search and replace may not ensure proper use of the acronym throughout the text. Currently, there is an inaccurate (and maybe inconsistent) use of CDRUSSTRATCOM (the commander) and USSTRATCOM (the staff) within the text. In some instances the staff (USSTRATCOM) was used where the commander (CDRUSSTRATCOM) is more appropriate. Remember staffs support commanders who have responsibilities.</p>	Rules for the use of acronyms and consistency with recently established policy.	A - Individual comments will change these.
8.		USAF	S	0.00			Add a picture of an ICBM launch facility or a FD&E launch.	This is the only force of the nuclear strike leg of the new triad without representation.	A – Will work with editors to get picture added

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
9.	2.	USJFCOM	S	0.00			General comment: This publication provides guidelines for the employment of nuclear operations. Although unclassified, this publication could possibly benefit a potential adversary. As such, recommend designating this publication as DoD Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information (UCNI).		R – Not appropriate for DoD UCNI. DODD 5210.83 described DoD UNCI as a classification to limit info on physical protection of DoD special nuclear material, equipment, and facilities. JP 3-12 does not fit.
10.		USARPAC G3 Plans (USA)	C	0.vi	3	2	Change to read as follows: "To provide the desired capabilities, nuclear forces must be diverse, flexible, effective, survivable, enduring, secure, and responsive.	The security of nuclear forces must be addressed when talking about their characteristics.	A – These are comments from the current 3-12. Will be incorporated into the new executive summary.
11.		USARPAC G3 Plans (USA)	A,C	0.viii	3	9	Change to read as follows: "Defensive forces can directly support offensive forces in five important areas: strategic application, regional conflicts, synergistic application, early warning forces, force protection (FP), and air defense.	Securing the nuclear forces from ground based threats is critical. Additionally, capitalize the first letter of the first word after the colon.	A – These are comments from the current 3-12. Will be incorporated into the new executive summary.
12.		USARPAC G3 Plans (USA)	C	0.vi	1	11	Change to read as follows: "Post-wartime considerations are war termination, termination strategy, consequence management (CM), and reserve forces.	Consequence management is a major mission for post-nuclear conflict scenarios in USPACOM.	A – These are comments from the current 3-12. Will be incorporated into the new executive

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
									summary.
13.		USMC	A	0.iii	TOC	16	Change to read: Command Relationships, Command and Control, and Command Responsibilities	Correct TOC title to match chapter II title.	A-
14.		USARPAC G3 Plans (USA)	C	0.vii	I	16	Change to read as follows: "The mitigation efforts of WMD effects require planning in advance and warning personnel, partial offsetting of long-term degradation, scope of CM , and appropriate operating procedures.	Mitigation of effects of WMD should include how the natural environment, personnel, and infrastructure are treated after a WMD event..	A – These are comments from the current 3-12. Will be incorporated into the new executive summary.
15.		USAF	S	0.00		28	Add "High Explosive (CBRNE) after "Nuclear" Also need to do a "Find and Replace" throughout the document to change a multitude of "CBRN" to "CBRNE"	CBRN has been changed to CBRNE to include high explosives as part of what was formerly "weapons of mass destruction" Although decision was made after first draft inputs to continue to use CBRN, instead of CBRNE, J7 has released a coordinated program directive (msg 271212 Aug 02) for development of JP 3-41, JTTP for CBRNE CM.	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
16.	3.	USJFCOM	S	0.00		28	Change as follows: "Thus, chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high explosives (CBRNE).... Also need to do a "Find and Replace " throughout the document to change a multitude of "CBRN" to "CBRNE"	Completeness; "CBRN" has been changed to "CBRNE" to include high explosives as part of what was formerly "weapons of mass destruction".	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
17.		USAF	M	0.01		3.6	Change to read This publication provides guidelines for the employment of joint forces in nuclear operations. It provides guidance for employment of both strategic and nonstrategic (theater) nuclear forces, and command and control relationships. This publication provides guidelines for the joint employment of forces in nuclear operations. It provides guidance for employment of both strategic and nonstrategic	Scope of publication as restated in the preface is not IAW the Program Directive. JCS J7 JDETD message DTG 121526Mar 01.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							(theater) nuclear forces; command and control relationships; and weapons effect considerations.		
18.	4.	USJFCOM	A	0.01		4.6	Change as follows: It provides This guidance covers for strategic and theater planning, and employment of nuclear forces, and command and control relationships.”	Editorial.	M – Changes in USAF comment above.
19.	5.	USJFCOM	A	0.01		11.18	Comment: Too many uses of the word “it;” there are four “its” starting sentences in the paragraph—reword appropriately Change to read, “This publication has been prepared under the direction of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It sets forth doctrine to govern the joint activities and performance of the Armed Forces of the United States in joint operations and provides the doctrinal basis for US military involvement in multinational and interagency operations. Joint Pub 3-12 H provides military guidance for the exercise of authority by combatant commanders and other joint force commanders (JFCs) and prescribes doctrine for joint operations and training. It provides military guidance for use by the Armed Forces in preparing their appropriate plans. It is not The intent of this publication is not to restrict the authority of the JFC from organizing the force and executing the mission in a manner the JFC deems most appropriate to ensure unity of effort in the accomplishment of the overall mission.”		A
20.		J7	A	0.03	TOC	16	Change to read as follows: "Command Relationships, <u>Command and Control</u> , and <u>Command Responsibilities</u> "	Correct to reflect content of associated text.	A
21.		USAF	S	0.03		32	Delete Appendix A – Treaty Obligations Reletter all subsequent Appendixes. Move “Summary of Applicable US Arms Control Treaties” on page A-1 to page I-7 and title it, “Figure I-2”.	The entire narrative was deleted from Appendix A. Recommend Figure A-1 be incorporated into the document where it is referenced. Adding the figure on page I-7 improves readability and eliminates the Appendix.	A
22.		USAF	A	0.04		7	Add: I-2 <u>Summary of Applicable US Arms Control Treaties.</u> II-7	Consistent with input to move Fig A-1 to Pg I-7 and renumber as Fig I-2.	A
23.		USAF	A	0.04		14	Change to read: A-1 <u>Summary of Applicable US Arms Control Treaties</u> A-1	Consistent with input to move Fig A-1 to Pg I-7	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								and renumber as Fig I-2.	
24.		USN	S	1.01		1.15	Delete the quote opening the Chapter: "The current levels of our nuclear forces do not reflect today's strategic realities. I have informed President Putin that the United States will reduce our operationally developed strategic nuclear warheads to a level between 11,700 and 2,200 over the next decade, a level fully consistent with American security." President George W. Bush (Press conference by President Bush and President Vladimir Putin, November 13, 2001 and replace with: <u>"The nature of the Cold War threat required the United States - with our allies and friends -- to emphasize deterrence of the enemy's use of force, producing a grim strategy of mutual assured destruction. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, our security environment has undergone profound transformation."</u> <u>The National Security Strategy of the United States - September 2002</u>	More appropriate for text. Original quote could be misperceived by a reader to infer the emphasis is on reducing the number of nukes when it is really on adjusting our security requirements based on threats and the security environment. The proposed quote is also extracted from the NSS, published 10 months after the press conference quote, and supports the role of doctrine in translating strategy to operational capability.	A
25.		USMC	A	1.01	1a.	18	Change to read: a. Purpose of United States (US) Nuclear Forces. Add US United States to the glossary.	Consistency with JP 1-01. Establish acronym on first use.	A
26.		USAF	S	1.01		18.20	a. Purpose of US Nuclear Forces. The permanent security interest of the United States remains its survival as a free and independent nation, with its fundamental values intact, and its institutions and people secure. The first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government is defending our Nation against its enemies.	Proposed replacement text is paraphrased from the introduction to current national security strategy (17 Sep 2002). http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssintro.html	A
27.	6.	USJFCOM	A	1.01		19	Comment: Too many uses of the word "its;" there are three "its" on this one line.	Editorial.	M – see USAF comment above
28.		J-3	S	1.01		28	National Security Policy Directive 14 is actually National Security Presidential Directive 14. Replace the word "Policy" with "Presidential"	Accuracy	A
29.		J7	A	1.01	1b	30	Change to read as follows: "The Policy Guidance for the Employment of Nuclear Weapons (NUWEP) is a Secretary of Defense . . . Capabilities Plan (JSCP) Nuclear Supplement . .	Correct use of acronyms; establish only if there is one or more uses in text.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)	
0.0	ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							.			
30.		USMC	A	1.01	1b.	30	<p>b. Nuclear Policy. National Security Policy Directive lays out Presidential nuclear weapons planning guidance. It provides broad overarching guidance for nuclear weapon planning. The Nuclear Weapons Employment Policy is a Secretary of Defense document that implements Presidential guidance.</p> <p>Delete “NUWEP Policy Guidance for the Employment of Nuclear Weapons” from the glossary.</p>	Consistency with JP 1-01. Acronym was used only once.	A – Same as Above	
31.		USMC	S	1.01		30	Change to read: “...of Nuclear Weapons (NUWEP) is a...”	Only use of term, so no acronym is used.	A	
32.	7.	USJFCOM	A	1.01		32	Add “(JSCP)” after “..Capabilities Plan”.	Establishes acronym.	A – Same as above	
33.	8.	USJFCOM	A	1.01		34	Change as follows: “... and Service eChiefs for preparing ...”	Editorial.	A	
34.		USN	S	1.01 to 1.02		40.10	<p>Change as follows: 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). The following laws require the department of Defense (DOD) to conduct a comprehensive review of the US nuclear posture and develop a long range plan to sustain and modernize US strategic nuclear forces in order to counter emerging threats and satisfy evolving deterrence requirements. As directed by 4(4) Section 1041 and 1042 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001 (Public Law 106-398) and (2) Section 1033 of the Fiscal Year 2002 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 107-107) This constituted the first a comprehensive review of nuclear forces since the first NPR was completed in 1994 and 2001. because of the critical role played by US nuclear forces in the national security strategy of the United States and its allies, the report was broader in scope than required by law.</p>	<p>The NSS is for the US not the US and its Allies. That is what treaties and defense agreements are for. Remember this is not a policy document nor is it a report, it is a doctrinal publication. And according to JP 1-01: The purpose of joint doctrine and TTP is to enhance the operational effectiveness of US forces. Joint doctrine and TTP will not establish policy. Joint doctrine should articulate the fundamental principles that guide the employment of two or more Military Departments in coordinated action toward a common objective. Joint doctrine and JTTP</p>	R – The 2001 NPR had a dramatic effect on the US nuclear posture and needs to be listed by name.	

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								<p>should not include detail that is more appropriate in Service doctrine, standing operating procedures, plans, and other publications.</p> <p>Granting that an introduction is required, it should however be brief and focused on the scope and written in a manner suitable to the target audience.</p> <p>I don't see this discussion providing many guidelines for the employment of joint forces, guidance for strategic and theater planning and employment of nuclear forces, nor information on C2 relationships.</p>	
35.		STRATCOM	S	1.02	Photo caption		Sea-launched should read Submarine-launched (i.e. SLBM) as it appears in the abbreviation and acronym portion of the glossary at the rear of the pub.		A
36.		USMC	A	1.02		2	Change to read: "...Act for <u>Fiscal Year (FY) 2001</u> ..."	Acronyms should be identified on first use.	A
37.		USMC	A	1.02		4	Change to read: "...of the Fiscal Year <u>FY 20002</u> ..."	Acronym previously identified.	A
38.		J7	A	1.02		7	Make this paragraph d.	Correct formatting.	A
39.		USAF	A	1.02		7	Change to read: This <u>The 2001 NPR</u> constituted the first comprehensive review of nuclear forces since ...	Paragraph starts with the words "This constituted..." Need to reword with defining what "this" is. Proposed change clarifies the reference to the NPR, not to the Defense	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								Authorization Act sections that are referenced immediately prior to this text.	
40.	9.	USJFCOM	A	1.02		7	Comment: Paragraph starts with the words “This constituted...” Is “this” referring to the NPR, or to the Defense Authorization Act? If the latter, move first line of paragraph up to line #5. Otherwise, clarify what topic this section is supporting.	Clarification of intent.	A- Corrected in the above comment
41.		USN	S	1.02		10	You need to better identify which QDR by sighting the year much like you say the 2001 NPR. It should read Quadrennial Defense Review - XXXX (QDR-XX). Note -- This change will need to be completed throughout the remainder of the text. Change to read, “Quadrennial Defense Review – 2001 (QDR-2001)” Change all instances of QDR to QDR-2001	Clarity. There has been more than one QDR and during the lifespan of this pub there will be more.	A
42.		USA	S	1.02	(1)	19	Replace “nation” and “nations” with “state” and “states”. Change to read “...cannot know with confidence what nation state , combinations of nations states , or nonstate actors...”	Accuracy, especially when using “nonstate actors in same sentence”.	A
43.		USAF	A	1.02		21	Change to read: “ its <u>US</u> deployed”	Specific action matches noun	A
44.		USAF	S	1.03		F1.01	Modify the “new triad” portion of the figure to show Bombers Aircraft .	Dual capable aircraft, when outfitted for nuclear operations, are part of the aircraft portion of the triad. Even C-130s with non-nuclear explosives are included within this concept. However, leave Bomber aircraft icon as-is.	R – The actual new triad from the 2001 NPR is just bombers
45.	10	USJFCOM	S	1.03		F1.01	Comment: DCA does not appear to be part of the new triad. Is so, how does DCA fit into US nuclear doctrine? The aircraft leg should include <u>both</u> bombers <u>and</u> fighters.		R – The actual new triad from the 2001 NPR is just bombers
46.		USFK	A	1.03	1.c.1	1	delete “operationally deployed”	redundant – used twice in	M – due to

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								the same sentence	below comment
47.		USN	S	1.03		1.04	Change as follows: ". . . planning, the United States will reduce its operationally-deployed strategic nuclear forces to a range of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads ; <u>the lowest possible number consistent with national security requirements and alliance obligations while maintaining a level that still provides a credible deterrent</u> but the lowest possible number consistent with national security requirements and alliance obligations.	Simplicity and readability. No need in a doctrinal pub to list specific numbers.	A
48.		USMC	A	1.03	1c.(1) and (2)	8. 15	No need to capitalize "new triad," anymore than the need to capitalize "existing triad." "New triad" is a generic term. Lower-case "new triad" throughout the publication.	Accuracy and consistency with JP 1-02. Generic term.	A
49.		USAF	A	1.03		11	Change to read: Add paragraph title: <u>Mix of Strategic Capabilities</u>	Adds parallelism to Para. C (1) and leads reader into following discussion.	A
50.		J7	S	1.03	1c(2)	14	Change to read as follows: "Enhanced <u>command and control</u> , intelligence, and adaptive planning capabilities support the New Triad."	Correctness.	A
51.		STRATCOM	M	1.03	1., (c), (2), (a)	21	Figure I-1 needs attention, headings above the triangles are mislabeled; Existing (should read... Cold War) Triad & New Triad. The bottom right corner of the new triad lists robust infrastructure and it should be labeled responsive infrastructure to be congruous with QDR/NPR language.		A
52.		J7	S	1.04	1c(2) (a)	02.03	Change to read as follows: "Deployed nuclear strike capabilities include the three legs of the existing strategic triad (<u>ICBMs, SLBMs, and bombers</u>) and theater-based, nuclear-capable dual-role aircraft."	Completeness.	A
53.		USAF	S	1.04		8	Change to read: "...reduce vulnerability through <u>security</u> , mobility..."	Security of nuclear weapons is a vital defense measure of the New Triad	A
54.	11	USJFCOM	S	1.04		8	Change as follows: "... vulnerability through <u>security</u> , mobility, dispersal, ..."	Completeness. Security of nuclear weapons is a vital defense measure of the New Triad.	A – Same as above
55.		J7	S	1.04	1c(2) (b)	8	Change to read as follows: "Passive defenses include measures that reduce vulnerability through mobility, dispersal, redundancy, deception, concealment, and hardening; warn of imminent attack and support consequence management activities that mitigate the damage caused by CBRN <u>weapon</u>	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendatio

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							use; and protection against attacks on critical information systems.”	have been used is “CBRN weapons.”	n.
56.		USAF	A	1.04		14	Change to read: “ The research and development and industrial ... The research, development, and industrial...”	Grammar, Readability	A
57.	12	USJFCOM	A	1.04		14	Change as follows: “The research, and development, and industrial ...”	Editorial.	A – same as above
58.		USN	A	1.04		17.19	Change as follows: A responsive infrastructure that can augment US military capabilities through development of timely new systems or production of existing capabilities in a timely manner provides strategic depth to the New Triad.	Simplicity and accuracy	A
59.	13	USJFCOM	A	1.04		20	Change as follows: “... particular, a <u>secure</u> modern, responsive ...”	Completeness. Security is an indispensable part of nuclear weapon infrastructure.	A – Same as USAF comment above
60.		USA	M	1.04	2.c	20	Delete “sector of the”	Wordiness.	A
61.		USAF	S	1.04		20	Change to read: In particular, a <u>secure</u> , modern, responsive nuclear weapons sector...”	Security is an indispensable part of nuclear weapon infrastructure	A
62.		USAF	A	1.04		23	Change to read: Add paragraph title: Broad Array of Options	Adds parallelism to Para. C (1) and Introduces paragraph	A
63.		STRATCOM	A	1.04		11, 16, and 19	No need to capitalize “new triad,” anymore than the need to capitalize “existing triad.” “New triad” is a generic term. Lower-case “new triad” throughout the publication.	Accuracy and consistency with JP 1-02. Generic term.	A
64.		J7	S	1.04	1c(4)	46	Change to read as follows: “Terrorists or rogue states armed with CBRN weapons will likely test US security commitments to its allies and friends.”	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN weapons.”	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
65.		USFK	A	1.05	1.c.4	5	change “modem” to “modern”	correct spelling	A
66.		USAF	A	1.05		5	Change “modem” to “modern”	Corrects misspelling	A – Same as above
67.	14	USJFCOM	A	1.05		5	Change as follows: “... access to modem modern military ...”	Correctness.	A – Same as above

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
68.		USA	S	1.05	(4)	6	Remove the words “over long distances”.	These words reflect that deterrence of potential adversaries with modern technology, to include WMD, is based only upon the need to deter threats to the U.S. homeland. Deterrence of WMD has no weapons range limitation as U.S. interests and allies may be threatened regardless of weapon range.	A
69.		J-5 NAC	S	1.05	1D(5)	13	Change “(START) I limits” to “(START) limits”	Correct reference to START. START II and START III never entered into force	A
70.		USN	S	1.05		14	Delete: (1,700 – 2,200 by 2012)	Detail not required in a doctrinal pub	A
71.		USN	A	1.05	(5)	16	Delete Roman numeral after “START F”	There is only one START Treaty. The former START II and START III are no longer viable agreements.	A – Same as comment above
72.		USN	A	1.05	(5)	16	Change “... November 2001 ...” to read “... <u>May 2002</u> ...”	Accuracy. Moscow Treaty was signed 24 May 2002.	M – Incorporated in comment above
73.		J-5 NAC	S	1.05	1D(5)	16	Change “START I” to “START”	Correct reference to START. START II and START III never entered into force	A
74.		J-5 NAC	S	1.05	1D(5)	16	Change "November 2001" to "May 24, 2002"	Correct date of Moscow Treaty signature	A
75.		J7	S	1.05	2a	33	Change to read as follows: "Deterrence of adversary CBRN <u>weapon</u> employment requires the adversary leadership to believe the United States has both the ability and will to . . . However, the continuing proliferation of CBRN <u>weapon</u> along with the means to deliver them increases the . . . ”	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								weapons.”	
76.		USN	S	1.05		33.36	Change as follows: Deterrence of adversary CBRN employment requires the adversary leadership to believe the United States has both the ability and will to <u>preempt or retaliate</u> promptly with responses that are credible and effective.	Completeness	A
77.		USAF	S	1.05		33.36	Change to read: Deterrence of adversary CBRN employment requires the adversary leadership to believe the United States has both the ability and will to <u>retaliate strike</u> promptly with responses that are credible and effective	Aligns statement with the rest of the document. We will not wait for an attack if we can avert one with an offensive strike.	A
78.	15	USJFCOM	S	1.05		35	Change as follows: “... <u>retaliate strike</u> promptly with ...”	Clarity. This aligns the statement with the remainder of the document and guidance in NSS. We will not wait for an attack if we can avert one with a preemptive strike.	A – same as above
79.	16	USJFCOM	S	1.05		42	Change as follows: “proliferation of CBRN <u>weapons</u> along with” Track fix throughout pub.	Completeness.	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
80.		USA	S	1.05	2.a	43	Replace “nation/terrorist” with “state/nonstate actor.”	Accuracy.	A
81.		USA	S	1.05	2.a	45	Change to read: “...may fail and the United States must be prepared to use nuclear weapons, if necessary.”	Clarity.	A
82.		J5	S	1.05		46	Add text and figure and end of text as follows: <u>The challenge of deterrence is to convincingly convey both will and capability to the opposing actor. Figure I-x lists deterrence challenges that were most prominent in a strategic deterrence requirements study commissioned by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council for the Joint Staff.</u>	Deterrence challenges reported to the Joint Staff in APR03 as the results of a 1-year study on strategic deterrence requirements through 2020 performed by the Strategic Deterrence Joint Capabilities Warfighting Assessment (JWCA) team.	A – Figure at the bottom of the matrix

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
83.		USN	S	1.06		4.09	Delete: Although the United States cannot know with confidence what nation, combination of nations, or nonstate actors pose threats to US interests, it is possible to anticipate the capabilities an adversary might employ. Thus, the capabilities-based approach focuses more on how an adversary might fight and the means it might use rather than who the adversary might be and where a war might occur.	Redundant with previous text (pg. I-2, lines 18-24)	R – It needs to be restated.
84.		USA	S	1.06	2.b	05.06	Change to read: "...United States cannot know with confidence what threats states, combinations of states, or nonstate actors pose to US interests..."	Accuracy.	A
85.		USMC	S	1.06	2b.	7.9	This sentence (Thus, the capabilities-based approach focuses more on how an adversary might fight and the means it might use rather than who the adversary might be and where a war might occur.) and (A capabilities-based approach focuses more on how an adversary might fight and the means it might use than who the adversary might be and where a war might occur.) from pg. I-2, lines 21 through 24 are nearly identical.	Redundancy.	R – It needs to be restated.
86.		USN	S	1.06		9.12	Change as follows: This approach requires the United States to develop and sustaining a modern and diverse portfolio of military capabilities. This portfolio serves the four key defense policy goals, identified earlier, that guide the development, deployment, and use of military forces and capabilities, including nuclear forces.	Simplicity Active voice	A
87.		J7 / STRATCOM	S	1.06	2b	12	Change to read as follows: "These capabilities require maintaining a diverse mix of conventional and special operations forces capable of high-intensity, sustained, and coordinated operations across the spectrum of conflict <u>range of military operations</u> ; survivable <u>and secure</u> nuclear forces; and the command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems required to direct these forces."	Consistency with the JP 1-02 definition of the term "conventional forces — Those forces capable of conducting operations using nonnuclear weapons." "Spectrum of conflict" is an undefined term.	A
88.		USAF	S	1.06	b	13	Change to read: "diverse mixture of <u>non-nuclear conventional and special operations</u> forces..."	"Non-nuclear" is a better word here. Since this pub is addressing nuclear ops, don't need to specifically	M – See above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								refer to conventional and special operations forces or even air, land, sea, and special operations forces.	
89.		USN	A	1.06		14	Delete: across the spectrum of conflict	Sentence stands alone without this phrase which is redundant with line 4	M – Changed in above comment
90.	17	USJFCOM	S	1.06		14	Change as follows: "... across the spectrum of conflict <u>range of military operations</u> ; survivable <u>secure</u> ..."	1. Correctness and consistency with JP 3-0 and paragraph #3 heading. 2. Completeness. Nuclear forces must be secure to provide effective deterrence.	A – see above comment
91.		USMC	S	1.06	2b.	14	Change to read: and coordinated operations across the range of military operations; survivable	From the DOD terminology database: 11/08/93: "spectrum of conflict" changed to "range of military operations" in the AP version of Joint Pub 2-0.	A See above comment
92.		USAF	S	1.06	b	19.22	Change to read: Therefore, if deterrence fails, both conventional and nuclear force structure and readiness <u>the force mixture</u> must provide a variety of options designed to control escalation and terminate the conflict on terms favorable to the United States and its allies.	Unnecessary to categorize conventional and nuclear structures. Tends to leave out other capabilities (e.g. SOF). Use of generic terminology is appropriate and is consistent with line 17 of the same paragraph.	A
93.		USN	A	1.07		5	Delete: vertical	Unnecessary adjective	A
94.		J-3	S	1.07		5	Recommend defining the term "vertical escalation."	Clarifies the term.	M – removed with below comment
95.		USA	A	1.07	2.c	5.06	Remove word "vertical" from Line 5 and "grave" from line 6.	Wordiness. The additional words are not necessary to the premise	A – Changed in above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								of the paragraph.	
96.		USMC	A	1.07	2c.	6	Add a comma after the word “event.”	When three or more items are listed in a series and the last item is preceded by <i>and</i> , <i>or</i> , or <i>nor</i> , place a comma before the conjunction as well as between the other items. (<i>Gregg Reference Manual, GPO Style Manual, and Words into Type</i>)	A
97.		USMC	A	1.07	2c.	8	Change to read: The decision to use nuclear weapons involves many political considerations, which impact not only nuclear weapons use, but also how to employ them.	The “them” at the end of the sentence reflects a plural noun.	M – See comment below
98.	18	USJFCOM	S	1.07		9	Change as follows: “use, but also how to employ them type and number of weapons used and method of employment.”	Completeness.	A
99.		USAF	S	1.07	2.d.	17	Delete “(refer to Appendix A, “Treaty Obligations”). Add “(see Figure I-2, which discusses the Nuclear Arms Control Treaties)” <u>Move figure A-1 to page I-7. Remove Appendix A. Renumber figures and re-letter appendixes.</u>	Identifies the proper figure with the deletion of Appendix A. The entire narrative was deleted from Appendix A. Recommend Figure A-1 be incorporated into the document where it is referenced. Adding the figure on page I-7 improves readability and eliminates the Appendix. See other inputs ref: this figure.	A
100.		CADD	S	1.07	d.	17	Change to read, (refer to Appendix A, “Treaty Obligations” which discusses the Nuclear Arms Control Treaties. Chemical, Biological and Radiological treaties are not discussed in this JP. Additionally, chemical, biological and radiological discussions are beyond the scope of this JP.	Clarifies for the reader the extent of CBRN to be discussed.	A - Changed in above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
101		USA	S	1.07	d.	17	Change to read, (refer to Appendix A, "Treaty Obligations" which discusses the Nuclear Arms Control Treaties. Chemical, Biological and Radiological treaties are not discussed in this JP. Additionally, chemical, biological and radiological discussions are beyond the scope of this JP.	Clarifies for the reader the extent of CBRN to be discussed.	A - Changed in above comment
102	19	USJFCOM	A	1.07		19	Change as follows: "... or conventional international law <u>that prohibits ...</u> "	Editorial.	A
103		USAF	S	1.07		21	Insert: Fig A-1 to this location and re-label it as Fig I-2, Renummer following figures as appropriate.	Improves readability, covers the information at an appropriate location in the text and eliminates the appendix.	A – See above USAF comment
104	20	USJFCOM	S	1.07		30.31	Change as follows: "However, both also recognize that these objectives and advantages cannot be outweighed <u>offset</u> by the expected collateral damage."	Clarity.	A
105		J-3	S	1.07		34.37	Replace last sentence with "Nuclear weapons use is not prohibited in armed conflict by LOAC. They are, however, unique from conventional and even other WMD in the scope of their destructive potential and long-term physiological effects."	All nuclear weapons in the US stockpile dwarf the effects of conventional munitions.	A
106		USA	A	1.08	3.	1-9	Recommend incorporating this paragraph in to Paragraph 2, Fundamental Considerations.	Range of Military Operations is a fundamental consideration when considering the use of nuclear weapons.	R – Moving would confuse the follow-on discussion
107	21	USJFCOM	A	1.08		F1.02	Change as follows: " Secure manufacture, transportation, and storage that are free from terrorist threat, theft, loss, and unauthorized access must be provided. <u>Ensure secure manufacture, transportation, and storage to mitigate terrorist threat and prevent loss, theft, and unauthorized access.</u> "	Clarity. The terrorist threat cannot be prevented, but we can take steps to mitigate the terrorist threat and prevent loss, theft and unauthorized access.	A – Changed in above comment.
108		USAF	S	1.08		F1.02	Change to read: Secure manufacture, transportation, and storage that are free from terrorist threat, theft, loss, and unauthorized access must be provided. <u>Ensure secure manufacture, transportation, and storage to mitigate terrorist threat and prevent loss, theft, and unauthorized access.</u>	The terrorist threat cannot be prevented, but we can take steps to mitigate the terrorist threat and prevent loss, theft and unauthorized access.	A
109		USAF	A	1.08		6	Change to read: ...by conventional forces, and protect allies."	Grammar, Readability	M – Changed in

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
									below comment
110	22	USJFCOM	A	1.08		6.7	Change as follows: "... by conventional forces, and protect allies, and help assure their security."	Editorial.	A
111		CADD	M	1.08	3.a. (1)	15	Change to read as follows: "As nuclear forces are part of the military element of national power, these forces must meet the criteria shown in Figure I-2."	Correctness. Nuclear forces are not an element of national power. They are part of the military element of national power.	A – Changed in above comment
112		USA	M	1.08	3.a. (1)	15	Change to read as follows: "As nuclear forces are part of the military instrument of national power, these forces must meet the criteria shown in Figure I-2. Instruments are the correct term vice elements (see JP 1)"	Correctness. Nuclear forces are not an instrument of national power. They are part of the military element of national power.	A – Changed in above comment
113		J7	S	1.08	3a(1)	15	Change to read as follows: "As one element part of the military instrument of national power, nuclear forces must meet the criteria shown in Figure I-2."	Correctness.	A
114		USN	S	1.08		15.16	Change as follows: As one element of national power, nuclear forces must meet the criteria shown in Figure I-2 <u>these employment considerations.</u>	Accuracy, Simplicity, and readability. Nuclear is not an element of national power. The accepted terminology is national instruments of power and they include military, political, informational, and economic.	A – Changed in above comment
115		J2P	A	1.09	3.a.4		Change to read: (4) Crisis. The United States maintains the capability to rapidly posturing <u>posture</u> its nuclear forces.	Correctness	A
116		J7	S	1.09		F1.03	Change to read as follows: "Deterring chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) <u>weapon</u> use or conventional military operations"	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
117		J-3	S	1.09		5	Recommend introducing the concept of flexible deterrent	Expands understanding of	R – Confuses

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							options (FDOs) within this paragraph. Examples of FDOs (increased readiness, deployment of systems, etc) are already included in the discussion but are not identified as FDOs.	deterrence.	the discussion
118		USMC		1.09	3a.(3)	7.08	General comment: Do not understand what “as well as increasing their survivability” is referring to in this sentence: Nuclear delivery systems deploying to dispersal locations can send a forceful message that demonstrates the national will to use nuclear weapons if necessary, as well as increasing their survivability . Change to read, “ weapons if necessary, as well as increasing their the delivery system’s survivability.”	As written, the sentence makes no sense.	A
119		J7	A	1.09	3a(4)	14	Change to read as follows: "(4) Crisis. The United States maintains the capability to rapidly posturing posture its nuclear forces."	Correctness.	A – Changed in above comment
120		J3612	A	1.09	3a4	14.15	The United States maintains the capability to rapidly posturing posture its nuclear forces.	Corrects grammar.	A – Changed in above comment
121		USAF	A	1.09		14.15	Change to read: “The United States maintains the capability to rapidly posturing posture its nuclear forces.”	Grammar—verb needed, not gerund	A – Changed in above comment
122		J-3	A	1.09		15	Change to read, “posture” instead of “posturing.”	Grammar.	A – Changed in above comment
123		J362	A	1.09	3a4	15	Replace “posturing” with “posture”	Corrects grammar	A – Changed in above comment
124	23	USJFCOM	A	1.09		15	Change as read: “The United States maintains the capability to rapidly posture its nuclear forces.”	Editorial, increases readability.	A – Changed in above comment
125		USA	A	1.09	(4)	15	CTR:”...to rapidly posturing ing its nuclear...”	Editorial	A – Changed in above comment
126		USMC	A	1.09	3a.(4)	15	Change first word “posturing” to “posture.”	Correctness.	A – Changed in above comment
127		USAF	A	1.09		16.18	Change to read: Conventional forces and intelligence activities require prudent management to avoid ensure avoidance of inadvertent escalation or mistaken warnings of CBRN attack.	Easier to read	A
128		USAF	S	1.09		18	Change to read: “...warnings of <u>adversary</u> CBRN attack.”	Clarifies that our activities should be structured in such a way	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								to minimize mistaken warnings about adversary actions, not ours.	
129	24	USJFCOM	S	1.09		18	Change as follows: "... warnings of CBRNE <u>attack by an adversary.</u> "	Clarity. Do not want to imply that we have chem. or bio weapons.	M – CBRN changed to WMD
130	25	USJFCOM	A	1.09		20	Change as follows: "This could require <u>requires</u> careful... ...should consider the potential military advantages an adversary..."	Clarity.	A
131		USMC	A	1.09	3b.(1)	27	Title of 2b(1) is Deterring CBRN Use and Conventional Military Weapons . Fig I-3, first bullet is Determining chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) use <u>or</u> conventional military operations. Change figure I-3 first bullet to, "Deterring WMD use and conventional military operations."	Inconsistency?	A
132		J7	S	1.09	3b(1)	27	Change to read as follows: "(1) Deterring CBRN <u>Weapon</u> Use and Conventional Military Operations. Deterrence of a CBRN attack depends on the adversary's perception of its warfighting capabilities relative to those of the United States and its allies. However, wartime circumstances may alter such perceptions. Shifts in the strategic balance may result from military action in which an adversary suffers significant destruction of its military forces and means of support. Thus, confronted with overwhelming conventional forces or a prolonged conventional conflict may lower the CBRN threshold by making CBRN <u>weapon</u> use appear the only viable option for regime survival."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
133		USAF	A	1.09		37.41	Change to read: "Thus, <u>when an adversary is</u> confronted with overwhelming conventional forces or a prolonged conventional conflict may lower the CBRN threshold by <u>may be lowered</u> , making CBRN use appear the only viable option for regime survival."	Existing sentence was incomplete and confusing.	A
134	26	USJFCOM	A	1.09		37.41	Change as follows: "Thus, confronted with overwhelming conventional forces or <u>the prospect of a prolonged conventional conflict</u> , may lower the CBRNE threshold may be lowered by making <u>since CBRNE use may appear as</u> the only viable option for regime survival."	Clarity. Existing text is awkward and confusing.	A – changed in above comment
135		USAF	A	1.10		2	Replace "and scope of conflict" with " <u>scope of conflict</u> ,"	Grammar for item listing.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
136		J7	A	1.10	3b(2)	4	Change to read as follows: ". . . nuclear supplement to the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP). "	Acronym already established.	A
137	27	USJFCOM	A	1.10		4	Change as follows: " nuclear supplement to the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP). "	Acronym previously established on page 1.01.	A – Changed in above
138		J-3	M	1.10		6	Change title of paragraph to " <u>Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning (STRIKWARN) Strike Warning (STRIKEWARN).</u> "	Corrects term IAW STANAG 2104, Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning; FM 3-3-1, Nuclear Contamination Avoidance; and the US Message Text Format (USMTF).	A – Changed in above
139		J-3	S	1.10		6.07	Change to read, "Friendly forces receive advanced warning of <u>friendly</u> nuclear strikes to ensure they are not placed at mitigate unnecessary risk <u>can take actions to protect themselves from the effects of the attack.</u> "	Clarity.	A
140		USA	M	1.10	(3)	6.19	Add reference to STANAG 2104, ATP45B.	Correct reference for STRIKWARN procedures that are used within NATO.	A – USA will provide line/in line/out (per discussion with USA)
141		USA	M	1.10	(3)	6.19	Add the following sentence to Line 9. "Commanders must ensure that STRIKWARN messages are disseminated in a sufficient amount of time for subordinate units to take actions to mitigate the possible consequences of US use of nuclear weapons. Consideration should also be given for dissemination of STRIKWARN information to allies.	Completeness.	A
142		USA	M	1.10	(3)	6.19	Change the title of this paragraph to read "Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning (STRIKWARN)". Change all entries to read, "STRIKWARN" and update glossary entry with the correct spelling and words, "Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning."	Completeness and correctness. Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning messages are US Message Text Format as well as NATO Standardized in NATO Standardization Agreement 2104, <i>Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning</i> . The correct term spelling is, "STRIKWARN" without	A – Changed in above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								the "e."	
143		J-3	S	1.10		6.19	Replace "STRIKEWARN" with " <u>STRIKWARN</u> " throughout the paragraph.	Proper term IAW STANAG, FM 3-3-1, and USMTF.	A
144		USA	A	1.10	(3)	7	Change to read: "nuclear strikes to ensure unnecessary risk is mitigated."	Clarity.	A
145		J-3	S	1.10		9	Change to read, "...whose units will <u>are likely</u> to be affected by the strike."	Clarity.	A
146		USN	S	1.10		12	Change as follows: Theater <u>Joint</u> forces potentially affected by the effects of US nuclear strikes are	Accuracy. Theater is too limiting. Not all forces are "theater forces" (when operating or transiting)	A
147		USMC	S	1.10		12.16	Change to read: "...Theater forces potentially affected by the effects of US nuclear strikes are informed of nuclear strikes through a STRIKEWARN message. Geographic combatant commands must develop procedures to ensure that coalition/allied forces receive STRIKEWARN information if they will be potentially affected by the effects of US nuclear strikes...."	A very verbose way of stating the obvious.	A
148		USA	S	1.10	(3)	14	Change to read as follows: "...to ensure that multinational forces. . .	Change here and throughout the JP. Multinational include allied and coalition. Use multinational throughout to be consistent.	A – Changed in above
149		CADD	S	1.10	(3)	14	Change to read as follows: "...to ensure that multinational forces. . .	Change here and throughout the JP. Multinational include allied and coalition. Use multinational throughout to be consistent.	A – Only instance of this. No other changes need to be made.
150		USA	A	1.10	(3)	15	CTR: "...by the effects of US nuclear..."	Clarity	M – Changed in above comment
151		J-3	S	1.10		15	Change to read, "...information if they will be potentially <u>are likely to be</u> affected by the effects..."	Clarity.	A
152		J-3	S	1.10		19	Add the following statement to the end of the paragraph, "STRIKWARN messages may be sent in the clear if the issuing commander determines that safety warnings override security requirements."	Doctrine. FM 3-3-1, Nuclear Contamination Avoidance, contains guidance to send	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								STRIKWARN messages in the clear to ensure the safety of friendly forces (Chapter 2).	
153		J7	S	1.10	3b(4)	21	Change to read as follows: "(4) Adversary CBRN <u>Weapon Use</u> . When formulating COAs, operation planning must address the possibility that an adversary will use CBRN <u>weapons</u> ."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
154		J7	A	1.10	3b(4)	23	Change to read as follows: "... also evaluate nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) defensive measures. Joint ... threat capability assessment indicates an CBRN potential ..."	Acronym does not meet guidelines for single use. Correct article..	A
155		USAF	A	1.10		23	Change to read: "also evaluate nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) CBRN defensive measures.	Aligns paragraph with remainder of document	R – changed in above comment
156	28	USJFCOM	A	1.10		23	Change as follows: "... also evaluate nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) CBRNE defensive measures."	Aligns paragraph with remainder of document.	R – changed in above comment
157		USN	S	1.10		25.26	Delete: and the appropriate JP 3 XX.01 series	Inappropriate reference - no such series	A
158		USN	A	1.10		26.27	Change as follows: In theater, The combatant commander must consider the adversary's CBRN weapon and delivery system when considering COAs.	Unnecessary phrase. It is assumed by the remainder of the sentence	A
159		USA	A	1.10	(4)	28	Change "an CBRN" to "a WMD".	Correctness.	A
160		USMC	A	1.10	3b.(4)	28	Change to read: the adversary threat capability assessment indicates a CBRN potential, the campaign	Correctness.	M – OBE due to above comment
161		USN	S	1.10		35.36	Delete: (through antisubmarine warfare, conventional theater attacks, sabotage, or antisatellite warfare)	Incomplete and unnecessary list	A
162		J7	S	1.10	3b(5)	38	Change to read as follows: "... eliminating intermediate retaliatory steps, rapid escalation is possible. The attrition of conventional and nuclear forces directly affects the decision process for escalation to nuclear warfare and may also contribute to minimizing damage ."	This statement is not relevant to the argument being made in the paragraph.	A
163		J-3	S	1.10		43.45	Replace the 1 st sentence with, "The immediate and prolonged effects of nuclear weapons including blast (overpressure, dynamic pressure, ground shock, cratering), thermal radiation, and nuclear radiation (initial, residual, fallout, blackout,	Clarity. Replacement sentence associates related effects under the three basic effects of	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							electromagnetic pulse) pose physical and psychological challenges for combat forces and noncombatant populations alike.”	blast, thermal radiation, and nuclear radiation. Effects are contained in JP 3-12.2.	
164		USAF	A	1.10		43.46	Change to read: “The immediate and prolonged effects of nuclear weapons—including blast, overpressure, electromagnetic pulse, visible light, blackout, thermal radiation, prompt (gamma and neutron) <u>radiation</u> , and activation products, and fallout—pose challenging physical and psychological problems for combat forces...”	Existing sentence was incomplete and confusing.	M – changed in above comments
165		USFK	S	1.10	3.b.6	44.45	including blast, , electromagnetic pulse, thermal radiation, prompt and delayed radiation	simplicity and removal of redundant information	R – full list of nuclear effects are important info.
166	29	USJFCOM	S	1.10		45	Change as follows: “... radiation, prompt <u>radiation</u> (gamma and neutron) and ...”	Clarity.	M – changed in above comments
167		J-3	S	1.11		1.12	Eliminate, unless we are dealing with enemy use of nuclear weapons on US Forces. (JP 3-11). The focus of this document should be on our ability to use our weapons.	Care must be taken in planning nuclear weapons use as to not degrade friendly operations.	R – Information relevant in context of battlefield after nuclear use.
168		USA	A	1.11	(6)	3	Delete word “perhaps”.	U.S. forces, by doctrine, are required to operate in a WMD environment for sustained periods of time.	R – only saying that operation may be required, not that equipment may not work.
169		J7	S	1.11	3b(6)	5	Change to read as follows: "Commanders and military planners must contend with significant challenges in a CBRN <u>nuclear/radiological</u> environment and incorporate mitigating or avoidance measures into operation planning utilizing authoritative documents detailing CBRN <u>nuclear/radiological</u> effects."	This paragraph is about nuclear effects, not CBRN effects.	A
170		USAF	A	1.11		7	Change to read: “ by using utilizing ”	Easier to read.	A
171		USA	M	1.11	(6)	10	Change last sentence in paragraph (6) to read, "The results of nuclear weapons may have a synergistic impact on the human body with the total effect being greater than the individual effect."	As written, the citation of and assumed special biological warfare agent susceptibility of radiation	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								exposed persons distorts the most essential fact: physiologically weakened persons, by radiation or exhaustion, have more difficulty to repair physical damage and are more susceptible to disease and complications from injuries.	
	172	J-3	S	1.11		10.12	Replace the last sentence with, "The effects of nuclear weapons used in combination with chemical or biological weapons may produce synergistic results on the human body resulting in total effect being greater than the individual effect."	As written, the sentence seems to infer that there is a special relationship between biological and radiological exposure. Physiologically weakened personnel (by exposure to radiation) may be more susceptible to injury from both chemical and biological agents.	M – changed in above comment
	173	USA	A	1.11	(6)	11	CTR: "...it may make a person personnel more..."	Editorial	M – Changed in above comment
	174	USA	A	1.11	(6)	11	CTR: "...it may make a person personnel more..."	Editorial	M – changed in above comment
	175	J7	S	1.11	3b(7)	14	Change to read as follows: " (7) Mitigation Efforts. Actions required to mitigate the effects of CBRN <u>weapons</u> are shown in Figure I-4."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
	176	J-3	M	1.11		16	Add "Consequences of Execution" subparagraph (8) as a wartime consideration.	The document should contain discussion of the consequences of execution as an important wartime consideration that must be taken into account when planning	R – This is covered in nuclear effects and mitigation efforts.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								nuclear operations. CofE includes impact on the campaign plan, fatalities/injuries, etc.	
177		USAF	S	1.11 1.12		19 17	Change order of paragraphs: Move (2) Termination Strategy ahead of (1) War Termination. Renumber as appropriate.	If this is truly war termination then “Termination Strategy” should be addressed before “War Termination	A
178		USAF	A	1.11		22	Change to read: “ enduring ensuring”	Typo.	A
179	30	USJFCOM	S	1.11		22	Comment: The phrase “enduring control over military forces” is not clear; does this imply that we expect to lose control of our military forces. Or do the authors mean to say that the adversary may have difficulty commanding forces due to our disrupting attack? Please clarify.		A – Clarified in below comment by the AF
180		USAF	S	1.11 1.12		26 1.3	Change to read: <u>The war</u> War termination strategy may initially involve the end of nuclear combat actions, but not necessarily all aspects of conventional warfighting.	The sentence states that war termination will not necessarily include all aspects of conventional warfighting. If this is the case, why call it war termination? Termination implies cessation of hostilities in this context. By terming it as a possible war termination strategy, the sentence transitions to the discussion in the following paragraph.	A
181	31	USJFCOM	S	1.11 1.12		26 1.3	Comment: The statement “War termination may initially involve the end of nuclear combat actions, but not necessarily all aspects of conventional warfighting” does not make sense. Termination clearly implies a cessation of hostilities, regardless of whether it’s conventional or otherwise. Either delete or clarify author’s intent.		A – Clarified in above AF comment
182		USA	M	1.12	Fig I-5		Add “Consequence Management” at a Post Wartime Consideration.	Consequence management will be a	A – USA will provide line/in

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								major post wartime consideration.	line/out (per discussion with USA)
183		USA	M	1.12	Fig I-5		Add Transition to Post-War Military Support Operations as a Post Wartime Considerations with the inclusion of the following subparagraphs: Occupation, Repair, Reconstitution, Transition to Civilian and Non-Military Activities, and Transition to Peacekeeping Activities.	The use of nuclear weapons will have a considerable impact upon post-war military support operations.	A – USA will provide line/in line/out (per discussion with USA)
184		USAF	S	1.12		F1.05	Change order of items: List Termination Strategy ahead of War Termination.	Consistent with input to swap order of paragraphs in the text	A – Changed in above comment
185		J7	A	1.12	3c(2)	13	Change to read as follows: ". . . strategy, national military strategy, and end state goals."	End state is two words without a hyphen.	A
186		J7	S	1.12	3c(2)	13	Change to read as follows: "However, there are no assurances that a conflict involving CBRN <u>weapons</u> is controllable or of short duration."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
187		USA	M	1.12	(2)	17	Add as a last sentence, "Information assurance protects and defends information by ensuring their availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality, and nonrepudiation. This includes providing for restoration of information systems by incorporating, protection, detection, and reaction capabilities.	Expands the discussion of C4ISR importance. See JP 3-13 for details.	A
188		CADD	M	1.12	(2)	17	Add as a last sentence, " To ensure this occurs information assurance protect and defend information by ensuring their availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality, and nonrepudiation. This includes providing for restoration of information systems by incorporating, protection, detection, and reaction capabilities. See JP 3-13 for details.	Expands the discussion of C4ISR importance.	M – Provided sentence is poorly written and confusing. USA comment below expands the discussion of C4ISR.
189		J7	S	1.12	3c(3)	19	Change to read as follows: "An adequate reserve of nuclear forces would preclude another country or nonstate organization from coercing the United States before, during, or after the use of WMD CBRN <u>weapons</u> ."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								weapons.”	
190		J-3	S	1.12		19.23	Replace “CBRN” with “nuclear weapons.”	Chem/Bio or RDDs are not going to significantly affect our nuclear reserve forces.	A
191		J-3	M	1.12		25	Add “Consequence Management” subparagraph (4) as a post wartime consideration.	Consequence management will be a major consideration for post wartime planning/operations.	A – USA will provide line/in line/out (per discussion with USA)
192	32	USJFCOM	S	2.01		7	Comment: Need to clarify in this JP whether DCA is considered in theater options and plans or not. The European theater addresses the US DCA request procedures and nuclear C2 in Allied Command Europe (ACE) 80-13 series guidance. USSTRATCOM EAPs are not used.		M – a note was added regarding the unique EUCOM relationship. Can not go much further in depth in an unclass pub
193		USMC	A	2.01	1.	10.11	Change to read: relationships, C2, and command responsibilities; integrated planning and targeting; employment and force integration; and combat readiness.	Correct punctuation.	A
194		USAF	A	2.01		10.11	Replace commas with semicolons after responsibilities, targeting, and integration	Parallels figure II-1	A – Changed in above comment
195		USAF	S	2.01	1	11.12	Change to read: “These four elements (See Figure II-1) are core to both strategic and theater nuclear operations.” Change to read: “These four elements (See Figure II-1) are core to both strategic and theater nuclear operations.”	Redundant to first sentence of the paragraph.	M – Keeps reference to figure II-1
196		J-3	M	2.01		16.17	Change sentence “National policy requires a single execution authority of nuclear weapons.” to “National policy requires a single execution and termination authority for nuclear weapons”	Must be clear that only the President can execute and <i>terminate</i> nuclear options.	A
197		J-3	M	2.01		17	Change sentence “The President retains sole authority for the employment of nuclear weapons.” to “The President retains sole authority for the employment and termination of nuclear weapons.”	Must be clear that only the President can execute and <i>terminate</i> nuclear options.	A
198		J-3	M	2.02		3	Change sentence “Nuclear weapon release and related...” to	Must be clear that only	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							“Nuclear weapons release/termination and related....”	the President can execute and <i>terminate</i> nuclear options.	
199		J-3	S	2.02		7	This paragraph should define top-down communications and should explain systems used to ensure critical orders are received.	Clarity.	R – Difficult to expand on the discussion in an unclassified pub.
200		USA	S	2.02	b.	7.11	This paragraph needs to be expanded to include a definition of top-down communications and how it ensures that critical orders are received.	Correctness.	R – Difficult to expand on the discussion in an unclassified pub.
201		J-3	S	2.02		7.12. 13.19	The focus of these paragraphs is C2 and command responsibilities of the platforms and equipment. They should address all C2 and command responsibilities involved with nuclear operations.	Knowing who owns the platforms or the ability to keep C2 systems up is important, but several key command responsibilities are not addressed.	A – other comments expanded on the nuclear C2 responsibilities
202		J-3	S	2.02		9.10	Change to read, “... must comprehend all strategic and theater nuclear plans and options.”	Both strategic and theater nuclear plans should be considered.	A
203		J-3	A	2.02		11	Change to read, “...execution, and reduces increases survivability, and reduces vulnerability problems of C2 systems.”	Grammar.	A
204		USA	A	2.02	b.	11	Place commas after the words “execution” and “survivability” and delete the “and” between.	Correctness.	M – fixed in above comment
205		CADD	A	2.02	c.	16	Change to read “Geographic combatant commanders have operational control (OPCON) over.....”	Consistency	A
206		USA	A	2.02	c.	16	Change to read “Geographic combatant commanders have operational control (OPCON) over.....”	Consistency	A – Same as above comment
207		J7	M	2.03	3	1	There is a disconnect between the title of this paragraph “Planning and Targeting” and its contents. The paragraph appears to supply planning and targeting information only for strategic nuclear operations. Where is the corresponding guidance for nonstrategic or theater nuclear planning and targeting? Insert a paragraph 3b that states ” b. Theater Nuclear	Completeness.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							Planning. Theater-specific planning and targeting considerations are addressed in JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning.</i> Re-label other paragraphs appropriately.		
208		J7	S	2.03	3a	3	Change to read as follows: "a. Strategic Nuclear Force Planning."	Per JP 1-02, force planning is planning associated with the creation and maintenance of military capabilities. It is primarily the responsibility of the Military Departments and Services and is conducted under the administrative control that runs from the Secretary of Defense to the Military Departments and Services.	A
209		USAF	S	2.03	3a	5.6	Change to read: "...planning and execution guidance ensures optimum targeting and <u>integration synchronization</u> of US nuclear forces..."	"Integration" is a better word here. It is also consistent with the text in paragraph 4 which amplifies force integration during employment operations.	A
210	33	USJFCOM	S	2.03		6	Change as follows: "... prior to, and during, and after conflict, and ..."	Clarity. More accurately reflects weapons employment.	A
211		USAF	S	2.03		6	Change to read: prior to and during prior to, during, and after	More accurately reflects weapons employment	M – Changed in below comment
212		USAF	S	2.03		18	Change to read: before or during before, during, and after	More accurately reflects weapons employment	M – Changed in above comment
213	34	USJFCOM	S	2.03		18	Change as follows: "... priorities before, or during, and after the execution ..."	Clarity. More accurately reflects weapons employment.	M – Changed in above comment
214		J-3	S	2.03		25.31	Recommend comparison of GCC and "strategic" level targeting be eliminated or clarified. If strategic refers to USSTRATCOM, then it should say so as they are also a CC.	The comparison of operational and strategic level nuclear targeting	A – See STRATCOM comment.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								responsibilities as written in this paragraph is confusing.	Confusing sentence removed.
215		USA	A	2.03	b.	26	Change to read "...taking <u>into</u> account of operational requirements..."	Clarity.	A
216		CADD	A	2.03	3.b.	27	Change to read "At the geographic combatant commander or subordinate joint force commander level,..."	Consistency with paragraph page 2.04 paragraph (1) (b).	A
217		USA	A	2.03	3.b.	27	Change to read "At the geographic combatant commander or subordinate joint force commander level,..."	Consistency with paragraph page 2.04 paragraph (1) (b).	A – same as above comment
218		J7	A	2.03	3b	27	Change to read as follows: "At the subordinate joint force or geographic combatant commander levels, targeting is the process . . ."	Correctness.	M – See comment below
219		USFK	S	2.03	3.b	28.29 combatant commander level, targeting is the process of selecting, prioritizing, <u>and identifying</u> the desired effects on targets.	geographic combatant commanders select, prioritize and identify desired effects. STRATCOM matches targets with weapon systems.	A
220		STRATCOM	M	2.03		29.30	Remove the sentence, "The purpose of targeting at the strategic level is to select targets in support of the nation's nuclear war plans."	The paragraph includes an unneeded reference that could be mistaken that strategic = nuclear. The reference is removed.	A
221		USAF	S	2.03	3b	30	Change to read: "...in support of the nation's <u>National strategic goals</u> nuclear war plans ..."	Correctness. Strategic level targeting is not limited to nuclear war plans.	M – The rational is exactly correct; however, this statement adds little and is removed.
222		USAES-DEI	S	2.03	3.b	32	Change to read: "Targeting includes the analysis of an adversary situation relative to the commander's mission, objectives, and resources at the commander's disposal, as well as the identification and nomination of specific vulnerabilities that, if exploited, accomplish the commander's purpose through delaying, disrupting, disabling, or destroying critical	Reason: Nuclear operations are obviously capable of causing tremendous environmental damage. For that reason it is more	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							adversary forces or resources. <u>Targeting decisions must also consider environmental considerations and impacts IAW JP 3-0, JP 3-34, and JP 4-04.</u> Finally, targeting is accomplished IAW international law, international agreements and conventions, and rules of engagement approved by the President and Secretary of Defense.”	(not less) important to include specific mention of the requirement to integrate environmental considerations into all joint operations. JP 3-0, Doctrine for Joint Operations, mandates appropriate integration of environmental concerns. See page III-34. The JP states, in part, that “JFC’s are responsible for protecting the environment in which US military forces operate to the maximum extent possible.” JP 3-34 covers Engineer Doctrine for Joint Operations and includes dozens of references to the need for solid environmental integration during all Joint Operations. JP 4-04 covers Joint Doctrine for Civil Engineering Support. It dedicates an entire chapter (see Chapter VI) to environmental integration in joint operations.	
223		USAF	S	2.03	3b	32.36	Change to read: Targeting includes the analysis of an adversary situation relative to the commander’s mission, objectives and resources at the commander’s disposal, as well as the identification and nomination of specific vulnerabilities that, if exploited, accomplish the commander’s purpose through <u>capture, neutralizing, deceiving, delaying, disrupting, disabling, or destroying</u> critical adversary forces or resources.	Consistency with text in JP 3-60, Joint Doctrine for Targeting, Pg I-2, para 3.b.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
224		USFK	M	2.04	3.b.1.a	37	The commander, USSTRATCOM, provides additional target guidance for strategic planning, while geographic combatant commanders, subordinate joint force commanders (JFCs), and component commanders provide additional guidance for theater nuclear planning.	The commander USSTRATCOM does not provide target guidance to the theaters for theater nuclear planning	A
225		J7	M	2.04	3b(1)(b)	41	Change to read as follows: "(b) Target Development, Validation, Nomination, and Prioritization. Target development focuses on identifying and nominating critical adversary military forces <u>capabilities and means of support and their means of support for attack.</u> "	Strategic nuclear targeting looks at targets other than just military forces.	A
226		USAF	S	2.05		F2.02	Change title to read: <u>Joint</u> Targeting Cycle Phases	Consistency with Fig II-1, page II-2 in JP 3-60, Joint Doctrine for Targeting	A
227		USAF	S	2.05		F2.02	Change Item 5 to read: "Mission Planning and <u>Force</u> Execution.	Consistency with Fig II-1, page II-2 in JP 3-60, Joint Doctrine for Targeting	A
228		CADD	A	2.05	Fig II-2	1	Change title of Figure II-2 to read "Nuclear Targeting Process", delete Targeting Cycle Phases from the top of the figure.	Paragraph (1) on page 2-04 is titled Nuclear Targeting Process. The figure reflects the same sub paragraph headings.	A
229		USA	A	2.05	Fig II-2	1	Change title of Figure II-2 to read "Nuclear Targeting Process", delete Targeting Cycle Phases from the top of the figure.	Paragraph (1) on page 2-04 is titled Nuclear Targeting Process. The figure reflects the same sub paragraph headings.	A - Same as above
230		USFK	S	2.05	3.b.1.c	1	<u>Capabilities Analysis.</u> Commander's guidance on desired effects are translated into weapon recommendations and targeting personnel quantify the expected results, to include consequence of execution, and calculate desired ground zeros.	There was no discussion of translating commander's guidance into weapon selection.	A
231		J7	M	2.05	3b(1)(e)	7	Change to read as follows: "(e) Mission Planning and Execution. Involves final tasking order preparation and transmission, specific mission planning and material preparation at the unit level, and Presidential authorization for use, <u>and execution.</u> "	Completeness.	A
232		USAF	S	2.05		7	Change to read: "Mission Planning and <u>Force</u> Execution.	Consistency with page II-7, para 1.e. in JP 3-60, Joint Doctrine for	A - same as above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								Targeting	
233		USAF	S	2.05		12.14	Change to read: Nuclear combat <u>Combat assessment is composed of two segments three interrelated components: battle damage assessment, munitions effectiveness assessment, and reattack recommendation.</u>	Consistency with Fig II-2, pg II-8 and text on pg II-9 in JP 3-60, Joint Doctrine for Targeting.	A
234		USMC	A	2.05		16	Change to read: "...JP 2-01.1 JTFP <u>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for...</u> "	Correct title of pub and acronym is not used again in pub, so spell it out.	A
235		USMC	A	2.06	3b. (2)(a)		Change to read: Generally, the nuclear forces required to implement a counterforce targeting strategy have specifically designed yields and more accurate weapon systems than the forces and weapons required to implement a countervalue strategy, because counterforce targets are generally harder, more protected, difficult to find, and more mobile than countervalue targets.	Clarity. Parallelism.	A
236		STRATCOM	C	2.06		Fig II-3	Change from countervalue to critical infrastructure.	See comments below – countervalue targeting violates LOAC.	A
237		J7	S	2.06	3b(2)(a)	8	Change to read as follows: "Typical counterforce targets include bomber bases, ballistic missile submarine bases, intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) silos, antiballistic and air defense installations, C2 centers, and CBRN <u>weapon storage facilities.</u> "	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
238		USAF	A	2.06		12	Change to read: "weapon systems <u>are</u> more"	Grammar	A
239	35	USJFCOM	A	2.06		12	Change as follows: "... weapon systems <u>are</u> more ..."	Editorial.	A – Same as above target
240		USN	A	2.06		12	At the end of the line add <u>are</u> after "weapons system" and before "more"	Grammar	A – Same as below target
241		STRATCOM	C	2.06		13.15	Change to read, "accurate than the forces and weapons required to implement a countervalue <u>critical infrastructure</u> strategy, because counterforce targets are generally harder, more protected, difficult to find, and more mobile than countervalue <u>critical infrastructure</u> targets."	Many operational law attorneys do not believe "countervalue" targeting (especially as defined in this JP) is a lawful justification for employment of force, much less nuclear force.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								Countervalue philosophy makes no distinction between purely civilian activities and military related activities, and could be used to justify deliberate attacks on civilians and non-military portions of a nations economy. It therefore cannot meet the “military necessity” prong of the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC). Countervalue targeting also undermines one of the values that underlies LOAC – the reduction of civilian suffering and to foster the ability to maintain the peace after the conflict ends. For example, under the countervalue target philosophy , the attack on the World Trade Center Towers on 9/11 could be justified.	
242		STRATCOM	C	2.06		17.23	Change to read, “(b) Countervalue-Critical Infrastructure Targeting. <u>Countervalue-Critical infrastructure</u> targeting strategy directs the destruction or neutralization of selected adversary military and military-related activities forces and their means of support, such as industries, resources, and institutions that contribute to an adversary’s ability to wage war. In general, weapons required to implement this strategy are not as numerous or accurate as those required to implement a counterforce targeting strategy, because countervalue-critical infrastructure <u>critical infrastructure</u> targets are generally softer and unprotected in relation to counterforce targets.	See comments above – countervalue targeting violates LOAC.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
243		J7	S	2.06	3b(2)(c)	25	Change to read as follows: "(c) Prioritization of Targets. Strategic nuclear t Targets are normally prioritized based upon the overall targeting strategy."	Consistency with the guidance added later in the paragraph.	A
244		J362	A	2.06	3b2c	30	Change to read: "...the theater's theater nuclear option..."	Deletes incorrect word.	A
245		USA	S	2.07	(d,e,f)	4.13	"layering" and "cross-targeting" are target defeat mechanisms used by STRATCOM to ensure target defeat. They are not targeting planning considerations for theater nuclear planning staffs. Change line 4 to read, "Layering. Layering is a targeting methodology target defeat mechanisms used by STRATCOM in which more than..."	Doctrine. Layering and cross targeting do not represent target planning considerations within the theater targeting process.	A – specify that it is a STRATCOM methodology
246		J-3	M	2.07		15.18	Replace paragraph with, "(f) Deliberate Planning. Deliberate planning is a highly structured process that engages commanders and staffs of the entire Joint Planning and Execution Community in the methodical development of fully coordinated, complex planning for nuclear contingencies. The deliberately developed nuclear plans and options provide the President, Secretary of Defense, and Combatant Commanders with the capability to rapidly respond to preplanned contingencies. Plans and options developed during deliberate planning provide a foundation for adaptive and crisis action planning."	Doctrine. Deliberate planning is conducted IAW JP 5-0 to develop "preplanned options" described in the original paragraph. Replacing "preplanned options" with the term "deliberate planning" brings JP 3-12 in line with the JOPES planning process contained in JP 5-0.	A
247		CADD	A	2.07	(f)	17	Question: Why delete the words either functionally or geographically."	The functional combatant commander is CDR STRATCOM the Geographic Combatant Commander is someone else.	A – USAF rational below explains decision
248		USA	A	2.07	(f)	17	Question: Why delete the words either functionally or geographically."	The functional combatant commander is CDR STRATCOM the Geographic Combatant Commander is someone else.	A – USAF rational below explains decision

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
	249	USAF	M	2.07		17.18	Change to read: expand the attack <u>either functionally or geographically or both.</u>	Reinstate wording that was deleted here. Without the phrase, the impression is left that the attack can only expanded physically into a larger geographic area. The attack can also be expanded into functional areas (transportation hubs, oil, power generation, etc) to achieve the desired effects. This does not add confusion (rationale for deleted). On the contrary, it provides additional options for targeting strategies.	A
	250	J7	S	2.07	3b(3)(e)	19	Change to read as follows: "(e) Nonstate actors (their facilities and operation centers that possess CBRN <u>weapons</u>)."	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
	251	J-3	M	2.07		20	Replace the paragraph title with "Adaptive and Crisis Action Planning"	Reference to Crisis Action planning brings this paragraph in line with JP 5-0. Emergent targets are planned for using adaptive and/or crisis action planning procedures.	A
	252	J-3	S	2.07		20.22	Delete first sentence of paragraph.	Clarity. As written, this sentence leads one to believe that emerging targets only appear after an "initial laydown of nuclear weapons".	R – Sentence says emerging target may appear after initial laydown. The military

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
									savvy audience will not come to the conclusion that emerging targets only appear after initial laydown.
253		USMC	A	2.07	3g.	21	Change “follow on” to “follow-on”	Accuracy and consistency with JP 1-02.	A
254		J-3	M	2.07		23.24	Change to read, “ This capability includes planning for and being able to perform “ad hoc” <u>Adaptive and Crisis Action Planning procedures contained in JP 5-0 and CJCS Emergency Action Procedures provide commanders with the procedures for conducting planning on newly identified emerging targets.</u> ”	Doctrine. Replaces the concept of “ad hoc” planning with the doctrinally accepted terms of adaptive and crisis action planning.	A
255		CADD	S	2.07	(g)	24	Change to read:” This capability includes planning for and being able to perform adaptive planning on”	Don’t use “ad hoc” not doctrinal correct.	M – Changed in above comment
256		USA	S	2.07	(g)	24	Change to read:” This capability includes planning for and being able to perform adaptive planning on”	Don’t use “ad hoc” not doctrinal correct.	M – Changed in above comment
257		USN	A	2.07		25	Replace a pool of forces with resources	More appropriate verbiage.	A
258		J7	S	2.07	4a(1)	28	Change to read as follows: “(1) Nonstrategic Nuclear Force Integration. JP 3-12.1, Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning, (S) provides guidance for nonstrategic nuclear force employment <u>integration.</u> ”	Consistency with the title of the paragraph.	A
259		CJCS/LC	S	2.07	(h)	31	Change to read:” Collateral Damage. US forces attempt to limit collateral damage consistent with the Law of Armed Conflict and to the extent consistent with employment purposes and desired effect on the target. US nuclear weapons have been designed to minimize collateral damage.”	accurate statement of law and policy on collateral damage	M – See comment below.
260		J-3	M	2.07		31.33	Replace paragraph with, “Nuclear Collateral Damage. Nuclear collateral damage is defined as undesired damage or casualties produced by the effects from friendly nuclear weapons. Commanders and staffs responsible for developing nuclear plans must consider avoidance of collateral damage as they develop their strike options. Specific techniques for reducing collateral damage include reducing weapon yield, improving	Doctrine. Replaces current paragraph with the JP 1-02 definition of nuclear collateral damage as well as explains the responsibilities commanders have in	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							accuracy, employing multiple smaller weapons, adjusting the height of burst, and offsetting the desired ground zero (DGZ). Detailed discussion of these techniques and collateral damage avoidance data is contained in JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning</i> , (S).	planning to limit collateral damage.	
261		J-3	S	2.07		32.33	Recommend deletion of sentence, "US nuclear weapons have been designed to minimize collateral damage."	NPR states that we should examine modifications or tailored weapons that would reduce collateral damage associated with our nuclear forces.	R – J3 Comment OBE due to above J3 comment being accepted.
262		CADD	S	2.07	(h)	33	Add, "Preclusion of collateral damage is a function of DGZ and HOB selection."	Completes the thought	R - Comment OBE due to above J3 comment being accepted.
263		USA	S	2.07	(h)	33	Add, "Preclusion of collateral damage is a function of DGZ and HOB selection."	Completes the thought	R - Comment OBE due to above J3 comment being accepted.
264		USFK	S	2.07	3.b.2.i	39.41	These criteria are normally identified by the president or supported geographic combatant commander.	Normally, damage criteria is directed by the supported commander or president. Wording was confusing.	R – Nuclear targeting comes from higher authority (CJCS/President) and is spelled out in national strategy and policy (NSPDs, etc)
265		J-3	S	2.07		42	Recommend adding a description of the levels of nuclear damage criteria (severe, moderate) to the paragraph.	Clarity and understanding. It is not widely known and often confused (e.g. there is no "destroy" damage criteria for nuclear weapons).	R – nuclear damage is further explained in 3.12-1
266		USAES-DEI	S	2.07	3b(2)	43	Change to read: "Commanders must estimate the number and	See 6 above.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
					(1)		characteristics of the weapons and delivery systems required to achieve the level of desired damage to designated targets while minimizing undesirable collateral effects <u>and environmental damage.</u> ”		
267		USFK	M	2.08	3.b.3	2.22	delete this entire section.	This section belongs in chapter III, theater nuclear planning. Also, these aren't target selection criteria, they are more a list of targets to be selected.	R – Acceptance of EUCOM comment above clarifies paragraph.
268		EUCOM	S	2.08	(3)	5	<u>Comment:</u> The paragraph leads the readers to believe that a set of factors will be listed that will “determine appropriateness of a target for nuclear weapon employment as well as specific weapon and delivery system selection”. No such factors are listed. Instead, a set of potential targets is listed. <u>Recommended Change:</u> Insert the following as the third sentence in the paragraph: “ These factors are: target hardness/ability to survive conventional strikes, size of target, geology/depth of target (for underground targets), desired level of damage, target defenses, proximity to populated areas, mobile/stationary target, potential for collateral damage.”	Clarification—provides readers with a list of factors for weapon–target match-up.	A
269		USAF	M	2.08		6.7	Change to read: Considering these target selection factors, possible adversary military forces and their means of support targets are:	The adversary targets may not necessarily be military forces and the means of their support. The list itself includes non-state actors, and there are many examples of adversary non-military resources on target lists.	A – adversary targets is descriptive enough.
270		J7	S	2.08	3b(3)(a)	9	Change to read as follows: "(a) CBRN <u>weapons</u> , associated delivery systems, C2, production, and logistic support units.”	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN weapons.”	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
	271	J-3	S	2.08		9.22	Ensure that these target types conform with JSCP guidance.	JSCP Guidance.	A
	272	USAF	S	2.08		19	Change to read: “non-state actors <u>or terrorists</u> ”	Encompasses more adversaries	R – a terrorist is a non-state actor
	273	36 USJFCOM	S	2.08		22	Change as follows: “Underground facilities, <u>to include nuclear storage, non-nuclear storage, and hardened ICBM missile launch control centers.</u> ”	Completeness and clarity.	A
	274	J362	S	2.08	3b2g	23	Add new paragraph: “(g) WMD storage facilities.”	Completes CBRN targets.	M- incorporated into the above comment
	275	CADD	A	2.08	4.a. (1)	28	Question: Does this still mean we have two targeting mythologies? Nonstrategic JP 3-12.1 (old FM 101-31-2) and APP 550 for strategic.” Change to read, “(1) Nonstrategic Nuclear Force Integration. JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning</i>, (S) provides <u>additional</u> guidance for nonstrategic nuclear force employment.”	If not change the wording to show JP 3-12.1 is used for both.	A
	276	USA	A	2.08	4.a. (1)	28	Question: Does this still mean we have two targeting mythologies? Nonstrategic JP 3-12.1 (old FM 101-31-2) and APP 550 for strategic.”	If not change the wording to show JP 3-12.1 is used for both.	A – see above comment
	277	J-3	A	2.08		28.29	Replace “nonstrategic” with “theater.”	Clarity/consistency.	A
	278	USMC	A	2.08	4a(1)	29	Change to read: <i>and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning</i> (S), provides guidance for nonstrategic nuclear	Correctness. The (S) goes before the comma.	A
	279	USAF	S	2.08		30	Change to read: “ <u>Non-traditional assets, such as dual-capable aircraft, are available to provide a full spectrum of responses.</u> ”	There are more systems able to deliver these weapons than is reflected by a majority of the discussion in this publication. There is only one other mention of dual capable aircraft in the publication (J-5 added text @ pg I-4, ln 4). An additional mention within the non-strategic force discussion is appropriate.	R – does not belong here.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
280		USFK	A	2.08	4.a.2	32.36	<p>(2) <u>Conventional/Nuclear Force Integration</u>. Integration of conventional and nuclear forces is crucial to the overall strategy. For many contingencies, conventional capabilities meet all know requirements. Conventional capabilities may be particularly useful to limit collateral damage and danger of escalation. It must be understood how integration of nuclear and conventional forces will affect the overall strategy.</p> <p>(3) Strategic Nuclear Force Integration.</p> <p>Change to read, “ (2) <u>Conventional/Nuclear Force Integration</u>. Integration of conventional and nuclear forces is crucial to the overall strategy. For many contingencies, conventional capabilities meet all know requirements. Conventional capabilities may be particularly useful to limit collateral damage and danger of escalation. It must be understood how integration of nuclear and conventional forces will affect the overall strategy.</p> <p>(3) <u>Strategic Nuclear Force Integration</u>. To make the most efficient use of the nation’s strategic assets and to maximize combat power, USSTRATCOM accomplishes strategic nuclear operations through the integration of US and allied strategic assets. Integration of forces exploits the full range of characteristics offered by US strategic nuclear forces to support national and regional deterrence objectives.”</p> <p>Re-number remaining paragraphs</p>	These sentences describe an important concept, the integration of conventional and nuclear forces. They deserves to be a separate paragraph.	M – Clarifies the believed intent of the comment
281		USA	S	2.08	(2)	33.34	Eliminate the sentence “For many contingencies, conventional capabilities meet all known requirements.”	The sentence does not fit in to the context of the paragraph. While conventional capabilities may achieve theater/national objectives, the integration of nuclear capabilities	R – above comment should eliminate some confusion

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								with conventional capabilities may be the factor that ensures the attainment of the objective.	
282		J7	S	2.08	4a(2)	36	Change to read as follows: "To make the most efficient use of the nation's strategic assets and to maximize combat power, <u>CDR USSTRATCOM</u> accomplishes strategic nuclear operations through the integration of US and allied strategic assets."	Correctness.	A
283		USMC	A	2.08	4a(2)(a)	42	Change to read: (a) Nuclear-capable aircraft . . .	Correct punctuation.	A
284		USAF	A	2.08		43	Change to read: " and <u>are</u> recallable"	Grammar	A
285	37	USJFCOM	A	2.08		43	Change as follows: "... resolve and <u>are</u> recallable, ..."	Editorial.	A – Same as above
286		USN	A	2.08		44	Delete: entire	Unnecessary adjective, "range of nuclear operations" stands alone	A
287		J-3	S	2.08		44	Eliminate "precision strike."	Nuclear capable aircraft may have many advantages. Accuracy (as compared to other systems) is not one of them.	A
288		EUCOM	S	2.08	4.a.(2). (a)	44	<u>Comment:</u> Currently reads "Aircraft delivered weapons also provide precision strike capability across the entire range of nuclear operations". <u>Recommended Change:</u> "Aircraft delivered weapons also provide strike capabilities across the entire range of nuclear operations."	Enhance accuracy -- there is no current precision nuclear strike capability in the inventory.	A – Same as the above comment
289		USA	S	2.09	(2)		There should be some discussion of the policy concept of preemption as well as an expanded discussion of retaliation.	This reflects current national security strategy and should be contained in any discussion of Joint nuclear doctrine.	R – not appropriate for an unclassified pub.
290		USA	S	2.09	(2)		Incorporate the concepts of passive defense in to the paragraph on Offensive and Defensive Integration.	Passive defense measures are a key to the New Triad.	R – The concept of passive defense

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
									and GMD are both mentioned
291		USAF	M	2.09		5.6	Change to read: <u>As a sign of national resolve and readiness, the numbers of ICBMs on alert may be increased and SSBNs may be deployed to dispersal locations. Additionally, sending SSBNs, which are also recallable, to dispersal locations is a sign of national resolve.</u>	The effect of recallability of SSBNs is little different than an adjustment of alert level of ICBM or an aircraft recall (or bombers taken off alert). The point here is the signal sent and effect desired from those deployments and changes in readiness levels of the strike capabilities portion of the triad.	A
292		J-3	S	2.09		9.11	<p>Recommend addition of the terms prelaunch survivability (PLS), probable error in height of burst (PEH), probability to penetrate (PTP), weapons system reliability (WSR), and circular error probable (CEP) to the glossary. Also, should explain why these factors are important to consider during integration of strategic forces.</p> <p>Add the following to the glossary.</p> <p>circular error probable. An indicator of the delivery accuracy of a weapon system, used as a factor in determining probable damage to a target. It is the radius of a circle within which half of a missile's projectiles are expected to fall. (JP 1-02)</p> <p>prelaunch survivability. The probability that a delivery and/or launch vehicle will survive an enemy attack under an established condition of warning. (JP 1-02)</p> <p>probable error height of burst. Error in height of burst that projectile and/or missile fuzes may be expected to exceed as often as not. (JP 1-02)</p>	Terms listed may be unfamiliar to readers. Need to explain how these factors influence integration of strategic forces.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							probability to penetrate. Depth that projectile and/or missile fuzes may be expected to penetrate as often as not. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)		
293		J7	A	2.09	4a(2)	14	Re-number as 4a(3). Re-number succeeding.	Correctness.	A
294		USA	A	2.09	(2)	14	Change subparagraph numbering from (2) to (3).	Correctness	A – same as above
295		J7	S	2.09	4a(2)	16	Change to read as follows: "Defensive systems include space warning, air defense warning and interceptors, ballistic missile defense (BMD) warning, and a worldwide integrated tactical warning and attack assessment (ITW/AA) system. Active theater BMD interception capabilities add an additional dimension to defense capability. These systems, coupled with additional passive defense measures, offer a damage limitation potential to US warfighting capabilities."	This paragraph concerns strategic offensive and defensive integration.	A
296		USA	A	2.09	(2)	19	Spell out "BMD".	First use of the acronym for ballistic missile defense.	M – fixed in above comment
297		CADD	S	2.09	(2)	21	Change to read: "...limitation potential to US warfighting capabilities. Defensive and Offensive Information Operations as described in JP3-13 expands the integration of offensive and defensive capabilities.	Completes the offensive and defensive thought.	A
298		USA	S	2.09	(2)	21	Change to read: "...limitation potential to US warfighting capabilities. Defensive and Offensive Information Operations as described in JP3-13 expands the integration of offensive and defensive capabilities.	Completes the offensive and defensive thought.	A – same as above
299		USA	S	2.09	c.	35	Substitute the word "enhancing" for the word "ensuring".	Defenses will only enhance, not ensure security.	A
300	38	USJFCOM	S	2.09		39	Change as follows: "President or <u>and</u> Secretary..."	Clarity. Eliminates potential implication of break in line of command requirements	A
301		USA	M	2.10	Fig. II-4		Change the title of the graphic to "Planning Considerations" vice "Offensive-Defensive Integration".	Correctness	A
302		USN	S	2.10		F2.04	Change as follows: Land, Air, Maritime, and <u>Space</u> , <u>and</u> Special Operations Forces	Accuracy	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
303		USA	A	2.10	(3)	2	Change subparagraph numbering from (3) to (4).	Administrative	A
304		USMC	M	2.10		4.7	Change to read: “(a) Flight Corridors. <u>Flight corridors must comply with international law governing airspace rights of non-hostile sovereign nations. In addition, Since strategic nuclear forces could occupy the same flight corridors simultaneously, affecting both strategic aircraft and missile flyout over friendly territory, it is imperative flight corridors are deconflicted and force employment is synchronized.</u> ”	Accuracy and clarity. International law safeguards and governs the airspace rights of sovereign nations. It is critical, therefore, to include the airspace rights of non-hostile nations as a planning consideration of flight corridors.	A
305		USAF	A	2.10	(3)(a)	5	Change to read: affecting both strategic aircraft and missile flyout	“Strategic” adjective used earlier in the sentence, don’t need to restate.	A
306		J7	S	2.10	4a(3)(a)	10	Change to read as follows: “These routes must avoid areas scanned by defenses to reduce potential execution against <u>engagement of friendly aircraft.</u> ”	Clarity.	A
307		USMC	M	2.10		13.14	Change to read: “(b) Overflight. ICBM and SLBM flight corridors may traverse the territory <u>and airspace</u> of other nuclear powers <u>sovereign nations only when permitted under international law. Consideration must be made with regard to their response. As a matter of national policy and pursuant to international law, the United States respects the airspace rights of non-hostile, sovereign nations. Overflight plans must be carefully reviewed to ensure compliances with international law.</u> ”	Accuracy and clarity. International law safeguards and governs the airspace rights of sovereign nations. It is critical, therefore, to include the airspace rights of non-hostile nations as a planning consideration of flight corridors.	A
308		USA	M	2.10	c.	16.21	Rewrite this paragraph to reflect the intent of the paragraph “Planning Considerations.” As written, this subparagraph discusses the movement or employment of US land, air, maritime or Special Operations forces through areas that have a high probability of being targeted with adversary nuclear weapons. This is a defensive focus and is not relative to considerations for planning the use of US nuclear weapons. The intent of the paragraph should be the planning considerations of how nuclear forces/operations are integrated with US land, air, maritime or Special Operations forces. All US forces are potential targets for adversary nuclear weapons.	Doctrinal/correctness.	A- Change to highlighted text

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							Change to read, “(c) Land, Air, Maritime, and Special Operations Forces. To the maximum extent practical, joint land, air, maritime, and special operations forces employment into or through an area with a high concentration of nuclear warheads or delivery systems should be avoided to the maximum extent practical. Conversely, nuclear weapon use in areas where friendly joint forces are operating should be carefully planned to prevent damage to friendly forces.”		
309		J-3	M	2.10		16.21	Recommend this paragraph be rewritten to focus on the planning considerations of how nuclear forces/operations are integrated with land, air, maritime, and special forces operations.	As written, this paragraph discusses the movement of friendly forces into areas that have a high probability of attack by enemy nuclear weapons. This is a NBC defensive focus and not relevant to considerations for planning the use of US nuclear weapons. NBC defense issues are contained in JP 3-11.	A - Change in above comment
310		USN	S	2.10		16.21	GENERAL COMMENT: I don't understand the purpose of this text as written particularly in context with the more inclusive subject of "planning considerations.: The two sentences seem disjointed at best. The first sentence seems to make some sense although it could probably be simplified (Land, air, maritime, and special operations forces employment into or through an area with a high probability of adversary nuclear warheads or nuclear delivery systems must be avoided to the maximum extent practical To the maximum extent practical, joint operations into or through an area with a high concentration of nuclear warheads or delivery systems should be avoided. Additionally, no justification has been provided on why they should be avoided - other than the obvious. The second sentence doesn't make sense at all "Operations in these areas may include high-payoff targets and have the greatest potential for nuclear detonations as the result	Clarity and understanding	M - Changed in above

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							of attack operations or defensive intercepts." Are we trying to infer that we should avoid joint operations in these areas because they could trigger explosions?		
311		J7	A	2.10	4a(3)(c)	19	Change to read as follows: " These Operations in these areas may include high-payoff targets and have the greatest potential for nuclear detonations as the result of attack operations or defensive intercepts."	Clarity and correctness.	M – Changes in above comment
312		USA	M	2.10	d.	22.28	Rewrite this paragraph to read "Ground, maritime and space systems can provide the commander near real time IPP information following the launch of adversary missiles. Depending on the location of forces, the commander can use the IPP data to warn and prepare threatened forces, execute intercept of adversary missiles, or....." Change to read, "Ground, maritime and space systems can provide the commander near real time IPP information following the launch of adversary missiles. Depending on the location of forces, the commander can use the IPP data to: move threatened forces to safer locations (time permitting); execute intercept of adversary missiles, or allow a missile to reach its predicted impact point when the missile is expected to detonate in a noncritical area (e.g., desolate, uninhabited land or unoccupied waters)."	IPP warning systems may include maritime systems as well as ground and space systems. Does a real time capability exist to provide IPP information? Movement of threatened forces would be extremely difficult; warning them so that they may take defensive measures may be a more accurate reflection of actual capabilities.	M – incorporates J7 comment below
313		J7	M	2.10	4a(3)(d)	24	Change to read as follows: "Depending on the location of forces, the commander can use the IPP data to: move threatened forces to safer locations (time permitting); execute intercept of adversary missiles , or allow a missile to reach its predicted impact point when the missile is expected to detonate in a noncritical area (e.g., desolate, uninhabited land or unoccupied waters)."	This is strategic nuclear force integration. The US has no operational capability to intercept ballistic missiles. Per JP 1-01, joint doctrine is written to reflect existing capabilities. If what is being discussed is cruise missile, then reword paragraph accordingly.	A – Put into USA comment above
314		USN	S	2.11		5.06	Replace: command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence with <u>C4ISR</u> Change in figure II-4 also	Accuracy	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
315		J7	M	2.11	4a(3) (f)	9	Change to read as follows: "(f) Decision Timelines. <u>Decision makers</u> Decisionmakers are required to review and select defensive and offensive actions within severely compressed timelines because of the short flight time of theater missiles and potentially increased uncertainty of mobile offensive force target locations. "	In accordance with the latest guidance from the Joint Staff Editors: Decision makers and decision making are two words when used as a noun. Decision-making is hyphenated when not used as a noun. Track this fix throughout the pub. Delete last sentence; this paragraph is not about theater force integration.	A
316		J-3	S	2.11		27	Change to read, " <u>Critical</u> C4ISR nodes require..."	Only critical nodes require this degree of survivability.	A
317		J6	S	2.11		27	Change "All C4ISR nodes..." to read " <u>Some</u> C4ISR nodes..."	Not all C4ISR nodes require survivable communications. The communications should only be as survivable as the node it supports. i.e. only ground nodes that withstand the nuclear blast and satellites require radiation hardening protection.	M – changed to critical C4ISR nodes below.
318		J7	A	2.11	4a(3) (g)	34	Change to read as follows: "This <u>decision-making</u> process must correlate offensive . . . rapid <u>decision-making</u> capabilities."	In accordance with the latest guidance from the Joint Staff Editors: Decision makers and decision making are two words when used as a noun. Decision-making is hyphenated when not used as a noun. Track this fix throughout the pub.	A
319		J7	M	2.11	4b	38	Change to read as follows: "b. Employment. Basic employment considerations are closely tied to the capabilities of assigned	Consistency with Chapter II, para 2c. Consistency	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							nuclear forces (i.e., weapons, delivery systems, and supporting systems under the COCOM of CDR USSTRATCOM and OPCON of the geographic combatant commanders). As addressed earlier, each leg of the strategic nuclear triad offers special characteristics that collectively provide a wide range of employment capabilities such as flexibility, effectiveness, survivability, and responsiveness.”	with Chapter I, para 1c.	
320		USN	S	2.11		41	Delete: special	Unnecessary adjective.	A
321		J-3	A	2.12		8	Change to read, “Options that which are very...”	Grammar.	A
322		USAF	S	2.12		16.19	Change to read: Strategic nuclear Nuclear force readiness levels are categorized as operationally-deployed or responsive. These two readiness levels provide strategic nuclear forces responsive to potential, immediate, and unexpected threats as depicted in Figure II-5.	Strategic, non-traditional, tactical, etc force readiness levels carry similar categorizations. No need to be specific regarding strategic forces here.	A
323		USAF	S	2.13		F2.05	Change to read “Uploading or <u>Modifying</u> Weapons on”.	A potential threat may be better deterred with changing weapon load out or weapon design/type.	A
324		J5	S	2.13.		F2.13	Change Responsive Force as follows: “ <u>Augmentation Capability</u> ”	SEDCDEF preference to avoid the use of term “responsive force”. Change reflects work of OSD working group on responsive capability.	A
325		USA	M	3.0			Chapter III, as currently written, inadequately addresses the role of nuclear weapons within theater operations. Paragraph 1. The Role of US Theater Nuclear Operations needs to be expanded to provide the reader information on how theater nuclear operations complement theater conventional operations. Recommend that this paragraph be rewritten with the following subparagraphs that will define the role of nuclear operations within regional combatant commands : a. Deterrence b. Counter Emergence of a Conventional Threat c. Reassure Allies d. Rapid Response Capability to Theater Crisis e. Retaliation Capability to Use of Adversary WMD	Better defines the actual role of US theater nuclear operations.	M – an extra paragraph has been added that expands the role of specific platforms which better define the role of nuclear operations within regional combatant commands.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
326		J-3	M	3.01		8	Recommend inserting a paragraph that explains the “Role of Theater Nuclear Operations.”	A paragraph should be inserted that details the role that theater nuclear plans/operation has in supporting theater conventional plans/campaign plans.	M – an extra paragraph has been added that expands the role of specific platforms which better define the role of nuclear operations within regional combatant commands.
327		J7	S	3.01	1a	10	Change to read as follows: "a. Proliferation and US Vulnerabilities. While the end of the Cold War has lowered concerns for strategic nuclear war, proliferation of CBRN <u>weapons</u> raises the danger of nuclear weapons use. There are 30 countries with various CBRN <u>weapons</u> programs, including many rogue states. With continuing advances in science, information technology, and the unstoppable spread of knowledge, CBRN weapons proliferation is likely. (1) Future adversaries may conclude they cannot defeat US military forces and thus, if they choose war, may reason their only chance of victory is CBRN <u>weapons</u> use to pressure a US withdrawal or against ports and airfields to block reinforcements. (2) Another US vulnerability inviting CBRN <u>weapons</u> use is its reliance on computers and high-tech electronics, making the United States much more vulnerable to the EMP effects of air-burst nuclear weapons."	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN weapons.”	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
328		USN	S	3.01		17.19	Change as follows: Future adversaries may conclude they cannot defeat US military forces and thus, if they choose war, may reason their only chance of victory is CBRN use to pressure a US withdrawal or against ports and airfields to block reinforcements.	Phrase is too limiting. They may have intentions other than pressuring for a withdrawal or blocking reinforcements. They may also target more than just ports or airfields.	A
329		J-3	S	3.01		17.28	Eliminate or add. APOD/SPOD vulnerability and EMP are listed as friendly vulnerabilities to enemy nuclear use. Are these the only ones? How are they linked to our deterrence	Combine all elements of para 1 into a general and cohesive paragraph on the	A – Paragraph changed to make paragraph

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							strategy? How is this linked to the THEATER strategy? Is this limited to WMD? Change to read, "(2) US military operations have become reliant on computers and high-tech electronics, making global and theater military operations much more vulnerable to the EMP effects of nuclear weapons detonated at high altitude. An adversary may conclude that just one high altitude nuclear detonation could wreak enormous damage to theater and global communications, computers, and weaponry electronic components, possibly reducing the US high-tech warfare advantage."	role of nuclear weapons in theater operations.	more cohesive.
330		J-3	S	3.01		24	Recommend replacement of "CBRN" with "nuclear."	"CBRN" does not make sense in the context of EMP effects on electronics.	A – paragraph reworded in above comment
331		USA	M	3.01	(2)	24.28	Delete or regrade this paragraph. The security classification of this paragraph content as written appears to expose a critical vulnerability of US systems and is typically only found in classified documents.	The content of this paragraph appear to expose particular vulnerability of US systems to a specific type of attack. Publication of this paragraph should be done under a classified document and deleted from the unclassified publication.	R – This vulnerability is public record. See the 1997 House Committee on National security testimony by Curt Weldon.
332		J-5 NAC	S	3.01	1a(2)	26	Change "air-burst nuclear weapons" to "nuclear weapons detonated at high altitude"	This is the correct way to describe where EMP comes from. Although any airburst can give off an amount of EMP, it is the high altitude option that produces the effect eluded to in this paragraph.	A – paragraph reworded in above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
333	39	USJFCOM	S	3.01		26.27	Change as follows: “An adversary may conclude that just one high altitude nuclear detonation could wreak enormous damage to theater and global communications ...”	Clarity. One HA nuclear detonation would wreak havoc on global communications; saying “theater and global” is therefore redundant.	A – paragraph reworded in above comment
334		STRATCOM	S	3.01		28	Change to read, “...components, negating possibly reducing the US high-tech warfare advantage.”	Exact effects are not known.	A
335		USMC	S	3.01		30.34	Delete the second quote.	Adds nothing to the text of the pub. If it important enough replace it at the top of the page and delete the other one.	A
336		J7	S	3.01	1b	40	Change to read as follows: "To maximize deterrence of CBRN <u>weapons</u> use, it is essential US forces prepare to use nuclear weapons effectively on the battlefield and against adversary CBRN <u>weapons</u> , and that US forces appear determined to employ nuclear weapons if necessary to prevent and punish CBRN <u>weapons</u> use. To maximize deterrence of CBRN use, it is essential US forces plan to use nuclear weapons effectively on the battlefield and against adversary CBRN. US forces must be prepared to employ nuclear weapons if necessary to prevent and punish CBRN use. "	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN weapons.” Eliminate redundant sentence	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
337		J-3	A	3.01		45	Delete sentence “To maximize deterrence of CBRN use it is essential US forces...and punish CBRN use.” The same text already exists at line 40.	Accuracy	A
338		USA	A	3.02	b.	2.3	Delete last sentence.	Does not contain additional information from previous sentence.	A
339	40	USJFCOM	A	3.02		3	Change as follows: “necessary to prevent and punish retaliate <u>against CBRN use.</u> ”	Clarity.	R – sentence removed
340		J7	S	3.02	1c(1) (a)-(h)	25	Change to read as follows: "(a) An adversary using or intending to use CBRN <u>weapons</u> against US/multinational/ alliance forces and/or innocent civilian populations that conventional forces cannot stop. (b) Imminent attack from adversary BWs that only nuclear weapons effects can safely destroy/incinerate (versus dispersed into atmosphere with conventional munitions).	“CBRN” has been used to replace “WMD” throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is “CBRN weapons.” Consistency	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							(c) Attacks limited to adversary CBRN <u>weapons</u> (e.g., against deep, hardened bunkers containing chemical or biological weapons or the C2 infrastructure required for the adversary to execute a CBRN attack) that could be employed against the United States. (d) Counter potentially overwhelming adversary conventional forces. (e) Rapid and favorable war termination on US terms. (f) Ensure success of US, coalition , and allied <u>multinational</u> operations. (g) Demonstration of US intent and capability to use nuclear weapons to deter adversary use of CBRN <u>weapons</u> . (h) Use of adversary-supplied CBRN <u>weapons</u> by third party terrorist organizations against US/ coalition/allied <u>multinational</u> forces and/or innocent civilian populations.”	with JP 3-16.	
34		USA	S	3.02	C.1.d	36	Change sentence to read “Counter potentially overwhelming adversary conventional forces, to include mobile and area targets (troop concentration).	Completeness. Articulates that combatant commanders may plan for the entire range of targets, to include mobile and area targets.	A
34		J-3	S	3.03		6.07	Recommend adding minimum safe distance (MSD), collateral damage distance (CDD), and least separation distance (LSD) to the glossary. Add the following to the glossary. Minimum Safe Distance. It is the distance from desired ground zero at which a specific degree of personnel risk and vulnerability will not be exceeded with a 99 percent assurance. For more information see JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning (S)</i> . Collateral Damage Distance. The minimum distance that a desired ground zero must be separated from civilian personnel and materiel to ensure with a 99 percent assurance that a 5	Clarifies terms.	A – add the highlighted terms to the glossary

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							<p>percent incidence of injuries or property damage will not be exceeded. For more information see JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning (S)</i>.</p> <p>Least Separation Distance (LSD). The minimum distance that a desired ground zero must be separated from an object to ensure no more than a 10 percent incidence of damage or obstacles with 99 percent assurance. For more information see JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning (S)</i>.</p>		
343		J7	S	3.03	1c(3)	9	<p>Change to read as follows: "(3) As the Plan Manager, CDR USSTRATCOM develops TNOs against facilities selected by the supported regional geographic combatant commander. CDR USSTRATCOM provides nuclear expertise to the supported <u>combatant</u> commander throughout the planning process to include:"</p> <p>Change to read as follows: "(3) As the Plan Manager, CDR USSTRATCOM develops TNOs against facilities selected by the supported regional geographic combatant commander. CDR USSTRATCOM provides nuclear expertise to the supported <u>combatant</u> commander throughout the planning process to include:"</p>	Correctness.	M – kept all the changed, but removed the unnecessary term plans manager
344		J-3	S	3.03		9	Recommend defining the term "Plan Manager".	Responsibilities of the plan manager should be clear to the reader.	M – term plans manager removed
345		USA	S	3.03	3-4	9.21	Paragraphs (3) and (4) should be rewritten to reflect that the theater owns the TNO process and that USSTRATCOM, as a supporting command, assists the theater in the development of theater nuclear options.	Development of theater nuclear plans is a doctrinal responsibility of combatant commands.	M – changes made to clear up who owns the TNO process.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
346		J-3	M	3.03		9.23	Recommend moving these subparagraphs to paragraph 3.a.(2) in the Planning portion of Chapter III.	These subparagraphs assign responsibilities for planning to USSTRATCOM and should not appear as a subparagraph to “nuclear weapons use”.	M – Paragraph slightly changed to spend less time on STRATCOM’s responsibilities. However, the info is needed in the context of the paragraph.
347		CADD	A	3.03	(3)	10	Change to read as follows: “. . .by the supported geographical combatant commander.	Consistency with other geographical combatant commanders.	A – changed in above comment
348		USA	A	3.03	(3)	10	Change to read as follows: “. . .by the supported geographical combatant commander.	Consistency with other geographical combatant commanders.	A – changed in above comment
349		J3612	S	3.03	1c3	10.19	USSTRATCOM provides nuclear expertise to the supported combatant commander throughout the planning process. to include: (a) Preparing the WHISKEY message. (b) Developing the TNO. (c) Drafting the ROMEO message. (d) Conducting required TNO maintenance.	While factually correct, this paragraph is the only place where the WHISKEY and ROMEO messages, and the concept of TNO maintenance, are addressed, and will probably confuse the reader rather than provide clarity.	A
350		USAF	A	3.03		11.19	Delete the subparagraphs a-d. include: (a) Preparing the WHISKEY message. (b) Developing the TNO. (c) Drafting the ROMEO message. (d) Conducting required TNO maintenance.	Paragraphs offer no relevant data...in fact, the paragraph begs for more detailed information	A – same as above
351		J-3	S	3.03		13.17	Recommend deleting references to WHISKEY and ROMEO messages and replacing both lines with, “(a) Preparing Emergency Action Messages.”	Eliminates requirement to define classified terms.	A – same as above

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
352	41	USJFCOM	A	3.03		13.19	Delete subparagraphs a-d.	Clarity. These paragraphs offer no relevant data and required further detailed information for them to be relevant.	A – same as above
353	42	USJFCOM	S	3.03		18	Comment: Given that SACEUR could potentially make this request, what is USSTRATCOM's role in the EUCOM theater since USSTRATCOM EAPs are not used?		A – Specifics of the process have been removed. Additionally, a note was added regarding the unique EUCOM relationship. Can not go much further in depth in an unclass pub
354		J7	S	3.03	1c(4)	21	Change to read as follows: "(4) <u>CDR</u> USSTRATCOM will coordinate all supporting component and combat support agency actions necessary and assist the supported <u>combatant</u> commander in understanding the effects, employment procedures, capabilities, and limitations of nuclear weapons."	Correctness.	A
355		STRATCOM	M	3.03		24	Add the attached section 2. Theater Nuclear Support Forces Renummer remaining sections in chapter 3	Answer's questions about theater assets, specifically addresses DCA	A
356		J7	S	3.03	2a(1)	38	Change to read as follows: " <u>CDR</u> USSTRATCOM provides the supported geographic combatant commander the firebreak authority for the expenditure of nuclear weapons following Presidential authorization."	Correctness.	A
357		J-3	S	3.03		38.39	"USSTRATCOM provides the GCC the authority for the expenditure of nuclear..." USSTRATCOM provides the technical means to pass the authorization, but are not in the chain of command.	Clarity. As stated the reader would be lead to believe USSTRATCOM has go/no-go authority in theater nuclear execution.	M – Changed in USFK comment.
358		USFK	M	3.03	2.a.1	38.40	Change last sentence to, "USSTRATCOM relays through a secure communications channel to the supported geographic combatant commanders the authority for the expenditure of	USSTRATCOM relays the authorization message from the president to the	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							nuclear weapons following Presidential authorization.”	supported combatant commander, he does not provide the authority.	
359		USA	M	3.03	2.a.1	40	Add the following sentence “Command and control and coordination must be flexible enough to allow the theater commander to strike time-sensitive targets such as missile launch platforms. Procedures must be well rehearsed so as to compress the time required between the decision to strike and the actual strike.	Doctrine. Emphasizes the necessity to develop and rehearse command, control and coordination procedures so as to allow the capability to strike fleeting, time-sensitive targets.	A
360		STRATCOM	S	3.03		41	Add the following note at the end of (1). “ <i>Note that EUCOM has a unique nuclear command and control relationship with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe.</i> ”		A
361		J7	S	3.04		Photo	Change to read as follows: "Theater nuclear support is thoroughly coordinated among <u>CDR USSTRATCOM</u> , the <u>Services components</u> , and the <u>geographic</u> combatant commander to ensure unity of effort.”	Consistency with the text.	A
362		USN	S	3.04		Photo	Delete photo and caption.	No value added to section content. Limited relation between photo and caption.	M – changed caption slightly to make more pertinent.
363		USA	A	3.04	(2)	2	Replace the word “component” with the word “combatant”.	Administrative/clarity.	A – same as above
364		J-3	S	3.04		2	Replace the word “component” with “combatant”	Doctrine.	A
365		J7	S	3.04	2a(2)	2	Change to read as follows: "The US element component commander in a multinational command provides guidance and publishes directives on the use of nuclear weapons by US forces in such commands.”	Consistency with JP 0-2, Chapter III, para 16c.	M – changed to combatant commander iaw below comment
366		USA	S	3.04	b.	12..01 7	Recommend not deleting the discussion of the services capabilities	Provides the reader with data he/she may not have from other sources.	R – Original JFCOM comment; original text implies that components would routinely coordinate nuclear support

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
									with each other. The ensuing discussion on coordination channels is no different than it would be for any other type of support.
367		CADD	S	3.04	b.	12.17	Recommend not deleting the discussion of the services capabilities	Provides the reader with data he/she may not have from other sources.	R – Original JFCOM comment; original text implies that components would routinely coordinate nuclear support with each other. The ensuing discussion on coordination channels is no different than it would be for any other type of support.
368		J7	S	3.04	2b	17	Change to read as follows: "When preparing nuclear support plans, <u>CDR USSTRATCOM</u> coordinates with supporting Service components and the geographic combatant commander to avoid fratricide and promote unity of effort. USSTRATCOM planners require input from Service experts on the theater or joint task force staffs to ensure appropriate weapon yields, delivery methods, and safe delivery routing. Targeting conflicts are resolved with direct consultations between the supporting and supported combatant commander's staffs. <u>CDR USSTRATCOM</u> will deploy a Theater Planning Response Cell (TPRC) familiar with the theater to provide nuclear planning and CBRN <u>weapons</u> expertise. The TPRC	Correctness.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							will include <u>provide</u> a consequence of execution and hazard prediction analysis to the supported <u>combatant</u> commander. The consequence of execution analysis provides the <u>decision maker</u> with an estimate of collateral effects during the expenditure of nuclear weapons.”		
369		J-3	S	3.04		17	Replace “When preparing...” with “When assisting in the preparation of...”	Geographical Combatant Commanders have the responsibility to prepare theater nuclear plans.	A
370		J-3	S	3.04		23	Change to read, “USSTRATCOM will deploy a Theater Planning Response Cell (TPRC), familiar with the theater, to the supported combatant commander to provide nuclear planning and WMD expertise.”	Clarifies the deployment location of the TPRC.	A
371		USMC	S	3.04		23	Change to read: “...will deploy a T theater P planning R esponse C ell (TPRC)...”	Terms are not capitalized in this usage.	M – TPRCs renamed. New name properly capitalized
372		USFK	A	3.05	2.b	1	The TPRC will provide consequence of execution and hazard prediction analysis to the supported commander.	Language usage, the TPRC is a group of people who provide products, they don’t include products.	M – Changed in above comment that changed TPRC to SST
373		J-3	M	3.05		8.17	Recommend revision of entire paragraph to clearly delineate responsibilities for theater nuclear planning. Geographic combatant commanders (or JFCs) are responsible for defining theater objectives, selecting targets, and developing nuclear plans required to support those objectives. USSTRATCOM is a supporting combatant commander when it comes to development of theater nuclear plans. Change to read, “ (1) Theater Planning. Geographic combatant commanders are responsible for defining theater objectives and developing nuclear plans required to support those objectives, including selecting targets. CDR USSTRATCOM, as the supporting combatant commander, provides detailed planning support to meet theater strategy during crisis action, adaptive, and deliberate planning. USSTRATCOM provides detailed planning support to meet theater strategy during crisis action,	Clarifies roles and responsibilities.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							adaptive, and deliberate planning. All theater nuclear...		
374		J7	A	3.05	3a	11	Change to read as follows: "... combatant commanders, initiates crisis action planning (CAP) procedures contained . . ."	Acronym does not meet guidelines; single occurrence does not warrant acronym use.	A
375		USMC	A	3.05	3a.	12	Delete (CAP).	Consistency with JP 1-01. Acronym is not in the glossary. The term crisis action planning is used only twice, which would mean the acronym would be used only once.	A – Same as above
376		USMC	S	3.05		12	Change to read: "...action planning (CAP) procedures..."	Only use of term, so no acronym is used.	A – same as above
377		J-3	M	3.05		19	Recommend revision of "Theater Planning" portion of the chapter to expand on the responsibilities of the CJCS, Joint Staff, Geographic Combatant Commander, USSTRATCOM, and supporting commands/agencies.	Clarifies roles and responsibilities.	M – roles of STRATCOM and combatant commander are further expanded on in above comment. The JS and CJCS's roles are in 3.a.
378		J7	S	3.05	3a(1)	19	Change to read as follows: "(1) Theater Planning. <u>CDR</u> USSTRATCOM provides detailed planning support to meet theater strategy during crisis action, adaptive, and deliberate planning."	Correctness.	A
379		USAF	S	3.05		19.20	Change to read: <u>When tasked</u> , USSTRATCOM provides detailed planning support to meet theater strategy during crisis action, adaptive, and deliberate planning.	STRATCOM's level of involvement in theater nuclear planning varies between theaters. It is not one-size fits all. JSCP would task STRATCOM as necessary based upon resident theater expertise, forces considered for use, and other factors.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
380		USFK	S	3.05	3.a.1	19.23	(1) Theater Planning. All theater nuclear option planning conducted by the geographic combatant commander follows Joint Operation Planning and Execution System (JOPES). USSTRATCOM provides detailed planning support to meet theater strategy during crisis action, adaptive, and deliberate planning.	The theater planners do theater planning with support from STRATCOM, therefore the first sentence should discuss the theater planners, not STRATCOM. Discussion is too focused on crisis planning, and not on deliberate planning.	M – Modified in response to J-3 comment below
381		J7	A	3.05	3a(1)	21	Change to read as follows: "... follows prescribed Joint Operation Planning and Execution System (JOPES) procedures ..."	Acronym does not meet guidelines; single use does not warrant acronym use.	A
382		USMC	A	3.05	3a.(1)	21	Delete (JOPES).	Consistency with JP 1-01. Acronym is not in the glossary. The term Joint Operation Planning and Execution System is used only once, precluding the use of an acronym.	A – same as above
383		USMC	S	3.05		21.22	Change to read: "...Execution System (JOPES) procedures..."	Only use of term, so no acronym is used.	A – same as above
384		USN	A	3.05		26	Replace crisis action planning with <u>CAP</u>	Acronym previously established	R – acronym removed
385		J7	S	3.05	3a(2)	32	Change to read as follows: "(2) As a supporting combatant commander, Commander, USSTRATCOM, provides theater planning support to the supported geographic combatant commander through <u>deployment of a strategic support team</u> and detailed target analysis, development, weaponing, and mission planning/analysis as depicted in Figure III-1."	Completeness.	M – same idea, but TPRC changed to SST.
386		STRATCOM	M	3.06		Fig III-1	Under the "development" column, a bullet for "legal review" should be added.	A legal review of potential targets for LOAC compliance is required, and should be noted in the process.	A
387		EUCOM	S	3.06	(3)	2	<u>Comment</u> : The paragraph mentions the importance of successfully integrating nuclear and conventional forces.	Highlights the type of conventional support	M – sentence added, but no

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							However, the nature of conventional support is only implied. <u>Recommended Change:</u> Insert the following as the second sentence of this paragraph: “ Nuclear operations in the theater may require a significant conventional support package that addresses concerns such as aerial refueling, ECM, CSAR, and nuclear weapons recovery.”	required in a nuclear operation.	need to go so in depth on examples.
388		USN	S	3.06		3.05	Change as follows: Combatant commanders must comprehend how nuclear and conventional forces interact and how nuclear missions affect the conduct of the entire campaign plan and, ultimately, theater strategy.	Better verbiage We are now talking execution vice planning	A
389		J-3	A	3.06		4	Change “affect” to “support”	In theater operations, nuclear weapons should be planned to support the campaign plan, hopefully affecting it in a positive way.	A
390		USAF	S	3.06		8	Change to read: “ Nuclear w uclear weapons and nuclear weapon systems”	Geographic combatant commanders have discretion to use non-nuclear weapons. Since the first sentence of the paragraph was deleted, the context no longer implies that the weapons are nuclear. It needs to be stated.	A
391		J7	S	3.06	3b	8	Change to read as follows: “ Nuclear w Weapons and weapon systems may be deployed into theaters, but geographic combatant commanders have no authority to employ them until specifically granted by the President.”	Clarity.	A – Accepted in comment below

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
392	43	USJFCOM	S	3.06		13	Comment: USSTRATCOM plans integrating DCA within the various theaters are not very apparent to the units that may be tasked to carry out these plans. How is US nuke doctrine integrated into European theater plans for US DCA employment?		M – a note was added regarding the unique EUCOM relationship. Can not go much further in depth in an unclass pub
393		USMC	A	3.06	3b.(2)	14	Add a carriage return between subparagraphs (2) and (3).	Format.	A
394		J7	S	3.07	4	17	Change to read as follows: "4. Continued Operations on a After Chemical, Biological, Radiological, or Nuclear <u>Weapons Use</u> "	"CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.
395		USAF	A	3.07	4.a.	20.22	Change first sentence to read: a. Beyond the effects of nuclear weapons on the battlefield and the casualties caused by CBRN weapons, they also can produce casualties from the psychological stress and effect of their use. <u>"The effects of nuclear weapons on the battlefield and the casualties caused by WMD weapons can produce casualties from the psychological stress and effect of their use."</u>	Readability.	A
396		J-3	A	3.07		23	Replace "shielding" with "protection"	It is unclear whether it refers to personnel or equipment. Shielding is associated with equipment. Protection covers both.	R – Shielding is the correct term when referring to protecting equipment or personnel
397		J7	S	3.07	4b	31	Change to read as follows: " US, allied, and multinational forces must prepare for further operations under conditions ranging from continued CBRN <u>weapons use</u> to a resumption of conventional means only."	Consistency with JP 3-16. "CBRN" has been used to replace "WMD" throughout the JP. WMD is a noun. CBRN is an adjective. What should have been used is "CBRN weapons."	A R – CBRN has been replaced with WMD per Joint Staff recommendation.

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
398		STRATCOM	M	3.04.05		23.01	Change to read, “ USSTRATCOM will deploy a <u>strategic support team</u> Theater Planning Response Cell (TPRC) familiar with the theater to provide nuclear planning and CBRN WMD expertise. The TPRC <u>strategic support team</u> will include <u>provide</u> ...”	Correct terminology. TPRC’s are being renamed.	A
399		USAES-DEI	S	3.5	3a(2)	43	Change to read: “...nuclear weapons effects to include estimated adversary fatalities as well as <u>environmental impacts</u> , those effects beyond the target country, and allied and coalition perception and possible reactions to nuclear strikes.”	See 6 above	A
400		J3612	S	5.2	20	1	Single Integrated Operational Plan Operational Plan (OPLAN) 8044 Revision (Year) (Basic)	Conforms to naming convention.	A
401		J-3	M	3.01 to 3.07			Ensure Chapter III is coordinated with the revision of JP 3-12.1, <i>Joint Tactics, Techniques and Procedures for Theater Nuclear Planning</i> .	Accuracy.	A – It was written in conjunction with the LA of 3-12.1.
402		USN	A	51.01			Delete Roman numeral after “START F”	There is only one START Treaty. The former START II and START III are no longer viable agreements.	A
403		J-5 NAC	S	51.01			Under Treaty Column, Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction and Limitation Treaty, Change “(START I)” to “(START)”	Correct reference to START. START II and START III never entered into force	A
404		J-5 NAC	S	51.01			Under Treaty Column, Moscow Treaty, Change to read "Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (Moscow Treaty)"	Correct reference to Moscow Treaty	A
405		J-5 NAC	S	51.01			Under Impact Column, Moscow Treaty, change 1 st bullet to read "Reduces US and Russian strategic nuclear warheads to a level between 1700-2200 by 31 December 2012"	The term "operational deployed" is not relevant to the Russians and is not part of the Treaty. The term operationally deployed refers to the method the US will use to reach their Treaty limit.	A
406		J-5 NAC	S	51.01			Under Impact Column, Moscow Treaty, change 2nd bullet to "No verification measures, but uses existing START	More accurate description of what START does for	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							verification regime to provide the foundation for transparency"	the Moscow Treaty	
407		J-5 NAC	S	51.01			Under Impact Column, Moscow Treaty, add 3 rd bullet: "Not yet entered into force"	Provides current status of Moscow Treaty. US Senate passed ratification, but the Russians have not	A
408		J-3	S	51.01			Recommend inclusion of discussion of various Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaties in the table. Add the following to the table: 1 st column, "Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaties" 2 nd column, " - The US is a party to several Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaties, including Antarctica, Latin America, Outer Space and Africa - Commanders need to be aware that these treaties have important implications for basing/deployment of US nuclear forces	The US is a party to several of these treaties, which have important implications for basing/deployment of US nuclear forces.	A – add as last row of figure as indicated.
409		J-3	S	51.01			Recommend inclusion of discussion of NPT Article VI obligation to pursue disarmament, include discussion of negative security assurances. Add as last bullet in NPT, "Through the Moscow Treaty, the US continues to reduce nuclear arms IAW the NPT."	These are important treaty obligations that every Administration has observed.	M – add some more information to NPT.
410		J-3	S	51.01			Recommend deletion of CTBT from table. Add as last bullet in CTBT, "The US Senate, on 13 October 1999, voted 51 to 48 against ratifying the CTBT."	US Senate vetoed ratification of the Treaty, President has said US will not pursue further efforts to ratify.	M – do not want to delete, because the treaty is still referenced frequently; but, will add additional information.
411		USA	S	51.01	Table		Recommend deleting CTBT from table.	Technically, the US has not ratified the CTBT and is therefore, not bound to adhere to it. However, the US continues not to test nuclear weapons due	M – do not want to delete, because the treaty is still referenced frequently; but,

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								to a self-imposed moratorium on nuclear testing declared in 1992.	will add additional information. See above comment
412	44	USJFCOM	A	51.01		F51.01	Comment: The full text for acronym START does not match the Glossary, page GL-1; deconfliction is required for consistency.		A – acronym removed IAW with below t rational
413		USAF	S	51.01		F51.01	Move figure to page I-7 and re-label as Fig I-2.	Incorporates figure within the chapter that mentions the topic.	A – IAW previous comments
414		USAF	A	52.01		13	Change to read: JP 3-01 series. <u>JP 3-01, Joint Doctrine for Countering Air and Missile Threats</u> <u>JP 3-01.1, Aerospace Defense of North America</u> <u>JP 3-01.5, Doctrine for Joint Theater Missile Defense</u>	1. Completeness. 2. IAW JP 1-01, references to other joint publications will include the full name of the referenced document. 3. Although not specifically cited, these publication apply to the concepts addressed within the publication.	A
415		USN	S	52.01		13	Delete: JP 3-01 series	Inappropriate List specific pubs	A – specific pubs listed in comment below
416		USAF	A	52.01		24	Change to read: CJCSI 3110.04A, <u>Nuclear Supplement to JSCP.</u>	Title as shown on current listing of CJCSI/M/Ns dated 4 Feb 03 located at http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/cjcsd/cjcs_current.pdf and consistent with title shown on pg II-7, line 35	A
417		USA	A	52.02			Add reference: NATO Standardized in NATO Standardization Agreement 2104, <i>Friendly Nuclear Strike Warning.</i>	Completeness. STRIKWARN messages are standardized in the US and NATO under this agreement.	A
418		USA	A	52.02			Add reference: National Security Presidential Directive-	Significant current	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							17/Homeland Security Presidential Directive-4, <i>National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction</i> , December 2002.	Presidential policy on combating WMD.	
419		STRATCOM	S	52.02	N/A	1	The term SIOP should be replaced with Operations Plan 8044 Revision 03, IAW CM-757-03, 8 Feb 03.		A
							Replace SIOP with "Operations Plan 8044 Revision 03"		
420		USN	A	52.02		5	Add: <u>Section 1041 and 1042 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 106-398)</u> <u>Section 1033 of FY 2002 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 107-107)</u>	Completeness Referenced with pub's text	A
421		USMC	S	99.00			General comment. The following acronyms are not used two or more times in the text of the pub and should be deleted from the glossary: "NUWEP, SSBM"	Compliance with JP 1-01.	A
422		USMC	S	99.00			General comment. The following acronym is used two or more times in the text of the pub and should be added to the glossary: "FY" FY – fiscal year	Compliance with JP 1-01.	A
423		J7	A	99.01			Delete the following acronym from Part I: NBC	Used only once. Used as part of the title does not meet acronym guidelines.	A
424		J7	A	99.01		8	Change to read as follows: "CJCSI Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff <u>I</u> nstruction"	Correctness.	A – Same as above
425		USMC	S	99.01		8	Change to read: "CJCSI Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff <u>I</u> nstruction"	Correct terminology.	A
426		J7	A	99.01		39	Change to read as follows: " SSBM <u>SSBN</u> fleet ballistic missile submarine"	Correct spelling.	A
427		USAF	A	99.01		39	Change to read: SSBM <u>N</u> fleet ballistic missile submarine	Correctness. See JP 1-02. and definition within publication at page II-09, line 3.	A – same as above
428		USMC	A	99.01		39	Change to read: SSBN	Typo.	A – same as above

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
429		USN	A	99.01		40	Keep acronym to read “START - Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction and Limitation Treaty”	Accuracy. Consistent with long title of treaty and with Appendix A	R – acronym removed
430		USAF	S	99.01		40	Delete acronym “START” and it’s definition as the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.	START is a “popular title”, not an acronym that stands for the title shown in JP 1-02 and this draft of JP 3-12. Recommend leaving the START I characterization in Fig A-1 as-is Recommend deleting START from JP 1-02 acronym list. . A short search of Library of Congress website http://thomas.loc.gov/home/treaties/treaties.htm yielded: Short Title: TREATY WITH THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ON THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS (THE START TREATY) Popular Title: START TREATY Formal Title: “The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (the START Treaty), signed at Moscow on July 31, 1991,	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								including Annexes on Agreed Statements and Definitions; Protocols on Conversion or Elimination, Inspection, Notification, Throw-weight, Telemetry, and Joint Compliance and Inspection Commission; and Memorandum of Understanding; all integral parts of the START Treaty.	
431		J-5 NAC	S	99.01		40	Change definition to "Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction and Limitation Treaty"	Correct title of Treaty	R – acronym removed
432		J7	M	99.03		4	Change to read as follows: " allocation <u>apportionment</u> (nuclear). The apportionment of specific numbers and types of nuclear weapons to a commander for a stated time period as a planning factor for use in the development of war operation plans. (Additional authority is required for the actual deployment of allocated weapons to locations desired by the commander to support the war operation plans. Expenditures of these weapons are not authorized until released by proper authority.) (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)"	Allocation and apportionment are two different concepts that are defined in JP 1-02. Allocation is distribution of limited resources among competing requirements for employment. Apportionment is the distribution for planning of limited resources among competing requirements. What is clearly being discussed in this definition is planning. This is explicitly stated in the text of the definition. This is apportionment, not allocation. Allocation relates to employment.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
433		J7	S	99.03		16	Change to read as follows: “counterforce <u>targeting</u> . The employment of strategic air and missile forces in an effort to destroy, or render impotent, selected military capabilities of an enemy <u>adversary</u> force under any of the circumstances by which hostilities may be initiated. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)”	Consistency with the term “countervalue targeting.” Consistency with current usage.	A
434		STRATCOM	C	99.03		20	Change to read, “ countervalue critical infrastructure targeting . Strategy directing the destruction...”	See comments above – countervalue targeting violates LOAC.	A
435		J7	S	99.03		20	Change to read as follows: "countervalue targeting. Strategy directing the destruction or neutralization of selected enemy <u>adversary</u> military and military related activities, such as industries, resources, and institutions that contribute to the enemy <u>adversary</u> 's ability to wage war. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)”	Consistency with current terminology and use.	A
436		USMC	M	99.03		20.23	General comment. Delete attempt to codify this term and definition in JP 1-02. How is this different that HVTs already defined in joint doctrine?	It is not necessary to start another train of thought that is similar to high-value targets. A high-value target is defined as a target the enemy commander requires for the successful completion of the mission. Critical Infrastructure only encompasses industries, resources and institutions. Perhaps it could be said that critical infrastructure is a class of HVT.	R – see rational
437		J7	S	99.03		34	Change to read as follows: "denial measure. An action to hinder or deny the enemy <u>adversary</u> the use of space,	Consistency with current terminology and use.	A

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							personnel, or facilities. It may include destruction, removal, contamination, or erection of obstructions. <u>(Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)</u> "		
438		EUCOM	S	99.04		12	<p><u>Comment:</u> Defining the term "hold at risk" is a welcome addition. However, a revision is proposed.</p> <p><u>Recommended Change:</u> Define as follows, " The ability to threaten an attack that generates a desired effect or level of damage against that which the enemy values."</p> <p>Change to read, "The ability to threaten an attack that generates a desired effect or level of damage against that which the enemy adversary values."</p>	US forces can already attack what the enemy values. The issue is whether such an attack can generate the appropriate level of damage or the desired effect. As an example, if a target is a sufficiently hardened and deeply buried facility, there may not be a system capable of generating the desired level of damage. Although we could attack the target, we really cannot hold that target at risk.	M – accepted comment and changed enemy to adversary
439		J7	S	99.04		12	Change to read as follows: "hold at risk. The ability to threaten to attack what the enemy adversary values. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)"	Consistency with current terminology and use.	M – comment integrated in to EUCOM def below
440		USN	S	99.04		12.13	<p>GENERAL COMMENT:</p> <p>I question the need to formally define this and include it in the DOD dictionary. If the consensus is the definition is required should it not be changed as follows:</p> <p>The ability to threaten to attack what the enemy <u>an adversary</u> values. . . .</p>	Accepted usage	M – see above comment
441		USMC	A	99.04		15	Change to read: multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle.	Accuracy and consistency with JP 1-02.	A
442		J7	S	99.04		19	Change to read as follows: "nonstrategic nuclear forces. Those nuclear-capable forces located in an operational area with a capability to employ nuclear weapons by land, sea, or air against opposing forces, supporting installations, or facilities. Such forces may be employed, when authorized by competent authority, to support operations that contribute to the accomplishment of the commander's mission within the operational area theater of operations. <u>operational area theater of operations. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)</u> "	The combatant commander may not have established a theater of operations.	A
443		USMC	A	99.04		20	Change to read: a capability to employ nuclear weapons by	The word "forces"	R / M –

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
							land, sea, or air forces against opposing forces,	appears in the JP 1-02 definition. Suggest deleting the word “forces” and adding (Upon approval of this revision, this modified term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)	Correction made in USMC comment above
444		USMC	S	99.04		20	General comment. If you delete this word you are changing the JP 1-02 definition and need to add the JP 1-01 verbiage that allows you to do this. Add at the end of the definition, “(Upon approval of this revision, this modified term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02).”	Correct procedures for changing a JP 1-02 definition per JP 1-01.	A
445		J7	S	99.04		35	Change to read as follows: "nuclear strike warning. A warning of impending friendly or suspected enemy adversary nuclear attack. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)”	Consistency with current terminology and use.	A
446		USMC		99.04		38. 40	General comment: Is this definition for nuclear weapon going to replace the existing definition or be added as a second definition?	Because the term nuclear weapon already exists, the intent for this definition must be clarified.	A – changed in below definition
447		J7	A	99.04		38	Change to read as follows: "nuclear weapon. A nuclear warhead and its necessary arming, fuzing, and firing components required to produce a nuclear yield. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02. Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will modify the existing term and its definition and will be included in JP 1-02.)”	There is an existing approved definition for the term “nuclear weapon” which reads as follows: “nuclear weapon A complete assembly (i.e., implosion type, gun type, or thermonuclear type), in its intended ultimate configuration which, upon completion of the prescribed arming, fusing, and firing	R – definition changed below

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
------	---	--------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------	------------------

0.0ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
								sequence, is capable of producing the intended nuclear reaction and release of energy.”	
448		USMC	M	99.04		38.41	Change to read: “nuclear weapon. <u>A complete assembly (i.e. implosion type, gun type, or thermonuclear type), in its intended ultimate configuration which, upon completion of the prescribed arming, fusing and firing sequence, is capable of producing the intended nuclear reaction and release of energy. A nuclear warhead and its necessary arming, fuzing, and firing components required to produce a nuclear yield. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02-)</u> ”	Use approved NATO and Joint definition already in JP 1-02.	A
449		J7	S	99.04		43	Change to read as follows: “operationally deployed <u>nuclear</u> weapons. Nuclear weapons that are on operational ballistic missiles or bombers or in bomber base weapon storage. Operationally deployed weapons are for immediate and unexpected threats. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)”	Clarity. All types of weapons are operationally deployed.	A
450		USMC	M	99.04		43.46	General comment. Do not agree to define “operationally deployed weapons” in a nuclear context only. Many weapons are operationally deployed. Delete this entry or make it for this publication only and not go into JP 1-02.		M – changed to operationally deployed nuclear weapon
451		J7	S	99.05		10	This “responsive force” definition seems to be missing text.	Correctness.	A – see below comments
452		J5	S	99.05		10.13	Change as follows: “ Responsive Force <u>Augmentation Capability</u> ”	SEDCDEF preference to avoid the use of term “responsive force”. Change reflects work of OSD working group on responsive capability.	A
453		USMC	M	99.05		10.15	Change to read: “responsive force. A force intended to address potential contingencies. The ability to reinforce in a timely and efficient manner the operationally deployed force with warheads from the responsive force will contribute to the deterrence of challenges and the dissuasion of arms competition. (Upon approval of this revision, this term and its definition will be included in JP 1-02.)”	Disagree that a responsive force be defined in nuclear terms only.	A – realizing that this is now referred to as a augmentation force per the above comment

Joint Staff Input to JP 3-12, *Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations* (Second Draft)

ITEM	#	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
0.0	ITEM #	SOURCE	TYPE	PAGE	PARA	LINE	COMMENT	RATIONALE	DECISION (A/R/M)
	454	J7	S	99.05		32	Delete the definition of “weapons of mass destruction” from the JP.	It is never used in the body of the text.	R
		STRATCOM	M	3.07	b	1.03	Change to read, “ Support Coordination. Nuclear support is coordinated through geographic combatant commander and/or subordinate JFC channels. <u>US Air Force or Navy delivery systems can provide nuclear support to Army or Marine Corps operations. Coordination with the Air Force component is through the air operations center by the collocated Army battlefield coordination element. Coordination with the Navy and Marine Corps components is through the naval and amphibious liaison element. Coordination with special operations forces is through the special operations liaison element.</u> ”	This sentence was removed from the first draft, because it was considered useless information. The USA requested that it be reinserted in second draft comments. Their requests were rejected on the matrix. After speaking to a USA representative, the rational to keep the discussion is warranted.	A

- Costs of escalation will be severe, exceeding the negative consequences of restraint
- US can/will effectively deploy power projection forces despite WMD use
- US stake in conflict is high, political will is strong
- US can counter aggression across the spectrum of conflict
- US can effectively protect its allies from attack
- WMD use will bolster rather than undermine US resolve
- US will not be deterred by WMD threat/use, and is willing to risk escalation
- US WMD defenses of its forces, population, and critical assets are effective
- Transfer of WMD to terrorists will be detected and attributed
- WMD use will result in severe personal consequences
- WMD use will be attributed to those responsible in a timely way
- They have something left to lose

Figure I-x Deterrence Challenges: What the opposing actor must believe