

FILE

**BRAC 2005  
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)  
VTC Meeting Minutes of 30 June 2004**

Mr. Al Shaffer chaired the meeting in the absence of Dr. Sega. The list of attendees is attached. Mr. Shaffer provided a brief summary of the open issues to be presented for the TJCSG principals' decision. All issue papers covered at this meeting are attached. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

**Key Discussion Points:**

- Dr. Rohde presented the issue paper concerning how to collect data for organizations/detachments with fewer than 30 people not included on the target list.
- Dr. Stewart emphasized the importance of documenting the rationale for deciding to collect data for organizations/detachments greater than 30 people visé the BRAC threshold of greater than 300 people organization.
- Subgroup leads presented their proposed values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as well as rationale for combining the 5 test resource category MV score with the weights for OAR MV to obtain a final score of MV of a facility for T&E.
- The TJCSG principals emphasized the importance of modeling and simulation in test and evaluation arena, however, indicated ranges are still paramount to demonstrate the key performance parameters in the operational environment.
- The TJCSG principals emphasized need for stronger rationale for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values proposed by the subgroups.
- Proposed C4ISR  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values for sensors, electronics & EW are acceptable at the component level, however, stronger rationale is needed for the overall C4ISR technical perspective. OAR is critical once EW components are integrated into a platform.
- Dr. Foulkes indicated the E&T Ranges Subgroup is providing a composite MV score for OAR to the TJCSG contrary to Dr. Stewart understanding. Dr. Stewart's understanding is the OAR MV score will be parsed out by the TJCSG technical capability areas.

**Decisions:**

- The following paragraph was approved to replace the paragraph # 6 on Issue paper #6-24-04-03:
  - 6) Detachments include geographically separated units and operating locations including personnel, facilities and equipment.

The following guidelines for detachments are:

    - Formally designated detachments of greater than 30 personnel shall report in their own data call.
    - All data for detachments less than 30 personnel will be aggregated but reported separately from the owning organization.

- The values for the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  were approved as proposed by the subgroups except for the Issue Paper # 6-30-01-Enabling Chem/Bio values changed from  $\alpha = .7$  &  $\beta = .3$  to  $\alpha = .5$  &  $\beta = .5$
- The TJCSG Principals agreed to release the MV Data Call Questions.

**Action Items:**

1. Provide detailed rationale for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  values proposed by subgroups (assigned to subgroup leads; due by 1030 1 July 2004)
2. Provide rationale for picking 30 people threshold for reporting data (assigned to subgroup leads; due by 1030 1 July 2004).

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_



Mr. Alan R. Shaffer

Acting Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group

**Attachments**

1. Critical Unresolved Issues (as of 30 June 2004)
2. CIT Issue Papers 30 June 2004

**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**June 30, 2004**  
**Attendees**

**Members:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, OSD (alternate Chair for Dr. Ron Sega)  
Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force via VTC  
Dr. John Foulkes, Army  
Mr. George Ryan, Navy (Alternate for RADM Cohen, Navy)  
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines via telephone

**Other:**

Dr. Jim Short, OSD  
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC Office  
Mr. Al Goldstyan, AF CIT Rep via VTC  
Mr. Roger Florence, DOD IG  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep  
Mr. Harshad Shah, TJCSG Assistant  
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army, A/L/S/S Subgroup  
COL Pete DeSalva, Marines Analysis Team Lead  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep  
LTCDR Jim Melone, Navy Analysis Team Rep  
Dr. Karen Higgins, Navy, Wpns & Armts Subgroup Lead  
COL Steve Evans, Marines, Analysis Team

## Critical Unresolved Issues (As of 28 Jun 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Concur/Non-Concur With Issue Paper
6-24-04-03(2)	Target List Criteria	Dr. Bob Rohde	Approval of Any Criteria Change or Target List Changes	Army – AF – Navy – Marines –
6-30-04-ALSS	Combined T&E a and B Weights for ALSS	Mr. Thom Mathes	Approve Proposed Weights	Army – AF – Navy – Marines –
6-30-04-Wpns & Armts	Combined T&E a and B Weights for Weapons & Armaments	Dr. Karen Higgins	Approve Proposed Weights	Army – AF – Navy – Marines –
6-30-04-C4ISR	Combined T&E a and B Weights for C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mleziva	Approve Proposed Weights	Army – AF – Navy – Marines –

CIT NOT REQUIRED FOR THIS WEIGHTING PROCESS

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

1

## Critical Unresolved Issues (As of 28 Jun 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Recommendations
6-30-04-Enabling	Combined T&E a and B Weights for Enabling Technologies	Mr. Bill Berry	Approve Proposed Weights	Army – AF – Navy – Marines –
6-30-04-05	Definition of "Fielding" for ACAT Questions	Dr. Short	Choose one of two options for definition of "Fielding"	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur

CIT NOT REQUIRED FOR THIS WEIGHTING PROCESS

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

2

## DATA CALL TARGET LIST

Issue #6-24-04-03

**Issue:** Develop a draft target facilities list.

**Point of Contact:** Mr. Larry Schuette

### Issue Summary: **DRAFT Target Facilities**

6/19/04 Final Update with All Subgroups' comments

6/21 Post Final Update with Navy BRAC insertions, fixed US ARMY redundancy fixed guideline #5 per Matt, #6 per Larry Schuette

6/22 – Version as of 1400 (the lost version: This was recreated from a printed hardcopy and the AF list provided by LTCOL Pride

6/22/04 – Version as of 2014. This version includes the Army list provided by Peter Cahill, and the inclusions/deletions provided by Navy BRAC office by Sowa email 6/18/04 0704

6/23/04 – Version as of 1614. Added back the Navy Medical, added Alexandria VA [PEO JSF] and verified that Navy COMOPTEVFOR is accounted for.

6/24/04 – Version as of 0700 Changes noted by Brian Simmons or Tom Mathes, Changes caught by Bob Rohde, and changes to add the multiple locations of ERDC labs.

The four technical JCSG subgroups developed common Guidelines, and compiled an integrated list for “Target Facilities” as listed below, so that “like facilities” can be better compared for Capacity, Mil Value and Scenario Analysis. The Guidelines explain the logic behind including, excluding or further clarifying those “target facilities” that are to receive Military Value Questions. In addition, where appropriate, the subgroups will send Requests for Clarification of Capacity data to ensure data is restructured in accordance with this list.

Guidelines for the creating the Target Facilities list:

- 1) Use the largest logical “facility” that will enable comparison of “like facilities” without unduly breaking into fine detail where little value is added.
- 2) Physical location along with specific element/ unit/ organization are noted for each ‘target facility’.
- 3) To ensure “inclusivity” and avoid a priori assumptions where there are questions about the current capacity data call, the basis of the list is all current respondents to the Capacity Data Call with the following caveats:
  - a. Level of activity reported was a filter to exclude respondents with very small or questionable RDATE&E function (as a percentage of workload or a low value). These included small support detachments..
- 4) Additional facilities were added to the list of Capacity Data Call respondents where activity was expected, but not seen and/or where Requests for Clarification have gone forward.

- 5) Headquarters and PEO/PM organizations are to be listed separately from RDT&E facilities to better delineate “like facilities” except when they are physically collocated and integrated with the RDT&E facilities. This separation will reduce the probability of “double counting” of funding for “like facilities”.
- 6) In general, organizational elements of fewer than 30 people are not separately identified on the target list by their location. However, data is still required to capture the full scope of related activities for these elements. For organizational elements of fewer than 30 people, data should be included with the owning organization, but be separately identifiable, i.e. include the location of the element. Any physical infrastructure that is either owned or controlled by the element should also be included and identified by its location. If an organizational element of 30 or more people that belongs to an organization on the target list is not currently separately identified on the list, do separately identify it and treat it as a separate organization for response purposes. MILDEP BRAC Offices may elect to create lists of elements consistent with the prior guidance to assist the owning organizations in determining which elements need to be separately reported and which may be included in the owning organizations submission.
- 6) Delete this bullet since major equipment (greater than \$3M) will be separately reported elsewhere in capacity (Note 3)

The lists below are derived by expanding a subset of the organizations/ installations/ facilities that responded to the capacity call. TJCSG will need to write a memo justifying why we dropped certain organizations from the list of who should respond to DC #2.

*Notes:*

- 1) *This is required to be able to separate the owning organization data from all geographically separated detachments. It may be possible that a significant % of an owning organization's data is attributable to multiple detachments of less/more than 30 persons each. Requires a change to the data call structure.*
- 2) The current MilVal Data Call construct does not provide for owning organizations to break out all necessary data (some is allowed for) for their detachments of any size. To get what we want will require some restructuring of the data call.
- 3) *Referring to a previous version of comments: There should be no reference to “overseeing infrastructure”, as some detachments have a significant infrastructure responsibility, and some do not.*

POSITIONS

AF: Concur—I think

Army—Concur

Navy – Non Concur, see Marine

Marine—Non Concur, but primarily because the language is too confusing / vague.

CIT Chair Position:

1. All CIT members concur except for para 6 above.
2. Para 6 has been polished so many times, it is virtually unintelligible
3. The position every one seems to agree with is:
  - a. Detachments under 30 shall not (ever) report by themselves
  - b. The TJCSG needs to collect the information for Detachments over 30 people
  - c. The difference in the CIT is:
    - I. One group of CIT thought is the information for units over 30 should always be reported as a separate facility
    - II. The other group of CIT thought is that the information for units over 30 should be reported by the parent unit with the ability of the TJCSG to disaggregate.
4. I believe the final recommendation does not matter; provided we have the information needed to support moving detachments. Since the Services and field units have displayed a talent for obfuscation of the data input, I recommend we have formally designated detachments with over 30 people report separately (I concur with the Army and AF).

Paragraph 6 should read:

- Detachments with fewer than 30 personnel shall not (ever) report by themselves
- Formally designated detachments of greater than 30 people shall report independently
- Geographically separated units that are not formally designated as detachments shall report through their owning organization.

**MILITARY VALUE SCORING: PLAN FOR COMBINED T&E; ALSS**  
**Issue #6-30-04-ALSS**

**Issue:** The TJCSG must approve the weights for combining the 5 test resource category military value score with the weights for open air range military value score to obtain a final score for military value of a facility for test and evaluation (follow on to 06-24-04-01).

**Air, Land, Sea and Space.**

**Point of Contact:** Mr. Mathes

**Issue Summary:**

- In 06-24-04-01, the TJCSG decided to allow each subgroup to define the weights ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) for combining the military value scores of the different test resource category. This will complete the equation:  
Test and Evaluation Mil Val for Facility =  $\alpha$  (MV 5 test resources) +  $\beta$  (MV for OAR)
- Each DTAP area may have it's own weights
- Weights shall add to 1; for areas with greater reliance on open air ranges, the weights for  $\beta$  will be greater
- Weights are justified, but this will be a subjective based on expert military judgment.

**Recommendation (ALSS):**

1. Air Platforms:  $\alpha = 40\%$                        $\beta = 60\%$

Rationale: Air Platforms are becoming increasingly dependent on Modeling & Simulation and the application of sophisticated analysis tools such as Hardware-in-the-Loop facilities, Integration Laboratories, special Measurement Facilities and Integrated Systems Test Facilities including Anechoic Chambers. This demand is driving significant enhancements to the MS&A toolset focused upon increased fidelity and applicability across the full spectrum from subsystem to system of systems spanning air, land, sea, and space connectivity. These non-OAR elements are currently critical to the fielding of air platforms but they have not eliminated the need for OAR work. As these M&S and laboratory tools rapidly mature, they are being paced by ever increasing demands resulting from higher levels of systems integration. Any significant changes to the above factors are more than a decade away.

2. Sea Platforms:  $\alpha = 35\%$                        $\beta = 65\%$

Rationale: This is based upon its contribution to full-spectrum research, development, test and evaluation, engineering and fleet support center for

submarines, autonomous underwater systems, and offensive and defensive weapons systems associated with undersea warfare, as well as for ship hull, mechanical and electrical systems, surface ship combat systems, coastal warfare systems, and other offensive and defensive systems associated with surface warfare.

3. Ground Platforms:  $\alpha = 40\%$        $\beta = 60\%$

Rationale: This based upon the need for lighter and more versatile vehicles to achieve a dominant maneuver capability that incorporate surveillance and targeting systems that can coordinate the use of a wide range of weapons. Weapon systems are becoming increasingly more complex, are required to operate in a Joint/Coalition environment, require a tremendous amount of integration, and all at a time of decreasing budgets and accelerated schedules. And yes indeed, PMs are being driven to use computer modeling and simulation, as well as physical simulation more aggressively. The requirement, however, to do more "live" testing, on the ranges has increased. It is needed to provide the VV&A for the M&S, but more importantly, to meet the ever increasing demands on demonstrating critical issues in as realistic an operational environment as possible for these increasingly complex systems. There will continue to be significant emphasis on the 5 "non-OAR" categories to do a lot of the work that can't be done on the ranges; but that just places an even greater burden on the ranges to demonstrate the performance of these complex systems-of-systems for the combatant commanders in the context of joint forces and seamless integrated networks, all the while trying to overcome threat forces on a dimension that we have never experienced before.

4. Space Platforms:  $\alpha = 70\%$        $\beta = 30\%$

Rationale: This is based upon its contribution to missile developmental engineering and production surveillance, buildup and launch of high altitude (up to 350 miles) suborbital research rocket payloads, and ballistic missile and theatre missile defense interceptor technology demonstrator programs.

**CIT Recommendations:**

**MILITARY VALUE SCORING: PLAN FOR COMBINED T&E  
W&A; NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY  
Issue #6-30-04-Wpns & Arms**

**Issue:** The TJCSG must approve the weights for combining the 5 test resource category military value score with the weights for open air range military value score to obtain a final score for military value of a facility for test and evaluation (follow on to 06-24-04-01).

**Weapons & Armaments**

**Point of Contact:** Dr. Higgins

**Issue Summary:**

- In 06-24-04-01, the TJCSG decided to allow each subgroup to define the weights ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) for combining the military value scores of the different test resource category. This will complete the equation:  
Test and Evaluation Mil Val for Facility =  $\alpha$  (MV 5 test resources) +  $\beta$  (MV for OAR)
- Each DTAP area may have its own weights
- Weights shall add to 1; for areas with greater reliance on open air ranges, the weights for  $\beta$  will be greater
- Weights are justified, but this will be a subjective based on expert military judgment.

**Recommendation (W&A):**

**1. Weapons:  $\alpha = 0.3$ ;  $\beta = 0.7$**

**Rationale:** OAR coefficient greater weighting as the other Test Resources. Usage, uniqueness, and replaceability for both current & future use are considered in these judgments. Weapons and Armaments T&E currently relies heavily on all six of these assets. As simulation becomes more possible and affordable and as FORCEnet increases in importance with its complex integrated battlespace scenarios simulation and other integration and system level facilities increase in utility. These simulated environments are, however, somewhat more portable and less unique than are open air ranges, and thus have less weight. W&A relies heavily on land, air and sea assets to test complex weapons systems against various air, land and sea targets. Testing includes actual launches from platforms against simulated or real targets, interaction with other platforms, and explosive detonation of the actual weapons. As weapons continue to evolve in both speed and distance dimensions, criticality of also OAR increases.

**2. Nuclear Technology:  $\alpha = 0.8$ ;  $\beta = 0.2$**

Rationale: Nuclear analysis requires use of some Open Air Ranges, e.g. environmental, hardening etc. There must be some assurance that these ranges are preserved for the future, thus there is some weight given to OAR, though it is less than the other types of T&E facilities.

**CIT Recommendations:**

**MILITARY VALUE SCORING: PLAN FOR COMBINED T&E; C4ISR**  
**Issue #6-30-04-C4ISR**

**Issue:** The TJCSG must approve the weights for combining the 5 test resource category military value score with the weights for open air range military value score to obtain a final score for military value of a facility for test and evaluation (follow on to 06-24-04-01).

C4ISR.

**Point of Contact:** Mr. Mlezvia

**Issue Summary:**

- In 06-24-04-01, the TJCSG decided to allow each subgroup to define the weights ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) for combining the military value scores of the different test resource category. This will complete the equation:  
Test and Evaluation Mil Val for Facility =  $\alpha$  (MV 5 test resources) +  $\beta$  (MV for OAR)
- Each DTAP area may have it's own weights
- Weights shall add to 1; for areas with greater reliance on open air ranges, the weights for  $\beta$  will be greater
- Weights are justified, but this will be a subjective based on expert military judgment.

**Recommendation (C4ISR):**

If the MV(OAR) for the Technical facility is zero,  $MV(T\&E) = MV(\text{non-OAR})$

If the MV(OAR) for the Technical facility is non-zero,  $MV(T\&E) = a(MV(\text{non-OAR})) + b(MV(OAR))$  where:

1. Information Systems Tech:  $\alpha = .85$      $\beta = .15$

Rationale: In C4ISR, OAR is just one of 6 TRCs, and the C4ISR community generally employs Ranges belonging to others when one is needed

2. Sensors, Electronics, and EW:  $\alpha = .65$      $\beta = .35$

Rationale: In Sensors, Ranges are one of three roughly equal physical assets, with Facilities and Equipment being the other two.

**CIT Recommendations:**

## **MILITARY VALUE SCORING: PLAN FOR COMBINED T&E; Enabling Issue #6-30-04-Enabling**

**Issue:** The TJCSG must approve the weights for combining the 5 test resource category military value score with the weights for open air range military value score to obtain a final score for military value of a facility for test and evaluation (follow on to 06-24-04-01).

**Enabling.**

**Point of Contact:** Dr. Berry / Foster / Guard

### **Issue Summary:**

- In 06-24-04-01, the TJCSG decided to allow each subgroup to define the weights ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) for combining the military value scores of the different test resource category. This will complete the equation:  
Test and Evaluation Mil Val for Facility =  $\alpha$  (MV 5 test resources) +  $\beta$  (MV for OAR)
- Each DTAP area may have it's own weights
- Weights shall add to 1; for areas with greater reliance on open air ranges, the weights for  $\beta$  will be greater
- Weights are justified, but this will be a subjective based on expert military judgment.

### **Recommendation (Enabling):**

1. Chem / Bio Def:  $\alpha = .7$   $\beta = .3$

Rationale: OAR testing with simulants is not a major part of the T&E program for CBD; Most of the T&E work in this area involves M&S vice OAR testing

2. Materials and Processes:  $\alpha = .9$   $\beta = .1$

Rationale: OAR has limited value in M&P T&E; T&E is done almost exclusively in test chambers and other measurement facilities

3. Bio Medical:  $\alpha = .9$   $\beta = .1$

Rationale: Biomedical is performed almost exclusively in a laboratory environment or other measurement facility.

4. Human Systems:  $\alpha = .9$   $\beta = .1$

Rationale: OAR for Human Systems testing is limited to a very few training scenarios.

5. Battlespace Environments:  $\alpha = .7$   $\beta = .3$

Rationale: A reasonable amount of work in Battlespace Environments T&E involves open air ranges. Most effort in this area involves the use of M&S techniques vice OARs.

**CIT Recommendations:**

**Definition of “Fielding” for ACAT Questions**  
**Issue #6-30-04-05**

**Issue:** Two Mil Val Questions use a term “fielded” which is likely to result in inconsistent responses unless defined.

**Point of Contact:** Dr. Rohde (with Matt Mlezvia & Jim Short)

**Issue Summary:**

- Reference #TECH023 (DoD #3022) : Acquisition Category (ACAT) Delivered Count (I/II) RD(A)T&E and Reference #TECH024 (DoD #3023) : Acquisition Category (ACAT) Delivered Count (III/IV) RD(A)T&E direct the identification of ACAT “programs that have been fielded during FY 01-03”
- “Fielded” is not defined, although interpretation the term affects whether a specific program is reported (Interpretations could range from first production to Full Operating Capability). The Army uses a term First Unit Equipped (FUE).
- Neither Joint Publication 1-02, Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms nor DoD Acquisition Regulations or Instructions define the term “fielded.”
  - Section 3.8.5. of DoD Instruction 5000.2 addresses Full-Rate Production and Deployment as follows “Continuation into full-rate production results from a successful Full-Rate Production Decision Review by the MDA (or person designated by the MDA). This effort delivers the fully funded quantity of systems and supporting materiel and services for the program or increment to the users. During this effort, units shall attain Initial Operational Capability.”
  - Joint Publication 1-02 defines initial operational capability (**IOC**) as “the first attainment of the capability to employ effectively a weapon, item of equipment, or system of approved specific characteristics that is manned or operated by an adequately trained, equipped, and supported military unit or force.”
  - The DAU AT&L Knowledge Sharing System states that the difference between FUE and IOC is that unit not only has possession of the new materiel system (FUE), but can fully use it in an operational environmental (IOC). The IOC is system specific in that what constitutes the IOC for any particular system is defined in its Operational Requirements Document.

**Army Recommendation:**

- Insert the following definition of “fielded” in both questions. “Fielded refers to attaining IOC as defined in JCS Pub 1-02, the first attainment of the capability to employ effectively a weapon, item of equipment or system of approved specific characteristics, and which is manned and operated by an adequately trained, equipped and supported military force or unit.”

Army: Concur

Navy: Concur

Air Force: Concur

Marines: Concur

**Air Force Recommendation:**

- Insert the following definition of “fielded” in both questions. “Fielded refers the first attainment of the capability to employ effectively a weapon, item of equipment or system of approved specific characteristics, and which is manned and operated by an adequately trained, equipped and supported military force or unit.” Also refer to JCS Pub 1-02.

Army: Non-concur

Navy: Non-concur

Air Force: Non-concur

Marines: Non-concur