



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

~~24780~~  
121057

MISSION ANALYSIS AND  
SYSTEMS ACQUISITION DIVISION

B-211332

APRIL 7, 1983

The Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr.  
The Secretary of the Army

Attention: The Inspector General  
DAIG-AI



121057

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Subject: Mission Area Analyses Conducted by the  
Army Training and Doctrine Command  
(GAO/MASAD-83-20)

During the past 2 years, we have been reviewing the Department of Defense's (DOD's) use of mission area analyses to assess the current or projected capabilities of the services to perform their assigned missions. To that end we have in process, or have completed, several assignments. The following are particularly pertinent with respect to the Army:

- Survey of the Army's Close Combat Mission (code 953016).
- Review of the Fire Support Mission (code 953022).
- Review of DOD's Mission Area Management (code 953025).
- Survey of Land Mine Warfare (code 953028).

During each of these assignments, we examined the extent to which the Army was conducting mission area analyses to identify needs and deficiencies within the mission area under review. This approach to our work inevitably led us to examine in some detail the Army's mission area analysis process that has been established for Army-wide application by the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). Based on the cumulative results of our work to date, this report provides you with some observations on the TRADOC mission area analysis program. The report also discusses the fact that we see an opportunity for the Army to obtain additional benefits from TRADOC's mission analysis program by more comprehensively implementing Chief of

(953027)

025237  
121057

B-211332

Staff Regulation 11-15 which requires long-range plans for materiel, doctrine, training, and organization.

TRADOC MISSION AREA  
ANALYSIS PROGRAM

TRADOC's mission area analysis program was established in response to Army Regulation 1000-1 which requires that mission needs be based on an analysis of Army missions. For purposes of the TRADOC mission area analysis program, the Army's combat tasks were divided into the following 12 mission areas

- Close Combat (Light);
- Close Combat (Heavy);
- Fire Support;
- Air Defense;
- Combat Service Support;
- Aviation;
- Nuclear Defense, Bacteriological or Chemical Environment, and Offensive Chemical Warfare;
- Battlefield Nuclear Warfare;
- Engineering and Mine Warfare;
- Intelligence and Electronic Warfare;
- Communications; and
- Command and Control.

Each of these mission areas is to be analyzed by the TRADOC school or center having responsibility for that mission area, such as the Infantry School for close combat (light) and the Field Artillery School for fire support. The purpose of the analysis is to determine deficiencies in the Army's ability to carry out necessary battlefield tasks in the late 1980s and to propose potential solutions to those deficiencies. These solutions could include, for example, changes to doctrine, training, organization, or acquisition of new items of equipment.

Following completion of each analysis, the responsible school or center is required to prepare a mission area development plan. This plan describes how and when the various deficiencies will be corrected. Many of the corrective actions, however, depend on actions by other Army activities or higher levels of command.

Most of the mission area analyses and mission area development plans have been completed. It is TRADOC's intention to require the schools to update their analyses annually, and to periodically conduct each analysis again.

Each year TRADOC also intends to prepare a battlefield development plan. This plan will summarize the deficiencies found in the various mission area analyses and prioritize them according to their importance. The first plan of this type was approved by the TRADOC commander in February 1983.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF CHIEF OF STAFF REGULATION 11-15

The benefits from mission area analyses can best be obtained if detailed long-range plans are developed that reflect necessary changes to doctrine, training, organization, and materiel. These plans should tie in with the budgetary system and should include the solutions to deficiencies identified from the completed analyses. In this regard, Chief of Staff Regulation 11-15, dated May 1981, requires preparation of such long-range plans.

Currently, such a plan exists for only one of these four elements. This is the plan for materiel and is called the Army Long-Range Research, Development, and Acquisition Plan. Army officials told us that no long-range plans specifically responsive to the Chief of Staff Regulation are contemplated for doctrine and organization. However, they expect that a plan for training will be developed in the near future.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

We believe the TRADOC mission area analysis program will improve the Army's requirements determination process. Useful features of the analysis program include prioritizing deficiencies, considering alternative solutions, and preparing implementation plans to correct the deficiencies discovered. We also believe the analyses will improve the credibility of Army statements of need.

B-211332


We believe institutionalizing the mission analysis concept depends mainly on the support given it by top service as well as DOD management. We hope, therefore, that your Office, and the Office of the Chief of Staff, will continue to support the mission analysis concept as designed by TRADOC, recognizing that improvements may be required in the process as experience dictates.

In addition, because of the inherent benefits of long-range planning, we support the requirements of Chief of Staff Regulation 11-15. We believe this regulation should be fully implemented, and we encourage you to expedite the development of long-range plans for doctrine, training, and organization.

In summary, we would like to compliment the U.S. Army and specifically TRADOC on the progress they are making in conducting mission area analyses. One of the most difficult activities is deciding how to invest limited available resources to maximize combat capability. In our years of work in reviewing DOD programs, we have come to appreciate the usefulness of mission area analyses as a management tool for decisionmakers.

We are sending copies of this letter to the Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Chairmen, Senate Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Governmental Affairs; and the House Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Government Operations; and the Secretary of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

  
W. H. Sheley Jr.  
Director