

Charter

Defense Materiel Readiness Board

1. PURPOSE: This charter establishes the operational procedures of the Defense Materiel Readiness Board (DMRB) and is considered a living document to be updated as required. This charter is maintained in accordance with the DMRB DoD Directive (under development).

2. AUTHORITY: The establishment of the DMRB is required by the FY 2008 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Sections 871 and 872.

3. BACKGROUND: The FY 2008 NDAA, Section 871 (reference Annex A), directed the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) to establish the DMRB to assess Materiel Readiness (MR) and evaluate plans and policies relating to the MR of the United States Armed Forces. Section 872 (reference Annex B) of the FY 2008 NDAA gives the SecDef the authority to designate any requirement of the Armed Forces for equipment or supplies as a critical MR shortfall and provide funding from the Defense Strategic Readiness (DSR) Fund to remedy those shortfalls. For a list of standard definitions as they apply to this document and the DMRB reference Annex C.

4. SCOPE: The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Materiel Readiness) (DUSD(L&MR)) will assume the function of Board Lead for the SecDef. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) will provide recommendations to the SecDef for the Board Chair and Board members.¹ The DMRB members will consist of “uniformed” officers of the Armed Forces with expertise in matters relevant to the function of the Board.²

5. MISSION STATEMENT: The DMRB is established by statute to provide an independent assessment of the MR of the Armed Services and make recommendations, as a result of collaborative effort of the active, guard, and reserve component representatives, to the SecDef and the Congress on remediation of materiel shortfalls. The DMRB will promote materiel improvements across the Armed Services through this process, as well as further assessment of current DoD plans, policies, and programs to ensure that the Joint Force Commander is provided with warfighting forces that have the maximum possible MR. The Board will assess ways to improve the processes for measuring readiness and, in conjunction with other standing entities, assists the SecDef with evaluating the ability of the industrial base to support the needs of the Armed Services.

6. OBJECTIVES: The DMRB shall provide independent assessments of MR, MR shortfalls, and MR plans to the SecDef and the Congress. In carrying out these functions, the DMRB shall,

a. Establish and refine DoD’s MR assessment process, enabled by

1) Establishing the DMRB and its processes and ensuring linkages with other readiness processes

¹ Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum, March 6, 2008, “Establishment of Defense Materiel Readiness Board”

² DoD OGC Msg, March 27, 2008, “Materiel Readiness Board” states only Uniformed Members of the US Armed Forces may serve as Board members. Board Staff may be both Uniformed Members and civilian personnel

2) Assisting the SecDef in assessing whether the industrial capacity of the DoD and of the defense industrial base is being best utilized to support MR

3) Assessing DoD systems for measuring the status of MR

b. Identify and analyze MR issues, enabled by

1) Assessing the adequacy of current DoD plans, policies, and programs to address shortfalls, sustainment, and improvement of MR

2) Identifying MR deficiencies caused by shortfalls in weapons systems, equipment, and supplies

c. Recommend corrective actions for critical MR issues (and DoD MR processes), enabled by

1) Recommending MR funding, metrics, plans, policies, and programs

2) Recommending designation of shortfall as “critical” and funding needed to address

3) Providing independent assessments and recommendations to the SecDef and Congress every six months regarding the MR of the Services pertaining to both MR issues and processes

4) Transmitting identified shortfalls to responsible DoD officials to prioritize and address

7. ORGANIZATION:

a. Board Lead – The DUSD(L&MR) is designated as the Board Lead. In this capacity he/she will report findings and recommendations of the Board directly to the SecDef.

b. Board Composition – The Board will be comprised of “uniformed” officers of the Armed Forces and will be represented by the following individuals:

1) Board Chair – The Director for Logistics, Joint Staff (DJ4) will serve as the Board Chair.

2) Statutory Members:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Office</u>
ARNG	Director, Army National Guard
ANG	Director, Air National Guard
USAR	Chief, Army Reserve
USAFR	Chief, Air Force Reserve
USNR	Chief, Navy Reserve
USMCR	Chief, USMC Reserve
USA	DCS, Logistics, G-4
USAF	DCS, Logistics, Installations and Mission Support (A4/7)
USN	DCNO, Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4)
USMC	DC, Installations & Logistics

3) Other Non-Statutory Attendees (representative examples):

<u>Component</u>	<u>Office</u>
Combatant Commands	Combatant Commanders' Logistics Directors (J-4s)
USTRANSCOM	Director, Strategy, Policy, Programs and Logistics (J5/4)
OSD (Defense Agency)	Director, DLA
NGB	Chief of Staff/J-4
OSD	USD(Comptroller)
OSD	USD(Personnel and Readiness)
OSD	DUSD(Industrial Policy)
OSD	Director, Program Analysis & Evaluation
JCS	J-3/7/8

c. Board Staff – The SecDef shall assign staff and request the CJCS and the Service Secretaries to assign staff to assist the Board in carrying out its duties. The principal board staff will consist of a Board Secretariat and two permanent groups whose purpose and mission is to support the DMRB.

1) Board Secretariat – The Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Program Support) (ADUSD(PS)) will serve as the Board Secretariat.

2) DMRB Review Group – The DMRB Review Group (DMRB-RvGp) will consist of one General Officer (O-7 or O-8) or Senior Executive Service (SES), nominated by, and to represent, each member of the DMRB. These nominations will be approved by the Board Secretariat. This group will review MR issues presented to it and make recommendations to the Board. In addition to the General Officers and Senior Executives appointed by the DMRB Members, other DoD organizations may attend as desired or required. The DMRB-RvGp will be co-chaired by the ADUSD(PS) and the Vice Director for Logistics, Joint Staff (VJ4).

3) DMRB Working Group – The DMRB Working Group (DMRB-WkGp) will consist of a minimum of two personnel (primary and alternate), military or department civilian personnel (O-5/O-6 or equivalent) for each DMRB member. Additionally, representatives from other DoD organizations may attend as desired or required. The DMRB-WkGp's primary responsibility will be to recommend Courses Of Action (COAs) on MR processes and issues to the DMRB-RvGp. This body will be co-chaired by representatives designated by the ADUSD(PS) and the VJ4.

8. RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. Board Lead. The Board Lead will review and forward the findings and recommendations of the Board, as submitted by the Board Chair, directly to the SecDef.

b. Board Chair. The Board Chair, via the semi-annual report described in 7.c.5 below, will submit to the Board Lead the results of the Board's assessments of MR and shortfalls, evaluations of related plans and policies, as well as recommendations for MR funding, metrics, plans, policies and programs.

c. Board Secretariat. The Board Secretariat will function as the principle administrative body for the DMRB and its support staff. In carrying out this responsibility the Secretariat shall,

1) Manage the overall agenda of the DMRB,

2) Accept and forward all recommendations on MR processes and issues for the Board's consideration,

3) Ensure all MR recommendations (processes and issues) are properly coordinated through the DMRB-WkGp and DMRB-RvGp prior to presenting to the DMRB,

4) Manage the assignment of DMRB member nominees/appointees for the DMRB-WkGp and/or related Integrated Process Teams (IPTs), as required, in support of the Board's agenda. All such assignments will be based on specific analytical need and the personal qualifications, background, and experience of each nominee/appointee,

5) Prepare the semi-annual DMRB reports for DMRB Chair approval and subsequent submission to SecDef through the Board Lead.

d. Review Group. The DMRB-RvGp shall:

1) Assist the DMRB in carrying out its responsibilities,

2) Support the DMRB direction to improve and maintain MR and effect necessary changes,

3) Determine and advise the DMRB on MR shortfalls and priorities,

4) Ensure current and projected MR shortfalls are identified, well defined, and properly analyzed,

5) Assess whether existing reporting systems and processes are sufficiently capable to enable the DMRB to monitor and measure DoD's overall materiel readiness posture,

6) Nominate topics for DMRB consideration in accordance with the DMRB issue submission instructions and example issue submission (reference Annex D and Annex E respectively), and provide recommendations to the DMRB on issues requiring review,

7) Provide guidance and task the DMRB-WkGp to address MR issues,

8) Establish and oversee the supporting structures and processes necessary to accomplish the DMRB functions,

9) Review MR issues submitted by the DMRB-WkGp and/or the Board Secretariat in accordance with the list of prioritization criteria (reference Annex F),

10) Recommend COAs on MR issues to the DMRB through a consensus process.

e. Working Group. The DMRB-WkGp shall:

1) Assist the DMRB-RvGp in carrying out its responsibilities,

2) Nominate topics for DMRB-RvGp consideration in accordance with the DMRB issue submission instructions and example issue submission (reference Annex D and Annex E respectively) and provide recommendations to the DMRB-RvGp on issues requiring review,

3) Seek out MR shortfalls and ensure they are submitted to the Board Secretariat,

4) Request the Board Secretariat establish IPTs as required to study and provide recommendations on MR issues,

5) Assist the IPTs in developing recommended solutions on MR issues,

6) Review MR issues submitted by the Board Secretariat and/or the DMRB-RvGp in accordance with the list of prioritization criteria (reference Annex F),

7) Recommend COAs on MR issues to the DMRB-RvGp through a consensus process.

9. MEETINGS AND REPORTS: The various components of the DMRB shall meet and report in accordance with the following guidance,

a. Statutory Members must provide a representative at the DMRB meetings and the DMRB Staff meetings (Review Group and Working Group). Other attendees, as referenced in 6.b.3 above, will provide a representative at the DMRB meetings and the DMRB Staff meetings as desired or as requested by the Board Secretariat.

b. The DMRB shall meet quarterly in September, December, March and June subject to the desires of the SecDef. The DMRB is required to prepare and submit a report summarizing its findings and recommendations not less than once every six months. The Board Chair shall approve the report and forward to the Board Lead. The Board Lead will, in turn, review and forward the report to the SecDef. Reports will normally be submitted following the December and June DMRB meetings.

c. The DMRB-RvGp shall meet on the same quarterly cycle as the DMRB but in advance of that body's meeting. As the DMRB's direct support staff, the DMRB-RvGp can be required by the DMRB to meet more frequently if necessary.

d. The DMRB-WkGp will meet monthly in support of the DMRB's requirements and agenda.

e. Semi-annually, the DMRB, with direct assistance from the Board Secretariat, shall prepare an unclassified report of its assessments, findings and recommendations. This report shall be submitted by the Board Chair to the Board Lead for further forwarding to the SecDef. If necessary, the report may be accompanied by a classified annex. In accordance with FY08 NDAA, Section 871, the SecDef shall, within thirty days of receiving the DMRB report, forward the report in its entirety, together with his comments, to the congressional defense committees.

10. PROCESSES/PROCEDURES

a. Submission of MR Issues:

1) Origins and Format – The DMRB will initially focus on analyzing existing MR processes and recommend improvements and integration of the DMRB with those processes. The Board will accept MR issues for review and analysis at any time during the year from any DoD organization. All MR issues must follow the format outlined in Annex D. There is no requirement for the Board to accept only those MR issues raised by the COCOMs. However, it is anticipated that the majority of the DMRB's MR issues will focus on COCOM Integrated Priority List (IPL) submissions, leveraging both the content and format of this established Joint Capability Integration and Development Systems (JCIDS) development process for identifying and addressing gaps in DoD MR.

2) Submission Timeline – MR issues may be submitted at any time during the year. However, the effort necessary for resolution of a MR issue is situational and in most cases will be directly related to the degree of analytical effort required to fully investigate, develop alternative COAs and evaluate and make final recommendations. As a rule-of-thumb, issue submissions should be made at least 90 days prior to the next scheduled DMRB. In most instances this will allow adequate time for the Board Secretariat to review a DMRB MR issue package, forward to the DMRB-WkGp, ensure establishment of the proper analytical support (including DMRB-WkGp establishment of any necessary IPTs), propose COAs, make final recommendations, and support any required movement of DSR Funds by the SecDef for critical MR shortfalls.

b. Interface with Other DoD Processes and Organizations:

1) Linkage and Integration – Although the DMRB is established to provide an independent assessment of DoD MR issues and report its findings and recommendations directly to Congress through the SecDef, it must establish linkages to other DoD processes and organizations concerned with total force readiness in order to completely carry out its responsibilities. Specifically, the Board should link, when appropriate, to existing JCIDS and Capability Portfolio Management (CPM) processes. It must be tied to each COCOM's Adaptive Planning and Execution (APEX) process, the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS), and, perhaps most importantly, it must be tightly integrated with the current Global Force Management (GFM) process. Additionally, the DMRB will coordinate its activity with the Senior Readiness Oversight Council (SROC). When MR issues are impacted by industrial base capacity the DMRB will coordinate with the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Industrial Policy) (DUSD(Industrial Policy)) on recommended COAs.

2) Scheduling for Synergy – The DMRB Secretariat will schedule DMRB quarterly meetings and synchronize its semi-annual reporting cycle to both accept input from, and provide input to, the Joint Staff's capability assessment timeline and processes, Global Force Management Board (GFMB) meetings, and DoD's Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) cycle. The DMRB will give special attention to MR issues arising from the Joint Staff semi-annual deficiency review process, which occurs just before the June and December DMRB meetings. As part of its non-reporting quarterly meetings (September and March), the DMRB will provide feedback directly to the Services on MR issues that can be resolved, in whole or in part, through the Service's PPBE process.

3) Adaptive Planning and Execution – The DMRB will seek to leverage the existing APEX process and the DRRS by reviewing all MR issues that might impact a COCOM's ability to execute and the relevance of the COCOM Concept Plan (CONPLAN) and Operation Plan (OPLAN). The board will provide timely, high-quality, strategic analysis and recommendations on MR issues related to those plans.

4) Global Force Management – The window on readiness provided by the Global Force Management System (GFMS) informs planners on just where additional effort (including the transfer of materiel assets) is needed to achieve desired/required force readiness. However, it does not make specific recommendations on how to *manage* or *improve* theater-wide or global MR. This will be the function of the DMRB. To carry out this role, the DMRB must be tightly integrated with the existing GFMB. GFMB decisions that consider force readiness (but not MR per se) must be complemented with DMRB processes and decisions to provide a continuous and comprehensive MR assessment and

management capacity. This effort will allow the DMRB to make recommendations on where and how risk associated with MR is acceptable or unacceptable, as well as how funding might be used to alter the readiness equation to enhance DoD capabilities. This link between MR, operational risk, and mission capability is something that the existing GFMS does not provide.

5) DMRB in a System-of-Systems Readiness Environment – In order for the DMRB to ultimately be successful, it will have to embed itself in a fully networked, system-of-systems model of DoD logistics and MR that includes the DRRS, the GFMS, the Defense Transportation System and the Defense Logistics System. In pursuing such a system-of-systems paradigm the DMRB will help drive a continuous readiness assessment that integrates and seeks to optimize the entire logistics chain.

Subtitle G--Defense Materiel Readiness Board

SEC. 871. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEFENSE MATERIEL READINESS BOARD.

(a) Establishment- Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a Defense Materiel Readiness Board (in this subtitle referred to as the 'Board') within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(b) Membership- The Secretary shall appoint the chairman and the members of the Board from among officers of the Armed Forces with expertise in matters relevant to the function of the Board to assess materiel readiness and evaluate plans and policies relating to materiel readiness. At a minimum, the Board shall include representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, each of the Armed Forces, and each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(c) Staff- The Secretary of Defense shall assign staff, and request the Secretaries of the military departments to assign staff, as necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its duties.

(d) Functions- The Board shall provide independent assessments of materiel readiness, materiel readiness shortfalls, and materiel readiness plans to the Secretary of Defense and the Congress. To carry out such functions, the Board shall--

- (1) monitor and assess the materiel readiness of the Armed Forces;
- (2) assist the Secretary of Defense in the identification of deficiencies in the materiel readiness of the Armed Forces caused by shortfalls in weapons systems, equipment, and supplies;
- (3) identify shortfalls in materiel readiness, including critical materiel readiness shortfalls, for purposes of the Secretary's designations under section 872 and the funding needed to address such shortfalls;
- (4) assess the adequacy of current Department of Defense plans, policies, and programs to address shortfalls in materiel readiness, including critical materiel readiness shortfalls (as designated by the Secretary under section 872), and to sustain and improve materiel readiness;
- (5) assist the Secretary of Defense in determining whether the industrial capacity of the Department of Defense and of the defense industrial base is being best utilized to support the materiel readiness needs of the Armed Forces;
- (6) review and assess Department of Defense systems for measuring the status of current materiel readiness of the Armed Forces; and
- (7) make recommendations with respect to materiel readiness funding, measurement techniques, plans, policies, and programs.

(e) Reports- The Board shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report summarizing its findings and recommendations not less than once every six months. Within 30 days after receiving a report from the Board, the Secretary shall forward the report in its entirety, together with his comments, to the congressional defense committees. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form. To the extent necessary, the report may be accompanied by a classified annex.

SEC. 872. CRITICAL MATERIEL READINESS SHORTFALLS.

(a) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL MATERIEL READINESS SHORTFALLS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Defense may designate any requirement of the Armed Forces for equipment or supplies as a critical materiel readiness shortfall if there is a shortfall in the required equipment or supplies that materially reduces readiness of the Armed Forces and that—

(A) cannot be adequately addressed by identifying acceptable substitute capabilities or cross leveling of equipment that does not unacceptably reduce the readiness of other Armed Forces; and (B) that is likely to persist for more than two years based on currently projected budgets and schedules for deliveries of equipment and supplies.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF BOARD FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

In making any such designation, the Secretary shall take into consideration the findings and recommendations of the Defense Materiel Readiness Board.

(b) MEASURES TO ADDRESS CRITICAL MATERIEL READINESS

SHORTFALLS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that critical materiel readiness shortfalls designated pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are transmitted to the relevant officials of the Department of Defense responsible for requirements, budgets, and acquisition, and that such officials prioritize and address such shortfalls in the shortest time frame practicable.

(c) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of section 1001 of this Act is hereby increased by \$2,000,000,000.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The additional transfer authority provided by this section—

(A) may be made only from authorizations to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008;

H. R. 1585—258

(B) may be exercised solely for the purpose of addressing critical materiel readiness shortfalls as designated by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a); and (C) is subject to the same terms, conditions, and procedures as other transfer authority under section 1001 of this Act.

(d) STRATEGIC READINESS FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the Department of Defense Strategic Readiness Fund (in this subsection referred to as the “Fund”), which shall be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) PURPOSES.—The Fund shall be used to address critical materiel readiness shortfalls as designated by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a).

(3) ASSETS OF FUND.—There shall be deposited into the Fund any amount appropriated to the Fund, which shall constitute the assets of the Fund.

(4) LIMITATION.—The procurement unit cost (as defined in section 2432(a) of title 10, United States Code) of any item purchased using assets of the Fund, whether such assets are in the Fund or after such assets have been transferred from the Fund using the authority provided in subsection (c), shall not exceed \$30,000,000.

(e) MULTIYEAR CONTRACT NOTIFICATION.—

DMRB Charter, Annex B

(1) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary of a military department makes the determination described in paragraph (2) with respect to the use of a multiyear contract, the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the determination and provide a detailed description of the proposed multiyear contract.

(2) DETERMINATION.—The determination referred to in paragraph (1) is a determination by the Secretary of a military department that the use of a multiyear contract to procure an item to address a critical materiel readiness shortfall—
(A) will significantly accelerate efforts to address a critical materiel readiness shortfall; (B) will provide savings compared to the total anticipated costs of carrying out the contract through annual contracts; and (C) will serve the interest of national security.

(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “critical materiel readiness shortfall” means a critical materiel readiness shortfall designated by the Secretary of Defense under this section.

Defense Materiel Readiness Board Definitions

Acceptable Cross-Leveling. (NDAA 08, Sec. 872) – The transfer of systems, equipment, components, piece-parts or commodities from one Service, formation, organization, or unit to another such that the receiving service, formation, organization, or unit attains the material requirements necessary to effectively perform its programmed or assigned mission – including contingencies, disaster relief (flood, earthquake, etc.), or other emergencies – and the transferring Service, formation, organization, or unit is not rendered materially incapable of effectively performing its programmed mission or a contingency mission assigned or underway at the time of the transfer.

Acceptable Substitute Capability. (NDAA 08, Sec. 872) – An exchange of one system, equipage, component, piece-part or commodity for another in order to accomplish a Service, formation, organization, or unit programmed or assigned mission – including contingencies, disaster relief (flood, earthquake, etc.), or other emergencies – which does not compromise or significantly degrade that Service's, formation's, organization's, or unit's ability to be "operationally effective" in the performance of that mission.

Critical Materiel Readiness Shortfall. (NDAA 08, Sec. 872) – Those quantities of weapons systems, equipment, and supplies that a Service, formation, organization, or unit is lacking in order to achieve the definition of "Materiel Requirements" below and that A) cannot be adequately addressed by identifying acceptable substitute capabilities or cross-leveling of equipment without unacceptably reducing the readiness of other Services; and B) that is likely to persist for more than two years based on currently projected budgets and schedules for deliveries of equipment and supplies.

Equipment. ¹A part of a system or subsystem for which operation and maintenance can be performed. ²[JP 1-02] (DoD) – In logistics, all nonexpendable items needed to outfit or equip an individual or organization.

Materiel. [JP 1-02] (DoD) – All items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, etc., and related spares, repair parts, and support equipment, but excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support military activities without distinction as to its application for administrative or combat purposes. See also equipment; personal property.

Materiel Readiness. [JP 1-02] (DoD) – The availability of materiel required by a military organization to support its wartime activities or contingencies, disaster relief (flood, earthquake, etc.), or other emergencies.

Materiel Requirements. ¹[JP 1-02] (DoD) – Those quantities of items of equipment and supplies necessary to equip, provide a materiel pipeline, and sustain a Service, formation, organization, or unit in the fulfillment of its purposes or tasks during a specified period.

Materiel Shortfall. [Modified JP 1-02] – Those quantities of weapons systems, equipment, and supplies necessary to bridge the gap between materiel physically available to a Service, formation, organization, or unit and materiel required to equip, provide a materiel pipeline, and sustain that

DMRB Charter, Annex C

Service, formation, organization, or unit in the fulfillment of its purposes or tasks during a specified period. This definition is grounded in the concept of “mission effectiveness”. The materiel shortfall bridge represents only those quantities required, above and beyond that which is currently available, for the Service, formation, organization, or unit to effectively perform its programmed or assigned mission (including contingencies, disaster relief (flood, earthquake, etc.), or other emergencies as defined in “Materiel Readiness” above).

Materiel System. [DSMC] – A final combination of subsystems, components, parts, and materials that make-up an entity for use in combat or in support thereof, either offensively or defensively, to destroy, injure, defeat, or threaten the enemy. It includes the basic materiel items and all related equipment, supporting facilities, and services required for operating and maintaining the system.

Military Capability. [JP 1-02] (DoD) – The ability to achieve a specified wartime (win a war or battle, destroy a target set) or contingency objective. It includes four major components: force structure, modernization, readiness, and sustainability. A) Force Structure – Numbers, size, and composition of the units that comprise US defense forces; e.g., divisions, ships, air wings. B) Modernization – Technical sophistication of forces, units, weapon systems, and equipments. C) Unit Readiness – The ability to provide capabilities required by the combatant commanders to execute their assigned missions. This is derived from the ability of each unit to deliver the outputs for which it was designed. D) Sustainability – The ability to maintain the necessary level and duration of operational activity to achieve military objectives. Sustainability is a function of providing for and maintaining those levels of ready forces, materiel, and consumables necessary to support military effort. See also readiness.

Personal Property. [JP 1-02] (DoD) – Property of any kind or any interest therein, except real property, records of the Federal Government, and naval vessels of the following categories: surface combatants, support ships, and submarines.

Readiness. [JP 1-02] (DoD) – The ability of US military forces to fight and meet the demands of the national military strategy. Readiness is the synthesis of two distinct but interrelated levels. A) Unit Readiness - The ability to provide capabilities required by the combatant commanders to execute their assigned missions. This is derived from the ability of each unit to deliver the outputs for which it was designed. B) Joint Readiness - The combatant commander's ability to integrate and synchronize ready combat and support forces to execute his or her assigned missions. See also military capability.

DMRB Issue Submission Preparation Instructions

1. General. These instructions describe the submission format for Materiel Readiness (MR) issues deemed critical by the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) 2008, Section 872. The format contains similar information and may resemble an Integrated Priority List (IPL) submittal.
2. Overall Format Instructions. Utilize the instructions below in order to standardize the submissions.
 - a. Style: succinct, bulletized prose
 - b. Font: 12 point, Times New Roman
 - c. Font Style: bold for titles and headers, normal for data entries
 - d. Spell out all acronyms when first listed
 - e. Length: preferably no longer than one page; if needed provide annexes for specific issues/categories
3. Branch/Component. Identify the branch and component submitting the critical MR issue.
4. Issue Title. Designate a short noun title that describes the issue.
5. Internal Priority. Initially, assign the issue a priority of “high”, “medium”, or “low”. As the issue matures and a greater level of analysis is completed an internal ranking within the submitting branch/component will be more appropriate (i.e. 3 of 4).
6. Tier I/II/III Joint Capability Area. Identify, at a minimum, one primary Tier I/II/III capability area to which the capability issue can be mapped. Where appropriate, also identify secondary and tertiary mappings.
7. Synopsis of the Problem. Provide a one-sentence description of the MR issue.
8. Discussion of the Problem.
 - a. Provide a brief description of the MR issue to include how long it has persisted despite efforts to address it and what previous efforts have been to address the issue (POM, PR, Budget Action, Supplemental, etc.).
 - b. Service Category – List whether this is a service-specific, multiple service, or DoD wide issue and the total units affected by this issue (if applicable).
 - c. Mission Analysis/Guidance Source – Cite any studies and/or analyses that were/are the basis for the identification of the MR issue and the strategic guidance document that assigned the mission whose execution is at risk because of the MR issue.
 - d. Critical Effect – Provide a one sentence description of the critical effect whose achievement is at risk because of the MR issue.
 - e. Risk – Identify the risk of not mitigating the MR issue on the execution of your current and future missions.
 - f. Current Resourcing – How is the MR issue currently being resourced?

DMRB Charter, Annex D

g. **Total Funding Required** – List the monetary value needed to address the issue. If an exact dollar amount has not been identified, list the most informed estimate.

h. **Proposed Solution/Mitigation Strategy** – Where possible, provide a brief description of your recommended strategy for mitigating the issue and identify if the proposed mitigation strategy would completely rectify the issue. Lastly, state whether or not the ability to “phase” a solution exists or if the issue must be accomplished as a “single point” solution.

9. **Programmed Capability**. If the issue is already addressed (in whole or in part) by an existing programmed capability, what is the most recent approved program strategy, even if not yet implemented, for issue mitigation? Identify the most recent supporting documentation even if issue mitigation does not begin until late in the out-years under an existing program. Address the extent to which this programmed strategy mitigates the issue and what residual mitigation efforts (if any) are required under the DMRB process.

10. **Resource Summary and Recommendation**. The resource summary will identify the current Program of Record (POR) and a resource estimate, if appropriate, for the recommendation. The recommendation will identify what the resource enhancement will provide above and beyond existing POR, if any.

11. **DMRB Representatives for this Branch/Component are:**

- a. List the DMRB representative here.
- b. List the DMRB – Review Group representative here.
- c. List the DMRB – Working Group representative here.

12. **List the Point of Contact:** provide the name, organization, phone number, and unclassified email address for the issue POC.

DMRB Charter, Annex E

- **Branch/Component:** United States Army Reserve
- **Issue Title:** Main Rotor Blade Shortage
- **Internal Priority:** 2 of 3 (Low, Medium, High)
- **Tier I/II/III (if applicable) Joint Capability Area:** Force Application/Maneuver
- **Synopsis of Problem:** Blade erosion resulting from sand exposure has decreased the lifespan of rotor blades and created a shortage in theater.
- **Discussion of the Problem:**
 - **Description** – Rotor blades are being rapidly consumed due to sand exposure. A shortage of rotor blades exists in theater resulting in increased down time for maintenance. Fewer available aircraft means less support of ground operations.
 - **Service Category** – Multiple services (all rotary-winged aviation assets)
 - **Mission Analysis/Guidance Source** – N/A
 - **Critical Effect** – Daily combat operations will be disrupted and fewer aviation assets will be available unless more rotor blades become immediately available.
 - **Risk** – If not addressed, fewer aircraft will be available to conduct mission support which will increase the risk to ground assets. Additionally, aircrews assume increased risk of mechanical failure during missions.
 - **Current Resourcing** – Aviation units are painting or taping the leading edge of rotor blades prior to each flight to prevent erosion. Each CAB has spent the remainder of their FY 08 money on blades.
 - **Total Funding Required** – \$XX,XXX,XXX
 - **Proposed Solution/Mitigation Strategy** – Establish a staging area in Kuwait to pre-position

aviation benchstock experiencing increased utilization due to the operating environment; decrease excess blades on hand for Continental United States (CONUS) units to support combat operations; maximize hardstand locations for aircraft staging areas to provide decreased sand exposure. These proposed solutions would help mitigate the shortage in theater, but would produce a shortage in CONUS units. This is a phased solution as it requires introducing more rotor blades into the inventory which will take time and cause maintenance to readdress the lifecycle of blades in use outside of theater to determine if more blade time is an acceptable risk to assume before replacing them.

- **Programmed Capability:** No programmed strategy has been approved to address this issue; only tactical-level solutions generated. This issue was not forecasted and, as such, has not been accounted for in our planned funding.

- **Resource Summary and Recommendation:**

	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
POR	X	X	X	X	X	X
Enh	Y	Y	Z	Z	Z	--

X – POR money already allotted
 Y – Enhanced funds requested through DMRB process to access Strategic Readiness Fund resources
 Z – POM action to complete resource requirements necessary to mitigate the MR issue across the remainder of the FYDP

- **DMRB representative** – LTG Stultz
 - **DMRB RvGp representative** – MG Bell
 - **DMRB WkGp representative** – COL Resnak
- **Point of Contact for this submission:** LTC John Smith, USAR, 123-4567, john.smith27@us.army.mil

Criteria for MR Issue Consideration/Prioritization

- Severity of the Problem
 - Assessment of Current Risk versus Future Risk; does the MR issue affect ongoing current operations (today) or future operations (tomorrow)?
 - What risk is assumed by foregoing a solution now?
- Complexity of the Problem
 - What is the complexity of the MR issue – is the “heart” of the problem to be found at the piece-part, component, equipment or system level?
 - What JCA type(s) and level(s)/tier(s) is/are affected by the MR issue?
 - What is the total number of Service members and/or units affected?
 - Is the issue service-specific, does it involve more than one Service/component, or does it affect all of DoD?
 - Could this issue extend beyond DoD to affect, or potentially affect, Joint or Interagency operations?
 - Is there a linked or embedded training and/or manpower issue associated with the MR issue or is it a “stand alone” material issue?
 - Can the MR issue be addressed as a “single point” fix or does the solution require a “phased” approach over a number of years/time periods?
- History of the Problem
 - What is the overall duration of the MR issue?
 - Have previous or current attempts been made to address the issue?
 - What were/are those efforts (POM/PR, Budget action, supplemental funding, etc.)?
 - If previously addressed, why did it/they fail to fully rectify the situation?
- Investment in the Problem
 - What is the “Parent” Program of Record associated with the MR issue and what is the “funding profile” of that POR?
 - What is the total money needed to adequately address the issue?
- Feasibility of Recommendations
 - What is the likelihood of success in resolving the problem/MR Issue?
 - Is the issue clearly within in the DMRB arena or would the issue be more properly addressed by another process/board/forum outside the DMRB?