



## Policy & Legislation

### DEFENSE FAR SUPPLEMENT (DFARS) CHANGE NOTICE 20060123

**D**oD published the following final and proposed DFARS rules on Jan. 23, 2006. Link to the *Federal Register* notices for these changes through the following Web site: <<http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/dfars/changenotice/index.htm>>.

#### Final Rules

##### Simplified Acquisition Procedures (DFARS Case 2003-D075)

Updates and consolidates text on the use of imprest funds and third-party drafts; deletes unnecessary cross-references; and relocates to the PGI (Procedures, Guidance, and Information) Web site at <<http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/pgi/index.htm>> guidance on the use of unilateral contract modifications and procedures for use of forms for purchases made using simplified acquisition procedures.

##### Contracting by Negotiation (DFARS Case 2003-D077)

Deletes unnecessary text on structuring of contracts and unnecessary cross-references; updates policy on source selection evaluation factors; and relocates to PGI, procedures for preparation of source selection plans and examples of source selection evaluation factors.

##### Specialized Service Contracting (DFARS Case 2003-D041)

Relocates to PGI, procedures for defining the geographical area to be covered by mortuary services contracts and procedures for distribution of those contracts; deletes a contract clause containing facility requirements for mortuary services, as these requirements are adequately addressed in state law; and deletes unnecessary requirements relating to contracting for laundry and dry cleaning services.

##### Acquisition of Utility Services (DFARS Case 2003-D069)

Deletes text on the use of competitive procedures and delegated authority to acquire utility services, as these issues are adequately addressed in the FAR; deletes obsolete text on preaward contract reviews; and relocates to PGI, procedures and corresponding definitions related to connection charges and award of separate contracts for utility services.

##### Utility Rates Established by Regulatory Bodies (DFARS Case 2003-D096)

Clarifies that utility rates established by independent regulatory bodies may be relied upon as fair and reasonable; and clarifies requirements for use of contract clauses addressing changes in rates for regulated and unregulated utility services.

##### DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program (DFARS Case 2004-D028)

Finalizes, without change, the interim rule published in DFARS Change Notice 20050524 regarding the DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program. The rule extends, through Sept. 30, 2010, the period during which companies may enter into agreements under the program. In addition, the rule expands the program to permit Service-disabled-veteran-owned small business concerns and HUBZone small business concerns to participate in the program as protégé firms. The rule implements Sections 841 and 842 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

#### Proposed Rules

##### Earned Value Management Systems (DFARS Case 2005-D006)

Updates policy on contractor earned value management systems (EVMS) to revise the contract dollar thresholds at which EVMS requirements are applied and to eliminate requirements for contractors to submit cost/schedule status reports. Requires compliance with American National Standards Institute/Electronic Industries Alliance Standard 748, Earned Value Management Systems, for cost or incentive contracts and subcontracts valued at \$20,000,000 or more; and requires a formally validated and accepted EVMS for cost or incentive contracts and subcontracts valued at \$50,000,000 or more. The objective is to streamline, improve, and increase consistency in earned value management requirements.

##### Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds (DFARS Case 2004-D022)

Adjusts acquisition-related dollar thresholds for inflation. Section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 requires periodic adjustment of the statutory acquisition-related dollar thresholds in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) for inflation, except for those established by the Davis-Bacon Act, the Service Contract Act, or trade agreements. The proposed FAR changes were published in the *Federal Register* on Dec.



12, 2005. This proposed DFARS rule makes comparable changes to acquisition-related thresholds in the DFARS.

### Foreign Acquisition Procedures (DFARS Case 2005-D012)

Relocates to PGI, procedures for requesting waivers of foreign source restrictions; for requesting waivers under North Atlantic Treaty Organization cooperative projects; for determining that it is necessary to award a contract for ballistic missile defense research, development, test, and evaluation to a foreign source; and for applying the Balance of Payments Program to an acquisition.

### DEFENSE ACQUISITION PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROJECT FINDINGS

**T**he Defense Acquisition Performance Assessment (DAPA) project, headed by retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish and including representatives from the military, industry, and academia, has submitted eight major findings and associated recommended actions across the spectrum of the defense acquisition process. The panel presented their findings in a 155-page report, dated January 2006, to the deputy secretary of defense.

**Strategic technology exploitation as a key U.S. advantage.** Militarily critical technologies need to be identified and documented early in the acquisition process to ensure that cutting-edge technologies have appropriate export controls.

**U.S. economic and security environments have changed.** The fundamental nature of defense acquisition and the defense industry has changed substantially and irreversibly over the past 20 years. New and emerging global markets have substantially affected the dynamics of acquisition reforms envisaged in the Goldwater-Nichols Act. In 1985, defense programs were conducted in a robust market environment where more than 20 fully competent prime contractors competed for multiple new programs each year. The industrial base was supported by huge annual production runs of aircraft (585), combat vehicles (2,031), ships (24), and missiles (32,714). In 1985, threats were well-known and well-defined. This allowed the department to conduct stable strategic planning. Today, the department relies on six prime contractors who compete for fewer and fewer programs each year. Reductions in plant capacity have failed to keep pace with the reduction in demand for defense systems (188 aircraft, 190 combat vehicles, eight ships, 5,072 missiles). The security environment

has become unpredictable, threats are often difficult to define, and situations often require asymmetric responses. The world dynamic has changed.

**Acquisition system must deal with external instability.** The acquisition system must deal with external instability, a changing security environment, and challenging national security issues. The Department must be agile—to an unprecedented degree—to respond quickly to urgent operational needs from across the entire spectrum of potential conflicts.

**DoD management model based on lack of trust.** The Department compounds the chaotic nature of its financial model with a program oversight philosophy based on lack of trust.

**Oversight is preferred to accountability.** Effective oversight has been diluted in a system where the quantity of reviews has replaced quality, and the tortuous review processes have obliterated clean lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability. The oversight process allows staffs to assume de-facto program authority, stop progress, and increase program scope.

**Oversight is complex—not process- or program-focused.** The current system is focused on programs, not on improving and standardizing the processes of acquisition; it inhibits rather than promotes steady improvement in achieving program success.

**Complex acquisition processes do not promote success.** Complex acquisition processes do not promote program success—they increase costs, add to schedule, and obfuscate accountability. Although the Department functions with a single serial acquisition process with extended planning horizons, the Department's budgeting process is based on short-term decision making in which long-term cost increases are accepted to achieve short-term budget "savings" or "budget year flexibility."

**Incremental improvement applied solely to "little a" acquisition process requires all processes to be stable—they are not.** The acquisition system is believed to be a simple construct that efficiently integrates the three interdependent processes of budget, acquisition, and requirements termed "Big A." "Little a" is the acquisition process that tells us how to buy but does not include requirements and budget, creating competing values and objectives.



The Defense Department is reviewing the team's recommendations. Review the entire report at <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dapaproject/documents/DAPA-Report-web.pdf>.

### **DOD GUIDE FOR ACHIEVING RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, AND MAINTAINABILITY AVAILABLE**

Col. Warren Anderson, USAF • Mark Schaeffer • Michael Zsak

**T**he challenges facing today's program manager have increased dramatically. DoDD 5000.1, *The Defense Acquisition System*, May 12, 2003, designates the PM as the life cycle manager for Total Life Cycle Systems Management (TLCSM), responsible not only for effective and timely acquisition of the system, but also for sustainment of a system throughout its life cycle. TLCSM has re-emphasized that the PM must consider systems development decisions in the context of the effect they will have on long-term operational effectiveness and suitability.

So what does this have to do with the 2005 *DoD Guide for Achieving Reliability, Availability, and Maintainability* (RAM)? Very simply, a systems reliability and maintainability and its resultant availability influence many of the key factors that encompass a total systems management approach.

#### **The Importance of RAM**

Achieving required levels of RAM is important for many reasons.

- Improved readiness: Poor reliability or maintainability causes readiness to fall below needed levels or increases the cost of achieving them.
- Improved safety: The ability to safely complete a mission is directly related to the reliability of the critical safety items.
- Improved mission success: The ability to undertake and successfully complete a mission is directly affected by the extent to which equipment needed to perform a given mission is available and operates reliably.
- Reduced total ownership costs: TOC captures the true cost of design, development, ownership, and support of DoD weapons systems. To the extent that new systems can be designed to be more reliable (fewer failures) and more maintainable (fewer resources needed) TOC for these systems will be lower.
- Reduced logistics footprint: Improved RAM reduces the size of the logistics footprint related to the number of required spares, maintenance personnel, and support equipment.

#### **Achieving RAM Through Disciplined Systems Engineering Process**

The key to developing and fielding military systems with satisfactory levels of RAM is to recognize them as integral to technical planning and execution (a.k.a. systems engineering) and to systematically manage the elimination of failures and failure modes through identification, classification, analysis, and removal or mitigation. Chapter 4, "Systems Engineering," of the *Defense Acquisition Guidebook* describes the systems engineering processes and the fundamentals of their application to DoD acquisition, addressing the many design considerations, including reliability and maintainability, that should be taken into account throughout the systems engineering process.

Additional information on systems engineering and related topics can be found on the Defense Acquisition University (Acquisition Community Connection (ACC) Web site in the Reliability and Maintainability Special Interest Area [https://acc.dau.mil/simplify/ev\\_en.php](https://acc.dau.mil/simplify/ev_en.php).

#### **How the New DoD Guide Can Help**

The new guide reflects RAM best practices throughout the department, industry, and academia. It emphasizes that RAM capabilities are achieved through a collaboration of skilled people and organizations with a clear mission and goal, armed with the right supporting information, adequately resourced, using effective technical tools and systems engineering management activities, and developing the necessary documentation at each product stage, throughout the life cycle.

The Guide is structured around a four-step model:

- Step 1: Before a system can be designed, the needs and constraints of the user must be understood and documented. This first step is the foundation required to define and achieve appropriate levels of RAM performance for a system.
- Step 2: After the user needs and constraints are accounted for, the process shifts to ensuring RAM requirements are designed in the system.
- Step 3: During the production phase the system must be manufactured such that the designed-in RAM performance remains intact.
- Step 4: The final step of the process, which is monitoring field experience, is often overlooked. Field experience can be used to improve maintenance, identify necessary improvements to the system, and provide much-needed lessons learned for future systems.



Each step has five elements that are necessary for success: a clear goal for the step; the right organizations and people; adequate supporting information; available tools, funds, and time to support the appropriate activities for that step; and a good record of the results.

### Audience and Structure

The guide was written for two audiences: Chapters 1 and 2 are at a level of detail appropriate for senior managers (milestone decision authority, program executive officers, program managers, requirements officers, testers). RAM practitioners are the intended users of the remainder of the guide. The appendices provide information on some key topic areas related to RAM including how RAM fits into the contracting process, reliability techniques, reliability growth management, and field assessment and system trending.

The 2005 DoD Guide for Achieving Reliability, Availability, and Maintainability, is available on the OUSD(AT&L) Systems Engineering Web site at [http://www.acq.osd.mil/ds/se/ed/publications/RAM%20Guide%20\(080305\).pdf](http://www.acq.osd.mil/ds/se/ed/publications/RAM%20Guide%20(080305).pdf). The OSD office of primary responsibility for the guide is OUSD(AT&L) Defense Systems/Systems Engineering/Enterprise Development. To provide feedback on the guide, e-mail [atl-ed@osd.mil](mailto:atl-ed@osd.mil).

*Anderson* is the deputy for systems engineering plans and policy, in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. *Schaeffer* serves in a dual capacity as the acting director, defense systems, and as the director, systems engineering in the Office of the USD(AT&L). *Zsak* joined Decisive Analytics Corporation following retirement from the Department of Defense after 34 years of service in support of Army, Air Force, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Defense Logistics Agency, and Navy acquisition efforts.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NEWS RELEASE (JAN. 20, 2006)

#### DOD RETURNS OVERSIGHT OF SELECTED AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

The Department of Defense announced today the return of milestone decision authority to the Department of the Air Force for 10 major programs. These programs had been temporarily redesignated under the authority of under secretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics in March 2005 at a time when Air Force leadership was in transition.

These 10 programs are once again ACAT 1C, which means they are approved at the Service acquisition executive

level. Their temporary designation of ACAT 1D programs meant that program decisions were approved at the USD(AT&L) level. Milestone Decision Authority for these 10 major defense acquisition programs now falls to Secretary of the Air Force Michael Wynne.

#### Air Force Non-Space Major Defense Acquisition Programs Redesignated as Air Force ACAT 1C Programs

1. Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)
2. B-2 Radar Modernization Program (B-2 RMP)
3. C-5 Aircraft Reliability Enhancement and Reengining Program (C-5 RERP)
4. Globemaster III Advanced Cargo Aircraft (C-17A)
5. C-130 Aircraft Avionics Modernization Program (C-130 AMP)
6. Hercules Cargo Aircraft (C-130J)
7. Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles (JASSM)
8. Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM)
9. Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS)
10. National Airspace System (NAS)

The department's review and approval process for large weapons systems is documented in DoD Directive 5000.1 and DoD Instruction 5000.2.

### AIR FORCE PRINT NEWS (JAN. 30, 2006) HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE REALIGNS SIMILAR TO 'J-STAFF' MODEL

Staff Sgt. C. Todd Lopez, USAF

WASHINGTON (AFPN)—The staff functions at Headquarters Air Force, major commands, and warfighting headquarters will soon all share the same "A-staff" structure.

By Feb. 1, the Air Staff at Headquarters Air Force will adopt an organizational structure that closely mirrors the Army's "G-staff," the Navy's "N-staff," and the joint "J-staff." The effort will help the Air Force optimize internal communications and communicate more efficiently with other Services, said Brig. Gen. Marshall K. Sabol, the Air Force director for manpower, organization, and resources.

"This change will enhance our warfighting capability and help our communications both horizontally and vertically in the Air Force, as well as with those on the joint staff and the office of the secretary of defense," Sabol said. "As we operate in deployed and joint environments, our communication will also be more effective and efficient."



## Policy & Legislation

The affected Air Force functions will be renamed and realigned so similar functions at all levels are referred to by the same name. Those same functional groupings will closely match other Services and the Joint Staff.

At Headquarters Air Force, the deputy chief of staff for manpower and personnel is now called "AF/DP." Under the reorganization, he will be referred to as "the A1." The A1 in the Air Force is responsible for plans and policies covering all military life cycles and civilian personnel management.

Changes at major commands and warfighter headquarters' levels that have not yet adopted the A-staff structure will follow suit by May 1. Similar functions at all levels will be "re-mapped" to nine standardized A-staff areas of responsibility shown in the chart on the right.

By adopting this staff structure, the Air Force will eliminate the difficulty sometimes encountered when leadership at one headquarters attempts to contact functional counterparts at another headquarters.

"Back in November, if I were to try to get a hold of a person [who] dealt with manpower issues, one command might call that the A5M, another the XPM, and still another the DPM," Sabol said. "That is very confusing. And even if you were to compare phonebooks, not one of them looks the same. This reorganization will change that."

Sabol said there have been concerns in the field the reorganization would equate to job loss. The reorganization will neither create nor eliminate jobs, he said. What the reorganization will do is make it easier for airmen to do their jobs, both within the Air Force and the joint environment.

"Whether you are at work, deployed, or even working from home, this will make it easier for you to do your work," he said. "Wherever you are, you are going to know who to talk to and how to communicate."

As part of the A-Staff structure, the Air Force assistant vice chief of staff will also serve as the director of staff. This title allows for better association with the joint staff and other Services. Retaining the assistant vice chief of staff nomenclature is required to fulfill the representational role the person plays in dealing with attaches and communication to foreign contingents while representing the chief of staff.



Mini Poster courtesy Air Force News Agency.

Not all functions of the Air Staff will be affected by the reorganization. The reorganization will not change special staff offices assigned to the secretary of the Air Force and will not filter down to the wing level.

### ARMY PUBLISHES NEW PAMPHLET ON LOGISTICS SUPPORTABILITY PLANNING

The Army has published a new DA Pamphlet 700-56, *Logistics Supportability Planning and Procedures in Army Acquisition*, which consolidates the content of two previous pamphlets—DA Pamphlet 700-55 and DA Pamphlet 700-29.

The new pamphlet, dated Dec. 5, 2005:

- Provides supportability planning and procedures in support of total life cycle systems management and the acquisition process
- Provides information on integrated logistics support, identifying tools for integrated logistics support tasks and supportability planning in all phases of the life cycle
- Emphasizes cost as an independent variable and addresses commercial and nondevelopmental items as well as procedures used to acquire training systems.



- Consolidates the procedures used to plan, conduct, and report on the Army's integrated test and evaluation process and provides details on software supportability planning
- Details the environmental, safety, and occupational health considerations in acquisition and addresses contractor support, post-production support planning, and procurement.

Download a copy of DA Pamphlet 700-56 from the Army Publishing Directorate Web site at [http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa\\_officialsite.htm](http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa_officialsite.htm) >.

### ARMY CORROSION PREVENTION AND CONTROL PROGRAM

**T**he Army has revised AR 750-59, *Army Corrosion Prevention and Control Program*, effective Jan. 9, 2006. AR 750-59 establishes Army policy and procedures for implementing and managing an effective corrosion prevention and control program for all Army systems, equipment, and components.

A major change in the Jan. 9 revision is the transfer of management of the Army Corrosion Prevention and Control Program to the U.S. Army Materiel Command.

Download a copy of DA Pamphlet 750-59 from the Army Publishing Directorate Web site at [http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa\\_officialsite.htm](http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa_officialsite.htm) >.

### ARMY REVISES INTEGRATED LOGISTICS SUPPORT REGULATION

**T**he Army has published a major revision to AR 700-127, *Integrated Logistics Support*, effective Jan. 19, 2006. This major revision:

- Eliminates the Acquisition Management Milestone System
- Eliminates integrated logistics support lessons learned
- Adds concept of total life cycle systems management
- Adds Army policy on performance-based logistics
- Adds responsibilities where the deputy assistant secretary of the Army (Integrated Logistics Support) is the Army acquisition logistician
- Changes integrated logistics support plan to supportability strategy
- Adds policy on integrated logistics support after fielding.
- Revises policy for contractor support.

Download a copy of AR 700-127 from the Army Publishing Directorate Web site at [http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa\\_officialsite.htm](http://www.usapa.army.mil/usapa_officialsite.htm) >.

### AMERICAN FORCES PRESS SERVICE (FEB. 3, 2006) DOD RELEASES QDR TO CHART WAY AHEAD TO CONFRONT FUTURE

Donna Miles

**W**ASHINGTON—The Defense Department unveiled the Quadrennial Defense Review today, charting the way ahead for the next 20 years as it confronts current and future challenges and continues its transformation for the 21st century.

The 92-page report, sent to Congress beginning today, represents “a common vision of where we need to go and what we need to do,” Ryan Henry, principal deputy under secretary for policy, told Pentagon reporters today.

The report was driven, managed, and authored by senior leaders throughout the department, from Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to Marine Gen. Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the Service chiefs and secretaries, to the combatant commanders, he said.

Its release corresponds with that of the fiscal 2007 DoD budget request, which President Bush will send to Congress Feb. 6.

The QDR aims to shift military capabilities to fight terrorism and meet other nontraditional, asymmetric threats, while shaping a defense structure better able to support and speed up this reorientation, Henry said.

At the same time, it recognizes the continued need to defend against conventional threats, conduct humanitarian missions at home and abroad, and help U.S. allies and partners develop their own defense capabilities.

The first of three QDRs conducted during wartime, this year's report focuses on the need for the U.S. military to continue adjusting to an era of uncertainty with asymmetric challenges, he said.

It incorporates lessons learned from operational experiences from Iraq and Afghanistan, Ryan said. Similarly, it incorporates experience gained in other operations associated with the so-called “long war” against terrorism in places like the Philippines, Horn of Africa, Georgia, and Northern Africa.

As a blueprint for shaping the force to carry out these far-reaching responsibilities, the QDR shifts from traditional thinking in pointing the direction forward, Henry said. “It's not about numbers. Numbers don't tell you if



you can get the job done,” he said. “It’s about capabilities.”

The report focuses on a lighter, more agile, more deployable force that operates more jointly with a streamlined, more efficient defense operation supporting it, Vice Admiral Evan Chanik, the Joint Staff’s director of force structure, resources and assessment, told reporters.

It promotes more special operations, intelligence gathering, language and cultural capabilities, improved communications, and enhanced security-cooperation activities.

Chanik called the QDR evolutionary rather than revolutionary and said it reflects an ongoing DoD transformation that began in 2001. The terrorist attacks on the U.S. on Sept. 11 of that year and the war on terror that resulted accelerated this transformation, he said.

“We’re making sure we have a range of capabilities into the future,” Chanik said.

Servicemembers won’t be surprised by what’s ahead for them in the QDR, Chanik predicted. “The average military guy out there understands we live in a changing world and that as this world changes, we need to change with it,” he said.

With its emphasis on education and training, the military ensures that its members have the skill sets they need to meet evolving requirements, he said.

### DOD PUBLISHES DMSMS GUIDEBOOK VERSION 1.1

**T**he *Department of Defense (DoD) Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages (DMSMS) Guidebook* is a compilation of the best proactive practices from across DoD Services and agencies for managing the risk of obsolescence. With material extracted from various DoD DMSMS management docu-



Navy Vice Adm. Evan Chanik (left), Joint Staff director of force structure, resources and assessment, and Ryan Henry, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, speak with reporters at the Pentagon about the Quadrennial Defense Review during a Pentagon press briefing on Feb. 3. Read the QDR in its entirety at <<http://www.defenselink.mil/qdr/>>. Photo by Tech. Sgt. Sean P. Houlihan, USAF.

ments, the new *DoD DMSMS Guidebook* provides the DMSMS program manager with a central repository of best practices. Additionally, it identifies assorted measurement tools that may be useful in analyzing and tracking the effectiveness of DMSMS programs.

The DMSMS PM will find this guidebook a preferred desktop reference to quickly pinpoint key actions required in managing DMSMS issues and concerns. (The original Version 1.0, dated May 25, 2005, is superseded by the updated Version 1.1, which was effective Dec. 31, 2005.) Download Version 1.1 from the AT&L Knowledge Sharing System Web site at <[https://acc.dau.mil/simplify/ev\\_en.php](https://acc.dau.mil/simplify/ev_en.php)>.

### OSD SYSTEMS ENGINEERING PLAN (SEP) PREPARATION GUIDE AVAILABLE

**T**he latest release of the *OSD Systems Engineering Plan (SEP) Preparation Guide*, Version 1.01, dated Jan. 20, 2006, is available at <<http://www.acq.osd.mil/ds/se/publications.htm>>. Also available at this same Web site is a Frequently Asked Questions link on preparing SEPs.



**DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**  
1010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1010



JAN -5 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS  
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE  
COMMANDERS OF THE COMBATANT COMMANDS  
ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE  
GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION  
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT  
DIRECTOR, PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION  
DIRECTOR, NET ASSESSMENT  
DIRECTOR, FORCE TRANSFORMATION  
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES  
DIRECTORS OF THE DOD FIELD ACTIVITIES

SUBJECT: 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review Execution Roadmaps

As the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) nears its completion, several important initiatives have been identified that warrant a greater degree of attention in execution. To this end, the Department of Defense will institute the follow-on QDR execution roadmaps listed at Tab A. The roadmaps will clearly define important objectives, timelines, performance metrics, and an oversight process to ensure the objectives identified during the QDR are achieved. The roadmaps will complement the Strategic Planning Guidance (SPG) and provide senior leadership with a mechanism to advance high-priority issues for decision through the FY 2008-2013 defense program.

**Roadmap Development and Approval.** To ensure that a successful transition is made from the QDR process to roadmap execution, the QDR IPTs will develop and coordinate the roadmaps for the Roadmap Co-Chairs identified at Tab A. The roadmaps should be coordinated with other DoD stakeholder organizations to identify programmatic, budgetary, operational or other considerations. Each roadmap should, at a minimum, address the points provided at Tab B.

Approving the roadmaps, adjudicating major implementation issues, and providing further guidance as necessary will be the responsibility of this office. Upon approval, the overall responsibility for the roadmaps will transition from the QDR IPTs to the Roadmap Co-Chairs, who are then responsible for implementing their assigned roadmaps. Execution Roadmaps will be released concurrent with the SPG, and will be prescriptive documents.

**Roadmaps and the Enhanced Planning Process (EPP).** The roadmaps will be addressed during the EPP. The roadmaps will identify programmatic objectives and corresponding areas in which to accept risk to inform the Joint Programming Guidance. The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Policy (PDUSD(P)); the Director, Program Analysis & Evaluation (PA&E); the Director, Joint Staff, J-8; and the Director, Joint Staff, J-5, will provide oversight and will coordinate issues with the Group of 12.





## Policy & Legislation

Your assistance in providing the necessary manpower and analytical support to these efforts is appreciated and necessary to ensure that key objectives of the QDR in these important areas are achieved. Thanks.

### TAB A: Execution Roadmaps and Chairs (Responsible IPT)

- **DoD Institutional Reform and Governance**, to be led by Kenneth Krieg, under secretary of defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and Army Lt. Gen. Walter “Skip” Sharp, director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- **Strategic Communications**, led by Lawrence DiRita, principal deputy assistant secretary of defense for Public Affairs, and Air Force Lt. Gen. Victor Renault, Joint Staff director for Strategic Plans and Policy.
- **Building Partnership Capacity**, led by Eric Edelman, under secretary of defense for Policy, and Navy Rear Adm. William Sullivan, vice director for Strategic Plans and Policy on the Joint Staff.
- **Sensor-based Management of the ISR** [Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance] **Enterprise**, led by Stephen Cambone, under secretary of defense for Intelligence, and Air Force Lt. Gen. Robert Kehler, deputy commander of U.S. Strategic Command.
- **Authorities**, led by Pete Geren, special assistant to the defense secretary, and Army Lt. Gen. Raymond Odierno, assistant to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- **Irregular Warfare**, led by Ryan Henry, principal deputy under secretary of defense for Policy, and Marine Lt. Gen. James Conway, the Joint Staff director of Operations.
- **Joint Command and Control**, led by John Grimes, assistant secretary of defense for Network and Information Integration, and Army Lt. Gen. John Wood, deputy commander of U.S. Joint Forces Command.
- **Locate, Tag, Track**, led by Linton Wells, deputy assistant secretary for Networks and Information Integration, and Navy Vice Adm. Evan Chanik, Joint Staff director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment.

### TAB B: Execution Roadmap Structure/Template

- Statement of Problem with Definition and Scope
- Strategic Direction from QDR with Objectives
- Annotated Plan of Action and Milestones
  - Milestones, Dates, Success Metrics
  - Projected FY08, FY09 and later year budgetary implications
  - Legislative or regulatory changes required for roadmap execution
- Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for specific events
- Organization and Oversight
  - Specify organizational structure (including Executive Committee membership)
- Reporting Requirements
- Appendices (as necessary)