Articles

- Advance Force Management Course
- Force Management Bulletin Board
- Army Flow Model
- NDAA for FY 2006
- AFMS RC Primer

A Force Management Update

A Quarterly Newsletter of the Army Force Management School 15 January 2006

ADVANCE FORCE MANAGEMENT COURSE

The annual review of the Advanced Force Management Course (AFM-C) was conducted in November of 2005. The recommended changes to the AFM-C include the incorporation of updates to course information for changes in DOD and terminology, processes and guidance. A proposed change to the sequence of instruction to incorporate and build a better understanding of the Army Force Development process was recommended. The AFM-C remains a four (4) week course. Week one deals with Strategy from DOD and Army level. The Combat Developer/Material Developer Sub-course is presented in the second week. The third week of instruction deals with Force Structure. The Force Development Sub-course is presented in the fourth week. AMF-C provides the student the processes to go from the National Security Strategy to the future Army force structure.

Barry Wright

THE FORCE MANAGEMENT BULLETIN BOARD

The basic policies and responsibilities in Army regulation (AR) 71-32 reflect sound management principles and the organization of America's Army. Force management and change have always been inseparable. However, the pace of changes in organizational orientation, technological advances, the rapid introduction of new systems, and the requirement for flexibility in priorities, has created an unprecedented fluidity in force management procedures, processes, and information. Much of the information required to conduct routine force management business was heretofore contained in ARs and did not lend itself to update and revision on a frequent and timely basis. In order to provide timely, flexible, and accurate information to implement force management policies, AR 71-32 is supported by procedures guides or "how to" manuals such as Department of the Army pamphlets (DA Pams), an electronic force management bulletin board (FMBB), and users' manuals for force management automated systems.

An electronic FMBB is established on the HQDA Decision Support System (DSS) to provide HQDA approved information Army-wide to customers working in force management related disciplines. This website contains the same information as the FMBB. These electronic media will permit the rapid update and dissemination of information to all users. The Director, Force Programs and DAMO-FDF is the Army staff (ARSTAF) proponent for the bulletin board and this website. The Director of the USAFMSA Requirements Documentation Directorate (RDD) is the executive agent for managing and updating the FMBB and website and is the only agency with a write capability to change data contained in the FMBB and website pages. The information contained in the FMBB and website sub-directories is HQDA approved, much of it was previously contained in ARs superseded by AR 71-32. This information will be used in all Army force management applications including, but not limited to, requirement and authorization documentation, combat developments, materiel developments, and official Army studies.

ARMY FOW MODEL

The Army Flow Model and Core Process Studies

The Army Flow Model (AFM) is an information support modeling system that enables the Army staff and Major Commands to rapidly assess force structure and policy decisions based on a fully integrated perspective rather than on a single functional or programmatic basis. Currently, AFM is the only system that provides these capabilities. AFM provides the capability to identify and assess proposed equipment/personnel authorization changes and predict equipment availability/readiness for both programmed and "What If" force structures and/or scenarios. AFM also directly supports the Total Army Analysis (TAA), Force Validation Committee (FVC) reviews (units activating or converting in two years) and Force Feasibility Reviews (FFR) which assess TAA impacts.

Force Validation Committee (FVC) process

The ARSTAF conducts a 1-2 year Force review (execution/ budget years) of activations/ conversions of major combat units (MCU's) as part of the Force Validation Committee (FVC) process. Special emphasis is placed on equipment modernization, personnel requirements and any follow-on actions. AFM provides complete equipment fielding (new and redistributed) feasibility analysis of near- term force structure decisions.

Force Feasibility Review (FFR) process

FFR is an event driven process that reviews force structure issues and the impacts of force structure decisions. The ARSTAF analyzes the force, to assure it is affordable, supportable and sustainable. Within the limits of personnel and budgetary constraints, the FFR determines if the force can be manned, trained, equipped, sustained, and stationed. The FFR may provide alternatives based on prior initiatives, unalterable decisions from the Army leadership or program budget decisions. AFM provides equipment and personnel authorization comparisons, projected equipment availability/readiness and end item costs of future program decisions in the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) years.

Total Army Analysis (TAA) process

The TAA is a phased force structure analysis process. It examines the projected Army force from both quantitative (rules of allocation) and qualitative (MATCH) perspectives. The product of the TAA is the Army's POM force. The POM force is based on internal and external inputs, including anticipated threats, scenarios, assumptions, Army coordination and agreements, such as allocation rules, resource assumptions, war-fighting capabilities, and infrastructure priorities. TAA and FFR provide the basis for the Army's POM development. The Army Flow Model provides complete analytical support to the TAA process enabling staff officers/ OI's to resource future force structure requirements (MATCH), assess the impacts of those decisions across the Army, and readily produce the ARSTRUC. AFM's Resource Allocation Model (RAM) is used in the simultaneity stack to match programmed units to TAA requirements based on user match criteria. RAM is also the historical database of record for TAA transactions.

Joe Albert

SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS ACTS FOR FY 2006*

The House of Representatives and the Senate resolved their differences and agreed to the Conference Report for the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2006 on the 18th of December 2005. The President signed the 2006 Defense Authorization Bill into law on the 6th of January 2006 three months into the fiscal year. In total the legislation authorizes $441.54B in budget authority (BA) for DoD and DoE defense related programs. The following are some significant items incorporated in the FY 06 Authorization Act.

NDAA FY 06 addressed acquisition reform by strengthening the existing "Nunn-McCurdy" amendment. Nunn-McCurdy requires DoD to inform Congress if a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) costs increase 15% beyond the current cost estimate and to provide Congress certification that the program is indispensable for national security should the costs exceed 25% of those estimates. The inherent weakness of Nunn-McCurdy was its toleration of updated cost estimates that disguised the "true" cost overruns. The FY 06 NDAA attempts to cure this weakness by limiting "rebaselining" and establishing two new criteria for evaluating cost growth. Cost growth is considered "significant" if it is above 15% of the original benchmark figures or 30% greater than the present estimate and growth is considered "critical" when it surpasses 25% of the initial baseline or 50% of the most recent cost estimate. Any MDAP experiencing "critical" cost increases necessitates a more critical review and requires an explanation as to the reasonableness of the expense growth and as to the national security importance for continuing the acquisition. Additionally, the legislation establishes three certification criteria for transition to Milestone B in the acquisition life cycle. In order to pass from Milestone A to B, it must be demonstrated that program technology is fully developed, that the program is fiscally executable, and that program success is highly probable.

Somewhat uniquely and in anticipation of the need for contingency funds, the Authorization Act provides $50B in supplemental funding in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The intent is to provide 6 months of continuation support for our ongoing strategic commitments with the expectation that a request for additional supplemental funds will be forthcoming in the second quarter of FY 06. The funds are provided specifically for soldier requirements, force protection, and continuing operations. In the area of force protection, $1.5 B of BA is provided for up-armored HMMWVs, add-on armor for tactical wheeled vehicles, improved body armor, IED jammers, night vision devices, and the recapitalization and modernization of Army tactical wheeled vehicles.

FY 2006 Army active duty end strength is authorized to climb from the 2005 level of 502,400 to 512,400 soldiers. Additionally the conferees gave the Secretary of Defense the power to further expand the Army between 2007 and 2009 to an end strength level of 532,400.

Noteworthy adjustments were made in the area of pay and benefits in FY 2006. Along with a 3.1% pay raise across all services, hardship duty pay more than doubled from $300 to $750 monthly; the active duty reenlistment bonus jumped from $60,000 to $90,000; the enlistment bonus doubled from $20,000 to $40,000; and a trial "recruit referral bonus" program was authorized. Under this referral program, a $1,000 bonus is awarded to Active Army, Army Reserve, or Army National Guard personnel who refer a non-immediate family member and non-prior service enlistment candidate to a recruiter. The bonus is payable upon the candidate's successful completion of both basic and advanced individual training. In addition to the referral bonus, a "transfer" bonus of as much as $2,500 is established as an inducement for active and reserve personnel willing to transfer to another service in either an active or reserve status.

Benefits for rehabilitating injured military personnel were also included in the authorization legislation. Injured service members are authorized an extra $430 pay per month during rehabilitation, military medical facilities are precluded from charging rehabilitating personnel for their meals, and travel and transportation expenses are provided for family members visiting injured service members.

Benefits for Reserve Component personnel were also addressed in the NDAA for FY 2006. Activated Reserve members access to and coverage under TRICARE Reserve Select (TRS) were enhanced, Reserve enlistment bonuses were raised from $10,000 to $20,000 and monthly "income replacement" pay of as much as $3,000 is mandated for certain involuntarily mobilized Reserve personnel. The enlistment bonus is also applicable for service members who depart active duty with less than 20 years of service, have an MOS in demand, and agree to join the Selected Reserve for at least three years. This incentive pay is referred to as an "affiliation bonus".

While indicating their support for the Future Combat System (FCS) and Army modularity, Congress has also expressed its managing, monitoring, and cost visibility concerns for both programs in the FY 06 NDAA conference report. With regard to FCS, the report language reflects these congressional concerns by directing the Comptroller General to conduct an annual assessment of the program, by restricting funding for the "Manned Ground Vehicle" effort till certain certification is provided by DoD, and by requiring subset program element (PE) code level of detail in budget requests for the FCS "Armored Systems Modernization" PE effective FY 08. The Congress's particular concern about modularity costs is reflected in the requirement

imposed upon Army to forward a report identifying each "program" in the modularity effort and "the requirements, acquisition objective, funding profile, and unfunded requirements for each program".

The macro breakdown of BA provided to the Department of Defense in the FY 06 Defense Appropriations Act is as follows: Military Personnel - $97B, Operations & Maintenance - $124B, Procurement - $77B, Research Development Test and Evaluation - $72B, Revolving and Management Funds - $2B, Other DoD Programs - $23B, and "Bridge" Supplemental - $50B. Army's portion of that BA is as follows: Military Personnel - $36B, Operations and Maintenance - $31B, Procurement - $12B, and Research Development Test and Evaluation - $11B.

* Sources used for this article:

House Armed Services Committee, Press Release, "House and Senate Conferees Approve the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2006 Conference Report", December 18, 2005
http://armedservices.house.gov/FY2006NDAAConferenceSummary.pdf

and

"Highlights of FY06 Defense Appropriations Bill", The U.S. House of Representatives: COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, December 18, 2005
http://appropriations.house.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=PressReleases.Detail&PressRelease_id=5

John Walsh

AFMS RESERVE COMPONENTS PRIMER

The Army Force Management School (AFMS) is developing a new Executive Primer entitled "The Reserve Components of the United States Military With Particular Focus on the Reserve Components of the United States Army The Army National Guard and United States Army Reserve". The primer is intended to be a thought-provoking look at the function and form of United States Reserve Components focusing on the Reserve Components (RC) of the United States Army – The United States Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. Setting the stage at the outset, the reviewer is challenged in the introduction to consider five challenging RC issues while reading the primer –

1. Is the term Reserve Components appropriate any longer?
2. Have the categories of Reserve Components been overcome by the dramatic changes in the global strategic environment?
3. Do the current mobilization statutes of Title 10 United States Code need to be amended to correlate with the current and anticipated future operational deployment requirements levied upon the Reserve Components?
4. Can the Reserve Components be over utilized?
5. Should RC force structure be a bill payer for other Army programs?

Then to facilitate issue discussion the primer addresses such topics as the historical development and legal authority for United States military forces Active and Reserve; Reserve Component identification; command and control of Reserve Components; the integration of Army Active and Reserve Components; the Reserve Component Categories; the mobilization statutes; the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve; Army AC/RC rebalance; the Posse Comitatus Act; and the "Insurrection" Act as well as other RC related subjects. The primer closes with perhaps the ultimate challenging question – What is the proper role and organizational structure for the Reserve Components of the United States Army? The primer will be placed on the AFMS web site and will be distributed to students attending AFMS RC instruction. Please forward any comments/questions concerning the primer to John Walsh email address jwalsh@afms1.belvoir.army.mil.

John Walsh