

→ CK *hold*

DPG DRAFT -- POSSIBLE MAJOR ISSUES

12 APR 1992

Dep Sec
1/11/92

Possible Major Issues for SecDef/DepSecDef note

- 2 Brigades for possible [-----] (p. 31)
 - Pivotal to our ability to defend in [-----] absent other access
 - Military likely to object on grounds of warfighting risk, inflexibility, cost. (Would [-----] pay for equipment?)
 - Issue also appears in MRC-East scenario statement of objective
- Forward Presence, Navy/USMC (also Air Force?) (p. 30-31)
 - New guidance to be able to maintain increased CENTCOM presence for long term (above CJCS August '91 message)
 - Navy/USMC may raise PERSTEMPO pressures (tacit end strength reclama, esp. USMC?), and flag resulting Europe presence cuts
 - Also dislike "explore...homeporting...and innovative presence"
- Total Force paragraphs (p. 15, 28)
 - Rejects traditional "maintain as small an AC as possible..."
 - Aim of "minimize casualties..."; "assume callup when required"

✓
✓
✓

Withheld from public release under statutory authority of the Department of Defense FOIA 5 USC §552(b)(5)

Separate background provided on:

- 6 "Pillars" (p. 27, 35 ff.)
 - New formulation is sound, but may face general resistance
 - Order between Sustainability and R&D may be issue?
 - New "Infrastructure and Overhead" pillar may be red flag
- New Acquisition Approach (p. 38, 40)
 - OUSD/A provided a rewrite, with less emphasis on change
 - Current draft instead draws heavily on DepSecDef/SecDef words

✓
✓

Other Possible Issues (for USD(P)/PDUSD(S&R) to note for now)

- Reconstitution target levels (p. 34)
 - Navy/USAF objected to draft as unstudied (stonewalling?)
 - Later ok'd equal or higher targets for stockpile scenario
- Sustainability days of supply levels (p. 37)
 - P&L raised [-----] for whole force in an earlier paper; then one scenario, [-----] for other units, for the DPG
 - DPG sticks with [-----] as yardstick, like strategy/base force
 - Exact levels now affordable remain unanalyzed; DPG mandates a confident estimate as a floor, calling for more if affordable
- Test and Evaluation assets funding targets (p. 40)
 - OUSD/A input detailed 0% real growth, 15% cost reduction
 - Services objected; details were deleted; now USD/A may object
- Installations Investment at "non-core" bases (p. 43)
 - Services object to denying MilCon for bases likely to close; say appears to prejudice Base Closure process
 - DASD/P&L, GenCounsel staff say guidance consistent with law
 - R&P reading sees guidance as both prudent and legal

✓
✓
✓
✓

Withheld from public release under statutory authority of the Department of Defense FOIA 5 USC §552(b)(5)

DECLASSIFIED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE INTERAGENCY SECURITY CLASSIFICATION APPEALS PANEL. E.O. 13526, SECTION 5.3(b)(3) ISCAP No. 2008-003, document 3

Doc #4
07-M-1928-A1