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The high level of mission readiness that has long distinguished US military forces is under siege on many fronts. A decade of war has eaten into readiness resources, pushing warfighters to extraordinary operational tempos, condensing training, and stressing equipment to the breaking point. Readiness is consumed as fast as we can build it. The constantly changing threat landscape further complicates the readiness challenge because warfighters must be trained and equipped to confront a variety of potential adversaries on battlefields that are evolving irregularly, asymmetrically, and rapidly. In addition, budget cuts are forcing reductions in existing force structure, manpower, training, and maintenance, and constraining investments in future readiness. Consequently, the Department of Defense (DoD) must find innovative ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the readiness production process in the face of growing readiness requirements and shrinking readiness resources. “We cannot take the readiness of our force for granted. We cannot send our soldiers into combat unprepared,” said US Army Chief of Staff Gen. Raymond Odierno, regarding looming readiness shortfalls. “If we don’t have the resources to ensure their readiness, our soldiers will be the ones who pay the price.”

The key to ensuring mission readiness is having a clear understanding of the trade-offs among requirements, resources and capabilities, costs, and risks. Decision makers must be able to see how each element impacts the others from a readiness vantage point, so they can allocate resources most effectively to achieve the highest levels of readiness. This requires solutions that are driven by a deep operational understanding, backed by analytical rigor, informed by the right data, and enabled by tools and technology. Booz Allen Hamilton is helping military organizations develop and implement readiness decision-support solutions that go beyond simply viewing and reporting current readiness status. Our approach integrates the operational, analytical, and technical dimensions of the readiness production process to arm organizations with the robust capability to measure, visualize, and analyze how their decisions impact readiness—today and in the future. With declining fiscal resources and an asymmetric, continuously evolving threat, DoD leaders must have the right information to make informed decisions that ensure mission success, while increasing efficiency and minimizing risk and cost.

Our experience shows that an effective readiness decision-support solution is composed of four major building blocks:

- Focus on the Specific Readiness Challenges or Goals to Be Addressed
- Create an Analytical Framework to Form the Right Relationships Among Requirements, Resources, and Costs
- Analyze, Integrate, and Aggregate the Data You Need
- Apply the Right Tools and Technologies

When developed and implemented using this approach, readiness decision-support solutions model the right readiness business processes; capture, validate, and apply the right data; and incorporate the right methodologies and metrics to produce actionable results to strengthen current and future readiness to meet mission goals. Several military organizations are already applying these building blocks to ensure that leaders are armed with readiness solutions that truly meet their needs.

Why Current Readiness Reporting Systems Are No Longer Enough

Readiness measures the ability of forces to carry out their assigned missions. Readiness can be assessed at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels; and it can be measured by qualitative assessments, such as a commander’s report that reflects judgment,

---

experience, and observed performance, and by quantitative assessments of personnel, training, equipment usage, maintenance cycles, supply chains, and other readiness factors. The Defense Readiness Reporting Systems (DRRS) and service-specific DRRS reporting programs, such as the Army DRRS-A, Navy DRRS-N, and Marine Corps DRRS-MC, collect current readiness and near-term projections from units with the goal of generating objective, accurate, and timely qualitative and quantitative readiness assessments. DoD and the military services have made great strides in implementing these readiness reporting systems and now have the capability to view and monitor current readiness status.

When the military could buy the readiness that forces needed, these reporting systems provided sufficient decision support; however, in today’s environment, these solutions are no longer sufficient to answer the harder, more complex questions faced by military leaders. For example, existing readiness metrics typically measure a unit’s level of readiness at a particular point in time but not how well the unit is progressing toward its planned readiness goals. This limits an organization’s ability to understand the current state and make informed changes, if needed, to achieve its goals. Similarly, current systems often assess readiness for just a single mission rather than the variety of missions that may be required, including the differing costs to man, train, and equip forces for each assigned mission. Readiness must be assessed from the right mission context. A humanitarian assistance/disaster relief mission is drastically different than a major combat operation. Some readiness systems also suffer from data that is unreliable, incomplete, or missing altogether. In addition, the quantitative methodologies that are used to measure the relationship between resources and readiness are usually inventory-based only—measuring what the force has versus what it should have. This approach lacks the ability to prioritize resources according to their importance in achieving the mission or to measure the readiness impact if specific resources are unavailable. In a declining fiscal environment, measuring everything with the same impact does not enable decision makers to make effective readiness-based trade-off decisions.

Another weakness of many systems is an inability to connect costs to readiness, making it difficult for decision makers to adequately prepare readiness-related budgets, justify needed readiness funding, or make readiness-based allocation decisions. Military leaders recognize, and are attempting to address, these and other challenges; however, without the right decision-support solution, they often must rely on readiness reporting outputs that are reactive, time-intensive, ad hoc, or manual, and do not completely address their needs. Instead, leaders need processes, metrics, data, and systems that yield repeatable and sustainable readiness assessments to support timely decision making.

The Readiness Production Process

How can military leaders achieve a comprehensive view of readiness that shows the trade-offs among requirements, resources and capabilities, costs, and risks? Readiness can be viewed as a supply-and-demand challenge. As shown in Exhibit 1, demand is driven by requirements to provide trained and ready forces for enduring, emergent, and contingency missions. The supply is composed of the personnel, equipment, training, ordnance, networks, facilities, and other resources available or needed to fulfill the readiness requirements. Equally important, resources also include the funding needed to procure, operate, and maintain the supply, which means that future planning and budgeting processes must factor in internal costs and total ownership costs. Military
forces pool these resources together to deliver the capability to achieve the mission. Lessons learned through operational employments are fed back into the cycle for continuous adaption to ensure future readiness.

Given current budget constraints and expanding mission responsibilities, the military services do not have the funds to acquire the resources and capabilities needed to meet all of their current requirements. However, deploying forces that are not fully manned, trained, and equipped puts lives at risk. Decision makers must ensure that resources and capabilities meet requirements—that the supply satisfies the demand—to enable mission accomplishment within fiscal constraints. Readiness gaps create operational risks. To combat those risks, one of the chief goals of an effective readiness decision-support solution is to show the impact of resource allocation on risk. It is not enough to simply know what resources cost; decision makers also need to know how different resource levels and mixes impact risk. Consequently, the process must also be informed by operational experts who truly understand an organization’s specific missions, including associated risks. This holistic view enables decision makers to allocate scarce readiness resources to minimize overall risk.
Guesswork is insufficient in a time of rising threats and falling budgets. Decision makers need capabilities that can collect and aggregate readiness data; analyze the trade-offs among requirements, resources and capabilities, costs, and risks; and then display the measured assessments at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels. They need the ability to analyze these elements within and across multiple military units for readiness tasks—such as readiness management and monitoring, root-cause analysis, portfolio management, and budget-impact assessment and justification processes. The solution framework should have a foundational consistency that guides its approach, but it also should be flexible enough to evolve with a rapidly changing operational environment, address unanticipated questions and needs, and support diverse warfighting capabilities. The overall goal is to generate timely, reliable, and precise readiness information to guide decision makers and help them make the most effective use of readiness resources.

The Building Blocks of Effective Readiness Decision-Support Solutions

Many military organizations have engaged Booz Allen to help them strengthen their readiness analysis and decision-support capabilities. They rely on the firm’s knowledge and experience with military operations, along with our technical and analytical capabilities, to support their readiness goals. Although readiness solutions must be tailored to the unique requirements of each organization, we have found that all successful implementations are built upon four foundational building blocks. These four building blocks are essential for developing and implementing solutions that address today’s complex readiness challenges.

Building Block No. 1: Focus on the Specific Readiness Challenges or Goals to Be Addressed

Readiness solutions can be aimed at improving any activity or element within the readiness production process, ranging from mission-based portfolio...
management at the strategic level to manning, training, and equipping forces within a force-provider organization at the tactical level. Whatever the challenge or goal, organizations must clearly identify, map, and assess the readiness production process that will be addressed. Similarly, the organization must have a clearly defined end-state with envisioned capabilities that the solution has to deliver. A solution that is too broadly or too narrowly focused will likely be inefficient, ineffective, or both.

Achieving the right focus requires a deep understanding of the readiness production process. Readiness consists of numerous interrelated factors, and measuring them involves a complex mix of stakeholders, supporting policies and guidance, and tools and technologies. The readiness process is influenced at the highest level by national strategies and policies for achieving strategic objectives, and these elements drive the generation of operational requirements, which, in turn, shape the force-generation process. Thus, in assessing its readiness process, an organization should not only examine what happens but also who carries it out (stakeholders), how it is carried out (tools and technologies), and why (policy, guidance, and other drivers). The assessment should include an understanding of the current state, including benefits and challenges, as well as an understanding of the gaps or weaknesses to be resolved.

Ultimately, readiness solutions must be driven by the organization’s mission, needs, and operating construct. They must take into account each stakeholder’s perspective. Immersion in the operational environment, with a keen understanding of the mission, is critical to getting the solution right, especially to ensure that readiness solutions support the process and not the other way around. A thorough understanding and assessment of an organization’s readiness production process will ensure that the solutions are focused on an organization’s readiness challenges and goals.

Tackling the Readiness Challenge

An effective readiness decision-support solution enables the Department of Defense and military services to answer a variety of essential readiness questions:

- What is my current readiness? What is driving my current readiness status?
- Where are my gaps? What should I do about them?
- What resources do I need to bring my readiness to the right level? How much do they cost?
- Where is my overlap? Can I create efficiencies through consolidation or reallocation of existing resources?
- Can I deconstruct my readiness from mission to capability to task to resource so I can demonstrate readiness for the mission?
- What are my mission priorities? How do I prioritize my resources from a mission perspective?
- What are my resource requirements?
- What are my available resources? Do I have sufficient resources to accomplish my assigned mission?
- What are my most/least important resources?
- What is my projected/future readiness? What do I need to do to make proactive changes now so I am ready when I need to be?
- Is my readiness progressing according to plan? Or am I ahead of or behind plan? If behind, where am I off track?
- What is the optimal allocation of my resources? If I have to make any cuts, where do I make them so they have the least impact on my readiness?
- What are my risks?
- What is the readiness impact to my reduced budget? How can I articulate it and justify my resource requirements?
Building Block No. 2: Create an Analytical Framework to Form the Right Relationships Among Requirements, Resources, and Costs

Building Block No. 1 provides the initial information by mapping the readiness process, uncovering gaps, and identifying where relationships need to be formed. This illuminates the foundation for the framework that needs to be established. Too often, organizations work within the confines of available data alone, evaluating the data they already have in the format they can retrieve it and then trying to determine what can be measured from it. Instead, up front definition of what readiness questions need to be answered and the outputs that need to be produced drives the design for the analytical framework.

With this knowledge, organizations can design an analytical framework for creating, aligning, and measuring readiness relationships. Where relationships need to be formed between readiness elements, methodologies can be applied to associate them. For example, after an organization identifies the need to measure the impact that personnel or equipment resources have on mission requirements, subject matter experts can apply their understanding of the operational environment to assign qualitative levels of impacts that each element has on the mission. The methodologies can be applied to translate those qualitative priorities into quantitative priorities in a repeatable, traceable, and consistent way. Doing this can provide richer, more nuanced measures of readiness that show, for example, that resource sufficiency is more than the sum total of on-hand equipment inventory or the sum total of available personnel. The process may also show that not all resources are needed for all missions, and some resources are more important than others. Organizations can use this knowledge to apply methodologies that give weight—that is, higher priority—to resources that have a higher impact on readiness. This provides a more accurate measure of readiness to guide resource allocation. Associating costs to resources in this framework results in a powerful solution that can prioritize deficiencies and optimize the allocation of resources.

When designing the analytical framework for readiness decision support, organizations should build in the flexibility to keep pace with changes in force structure, evolving mission demands, fluctuating resources, and emerging technologies and methodologies. This enables the solution to go beyond measuring and reporting current readiness, and arms decision makers with the mission readiness-based justification for other processes, such as equipment lifecycle decisions, future force structure compositions, and budget submissions.

Building Block No. 3: Analyze, Integrate, and Aggregate the Data You Need

After an organization creates the analytical framework, the next step is finding the data that is needed to populate it. Organizations must ask themselves:

- Do we already collect this data?
- Do other databases have it?
- If we don’t already have it or can’t obtain it elsewhere, how can we get it?

Organizations are often surprised to discover that data they assume is readily available is either not available or riddled with data challenges. For example, data inaccuracies in external, stove-piped systems are dramatically brought to light when the data is exposed to the organization that knows the data best. Data may also be inaccurate or incomplete; and there may be conflicts between “authoritative” databases, with no way to discern which information is accurate. Sometimes data within a system changes without traceability to what information changed or why; or the data isn’t kept up to date. Extracting critical readiness data from legacy systems can be especially challenging, because
they cannot easily integrate with other systems and are often too expensive to modernize. Integrating data sources with different levels of security classification also creates difficulties, as does integrating data from systems with inconsistent standards or metadata. These and numerous other challenges can make it difficult for organizations to obtain the data they need for readiness decision making.

Such obstacles can be overcome with an effective data-engineering process consisting of these basic steps:

- **Step 1:** Articulate clearly the data requirements.
- **Step 2:** Evaluate extracts from potential data sources and identify the best target source.
- **Step 3:** Create a formal agreement among data owners to establish mechanisms for how data will be shared, how change will be managed, and how they will collaboratively respond when things go wrong.
- **Step 4:** Establish an ongoing engineering process to integrate data with the most sophisticated means possible while accommodating legacy restrictions requiring extraction, transformation, and loading processes.
- **Step 5:** Develop and apply verification and validation processes to proactively identify data conflicts, inaccuracies, and missing data and to ensure the right output is produced.
- **Step 6:** Develop a feedback mechanism to correct errors at the source.

The data engineering process must be capable of supporting data sources of varying capabilities, whether they are enterprise systems, stand-alone systems, or manual processes for collecting data or generating files. The process also must support a variety of transfer methods to ensure that data is secure, and that it keeps the integrity of the dataset. For example, highly sensitive personnel data must be handled accordingly, and data from “pass through” systems cannot be altered from that which exists in the authoritative source. In addition, the process should employ an automated quality assurance process that can be continuously enhanced as more issues are found, so it can eventually evolve into 100 percent validation. Throughout the process, data engineers should work with data owners to improve their datasets, rather than trying to improve the data after it is received. The latter approach tends to exacerbate problems in the long run. Organizations should be transparent about data issues and work continuously to improve bad data over time, while resolving conflicts and special circumstances with business rules that are incorporated into the process.

Data should be analyzed and scrutinized with the same level of rigorous, detailed analysis as applied in the first two building blocks. Data should be validated at each step—from the time it is received until after it is incorporated into the solution. Getting the right data for readiness decision making is a complex process, but reliable data is essential to achieving actionable results.
Building Block No. 4: Apply the Right Tools and Technologies

The first three building blocks provide the rigor needed to set the readiness solution on the path to success by identifying the right policy, process, metrics, data, and functional, security, and technical requirements. Leading with the first three building blocks also provides the right baseline from which to evaluate technology solutions. This approach generates the information needed to make sound technical investment decisions, particularly by giving decision makers a clear understanding of the technical trade-offs among alternatives. It guides the organization to the right technology decision instead of trying to back into a solution when technology is selected first. A readiness solution should be designed for the mission, designed in partnership with stakeholders at every step, designed for the operator, and designed for flexibility.

In addition, organizations should be guided by these key principles as they select specific technologies for each solution:

- Start with the end-state vision when designing the solution to ensure that it will be scalable to support long-term as well as near-term needs.
- Approach the solution from a technology-agnostic perspective, thus allowing the requirements (operational, functional, data, analytical, security) to drive the solution.
- Build security into the solution from the beginning to protect information and maintain compliance with network policies. Bolting it on after the fact requires rework.
- Involve stakeholders early. Ensure they verify and validate requirements in a way that reflects how they will use the solution, such as by developing interactive mock-ups with working “click streams” that mimic a live system and true user experience.
- Create an open and collaborative environment that brings diverse skill sets together to evaluate the problem from all angles, facilitates joint problem-solving, and promotes user adoption through transparency.
- Assess the technical, functional, and cost trade-offs of potential technologies in order to make informed investment decisions, including calculating return on investment.
- Provide flexibility to adjust to changing priorities and requirements.

Too often, the urgent need for a readiness solution drives an organization to move too quickly into technical development and implementation. Leading with technology rather than with a clear understanding of the readiness problem to be solved and the goals to be achieved can result in suboptimal solutions, no matter how fast they are delivered. More likely, this approach ends up costing more time and money and still falls short of the goal while leaving dissatisfied stakeholders in its wake.

As organizations put in place these four building blocks, they also should be guided by two important principles:

- **Make bite-sized improvements to readiness decision-support capabilities.** Although it is possible to build a complete, end-to-end readiness solution, this is probably not feasible, given current budgets constraints, nor is it necessary. Most organizations
already have functioning elements of a solution in place. Before embarking on a project, organizations should assess their current readiness solutions to identify their highest priority needs, such as attacking data problems, applying prioritization methodologies for a more accurate output, or incorporating a validation and verification process. With modest investment, organizations can then build on existing infrastructure to address their most pressing needs.

- **Integrate diverse operational, technical, and analytical skills into a cohesive team to jointly develop readiness solutions.** Although most organizations tap into the expertise of operational, technical, and analytical teams to create readiness solutions, too often these three groups work separately, in a linear fashion, or stay within their specific roles. This inhibits much of the creative problem-solving required for a complex issue such as readiness. In contrast, bringing together experts from different perspectives to work jointly on the project spurs creative insights that can solve unanticipated problems or address the unique requirements of a particular organization. Although this approach might seem more expensive, organizations can create more cost-effective solutions by integrating their operational, technical, and analytical capabilities from the beginning and throughout the process.

**Conclusion**

All military organizations are readiness stakeholders in some way, and all face similar challenges. Gone is the era of simply “buying” readiness. Constrained budgets and rapidly evolving and expanding mission requirements create a compelling need for organizations to improve their readiness decision-support capabilities. Organizations share a common goal of making better—and more analytically informed—decisions regarding increasingly scarce resources.

Improving readiness decision making begins with an understanding of the readiness production process. Each organization must rigorously assess its process—across all areas and from every angle—to identify problems and guide the creation of targeted solutions that can have the highest impact on improving decision making and readiness. In crafting solutions, organizations will bring to bear operational, technical, and analytical expertise to design precise measures, implement the right analytical tools, and obtain the necessary data for their readiness decision-support systems. Organizations do not have to scrap existing readiness solutions and capabilities; rather, they can build on their investments by injecting policy and process improvements and implementing analytical, data, and technical solutions to instill greater analytic rigor throughout their existing solution sets. By following this approach, organizations will:

- Enhance understanding of their readiness production processes
- Gain insight into readiness gaps and shortfalls
- Identify cost drivers and readiness degraders to enable a better focus on activities that improve readiness efficiencies, processes, and activities
- Measure progress toward readiness requirements
- Improve decision making to minimize risk, allocate resources more effectively, and make informed trade-offs between current readiness and future readiness investments.

With these capabilities, the DoD and military services can strengthen the readiness of our fighting forces and give them the best chance to succeed in performing their missions—both today and in the future.
Case Studies: Applying the Readiness Building Blocks

In recent years, Booz Allen has helped numerous US military organizations strengthen readiness by helping them improve key elements of their readiness reporting systems. In one engagement, Booz Allen helped the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command develop and implement a comprehensive readiness solution set. In other engagements, Booz Allen helped military organizations identify their most pressing areas for improvements, and target specific areas based on the highest priorities and budget constraints. Here are a few examples:

**Navy Expeditionary Combat Command.** When the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC) was established in 2006, its forces were heavily engaged in combat in Afghanistan and Iraq. Consequently, the newly created organization had an immediate need for a readiness reporting system to ensure the units under its charge were ready to deploy and perform their missions. Booz Allen partnered with the NECC to create the Readiness and Cost Reporting Program (RCRP) built upon the four building blocks. The NECC began by rigorously assessing its readiness production process and needs. In designing an analytical framework for defining and measuring readiness, the NECC brought together operational, technical, and analytic experts to establish weighted measures of the relationships among readiness variables, including resources, capabilities, and costs. The NECC then worked to obtain reliable data for those measures, designing a data framework that integrates directly with over 20 other authoritative data sources. The framework enables the RCRP system to aggregate resource data for computing readiness scores that are used to populate the readiness picture in the DRRS-N. Finally, the NECC and Booz Allen applied the latest technologies and tools to build a web- and Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)-based readiness system.

Today, RCRP integrates with more than 20 authoritative data sources and is fully accredited on the Non-Classified Internet Protocol Router Network (NIPRNET) and Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) with over 3,800 systems users. It enables NECC Commanders at all levels to visualize and assess readiness and respond to Combatant Command demand signals. Because RCRP establishes weighted relationships between resources and readiness, decision makers can see the most important resource drivers in producing readiness, accurately assess risk, and prioritize resource allocation. Equally important, RCRP establishes a traceable link between cost and readiness, thus enabling the Navy to tie NECC readiness to budget processes. The program captures, displays, and reports the resource readiness to the Navy’s DRRS-N system from more than 450 readiness-reporting units in the NECC.
In addition to helping the NECC attain the highest level of readiness with its existing resources, RCRP has saved an estimated US$130 million in equipment cost savings and avoidance, and US$30 million in manpower time savings. Using the RCRP budgeting capabilities with performance pricing models, the NECC was able to justify a baseline funding increase from US$348 million in the 2010 Program Objective Memorandum (POM) to US$1.2 billion in 2012.

**Joint Training Information Management System.**
The Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, Services, Combat Support Agencies, and National Guard use the Joint Training Information Management System (JTIMS) to identify training requirements, develop training plans, and evaluate and assess joint training exercises. JTIMS was developed by Joint Staff Operational Plans and Joint Force Development (J7) and Booz Allen in accordance with the DoD net-centricity vision. It provides the Joint Community with an application to facilitate the overall Joint Training System (JTS) and helps ensure the military forces are trained and ready for joint operations. JTIMS provides an integrated tool suite for automating and facilitating the four phases of the Joint Training System (JTS)—requirements, planning, execution, assessment—and generates authoritative Joint Training and Exercise data that provides DRRS-based readiness with Training Proficiency Assessments (TPA). This enables the Combatant Command to conduct end-to-end joint training and exercise lifecycle through one integrated system. JTIMS integrates with DRRS to ensure that training objectives and assessments are tied to authoritative Mission Essential Task Lists (METLs).

**Commander, Navy Installations Command.**
With the advent of the Navy Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS-N), the Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC) faced the daunting challenge of implementing the new readiness reporting process across more than 74 installations worldwide. In partnership with Booz Allen, the CNIC built upon its existing readiness processes to transition them to the DRRS-N construct. Among the improvements, the CNIC established a Mission Framework and Resource Framework to accurately measure and report readiness across Personnel, Equipment, Supply, Training, Ordnance, and Facilities (PESTOF). CNIC also established meaningful metrics and authoritative data sources necessary to calculate PESTOF resource scores. As part of the process, CNIC also used a systematic approach to map resources to tasks based on impact, which enabled it to establish consistent reporting standards across all 12 regions and 74 installations. The effort enabled CNIC to implement DRRS-N across the entire organization, creating processes and business rules for DRRS-N reporting and providing training to all installations.
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