

**Page Denied**

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied

28 April 1981

A PROPOSED STRUCTURE FOR A  
PART OF PROGRAM REVIEW

- BACKGROUND
- GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED APPROACH
- TEST CASE ILLUSTRATING ROLE OF MISSION EXPERTS
- SPECIFIC PROPOSAL FOR UPCOMING PROGRAM REVIEW

BACKGROUND

- NFIP PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS
  - PROGRAM MANAGERS SUBMIT REQUESTS IN PRIORITY ORDER
  - ICS REVIEWS SUBMISSIONS AND PRESENTS ALTERNATIVES IN ISSUE PAPERS. ALTERNATIVES MIGHT INCLUDE:
    - CHANGES IN PRIORITIES
    - NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PACKAGES
    - CHANGES IN BUDGET LEVELS
  - RESULTS OF REVIEW ARE SUMMARIZED IN DCI DECISION LETTERS
- AREAS FOR POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT
  - MORE STRUCTURED REVIEW ACROSS PROGRAMS
  - BROADER COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN REVIEW PROCESS

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED APPROACH

PARTICIPANTS

- FUNCTIONAL TEAMS WITHIN ICS
  - PRODUCTION
  - IMAGERY COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND EXPLOITATION
  - SIGINT COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND REPORTING
  - HUMINT COLLECTION AND REPORTING
  - OTHER COLLECTION
  - GENERAL SUPPORT
  
- MISSION EXPERTS FROM COMMUNITY
  - FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION AND INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS
  - TREATY MONITORING
  - I&W/CRISIS MANAGEMENT
  - MILITARY WEAPONS R&D AND PROCUREMENT
  - MILITARY OPERATIONAL PLANNING AND FORCE EMPLOYMENT
  - COUNTERINTELLIGENCE
  - COVERT ACTION
  
- REPRESENTATIVES OF PROGRAM MANAGERS

PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES

- FUNCTIONAL TEAMS PREPARE OVERVIEW PAPERS
  - BASELINE
  - AT RISK
  
- HEARING ON EACH FUNCTIONAL AREA WITH ATTENDEES FROM
  - PROGRAM MANAGERS
  - MISSION EXPERTS
  - FUNCTIONAL TEAMS
  
- MISSION EXPERTS ASSIGN BENEFIT SCORES (BASED ONLY ON THEIR MISSION) TO PACKAGES AT RISK WITHIN EACH FUNCTIONAL AREA
  - METHODOLOGY FOR ELICITING SCORES IS BASED ON THAT USED IN DOD
  - RATIONALE FOR SCORES IS RECORDED BY REPRESENTATIVE OF FUNCTIONAL TEAM
  
- EACH FUNCTIONAL TEAM WRITES AN ISSUE PAPER ON ITS FUNCTIONAL AREA COMBINING MISSION EXPERTS' BENEFIT ASSESSMENTS WITH COSTS

TEST CASE ILLUSTRATING  
ROLE OF MISSION EXPERTS

- TEST CASE WAS RUN WITHIN ICS
- BASED ON FY 82 BUDGET DATA
- ONE FUNCTIONAL AREA: IMAGERY
- ONE MISSION AREA: I&W/CRISIS MANAGEMENT
- 55 IMAGERY PACKAGES IN BASELINE
- 40 IMAGERY PACKAGES "AT RISK"

TYPES OF IMAGERY PACKAGES IN BASELINE

COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

- GDIP - PEACETIME AIRCRAFT RECONNAISSANCE
  - NRP - KH-8, 9 FLY REMAINING VEHICLES, TERMINATE PROGRAM
    - KH-11 NOMINAL PERFORMANCE AND MANAGEMENT PREPARATION FOR BLOCK II, ACCELERATED 7 AND 8
- STAT  IOC AUG 85
- SHUTTLE TRANSITION
  - ALL R&D, SUPPORT TO OPERATIONS

EXPLOITATION AND DISSEMINATION

- CIAP - OIA/NPIC/OGSR OPERATIONAL
    - IDEX PHASE I FUNCTIONING, PHASE II R&D
    - R&D FOR MAJOR UPGRADES IN NPIC EXPLOITATION
  - GDIP - PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCESSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
    - ALL EXPLOITATION ORGANIZATIONS OPERATIONAL INCLUDING CRISIS MANAGEMENT, UPGRADES TO EQUIPMENT, R&D AND PHOTO LAB
- STAT - DDS - 4 RECEIVER STATIONS, KH-11

IMAGERY SUPPORT

- CIAP - BASIC ADP SUPPORT, NO CAMS ENHANCEMENT
- ICS - PTO MANNED AT CURRENT LEVEL
- GDIP - AIRES DEVELOPMENT, O&M AND SUPPORT, COINS INTERFACE



25X1



TYPES OF IMAGERY PACKAGES AT RISK

COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

- GDIP ● AIRCRAFT (U-2, KC-135) MODIFICATIONS, UPGRADES AND SUPPORT
  - NEW PROCESSING EQUIPMENT AT DIA
- NRP ● LAUNCH DATE ACCELERATIONS
  - STORE ON ORBIT
  - ADDITIONAL SATELLITE ACQUISITIONS

EXPLOITATION AND DISSEMINATION

- CIAP ● ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND TRAINING
  - R&D AND METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT
  - ACCELERATE NPIC UPGRADES
- GDIP ● ADDITIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING
  - SOFTCOPY EXPLOITATION AND EQUIPMENT
  - NISC IMAGERY ENHANCEMENTS

IMAGERY SUPPORT

- CIAP ● CAMS ACCELERATION AND UPGRADES
- GDIP ● ADDITIONAL AIRES MANPOWER
  - SUPPORT FOR NEW IMAGING SYSTEMS

METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING  
BENEFIT OF PACKAGES AT RISKS

- GOALS
  - ASSIGN NUMERIC BENEFIT SCORE TO EACH PACKAGE AT RISK WHICH REPRESENTS THE EXPERTS' JUDGMENT OF RELATIVE CONTRIBUTION TO MISSION BEING EXAMINED
  - RECORD RATIONALE UNDERLYING THE SCORES ASSIGNED
  
- APPROACH
  - FIRST, PLACE PACKAGES IN RANK ORDER USING PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
  - THEN, USE RANK ORDER TO EFFICIENTLY ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT RELATIVE EQUALITIES OF DIFFERENT COMBINATIONS OF PACKAGES. SOLVE RESULTING EQUALITIES FOR BENEFIT SCORES.
  
- BENEFIT SCORES
  - REPRESENT ACCUMULATED BENEFIT OVER THE PROGRAM PERIOD
  - ARE ASSIGNED INDEPENDENT OF COSTS
  - WHEN COMBINED WITH COSTS, ALLOW INTERLEAVING OF PACKAGES ACROSS FUNCTIONAL AREAS

LESSONS LEARNED FROM TEST CASE

- ZBB PACKAGE DESCRIPTIONS ARE OFTEN INADEQUATE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS OF MISSION EXPERTS
- PROGRAM MANAGERS SHOULD BE REPRESENTED AT ALL MEETINGS
- WE NOW BETTER UNDERSTAND HOW TO CONDUCT MEETINGS
- COMPUTER SUPPORT IS USEFUL IN STRUCTURING PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
- AMOUNT OF TIME INVOLVED IN MEETINGS IS SIGNIFICANT. ESTIMATES BASED ON TEST ARE:
  - MISSIONS EXPERTS: 4-8 PERSONS X 1-1/2 DAYS PER FUNCTIONAL AREA
  - PROGRAM MANAGER REPS: 3 PERSONS X 7-1/2 DAYS\* PER FUNCTIONAL AREA
  - ICS\*\* : 2 PERSONS X 7-1/2 DAYS\* PER FUNCTIONAL AREA

---

\*7-1/2 DAYS REPRESENTS 1-1/2 DAYS FOR EACH OF 5 MISSION AREAS

\*\*EXCLUDES PREPARATION TIME FOR OVERVIEW AND ISSUE PAPERS. ESTIMATE FOR THESE IS 2 PERSONS X 4 WEEKS PER FUNCTIONAL AREA.

PROPOSAL FOR FY 83-87 PROGRAM REVIEW

- EVALUATE TWO FUNCTIONAL AREAS
  - IMAGERY
  - ELINT
- AGAINST FIVE MISSION AREAS
  - I&W/CRISIS MANAGEMENT
  - MILITARY OPERATIONAL PLANNING AND FORCE EMPLOYMENT
  - MILITARY WEAPONS R&D AND PROCUREMENT
  - TREATY MONITORING
  - FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION AND INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS
- PRODUCING
  - AN ISSUE PAPER ON EACH FUNCTIONAL AREA SUMMARIZING MISSION EXPERTS' JUDGMENTS
  - RANKINGS OF PACKAGES AT RISK TO BE USED DURING PROGRAM AND BUDGET REVIEW

TIME REQUIRED OF MISSION EXPERTS

- REVIEW OF OVERVIEW PAPER
  - APPROXIMATELY 2 DAYS\* FOR EACH MISSION EXPERT DURING LATE JUNE
  
- MEETINGS TO ASSESS BENEFITS
  - APPROXIMATELY 3 DAYS\*\* FOR EACH MISSION EXPERT DURING  
30 JUNE - 10 JULY
  
- REVIEW OF ISSUE PAPER
  - APPROXIMATELY 2 DAYS\* FOR EACH MISSION EXPERT DURING LATE JULY

---

\*1 DAY FOR EACH FUNCTIONAL AREA

\*\*1 1/2 DAYS FOR EACH FUNCTIONAL AREA

QUESTIONS

- HOW FAMILIAR WILL I&W MISSION EXPERTS BE WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS AND SYSTEMS DISCUSSED IN PACKAGE DESCRIPTIONS?
- HOW MANY I&W/CRISIS MANAGEMENT EXPERTS SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS?
- WOULD YOU ENDORSE PARTICIPATION OF THE I&W WORKING GROUP?
- WHO WOULD YOU SUGGEST WE INCLUDE AS EXPERTS IN OTHER MISSION AREAS?