

#73

~~SECRET~~

USDP-11

24 May 1982

Integrated Tactical Surveillance System

USD(P)

Issue: Should funding for the Navy Integrated Surveillance System (ITSS) be approved without a programmatic review?

Military Department: Navy, Defense Reconnaissance Support Program (DRSP)

Rationale:

- The Navy has recognized their serious ocean surveillance and targeting problems and has been conducting, over the period of a year, a very productive analysis to define this problem. While briefings have been reviewed by the CNO, final alternatives have not been selected. CNO decision on this matter is expected in the next 30-90 days.
- In anticipation of this decision, the Navy has programmed significant funds, as a planning wedge, in their POM-84 submission. An additional funding wedge was placed in the DRSP in anticipation of Air Force and/or Navy requirements for a radar satellite system.
- To further complicate the issue, \$76.4M of ITSS funding in FYDP 1/82 has been spread to ITSS supporting projects in POM-84. The detail of this distribution was not provided in the Navy POM-84 submission.
- Before approving these resources for budget action, the overall architecture and program detail should be available to assure cross-program coordination.
- Alternative 2, as a management issue, would require the Navy to develop and submit the required programmatic information before continuing to the budget detail.

Cost Summary:

		Costs (FYDP \$ Millions)	
		FY-84	FY 84-88 Total
Estimated POM Resources (Alt 1)	- Navy	\$31M	\$1,333
	- DRSP	\$80M	\$1,376

Proposed Changes to POM Resources (Alt 2)

Management Issue

Office of the Secretary of Defense
 Chief, RDD, ESD, WHIS
 Date: 08 AUG 2016 Authority: EO 13526 + S.O.S.C 5552
 Declassify: X Deny in Full: _____
 Declassify in Part: _____
 Reason: _____
 MDR: 16 -M- 0943

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
 Authority: EO 13526
 Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
 Date: AUG 08 2016

16-M-0943

~~SECRET~~

USDP-13

24 May 1982

Ocean Surveillance Information System (OSIS)

USD(P)

Issue: Should approval be given to basic improvements in the OSIS without adequate funding or clear management direction?

Military Departments: Navy, General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP)

Rationale:

- Navy has initiated programs to significantly improve the quality and timeliness of information provided to fleet operations. This includes the ability to provide data in a manner adequate to support OTH targeting.
- OSIS has previously been a jointly funded program. One segment of the funds (RDT&E and OPN through OP-094) are provided by the Navy. The other segment (OMN through OP-009) are funded in the GDIP. This latter is funded in the NFIP, and as such, will not make program recommendations to the DCI until June.
- POM-84 provides funding for the OP-094 Navy segment. The GDIP has not indicated that funds will be available to support their segment. The result is a \$12M shortfall in OPN and a \$25-40M shortfall in OMN in FY 84-88.
- There is also a management issue relating to initiating a program of this magnitude without a joint program office, with a clearly defined mandate and charter.
- Alternative 2 would require the GDIP to commit funding (consistent with previous agreement) as part of POM-84.
- Alternative 3 would move all funding and program management to Navy.
- Alternative 4 would move all funding and program management to GDIP.

Cost Summary:

		Costs (FYDP \$ Millions)	
		FY-84	FY 84-88 total
Estimated POM Resources (Alt 1)	- Navy	\$16	\$51
	- GDIP	0	0
Proposed Changes to POM Resources			
Alternative 2	- GDIP	+\$ 4	+\$20
Alternative 3	- Navy	+\$ 4	+\$20
Alternative 4	- Navy	-\$16	-\$51
	- GDIP	+\$20	+\$71

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: AUG 08 2016

~~SECRET~~

24 May 1982

Space Based Radar

USD(P)

Issue: Should funding in the Defense Reconnaissance Support Program for a space based active radar surveillance system be approved in the absence of a formal, validated JCS or Service operational requirement.

Military Department: Defense Reconnaissance Support Program (DRSP)

Rationale:

- The FY 84 DRSP POM provides funds for the development, procurement and launch of two active radar satellites to provide Air Force and Navy force commanders with real-time tactical and strategic surveillance, warning, classification, identification and targeting information on high interest aircraft and surface ships.
- This program, as currently structured, would result in a proof-of-concept/prototype system for launch in FY 1989.
- The Department of the Navy has stated no formal operational requirement for an active radar satellite system. While such a capability is currently under consideration as one of the results of the Integrated Tactical Intelligence System (ITSS) studies, no decision has been made by the Navy.
- The Department of the Air Force has stated no formal statement of need for a radar satellite system solution to the Tactical Warning problem.
- A formal requirement statement from a Military Department or the Joint Chiefs of Staff defining the specific operations constraints and performance requirements to be satisfied by an active radar system is needed for this major systems new start.
- Continued funding for a \$1.3 billion dollar technology demonstration/proof-of-concept system is not supported.
- Alternative 2 defers any programmatic decision on this program until Navy or Air Force decisions are made with regard to requirements. (30-90 days)

Cost and Manpower Summary

	Costs (FYDP \$ Million)	
	FY 84	FY 84-88

Programmed Resources (Alt 1)	\$80	\$1376
------------------------------	------	--------

Proposed Changes to POM Resources (Alt 2)

Management Issue

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
 Authority: EO 13526
 Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
 Date: AUG 03 2016

~~SECRET~~

28

Integrated Tactical Surveillance System (ITSS)

Issue Sponsor: USDR

Issue: Should the ITSS program be funded at the POM level?

Military Department: Navy.

Rationale:

- DepSecDef approved ITSS in January 1981; designated it a major system.
- Three competitive concept exploration studies were conducted to develop proposed system architectures. Completed in February 1982; cost \$30 million.
- Concern in OSD and Congress was that ITSS was an effort to revive a Space-Based Radar (SBR) program. Congress directed SBR efforts to be carried out in DRSP. The Navy supports this; thus, DRSP contains a Radar Satellite program.
- The POM contains no funds for SBR development. Near term efforts to concentrate on C² enhancements. Navy supports SBR in long term.
- Congressional and Navy actions have reduced ITSS funding since MENS approval, pending better definition of system architecture.
- POM realigns funding profile, reducing near term funding (-\$76 million in FY 1984; -\$70 million in FY 1985). However, it is not clear that the program status is on sound enough footing to warrant the investment indicated. A review of acquisition strategy and management concepts are needed.
- Alternative 2 reduces FY 1984 funds by \$20 million and FY 84-88 funds by \$410 million in absence of better explanation of program direction.

<u>Cost Summary:</u>	TOA (FYDP \$ Millions)	
	FY 84	FY 84-88 Total
Estimated POM Resources (Alt 1)	30.9	1398.0
Proposed Changes to POM Resources (Alternative 2)	-20.0	-410.0

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: AUG 03 2016

~~SECRET~~