

73rd MORSS CD Cover Page

UNCLASSIFIED DISCLOSURE FORM CD Presentation

712CD

For office use only 41205

21-23 June 2005, at US Military Academy, West Point, NY

Please complete this form 712CD as your cover page to your electronic briefing submission to the MORSS CD. Do not fax to the MORS office.

Author Request (To be completed by applicant) - The following author(s) request authority to disclose the following presentation in the MORSS Final Report, for inclusion on the MORSS CD and/or posting on the MORS web site.

Name of Principal Author and all other author(s): **Lieutenant Colonel Tim Trainor, Ph.D.
Professor Greg Parnell, Ph.D.**

Principal Author's Organization and address:

**Department of Systems Engineering
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York 10996**

Phone: (845) 938-5534

Fax: (845) 938-5919

Email: timothy.trainor@usma.edu

Original title on 712 A/B: **USMA Study of the Installation Management Agency
CONUS Regional Structure**

Revised title: **USMA Study of the Installation Management Agency CONUS Regional Structure**

Presented in (input and Bold one): (**WG_28**, CG____, Special Session ____, Poster, Demo, or Tutorial):

This presentation is believed to be:
UNCLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 23 JUN 2005		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE USMA Study of the Installation Management Agency CONUS Regional Structure				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Systems Engineering United States Military Academy West Point, New York 10996				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM201946, Military Operations Research Society Symposium (73rd) Held in West Point, NY on 21-23 June 2005 . , The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



USMA Study of the Installation Management Agency CONUS Regional Structure

Presented by:
Lieutenant Colonel Tim Trainor, Ph.D.
Professor Greg Parnell, Ph.D.
Department of Systems Engineering
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York

June 2005

"The views expressed in this presentation are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government."



AGENDA




- **Background on the Problem**
 - **Problem Definition**
 - **The Systems Engineering and Management Process as a Problem Solving Approach**
 - **Value Hierarchy of 'Core' Organization functions**
 - **Organizational Design Alternatives**
 - **Applying Multiple Objective Decision Analysis to evaluate alternative organizational designs**
 - **Study Results & Recommendations**
 - **Conclusions**
-



Problem Background



- In 2002, the US Army reorganized its process for managing installations:
 - ✓ Operational Commanders no longer control day-to-day functions.
 - ✓ Responsibility was vested in the new Installation Management Agency (IMA).
 - ✓ Control of significant resources was shifted to the IMA.
- The IMA created quickly a geographically-based organizational structure through which to manage Army installations:
 - ✓ 7 Regions worldwide (4 in the continental US).
 - ✓ Approximately 20 installations per Region.





Problem Statement




- Senior Army leaders asked West Point to conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the current IMA region organizational design in the US, and provide recommendations for potential alternative structures.
- Study motivated in part by pressures to reduce personnel slots in headquarters.

**The study was initiated on 3 June 2004,
and conducted over a 10-week period.**




Systems Engineering and Management Process as a Problem Solving Approach






Problem Definition for the IMA Organization





Value Hierarchy of Core Functions for IMA Regions





Design & Analysis of Alternative Organizational Structures



Design & Analysis

Alternatives Generation:

- Defined key organizational design dimensions
- Created 8 alternatives based on dimensions

Modeling & Analysis:

- Built a multiple objective decision analysis model to evaluate the value of design alternatives
- 'Value' based on ability to fulfill core functions




Generating Region Design Alternatives



Created Alternatives using a Range Of Design Dimensions

Key Dimensions Of Organization Design	Range of Design Dimensions
Functions that Regions Perform	Performs only 1 up to all 3 'Core' functions
# People performing Functions	From 50 up to 388 (current # people)
Number of Regions	From no regions to 8 regions
Region Geographic Boundaries	Aligned with other key governmental agency boundaries
Region Headquarters Location	Varied based on geographic boundaries



West HQ: San Antonio

Functions:

- Command & Control
- Assessment
- Resource Analysis



Total Number of People Performing these Functions in Regions = 388

Northeast HQ: Rock Island

East HQ: Ft Monroe

Midwest HQ: San Antonio

Southeast HQ: Ft McPherson

Functions:

- Command & Control
- Assessment
- Resource Analysis






Multiple Objective Decision Analysis Modeling to Evaluate Alternatives



Based on the Value Hierarchy of Core Functions for IMA Regions



Step 1:

Created objectives and evaluation measures for each key sub-function to quantify how well an alternative fulfills that sub-function.

Step 2:


Weighted evaluation measures, sub-functions and functions to capture their relative importance to the effectiveness of the regional structure.

Step 3:

Scored each alternative using Value Functions for each evaluation measure and determined an overall 'potential value-added' for how well the alternative meets the key objective.



Step 1. Objectives and Evaluation Measures for Functions





Command and Control Evaluation Measure Definitions



Sub-Function	Measure Name	Definition
1.1	Weighted # of General Officer HQ's in regions	Summation of the total number of 'stars' in a region, averaged across regions (lower is better (LIB))
1.1	# of different major HQs in region	Average number of different major HQs represented in a region (LIB)
1.2	Constructed multi-dimension span of control measure	Summation of 11 span of control indicators weighted by Region Director input, averaged across regions (LIB)
1.3	# of installations in region	Average number of installations in region (LIB)
1.4	# of different major agencies represented in region	Average number of distinct outside agencies in a region (LIB)




Step 2. Developing Weights for the 14 Evaluation Measures

Weights: Method to represent relative importance of evaluation measures.

		Level of Importance of the Measure		
		Critical Factor	Important Factor	Factor
Variance in the Measure Scale	High	1. # GO HQs per region	5. Travel Time from Region HQ	11. Size of Region Staff
		2. Span of Control	6. # Installations per region	
	Medium	3. # Assessment people per installation	7. # Resource Analysts per Installation	12. # different agencies per region
		4. # Facilities per region	8. # Assessment people per Region	
			9. Area of Roadways	
	Low		10. # different major HQs per region	13. Budget \$ per Resource Analyst
				14. # Gov't. Supply Agencies per region



Step 2. Resulting Evaluation Measure Weights





Evaluating Alternative Organizational Designs



Decision Making

Alternative Scoring:

- Developed value functions for each evaluation measure
- Used an additive value model to rank alternatives

Decision:

- Developed recommendations for Army leaders from insights gained from multiple objective decision analysis model
- Used sensitivity analysis to enhance model credibility



Step 3. Scoring Alternatives Using Value Functions for Evaluation Measures



Value function - A function that assigns value to an evaluation measure score:

- value functions capture returns to scale but not risk preference
- in this study, we converted each evaluation measure raw score to a common scale from 0 to 10.

Additive Value Model – Used to rank alternatives when we have multiple, conflicting objectives:

- assumes there is no uncertainty about the alternative scores

$$v(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i v_i(x_i) \quad \text{where}$$

$v(x)$ is the overall value of alternative x

w_i is the weight of measure i

$v_i(x_i)$ is the value function score of alternative x on measure i



Value Function for the Constructed Multi-dimension Span of Control Measure





Objective: Maximize capability to lead garrisons

Definition: Summation of eleven span of control indicators (normalized to a value between 1 and 10) weighted by Region Director input, averaged over all the regions in the alternative
(higher is better)

Global Weight: 0.17

Type: Direct, constructed

Value Curve: Linear






Value Function for the Number of Installations in a Region



Objective: Maximize capability to understand and articulate installation issues to IMA HQ


Definition: Number of installations in region, averaged over all the regions in the alternative (**lower is better**)



Global Weight: 0.08


Type: Proxy, natural

Value Curve: Convex (exponentially decreasing). Understanding and articulating installation issues becomes significantly more challenging as the number of installations increase; therefore, the value drops off quickly.






Results of Alternatives Evaluation



- Additional regions add potential value, but at a diminishing rate.
- Current structure has *significantly* greater potential value than 2 or 3 region alternatives, and *slightly* less value than 5 or 8 region alternatives.



Results of Alternatives Evaluation




- Reducing the number of regions does not significantly lower manpower unless you also reduce the functions performed.



Sensitivity Analysis of Evaluation Measure Weights



- Adjusted the global weight of each evaluation measure by plus or minus 0.05 to determine if the results would be affected.



- All lines follow the general shape of the potential value added versus regions graph indicating that the shape of the results curve is not sensitive to changes in the global weights of the evaluation measures.



Study Results & Recommendations



- ***IMA is a new organization implemented in a transforming Army at war***
 - *Region Directors understand their role to support the operational units.*
 - *Regions need to develop their expertise to accomplish their mission.*
- ***Core functions of the IMA regions are command and control (C2) for installation management, ensuring installation operational capability, and analyzing installation resource needs***
 - *C2 is essential*
 - *Assessment has potential value IF region personnel build expertise*
 - *Resource analysts without dollar authority have limited impact*



Study Results & Recommendations



- ***Alternatives evaluation was based on Potential Value Added of Regions vs. Authorized Manpower***
 - *C2 alone can be done with about 50 people in DC*
 - *C2 and Assessment can be done with 30% saving in authorized manpower*
 - *Creates a 10% decrement in potential value*
 - *C2, Assessment, and Resource Analysis with 388 personnel*
 - *Potential Value of 5 regions $\approx$ 4 regions > 3 regions >> 2 regions*
- ***Recommendations***
 - *Retain Current 4 region structure*
 - *To achieve any needed manpower savings reduce the resource analysis function in regions*
 - *IMA needs a transparent resource allocation process that will enable better communication*



Conclusions



- The Systems Engineering and Management Process provides a good analysis framework for organizational design issues.
- Building a value hierarchy of 'core' functions is key to developing and evaluating good alternative organizational designs.
- Multiple objective decision analysis can be effectively used for evaluating organizational designs.