

Strengthening the Next QDR (2010) Through Timely and Relevant Analysis

MORS Workshop, January 12-15, 2009

A. BACKGROUND

Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Legislation

In 1995, the U.S. Congress established the Commission on Roles and Missions (CORM) to reevaluate selected roles and missions issues of each military Service. Comprised of both civilian and retired senior military officers and supported by a military and civilian staff, the CORM recommended a quadrennial strategic review which led to the congressional requirement for a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR).

The QDR primary requirement is to “conduct a comprehensive review [of DoD]...with a view toward determining and expressing the defense strategy of the United States and establishing a defense program for the next 20 years” (Title 10 USC Sec 118). The first QDR report was issued in 1997 followed by subsequent reviews in 2001 and 2006. Since the release of the first report, the legislative language requiring the QDR has changed slightly, but the essence of the review remains the same. Key tasks that DoD must (by law) submit results on to Congress in the next QDR report include:

“(b1) to delineate a national defense strategy consistent with the most recent National Security Strategy prescribed by the President pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a);

(b2) to define sufficient force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program of the United States associated with that national defense strategy that would be required to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in that national defense strategy;

(b3) to identify (A) the budget plan that would be required to provide sufficient resources to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in that national defense strategy at a low-to-moderate level of risk, and (B) any additional resources (beyond those programmed in the current future-years defense program) required to achieve such a level of risk; and

(b4) to make recommendations that are not constrained to comply with the budget submitted to Congress by the President pursuant to section 1105 of title 31.

(c) Assessment of Risk. - The assessment of risk for the purposes of subsection (b) shall be undertaken by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That assessment shall define the nature and magnitude of the political, strategic, and military risks associated with executing the missions called for under the national defense strategy.”

Past QDRs

The three QDRs conducted to-date have differed along several dimensions. Some of the major issues differentiating the reviews include: different National Security Strategies in response to strategic environments; degree to which review was driven by budget constraints; different roles for defense in national security; and first versus second term of a presidential administration.

Broadly speaking, the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review built upon the strategic foundations of both the Bottom-Up Review and the CORM and introduced the “Shape-Respond-Prepare” strategy. The 2001 review focused on transforming forces to meet new challenges posed by 9/11 and identifying a new approach to assessing risk.

The most recent review (2006) shifted emphasis from traditional to non-traditional challenges. Specifically, it directed the department to shift its weight from capabilities largely aimed at traditional war-

fighting challenges to capabilities that address irregular, catastrophic, and disruptive challenges. The 2006 review also introduced a new force planning construct that distinguishes between “steady state” and “surge” operations across three operational categories: homeland defense, war on terror/irregular warfare, and conventional campaigns. A unique feature of the 2006 review was its use of follow-on execution “roadmaps” that continued after the release of the report and focused on executing guidance in specific areas (such as irregular warfare).

B. PURPOSES

This workshop will

- Examine DoD assessment capabilities for performing QDR 2010 (to include such activities as gaming of advanced operational concepts).
- Identify past analyses and analytical methods applicable to determining DoD and other USG capabilities and resource requirements.
- Provide a neutral environment in which OSD, the Joint Staff, Defense Agencies, Unified Commands, the Services, and other USG agencies can discuss analytical plans and preparations for QDR 2010.
- Provide ideas and analytical status to OSD/JCS decision makers who are planning for QDR 2010.
- Identify other activities that can help joint analysis in the 21st century

The following areas will be addressed:

- **Analytic Results.** These results will be based on existing strategies, missions, operational concepts, and forces; and on suggestions concerning changes required to deal with evolving security challenges of the 21st Century.
- **Analytic Structure and Processes.** This includes how the analysis could be structured to support the QDR and the processes needed to support this structure, including status and plans for “collaborative analysis.”
- **Analytic Tools.** This is a significant focus of the workshop. It will examine the status of key tools and methodologies that support joint analysis -- in traditional and new mission areas -- identifying limitations and suggesting remedies.
- **Data Collection.** The role of the Joint Data Support (JDS) office and other sources of data will be explored. The focus will be on identifying limitations and suggesting remedies.
- **Analyst/Decision Maker Interactions.** Carefully informing the decision maker on what to expect from analysis and educating the analysts on the needs of decision makers.
- **Military Operations Research Society.** Proposals concerning how MORS can be helpful.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE

Dates: Jan 12-15, 2009

Place: ANSER, Shirlington, VA

Classification: SECRET (REL); 1 Working Group SECRET (NOFORN)

Chair: Mike Leonard (IDA); Co-Chair: Jim Thomason (IDA)

Advisors: Jim Bexfield, (OSD/PA&E); Lisa Disbrow, (JS/J8); Amanda Dory (OSD/Policy)

Participation and Fees: TBD

Invitations will be issued by the MORS office about 4 weeks prior to the workshop. MORS anticipates that this workshop will be oversubscribed. As a result, applicants that are not part of the program (i.e. not a briefer, panel member, chair/co-chair) will be asked to provide a brief description of how their background contributes to a working group. MORS regrets that due to the limited space some applicants may not get invitations.

D. TENTATIVE AGENDA

Pre-Session (Optional) Monday Afternoon 12 January	1300-1700	<p>Background briefs on various topics such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QDR legislation and results from previous QDRs (Mike Leonard, IDA) • Lessons from Past QDRs (Jim Thomason, IDA) and QDR Challenges (Web Ewell, PA&E) • UK’s Analysis of Defense Capabilities (Commodore Morse) • Mobility Capabilities Requirements Study (MCRS) (Peter DeFleuri, PA&E) • Analytic Agenda (COL Charbonneau (JS), Laura Cooper (Policy), Jim Stevens (PA&E) • Costs (Kristy Kolesar, PA&E)
Plenary I Tuesday Morning 13 January	0800-1215	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome/Overview—Mr. Mike Leonard • Perspectives of the New Administration, e.g., Randy Scheunemann or Michelle Flournoy • A National Security Perspective—Dr. Peter Feaver • Perspectives of Other Government Agencies – Amb (ret) Charles Freeman • The Project on National Security Reform—Dr. Jim Locher • DoD Perspectives (OSD, Joint Staff)
Tuesday Wednesday and Thursday Jan 13-15	Tues: 1330-1700 Wed: 0800-1700 Thurs: 0800-1100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group meetings.
Plenary II Thursday 15 January	1100-1200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quadrennial Homeland Security Review – John Whitley, DHS • Quadrennial Intelligence Community Review – DNI (TBD)
Outbriefs Thursday 15 January	1330-1600	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesis and Working Group outbriefs.

Synthesis Group (Chaired by Roy Rice TBE)

The synthesis group will summarize and integrate the information and recommendations covered in the workshop. Their plenary presentation at the Thursday outbrief will include lessons learned and suggestions of how we can collaboratively work together to mitigate limitations.

Working Groups

The five Working Groups (and Chairs) are:

1. Dealing with Islamic Extremism (Iraq, Afghanistan, and Beyond) – Mike Baranick (NDU)
 - **Purpose:** Identify/compile viable strategies for dealing with Islamic extremist challenges as well as evidence from the MORS community as to what USG (and allied) resources and capabilities (mix, level) could help/suffice to implement the strategies.
2. Countering WMD Proliferation – Pat McKenna (STRATCOM)

- **Purpose:** Identify strategies for countering WMD proliferation, and capabilities/ resources to implement strategies.
3. Providing for Homeland Security/Defense – Dr. Jerry Diaz (HSI)
 - **Purpose:** Examine the analytic seams between the Homeland Defense and Homeland Security mission spaces. Identify those key areas that are likely to be of concern in both the 2010 QDR and 2009 QHSR.
 4. Dealing with a Peer Competitor –Trip Barber (Navy) –This working group will be held at the SECRET (NOFORN) level.
 - **Purpose:** Identify strategy options for Dealing with a Peer Competitor, and assess how to implement them.
 5. Integration/Strategy (Balancing Strategy and Capabilities)—Dr. Jim Thomason (IDA)
 - **Purpose:** Identify viable strategy-capability balancing approach (es) for the upcoming QDR; identify promising candidates for post-QDR development/implementation

Working Group Guidance

The working groups will include both presentations and problems solving discussions. Working groups may break into subgroups to help with problem solving. General guidance includes:

- Identify key missions, strategies, operational concepts, forces, and issues that are likely to be of concern in QDR 2010.
- Examine available analytic methods, models and data and *near-term* evidence/applications/improvements that would address decision-maker needs *during* QDR 2010. This includes identifying analytic capability gaps and means to eliminate or mitigate them.
- Suggest future courses of action that would enhance post-QDR joint analysis capabilities.

The above guidance is not rigid or all inclusive. Working groups and subgroups are encouraged to explore any topic that may provide valuable analytical insights relative to QDR 2010.

Component Coordinators

Each Service, OSD, and the JCS will be given the opportunity to provide a coordinator for each Working Group. The coordinator would, at a minimum, solicit appropriate subgroup membership from their component. In addition, they may be asked to provide a short presentation on their component's perspective and participate in the pre-workshop planning for the group.

Workshop Products

- Executive Summary and briefing to sponsors and other interested members of DoD
- PHALANX article
- Briefing at the next MORSS
- Report to MORS Office