



Valuation of Capabilities and System Architectural options to Meet Affordability Requirement

Ronald E. Giachetti, Ph.D.

Professor
Systems Engineering
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA
regiache@nps.edu

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 27 MAY 2014		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2014 to 00-00-2014	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Valuation of Capabilities and System Architectural options to Meet Affordability Requirement				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) Naval Postgraduate School, Systems Engineering, Monterey, CA, 93943				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 AFCEA 11th Annual Acquisition Research Symposium, 14-15 May 2014, Monterey, CA.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 17	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Motivation



- DoD projects meet conditions that make the Real Options approach attractive for the valuation of flexibility in system architectures:
 - ◆ High uncertainty due to long anticipated operational life with technological change and a dynamic, changing operational environment
 - ◆ Flexible, modular, open architectures are a means to mitigate against the risk inherent in the uncertainty



Real Options values the flexibility built into a system architecture

Can help justify investment in flexibility up front and support analysis of alternatives

Real Options



Traditional cost analysis:

- Estimate cashflows
- Discount to obtain NPV
- Make a invest/not invest decision
- **Real Options** estimate a dollar value on the ability to make choices – decision flexibility has value!

Black-Scholes Equation

$$C = S \times N(d_1) - Ee^{-rt} N(d_2)$$

$$d_1 = \frac{\left[\ln\left(\frac{S}{E}\right) + \left(r + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)t \right]}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 t}} \quad d_2 = d_1 - \sqrt{\sigma^2 t}$$

Real Options for Capabilities



- DoD acquires systems to deliver capabilities to the warfighter

Real Options values the flexibility based on a cost-benefit analysis assuming all benefits can be put in dollar terms



Capabilities are not measured in dollars \$\$\$\$\$


- The Real Options framework needs to be adapted to the way DoD values and acquires systems

Value of Weapon Systems




- Value is in capabilities delivered by system
- Options are for additional future capabilities


F-111



Range



(b) Combined Pareto front v1 (Pareto points denoted by +)



Architecture




The system architecture must be designed to accommodate options



Reserved space and plan for future accommodation



LCS Mission Modules




Architectural Options



The architectural options approach involves the following steps:

1. identify sources of uncertainty,
2. define measures for the capabilities,
3. model uncertainty using scenarios,
4. partition the system architecture into modules,
5. define architectural options in the architecture,
6. value options,
7. present the valuation to the decision-maker.



Operational Uncertainty



Unknown operational needs during a long lifespan



B1-B designed for nuclear mission,
converted to conventional bombing mission

Gerald R. Ford (CVN 78) anticipated
operational life of 50 years




Technological Uncertainty




Technological Evolution



Sailors in submarine
(source: undersea warfare)




Architecture Options



Modularization



Modularization
Open interfaces
infrastructure



Source: Jack Abbot, AOC Inc.
in presentation to NPS on April 27, 2006

Architecture Heuristic: Minimize coupling between subsystems
Maximize cohesion within subsystem

Interactions between subsystems




Spatial	Associations of physical space and alignment, needs for adjacency or orientation between two elements
Energy	Needs for energy transfer/exchange between two elements (e.g., power supply)
Information	Needs for data or signal exchange between two elements
Material	Needs for material exchange between two elements

Modularization Algorithm




DSM Matrix; 17-Jul-2013 12:23:47



Modularization



New DSM Matrix; 17-Jul-2013 12:23:47; Total Cost: 4640



Example



Desert Patrol Vehicle



Architecture Options:

- Engine
- Weapon
- Fuel
- Passengers
- Mission modules

Cost to design:


Engine compartment and mounts to enable option for changing engine

Increase/decrease fuel capacity

Mounts/space/interface for various weapon types

Capacity to accept future mission modules

Option Cost and Value



Conclusions



- **Motivation:** Flexibility is being left on the table – rethink system architectures in terms of “options” can help recapture and use this flexibility
 - ◆ Decision makers do think about these types of options, but the informal approach may miss options, is not based on valuation, and human cognitive limits in evaluating multiple options concurrently
- Almost all work on options has looked at options in the PROJECT, this work examined *options in the system architecture*
- Previous work values options using cost information; this work valued *capabilities using MOEs/MOPs*
- Model goes hand-in-hand with evolutionary acquisition of capabilities