DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY – DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-5000

INTELLIGENCE

JUL 19 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIR, INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP

SUBJECT: Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG) Military Value Report

The following memorandum is provided, in response to your May 28, 2004 memorandum entitled, "Intelligence Steering Group Comments on the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group Draft Military Value Report." Attachment A is the specific rationale for the revisions made to the IJCSG Military Value Report. The IJCSG Military Value Report is included for your approval in Attachment B.

Please note that there is an outstanding IJCSG issue regarding collection and evaluation of Intelligence-related Management and Headquarters activities across the Military Services and Defense Intelligence Agencies. If this issue cannot be resolved by the IJCSG, I anticipate that I will formally request that you clarify that it is the responsibility of the IJCSG within the BRAC process.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Ms Deborah Dunie, Principal Staff Assistant to the Chair, IJCSG, at 703-614-5942.

Carol A. Haave
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Counterintelligence and Security)
Chair, IJCSG

Attachments:
As stated

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY – DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

IJCSG RESPONSES TO 28 May 2004 ISG COMMENTS

ISG COMMENT	IJCSG RESPONSE
Develop/codify a methodology for comparing activities with similar functions. Consider the use of more than one scoring plan to establish the military value (MV) of intelligence facilities.	After considering multiple options, the IJCSG decided to use a single scoring plan with one function, "Intelligence," with "binning" used during the Scenario Development phase as the methodology for comparing facilities to assess the MV. Single scoring plan/comparison of facilities: The Intelligence community's functions are very broad and diverse. If a scoring plan was developed for each function addressed in Capacity Analysis, 58 scoring plans would have resulted. This excessive number of scoring plans would have been unworkable and not representative of the military value of the facilities performing the functions. Likewise, multiple scoring plans would not have achieved the goal of BRAC 2005 to look across the Defense Intelligence community to optimize efficiencies and consolidate or collocate where appropriate. Consequently, the IJCSG decided to continue using a single scoring plan with the single function, Intelligence. The single scoring plan will produce a "1-to-N" listing of intelligence facilities that is predominantly a reflection of a facility's condition performing its current intelligence mission. The Military Value Scoring Plan will determine the value of the facilities tied to the intelligence function performed therein, rather than the value of the function itself. Where metrics are associated with people, the plan focuses on the relationship between intelligence facilities and the people performing the intelligence function, rather than upon the efficiency of the people independent of facilities. The "1-to-N" list mentioned above will be used to identify clusters/bins of similar facilities for further targeted data calls and analysis. Binning, in conjunction with Analytical Frameworks and Policy Imperatives, will further refine the analysis to ensure analysis will be of similar facilities performing similar missions. These bins will be determined by the IJCSG Principals consistent with approved BRAC analytical constructs to enable Scenario Development options.
MV should determine the value of facilities to the functions not the value of the function itself.	The revised scoring plan focuses on the relationship between intelligence facilities and the people performing the intelligence function rather than upon the efficiency of the people

Emphasize the relationship between people performing intelligence functions and the facilities in which they perform those functions, over the efficiency of the people independent of the facility.	independent of the facilities. The Military Value Scoring Plan has two attribute categories, Physical Infrastructure and Location. The Physical Infrastructure Attribute Category includes Facility Capability, Facility Condition, Survivability/Force Protection, Specialized Equipment and Ownership/Type Space attributes of the intelligence facility. The Location Attribute Category includes Geophysical Constraints, Mission Assurance/COOP, Buildable Land, Human & Intellectual Capital, Geographic & Professional Relationships (Industrial/Academic/Government) and Economic Cost of Location attributes of the intelligence facility. The revised MV Scoring Plan no longer contains either Population-based or 24/7 Operations metrics. The current attributes, metrics, and weights differentiate the hard-to-reconstitute assets to support BRAC goals to preserve the right amount of capabilities and capacities, especially hard-to-reconstitute DoD assets. The revised MV Scoring Plan follows the intent of BRAC legislation and ISG guidance.
Review functions to be analyzed in light of the three intelligence functions identified in your capacity report. There was confusion whether the functions identified in the report were attributes or functions.	The revised MV Scoring Plan eliminates confusion by clearly identifying attributes under the single function of intelligence. This revision reflects the intent of BRAC to focus on facilities rather than on intelligence business practices.

ISG COMMENT	IJCSG RESPONSE
Revise the amplification contained in all questions to ensure all responses will be consistent with their intent, and provide auditable information. To facilitate data collection and certification, ISG recommended consolidating questions with like responses (e.g., Yes/No, Number of Personnel, etc.). Additionally, create a cross-reference field that links military value metrics will their corresponding data call questions.	The IJCSG reviewed and revised each MV question, with its associated amplifying comments and data sources, to ensure responses solicited would be consistent with the intent and would provide auditable information. Additionally, the IJCSG DoD Inspector General's representative reviewed the changes and found the changes acceptable in this regard. Additionally, a cross-reference field linking military value metrics with the appropriate data call question has been included as requested consistent with the report template format. The Data Standardization Team (DST) reviewed the questions and had minor comments. These minor comments were incorporated into the questions.

ISG COMMENT	IJCSG RESPONSE
The MV Analysis Report should include a complete set of questions for the second data call that your JCSG will need to support the military value scoring plans. The questions should clearly distinguish between those questions that have already been asked in the first data call and those that will be included in the second data call. Each JCSG must also review the totality of its questions to ensure that redundant questions (questions that will result in the same response) are eliminated. The second data call will provide an opportunity to include questions to support your capacity analysis that were either omitted in the first data call or, based on what you have learned through feedback from the query process, clarify existing question to ensure that data received is consistent with your capacity analysis framework. These additional capacity-related questions should be included in a new section of your report.	The revised MV Analysis Report includes a complete set of questions for the second data call that the IJCSG will need to support the MV Scoring Plan. The questions clearly distinguish between those questions that have already been asked in the first data call and those that will be included in the second data call. The IJCSG also reviewed the totality of its questions to ensure redundant questions (questions that will result in the same response) were eliminated. There are no additional capacity analysis questions identified at this time.
Crime and Unemployment Rate metrics use one minus the crime/unemployment rate to determine the installation score; this process will place all installations within a very tight band. Consider alternate methods of scoring.	Crime rate and Unemployment Rate metrics were deleted from the revised MV Scoring Plan.
Budgets do not provide an accurate measure of an activities MV because they are fluid and do not provide a direct value measure of an organization's ability to perform work. An alternate measure would evaluate the specific type of work an organization performs.	All budget related metrics were replaced in the revised MV Scoring Plan with metrics based on facility infrastructure and location attribute categories.

ISG COMMENT	IJCSG RESPONSE
Weighting of Metrics: Under criterion 4, the Dissemination and Sustainability functions have the same rank (2), but different weights (20 and 15) without an explanation as to why there is a difference in the values.	The revised MV Scoring Plan deleted Dissemination and Sustainability as attributes to be analyzed; therefore, the issue has been resolved.
Weighting of Metrics: Review the weighting for the Quality of Life attribute	Quality of Life questions fall under Criterion 7 and will be addressed during the Scenario phase of the BRAC process. Consequently, the Quality of Life metrics were removed from the MV Scoring Plan and will not be scored under Criteria 1-4.
Weighting of Metrics: Under the Analysis function, there is equal weighting of Operation Hours, Deployed Workforce, Format of Data, Foreign Language Skills, Cultural and Regional Expertise, and Scientific and Technical Expertise. Consider discriminating among the metrics by assigning different weights.	The revised MV Scoring Plan deleted Analysis as an attribute to be analyzed. Since the subject metrics were also deleted, the issue has been resolved.
Weighting of Metrics: The Security and Survivability receives a 7.5% attribute weight, which is equal to the combined weight of Quality of Life and Facility Location. Review this weighting to ensure the weighting is appropriate.	The Security and Survivability attribute has been modified in the revised MV Scoring Plan. It appears as "Survivability and Force Protection" under the Physical Infrastructure Attribute Category. It now receives a value equal to the Facility Condition value but slightly less than Facility Capability. This value is appropriate because of the critical need to protect classified information and maintain mission operations during crises.
Weighting of Metrics: Provide a complete description of how weights of individual metrics were determined.	Complete explanations for metric weights are included in the revised MV Scoring Plan consistent with the report template format.
Many questions include a variation of, "…in this facility…;" yet, the tables provided are intended to be variable length keyed to specific facility numbers. Also, some headers describe the variable nature of tables; many do not. Consider modifying text to read "…for your organization, complete the table below for each facility where…"	The IJCSG modified the questions addressed by this concern to reflect the suggested language.

ISG COMMENT	IJCSG RESPONSE
There are several MV questions that require binary (Yes/No) responses. Many of these binary questions inquire about functions being performed, but do not discriminate between activities that perform these functions regularly and those that perform them on an infrequent basis. Consider defining the metrics based on the current capability of activities to perform the functions or by modifying the metrics to quantify activity performance levels for the function (i.e., establish thresholds, sliding scales, etc.).	In the revised MV Scoring Plan, binary responses were assigned to those questions for which the response is appropriate and thresholds for responding were provided in question amplifications. In cases where binary responses were not appropriate, those metrics were modified to ask for numeric responses.
Report should address on-site contractors working at the facility.	Amplification provided with personnel-related questions gives guidance on addressing on-site contractors.
Include a list of definitions for commonly used terms ("routinely", "workforce," "unique," "specialized," etc.) as a part of the MV Questions to ensure responses provide data that is consistent and useful in this and subsequent phases of the BRAC process.	If a definition of a term was deemed necessary, it is provided in the amplification of the question that uses that term.
Develop and include consistent table headers for all variable length tables.	Consistent table headers were used for all variable length tables.
Once the MV Scoring Plan has been revised, it needs to have new Sensitivity Analysis tests performed and included in the MV Analysis Report.	New Sensitivity Analysis tests on both similar and dissimilar facilities have been performed and the results have been included in the final MV Analysis Report.