

Exhibit R-2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification				Date: May 2009			
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06			R-1 Item Nomenclature Budget and Program Assessments, 0606100D8Z				
Cost (\$ in millions)	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010				
Total PE Cost	1.687	5.846	5.929				
Budget and Program Assessments, P101	1.687	5.846	5.929				

A. Mission Description and Budget Item Justification:

This supports the Office of the Director, Program, Analysis & Evaluation (PA&E). It funds assessments that will help resolve budget and programmatic issues across the full range of the Department’s activities. This program initiates analysis and leverages ongoing research and study efforts occurring in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Joint Staff (JS), Combatant Commands, the Military Departments, Defense and other federal agencies to analyze, modify, design, and balance Department capabilities.

Projects that support this effort will help inform the leadership on program alternatives, capability concept development, design and cost, the appropriate balance of capabilities across the force, identify how well the Department’s expenditures are meeting its goals, and how well the force can implement the Defense strategy.

Other studies in our analytic plan that would be funded from this source include Analytic Agenda preparatory QDR 2009-2010 work to encompass selected model and data development as well as development of new baselines for selected scenarios. In addition, analytic studies in support of acquisition milestone decisions, quick turn analysis needed in support of Nunn-McCurdy reviews, and other studies as directed by the Secretary of Defense and Congress may also be conducted. For example, in previous years analytic products included research and analysis for the E-10A, Space Radar, BAMS; Nunn-McCurdy reviews for WIN-T, SBIRS, Global Hawk; and Program Review issues for TSAT, AEHF, WGS, ABL, STSS, Battlespace Awareness portfolio, studies for information assurance, Minuteman replacement, and tactical ground communications.

Exhibit R-2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification		May 2009	
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06		R-1 Item Nomenclature Budget and Program Assessments, 0606100D8Z	
B. Program Change Summary:			
	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
Previous Budget Estimates Submission	5.750	5.888	5.972
Current Budget Estimates Submission	1.687	5.846	5.929
Total Adjustments	-4.062	-0.042	-0.043
Congressional program reductions	-4.000	-	-
Congressional reductions (other)	-0.011	-	-
Congressional increases	-	-	-
Inflation	-	-	-
Revised economic assumptions	-0.052	-0.042	-0.043
Change Summary Explanation:			
<u>FY 2008</u>			
Congressional program reductions:			
-\$4.000 per FY 2008 Appropriations Conference Report			
Congressional reductions (other):			
-\$0.003 per section 8097 of FY 2008 Appropriations Bill (Contractor Efficiencies)			
-\$0.008 per section 8104 of FY 2008 Appropriations Bill (Economic Assumptions)			

Exhibit R-2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification		Date: May 2009
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06	R-1 Item Nomenclature Budget and Program Assessments, 0606100D8Z	
<p>C. Other Program Funding Summary: N/A</p> <p>D. Acquisition Strategy: A mix of competitive contracts with commercial firms and research provided by colleges and universities.</p> <p>E. Performance Metrics: The products or expected outcomes of this program are studies and analyses to support resource allocation decisions, acquisition decisions, and issues of high interest to the Secretary of Defense. Performance is measured by the quality of the analysis and is monitored through the review of our organizational assessment process. Our primary goal is to ensure that study and analytical products are timely, clear, complete, accurate, responsive, balanced, and objective.</p> <p>Findings from these efforts directly influence and shape the program of record, resulting in enhancements to warfighting capability and ensures that the Warfighter has the proper equipment and personnel for the conditions or conflicts on hand in a timely manner. Results often lead to recommendations that are implemented by the Military Departments and Combatant Commanders for force restructuring, better apportionment of assets, and the redistribution of capabilities for warfighting missions. In addition, our long-term program alternatives provide assessments to ensure acquisition investments are affordable, support the national security strategy, and balance long-term risks.</p> <p>Deliverables would include reports, briefings, and analyses designed to illuminate critical issues facing the Department. This will include recommendations for new modeling techniques, programmatic alternatives, and scenario development. The Department needs to review its current analytical tools, models, and methods to better analyze the issues we face in a new, more complex warfighting environment where we face non-state actors, interactions with coalition, foreign, state, and local law enforcement entities, and non-traditional threats such as improvised explosive devices, chemical and biological warfare agents, and WMD. Warfighting analysis has traditionally been in the kinetic domain of modeling and simulation. The new strategic environment necessitates a re-evaluation of the modeling and simulation, tools, techniques, and data that are used by the analysis community within this environment. We also need to assess our current tools and data to ensure they are congruent and support the new ways in which the Department’s leadership is beginning to think about current operations and problems (i.e., capability-portfolio analysis), such that analysis and information best serves the decision-making process.</p>		

Exhibit R-2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification						Date: May 2009	
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06			Project Name and Number Budget and Program Assessments, P101				
Cost (\$ in millions)	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010				
Budget and Program Assessments, P101	1.687	5.846	5.929				

A. Mission Description and Budget Item Justification:

This supports the Office of the Director, Program, Analysis & Evaluation (PA&E). It funds assessments that will help resolve budget and programmatic issues across the full range of the Department’s activities. This program initiates analysis and leverages ongoing research and study efforts occurring in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Joint Staff (JS), Combatant Commands, the Military Departments, Defense and other federal agencies to analyze, modify, design, and balance Department capabilities.

Projects that support this effort will help inform the leadership on program alternatives, capability concept development, design and cost, the appropriate balance of capabilities across the force, identify how well the Department’s expenditures are meeting its goals, and how well the force can implement the Defense strategy.

Other studies in our analytic plan that would be funded from this source include Analytic Agenda preparatory QDR 2009-2010 work to encompass selected model and data development as well as development of new baselines for selected scenarios. In addition, analytic studies in support of acquisition milestone decisions, quick turn analysis needed in support of Nunn-McCurdy reviews, and other studies as directed by the Secretary of Defense and Congress may also be conducted. For example, in previous years analytic products included research and analysis for the E-10A, Space Radar, BAMS; Nunn-McCurdy reviews for WIN-T, SBIRS, Global Hawk; and Program Review issues for TSAT, AEHF, WGS, ABL, STSS, Battlespace Awareness portfolio, studies for information assurance, Minuteman replacement, and tactical ground communications.

Exhibit R-2a, RDT&E Budget Item Justification	Date: May 2009
--	----------------

Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06	Project Name and Number Budget and Program Assessments, P101
--	---

B. Accomplishments/Planned Program:

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	
Accomplishment/Effort/Subtotal Cost	1.687	5.846	5.929	
RDT&E Articles Quantity				

FY 2008 Accomplishments:

Specific projects conducted in FY2008 are as follows:

- *Contribution of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) to High-Value Target (HVT) Missions-New Locations:* Determine the right balance and size of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) support for SOCOM-related High-Value Target (HVT) missions globally in order to inform DoD investment strategies for GWOT. Expanded the FY07 effort on SOF-related HVT missions in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) to other areas including OEF-Afghanistan, OEF-Pakistan, and the Horn of Africa. Near- and long-term technology implications of certain ISR capabilities were assessed. The study also addressed the potential to transfer SOCOM TTPs to conventional forces for this mission. Using rigorous data-analysis, the study quantified the right balance of ISR capabilities, e.g. Full Motion Video (FMV), HUMINT, SIGINT, for success in HVT missions. Results led to increases in specific FMV capabilities, both in terms of short-term efforts (e.g. SecDEF directed ISR surge and Joint Rapid Acquisition Committee) and longer-term program-of-record enhancements. Results also informed decisions regarding better apportionment of assets, including redistribution of capabilities both into and out of CENTCOM. This study was conducted in collaboration with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (OUSD(I)).
- *ISR Support for Conventional Forces and Missions in GWOT:* This study supported OSD long-term resource decisions and CENTCOM short-term ISR operational effectiveness using a data intensive approach that quantitatively linked ISR inputs to operational outcomes (e.g. FY07 High-Value-Target ISR study). This effort involved close collaboration with OUSD(I) as well as CENTCOM and Command elements (J-2, J-3) to obtain large quantities of intelligence and operational data. The study also analyzed supporting aspects of ISR, including Tasking, Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination (TPED) and communication (e.g. bandwidth).

Exhibit R-2a, RDT&E Project Justification		Date: May 2009
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06	Project Name and Number Budget and Program Assessments, P101	
<p>FY 2008 Accomplishments continued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Enhancing Joint Analysis System (JAS) for Key Departmental Studies:</i> Enhanced the JAS to model the Homeland Defense (HD) Interdiction Analytical Baseline Study, which will also supported NORTHCOM's HD CBA. JAS and the Combating WMD Analytic Baseline are being used by DTRA for their Campaign X exercises. In addition JAS was used for a Seabasing study conducted by the Joint Staff. <p>FY 2009 Plans:</p> <p>Analysis in the following areas is planned for FY 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Appropriate Balance Between Conventional and Irregular Warfare Capabilities • Way Ahead in Iraq and Afghanistan • Nuclear Posture Review and the Future of the Nuclear Triad • Missile Defense and the Balance Between Rouge and Regional Threats • Mismatch Between Cost of Current Forces and Projected Budgets • Role of Guard/Reserve and How Access Policies and Capability Mix Influence Force Sufficiency • Ground Force Structure Analysis and the Kinetic Battlefield to Include Analysis of Future Threats and Equipping Strategies • The Total Cost of TACAIR and Mix of Capabilities, Air-to-Air, Air Superiority, and Electronic Warfare • Readiness for the Rotating Army, Readiness in Dwell and Reachback Capabilities • C4ISR Capabilities • Strategic versus Tactical ISR • Space Strategy and Capabilities • Cyberspace Strategy and Security • Tradeoffs between C4ISR Capabilities in Space versus "Air-breathers" • Communications Architecture (TSAT, WIN-T, JTRS, Airborne Tier) • Long Wave IR • Homeland Defense and Consequence Management 		

Exhibit R-2a, RDT&E Project Justification		Date: May 2009
Appropriation/Budget Activity RDT&E, DW BA 06	Project Name and Number Budget and Program Assessments, P101	
<p>FY 2010/2011 Plans: Efforts conducted within this program reflect current and pressing challenges of the Department. As needs arise, projects are planned and formulated to solve current challenges. Consequently, the specifics efforts may vary from year to year. Nonetheless, the following areas are planned in future years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to expand mission and regional breadth of ISR-support studies, still using data intensive approach that quantitatively links ISR inputs to operational outcomes. • Improve the accuracy of combat adjudication models and other simulation tools for studying the full range of combat operations from irregular warfare to large, full scale force-on-force combat. The effort will explore and develop techniques to explicitly account for dependencies and the constraints imposed by spatial and temporal (space and time) separations distinguishing combatants. • Assess capacity needed within DoD, as well as the role of agencies and allies in a range of scenarios against Force Planning Construct of homeland defense, irregular warfare/war on terror, and conventional conflict across steady state and surge environments. • Determine the contribution of DoD forces as part of a local, state, and federal interagency response to current and future homeland defense consequence management scenarios. • Continue assessments for technologies and strategies for space and cyberspace security <p>C. Other Program Funding Summary: N/A</p> <p>D. Acquisition Strategy: N/A</p> <p>E. Major Performers: N/A</p>		

UNCLASSIFIED

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

UNCLASSIFIED