QDR 2001 . . . and Beyond
A Process Roadmap
Navy M&S
Supporting the QDR
24 May 00
QDR 2001...and Beyond A Process Roadmap
Unclassified

US Navy M&S
xxxxx, xxxxxxx

United States Department of Defense
Defense Modeling and Simulation Office
1901 N. Beauregard St., Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22311-1705

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
APUBLIC RELEASE

14. ABSTRACT
Through combat-credible presence forward, the Navy provides our nation the means for both continuous shaping and timely response to crises. The Navy's transformation into a knowledge-superior force enables it to dictate the operational tempo across sea, air, land, space, and cyberspace -- an expanded battlespace. New mission areas, such as TMD and land attack, drive both new capabilities and additional capacity.

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:
a. REPORT
Unclassified
b. ABSTRACT
Unclassified
c. THIS PAGE
Unclassified

17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Public Release

18. NUMBER OF PAGES
20

19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
Fenster, Lynn
lfenster@dtic.mil

19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER
International Area Code
Area Code Telephone Number
703767-9007
DSN
427-9007
Outline
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  • IWAR/CPAM Process

The Bottom Line
OPNAV QDR Organization

QDR WG

N51 Lead

10 Subgroups

- Asymmetric Warfare & Homeland Defense
- Strategy & Force Sizing
- Staff Reorg., RBA & Streamlined Infrastructure
- Nuclear Deterrence & NMD
- Modeling
- Strategy for Balance: Readiness, Recap. & Transformation
- Transformation Strategy
- Total Force
- Overseas Presence
- Space

N81 Lead
PAST QDR LESSONS LEARNED - Navy

• DUAL MTW SCENARIO ALONE NOT ADEQUATE FOR SIZING NAVY FORCE STRUCTURE

• NAVAL FORCE STRUCTURE ASSESSMENTS MUST INCLUDE A COMBINATION OF **FORWARD PRESENCE, CRISIS RESPONSE, AND WARFIGHTING MISSIONS**

• OSD/J-8 DYNAMIC COMMITMENT WARGAMES DURING LAST QDR SUGGESTED AN APPROACH FOR INCREASING FOCUS ON PRESENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE
NAVAL FORCE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS

GLOBAL NAVAL FORCE ALLOCATION
• 5-10 YR PERIOD
• FORWARD PRESENCE
• CRISIS RESPONSE
• MTW/SSC

+ SUFFICIENCY OF FORCES ASSIGNED
• GNFPP ALLOCATIONS
• MOOTW/SSC/MTW EFFECTIVENESS

STRESS ON NAVAL FORCE STRUCTURE
• PERSTEMPO
• OPTEMPO
• SHORTFALLS IN MEETING COMMITMENTS
  – DELAYED ARRIVALS
  – INADEQUATE NUMBERS
• IMPACT OF SHORTFALLS ON FORCE EFFECTIVENESS
GLOBAL NAVAL FORCE ALLOCATION TOOLS

HUMAN-IN-THE-LOOP PLANNING TOOL

SeaState

AUTOMATED ASSESSMENT TOOL

FORSAT

REQUIRED FORCES FOR CONTINGENCIES

- HISTORICAL DATA BASE
  - DEPLOYMENT
  - READINESS

- PROJECTION 12-18 MONTHS
  BASED ON EMPLOYMENT SCHEDULES

- UNIT SELECTION FOR CRISIS RESPONSE BASED ON
  - ROC/POE MATCH WITH UNTL
  - RESPONSE TIME

- PLAN TO USE FOR DC SUPPORT

- SIMULATION (STOCHASTIC)
  PROJECTS PRESENCE, UNIT AVAILABILITY AND READINESS INTO FUTURE TIMEFRAME

- STATISTICALLY BASED
  CHARACTERIZATION OF CRISIS OCCURRENCE

- IMPLEMENTS AUTOMATED RULE SET FOR FORCE ASSIGNMENT

- PLAN TO USE FOR QDR ANALYSIS
FORCE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS TOOL (FORSAT)

- MOEs
  - RESPONSE TIMES
  - PERSTEMPO/OPTEMPO
  - SHORTFALLS IN MEETING COMMITMENTS
    - CONTINGENCIES
    - FORWARD PRESENCE
    - POTENTIAL MTW
  - IMPACT ON FORCE EFFECTIVENESS

GLOBAL NAVAL FORCES STATUS

MULTIPLE CRISSES
N81 MOOTW ANALYSIS CASE SET

OPPOSED NEO CASE (97)

C⁴ISR SCUD HUNT (97)

SWA AMPHIBIOUS RAID (97)

NIGERIA NEO (MCCDC MISSION AREA ANALYSIS CASE)

TOBAGO INTERVENTION (98)

PHILIPPINE HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE (98)

MARITIME INTERDICTION (99)

NO-FLY ZONE (99)
MOOTW Example:
TOBAGO INTERVENTION*

• PROTECT AND EVACUATE US CITIZENS/OTHERS
• NEUTRALIZE TROOPS SUPPORTING COUP
• STABILIZE SITUATION
• MAINTAIN THE PEACE

* Scenario is fictitious and used only for development of analysis methodology

IN CONJUNCTION WITH OECS NATIONS, ASSIST IN RESTORATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT
SCREEN CAPTURE
NO BEACON EFFECT
75TH INFANTRY PARACHUTE ASSAULT

1/75 Inf Dispersion Area

2/75 Inf Dispersion Area
SUMMARY

• DUAL MTW SCENARIOS DO NOT FULLY ADDRESS REQUIREMENTS CHALLENGING FUTURE MILITARY FORCE STRUCTURE

• FORCE STRUCTURE ASSESSMENTS MUST INCLUDE FORWARD PRESENCE AND CONTINGENCY RESPONSE

• ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF FORCE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS:
  – GLOBAL NAVAL FORCE ALLOCATION
  – FORCE SUFFICIENCY
PROVIDES SENIOR NAVAL LEADERSHIP THE FOUNDATION FOR RESOURCE DECISIONS BY CONDUCTING END-TO-END CAPABILITIES ANALYSIS OF WARFARE AND SUPPORT AREAS

*Provides linkage* across Naval strategic vision, threat assessment and programs

*Prioritizes warfighting and support capabilities* through integration and synchronization of current and planned programs

*Identifies impact of trade-offs* on near, mid, and far term warfighting capabilities
IWARS

Strategic Planning

Naval Strategic Vision
- The “long” view
- Overarching Vision
- Strategy to concepts

CNO Strategic Planning Guidance
- Strategic environment
- Bridges concepts and capabilities

Long Range Planning Objectives
- Operational capabilities
- Management objectives

SECNAV Planning Guidance
- Initiates PPBS Cycle

Analysis and Programming

CPAM

POM

Balanced/Integrated Capabilities
INTEGRATED WARFARE ARCHITECTURE (IWAR)

- Translates vision to guidance for acquisition community
- Foundation for resource decisions
- Current road map for warfare/support areas
- Focus on capabilities vice systems
  - Cost Constrained = 100% TOA Coverage
- Evaluates programmed force capabilities against projected threat using common analytical baseline
  - Excursions run to examine high risk/high payoff options
- Integrated product team approach
- Standing Architecture, not tied to PPBS Cycle
CNO PROGRAM ANALYSIS MEMORANDUM (CPAM)

- Assesses current FYDP programs and their contributions to a balanced program
- Provides balanced program across capability area and over time
- Describes impact of programmatic decisions on warfare capabilities (near/mid term)
- Recommends capability alternatives/options and trade-offs
- Raises issues that must be resolved in POM
- Supports *programming guidance*
- Ties directly to PPBS Process
SUMMARY - NEW IWAR/CPAM PROCESS:

• More efficient
  – Integrated capability not “collection of parts”
  – Improved decisions of cost vs capability
  – Earlier “up-front” program guidance adds program stability, enhances sponsor/vendor cooperation
  – Strengthen linkage between strategy, capabilities, and resources

• More effective
  – Capabilities-based assessments, not platform-based
  – Cross-capability integration allows comparisons
Navy QDR Strategic Linkage

Concept

Means

Ways

Ends

Maritime Power
Forward Presence
Knowledge Superiority
Battlespace Control
Battlespace Attack
Battlespace Sustainment
Regional Stability
Deterrence
Timely Crisis Response
War Fighting and Winning

FORWARD
...FROM THE SEA
Through combat-credible presence forward, the Navy provides our nation the means for both continuous shaping and timely response to crises.

The Navy’s transformation into a knowledge-superior force enables it to dictate the operational tempo across sea, air, land, space, and cyberspace -- an expanded battlespace.

New mission areas, such as TMD and land attack, drive both new capabilities and additional capacity.
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The Bottom Line

We are executing a plan to position the Navy for QDR ‘01…

...with a coherent message