



Presidential Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection

Commission could not get industry, especially the banking/financial industry to discuss vulnerabilities with them. The game broke through these barriers and finally the banking team had to go to the government for help due to having no power...interdependencies.

Results: DOE and major industry partners initiated a comprehensive review and overhaul of their National Emergency plans, which they realized were outdated. Many of the game findings included in the Commission report. Afterwards DOJ/FBI told to do an Interagency (23 departments and agencies, including DoD as 1 of 23) Five Year Counterterrorism plan, to include the Infrastructure vulnerabilities.

China Economic and Energy Security

Sponsored by senior leadership in US government and China to investigate issues concerning energy security. Game was first strategic simulation to involve senior leaders from China, US and industry. Game was conducted in Beijing, officially supported by the Central Party School (on behalf of the Chinese Government) and Georgetown (on behalf of the US government).

Results: Game provided key insights and challenges to respective stakeholders that had not been fully address. Key policy considerations for respective government teams as well as candid interactions with senior industry leaders established this process as important for both governments to continue. Current discussions being conducted within government leadership concerning next steps. Series of games over a period of approximately five years in discussion.

A-12 ADR

Coordinated with the General Counsel of the Navy to facilitate candid discussions, in a simulated, non-attribution forum between the government and the contractors to resolve issues.

Results: The preparation and analysis for the game was used by an independent team within the Navy to assist them in their strategies and negotiations.

NAVAIR

Game effectively utilized by Commander of NAVAIR to assess his organization and determine appropriate alignments for a more effective organization for acquisitions. This game was 50% industry participants at a very senior level, including Wall Street and was used by the Commander to educate his work force and industry concerning each other's roles and responsibilities.

Results: Game provided the baseline of NAVAIR and the basis for change that the Commander and his Executive Steering Group moved forward on.

NAVSEA

Industry / government game included 5 of the 6 shipbuilder CEOs to investigate how to build more ships for the same amount of money. ADM Giambastiani, who was then N8, also used this forum to position the advanced appropriation strategy.

Results: A few weeks later the Navy and the shipbuilder CEOs were on the Hill testifying the value of this new strategy and this helped the Navy get its Multi-year buys for ships.

NAVSEA shipbuilding game resulted in a second game done the next year for VADM Nanos concerning Full Service Contracting (FSC).

Results: After the game, which was also attended by OSD, it then initiated its policy concerning PBL. Before the game, industry was strongly lobbying for FSC, but when we pushed on the liabilities that would go with it; they backed off and went to the lesser level of responsibility of PBL.

NAVSEA Organizational Strategy Games:

2007 SEA05 Customer Service Agreements for the Engineering Leadership of NAVSEA. Focus was on the negotiations of the Customer Service Agreement with the PEOs which would involve the deployment of resources to support the Program execution and management customers.

Results: SEA05 was able to better assess how to better deploy limited resources and could better manage those resources from a corporate perspective

NAVSEA Competency Alignment (CAO). NAVSEA leadership wanted to assess current status of CAO implementation strategy with its key stakeholders, to include the PEOs, OPNAV, the Fleet and Industry. An internally focused game was used to better assess what is and is not working with NAVSEA and to identify opportunities for change.

Results: NAVSEA leadership is reviewing the game insights and next steps to be included in new strategic initiatives for 2009.

OSD, AT&L

Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics sponsored two strategy games to better assess potential issues concerning the industrial base and the availability of air assets to maintain US position for Joint Air Dominance

Game I involved the warfighters, led by the respective operational COCOMs to determine shortfalls and to assess the potential impacts of the near term decision of shutting down production lines of current assets, to include the F-22 and the F/A-18.

Results: Respective shortfalls were confirmed during game play, based on simultaneously demand signals from COCOMs. OSD will position key game issues for next administration to determine potential for alternative portfolio investment strategies by DoD.

Game II which was a companion to Game I was focused on addressing presenting alternatives in the “art of the possible” of what could be done within budget constraints. Specific issues to be addressed included the shortfalls due to the delays in the JSF, better business practices that would be a better investment strategy (e.g. management of strategic materials). Simulated RFI and RFP process was used to allow the government to strategize with industry

Results: Government and industry are currently reviewing insights gained during the game. One key insight is the need for more direct communication between government and industry throughout all phases of the acquisition process. Better understanding of technology developments and risks identified by industry will allow better decision making by the government.

MUOS-(Mobile User Objective System) Narrow Band Width Satellites

Sponsored by the ASN-RD&A during the AoA process. Significant industry participation from traditional defense contractors as well as non-traditional to review acquisition strategies with Navy leadership.

Results: Navy Comptroller moved \$1B after this game.

ASN-RD&A

Series of games focused on the respective SYSCOMS, and their respective PEOs and Program Managers. The ASN-RD&A wanted the program managers and PEOs to experience the results of their respective acquisition strategies. The series of games brought together industry, SYSCOM leadership, Navy Leadership as well as Wall Street to better understand the risks and opportunities for improvement in acquisition.

Results: Series of games influenced the development of a new program manager management tool, initiated by the Department of the Army with Defense Acquisition

University leadership. Ultimately adopted by Department of Air Force, Department of the Navy and Homeland Security.

On behalf of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition involving PEOs and DASNs and the importance of consistent messaging concerning programs to the Navy, OSD and Congress.

Results: ASN-RD&A gained insights into his organization, could establish his priorities and was able to force major players to interact and gain insights from one another as he mixed the teams up and took Peas out of their comfort zones.

BMC2 (Battle Management Command and Control)

This senior-level game engaged the services and OSD with very candid interactions concerning investments in C2 and inner/interoperability issues with Secretary Wynne (AT&L), Cebrowski, Network Centric Warfare, Gen Kellog (J6) and ADM Giambastiani (JFCOM) prior to invasion of Iraq.

Results: A month after the game a MID912 was issued which moved over \$300M in programs from the Services to JFCOM. This was to achieve better inneroperability among the respective service program investments

US Navy

On behalf of the Chief of the Navy Staff, and the CNO concerning Navy roles and responsibilities within OPNAV, US Navy assessed two alternatives within its corporate operations concerning budgets and financing (to combine or not).

Results: Game was used to validate Navy OPNAV strategy. Some OPNAV reassessed their operations and responsibilities, especially N3/5 which acknowledged during the game that it had to be more involved at the front end of the budget process with operational requirements and priorities.

Negotiation Strategy

On behalf of Commander of SPP. Issue concerning incentives and other contract strategies which needed to be explored. Sole source contract to Lockheed, negotiated every year. Reevaluation of contract and what the government was paying for revealed some opportunities for renegotiations.

Results: New contract structure, changed incentive award structure. Navy saved more than \$300M from a \$1.3B contract. Commander of SPP stated the savings were more than that as he then applied the insights to other contractors, such as General Dynamics.

JFCOM/USD P&R

A three-game series after JSIMS was cancelled. Secretary Wynne sent memo establishing the alternatives to be looked at during AoA. Army and Marines assumptions and positions that they tried to support during AoA significantly challenged during the games.

Results: JFCOM's position of representing the COCOMs for requirements not supported by COCOMs. JCS (J7) became more involved as it was realized that training/readiness are on very close parallels, if not one in the same. A prototype for more agile and responsive/relevant acquisition was proposed that was developed during the game JCS, OSD and JFCOM changed parts of their organizations to more effectively work together. After Game Two, JCS team stated that we did not know how to effectively use and manage the technologies already invested in. Established a Tiger Team and the first 2 game findings to interview the COCOMs and discovered that 90% of what was being done for training/readiness COCOMs did not find value in.

Port Security

A three-game series with the first two focusing on Command and Control between Coast Guard and Navy and the third involving private industry and DHS with National Response Plan. First game was previous to 9/11 with the second game classified and findings briefed to ADM Fallon and other senior leaders of the Navy and Coast Guard.

Results from Games 1 and 2: MOU signed between USN and CG roles/responsibilities in Homeland Security/Homeland Defense. Navy began to look at joint requirements with CG. Navy established MDA initiative as a priority for Navy Roles and Responsibilities.

Game 3. DHS sponsored game in Port of New York/New Jersey to investigate the issues between roles and responsibilities between the governments and the expectations of the primary users of the port, private industry.

Results: Government agencies, including the Coast Guard, FEMA and the Port Authorities began to investigate the need for significant changes being made to some of their operational procedures, including more involvement of industry.