2017 Fleet Design Wargame
Executive Summary

1. **Purpose.** Through gameplay and follow-on analysis, explore how the Fleet should be designed in the future to maximize operational effectiveness in contested battlespace.

2. **Background.** The United States Navy is *no longer assured* of maritime supremacy. Since the end of the Cold War, the Navy has focused primarily on force projection, allowing sea control capabilities to atrophy. Meanwhile, other emerging powers have radically transformed from coastal defense forces to formidable, *peer-level adversaries*. Therefore, the U.S. Navy must *adapt its Fleet Design* to win the sea control fight. In the scenario, RED was attempting to land an amphibious force on an island belonging to GREEN, and ally of BLUE. The mission of US forces was to deter the amphibious landing and to defeat it by force if necessary. The Fleet Design Wargame is played at the operational level, and it is a closed game, so that the "fog of war" is simulated. It is hybrid of a system and a seminar game, meaning that the opposing teams play according to fixed rules, followed by open discussion afterwards.

3. **Study methods.** The Fleet Design Wargame consisted of three separate gameplay sessions. During each session, the BLUE Team received a different order of battle. During gameplay, the study team observed the players' decisions to organize and maneuver their forces, as well as the rationale behind those decisions. After two to three turns of gameplay, a member of the study team facilitated a seminar in which all players discussed the game results. Each team, BLUE and RED, had a leader playing as the "Task Force Commander," and a supporting staff. The Blue Team consisted of three SWOs, a Navy pilot, an Air Force pilot, a Navy cryptologic warfare officer, two human resources officers, and a supply officer. The RED team consisted of three SWOs, one Marine NFO, one Navy cryptologic warfare officer, two Naval intelligence officers, and two supply officers. Search was adjudicated using probability tables and dice. Combat actions are being analyzed using combat models, such as a stochastic implementation of the salvo model.

4. **Study findings.** The game demonstrated the combat potential that networked platforms, sensors, and weapons provide. Long endurance systems, such as the MQ-4C Triton and the Medium Displacement Unmanned Surface Vehicle (MDUSV) can be the eyes and ears of missile platforms like destroyers. The game also showed that with its range alone, an ASuW-capable Maritime Strike Tomahawk provides BLUE forces with greater flexibility when stationing units. On the other hand, unmanned systems also provide RED with a wider range of options to escalate and test U.S. resolve during phase 1. The study team also found that expeditionary warfare can have a double effect on the sea control fight. The presence of an LHA is a "double threat" to the enemy, acting as both an F-35B platform, and as a means of landing Marines.

   Additional findings, including classified results, will be provided in a final analysis report and brief.