

**Army Regulation 5-5**

**Management**

# **Army Studies and Analyses**

**Headquarters  
Department of the Army  
Washington, DC  
13 April 2011**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# ***SUMMARY of CHANGE***

AR 5-5

Army Studies and Analyses

This major revision, dated 13 April 2011--

- o Prescribes revised policy and guidance for managing the Army Study Program (para 2-4).
- o Describes the role of the Senior Analyst Advisory Board (para 2-6).
- o Provides guidance for planning and budgeting for the Army Study Program (paras 3-2 and 3-3).
- o Provides background on the Military Operations Research Society (para 6-2).
- o Makes administrative changes (throughout).

Effective 13 May 2011

## Management

### Army Studies and Analyses

---

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

MARTIN E. DEMPSEY  
*General, United States Army*  
*Chief of Staff*

Official:

  
JOYCE E. MORROW  
*Administrative Assistant to the*  
*Secretary of the Army*

**History.** This publication is a major revision.

**Summary.** This regulation prescribes policy and guidance and assigns responsibilities for managing the Army Study Program. This regulation also clarifies and updates responsibilities, procedures, and guidance on the performance and evaluation of a study.

**Applicability.** This regulation applies to the active Army, the Army National Guard/Army National Guard of the United States, and the U.S. Army Reserve, unless otherwise stated. It applies to the Army National Guard when using Federal funds for study efforts.

**Proponent and exception authority.** The proponent of this regulation is the

Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8. The proponent has the authority to approve exceptions or waivers to this regulation that are consistent with controlling law and regulations. The proponent may delegate this approval authority, in writing, to a division chief within the proponent agency or its direct reporting unit or field operating agency, in the grade of colonel or the civilian equivalent. Activities may request a waiver to this regulation by providing justification that includes a full analysis of the expected benefits and must include formal review by the activity’s senior legal officer. All waiver requests will be endorsed by the commander or senior leader of the requesting activity and forwarded through their higher headquarters to the policy proponent. Refer to AR 25–30 for specific guidance.

**Army internal control process.** This regulation contains management control provisions and identifies key management controls that must be evaluated (see appendix D).

**Supplementation.** Supplementation of this regulation and establishment of command local forms are prohibited without prior approval from the Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8, ATTN: DAPR–ASP, 700 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310–0700.

**Suggested improvements.** Users are invited to send comments and suggestions directly to the Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8,

Army Study Program Management Office, ATTN: DAPR–ASP, 700 Army Pentagon, Room 3E393, Washington, DC 20310–0700.

**Committee Continuance Approval.**

The Department of the Army committee management official concurs in the establishment and/or continuance of the committee(s) outlined herein. AR 15–1 requires the proponent to justify establishing/continuing committee(s), coordinate draft publications, and coordinate changes in committee status with the U.S. Army Resources and Programs Agency, Department of the Army Committee Management Office (AARP–ZX), 105 Army Pentagon, Washington DC 20310–0105. Further, if it is determined that an established “group” identified within this regulation, later takes on the characteristics of a committee, as found in the AR 15–1, then the proponent will follow all AR 15–1 requirements for establishing and continuing the group as a committee.

**Distribution.** This regulation is available in electronic media only and is intended for command levels C, D, and E for the active Army, and D and E for the Army National Guard/Army National Guard of the United States, and the U.S. Army Reserve.

---

#### Contents (Listed by paragraph and page number)

##### Chapter 1

Introduction, *page 1*

Purpose • 1–1, *page 1*

References • 1–2, *page 1*

Explanation of abbreviations and terms • 1–3, *page 1*

Responsibilities • 1–4, *page 1*

Overview • 1–5, *page 2*

---

\*This regulation supersedes AR 5–5, dated 30 June 1996.

## **Contents—Continued**

Scope • 1–6, *page 2*

### **Chapter 2**

#### **Army Study Program Management, *page 2***

Army studies • 2–1, *page 2*

Program objectives • 2–2, *page 2*

Performing organizations • 2–3, *page 2*

Policy • 2–4, *page 2*

Study Program Coordination Committee • 2–5, *page 3*

Senior Analyst Advisory Board • 2–6, *page 4*

Centralized coordination • 2–7, *page 4*

### **Chapter 3**

#### **Army Study Program Planning and Budgeting, *page 4***

Introduction • 3–1, *page 4*

Planning • 3–2, *page 4*

Budgeting • 3–3, *page 5*

Annual study program • 3–4, *page 5*

Unprogrammed study requirements • 3–5, *page 5*

### **Chapter 4**

#### **Army Study Program Evaluation, *page 5***

Requirements and procedures • 4–1, *page 5*

Headquarters, Department of the Army agency; Army command; Army service component command; and direct reporting unit program evaluations • 4–2, *page 5*

Evaluation • 4–3, *page 6*

### **Chapter 5**

#### **Life Cycle Management of Individual Studies, *page 6***

Study management • 5–1, *page 6*

Study sponsor • 5–2, *page 6*

Sponsor's study representative and the technical representative • 5–3, *page 6*

Study advisory group • 5–4, *page 6*

Council of colonels • 5–5, *page 6*

Approval to conduct a study • 5–6, *page 7*

Reporting requirements • 5–7, *page 7*

Study phases • 5–8, *page 7*

### **Chapter 6**

#### **Related Roles and Activities, *page 9***

Army Operations Research Symposium • 6–1, *page 9*

Military Operations Research Society • 6–2, *page 9*

### **Appendixes**

**A.** References, *page 10*

**B.** Examples of Study Efforts, *page 12*

**C.** Literature Search Sources, *page 13*

**D.** Internal Control Evaluation, *page 13*

### **Glossary**

## Chapter 1 Introduction

### 1–1. Purpose

This regulation prescribes policy and guidance for managing Army studies and assigns responsibilities for maintaining and improving the quality of Army studies and analyses.

### 1–2. References

Required and related publications and prescribed and referenced forms are listed in appendix A.

### 1–3. Explanation of abbreviations and terms

- a. Abbreviations and terms used in this publication are explained in the glossary.
- b. In this regulation, "studies and analyses" will be referred to as "studies."

### 1–4. Responsibilities

- a. *Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8.* The DCS, G–8, will—
  - (1) Serve as the Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) proponent for this regulation.
  - (2) Serve as the authority to approve exceptions to this regulation consistent with controlling laws and regulations.
  - (3) Serve as the HQDA executive administrator for Army studies, ensuring that the formulation of study policy and study priorities support current Army initiatives.
  - (4) Co-chair the Study Program Coordination Committee (SPCC) with the DCS, G–3/5/7. This program is centrally funded by HQDA with management decision evaluation package (MDEP) VSTD (VSTD is a MDEP for HQDA studies).
  - (5) Oversee all arrangements for the Army Operations Research Symposium (AORS).
  - (6) Provide necessary input for Congressional testimony and responses to Congressional inquiries about studies within the scope of this regulation.
  - (7) Have the Army Study Program Management Office (ASPMO) as its executive administrator. The ASPMO is responsible for policy and doctrinal guidance related to Army studies; specifically, this regulation and DA Pam 5–5. The ASPMO will—
    - (a) Promote liaison with senior Army leadership and Army analysis organizations on matters involving study programs, research activities, and Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) as they impact the Army force generation model and the core enterprises.
    - (b) Provide management oversight of the SPCC-approved study efforts recommended for funding under MDEP VSTD.
    - (c) Promote collaboration between Army study sponsors (SSs) and RAND Arroyo research staff for Arroyo Center Policy Committee-approved study efforts recommended for funding under MDEP VARY (VARY is a MDEP for the RAND Arroyo Center) (see AR 5–21).
  - (8) Establish and maintain an information database of completed studies, analyses, results, recommendations, and completed evaluations accessible to the Army analytic community.
- b. *Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7.* The DCS, G–3/5/7 will—
  - (1) Co-chair the SPCC with the DCS, G–8.
  - (2) Establish operational priorities for HQDA.
- c. *Senior Analyst Advisory Board.* The SAAB will—
  - (1) Provide program direction for operations research and systems analysis activities within the Army.
  - (2) Provide oversight and advisory guidance to the Army analytic community.
  - (3) Assist the ASPMO in developing annual Army Study Planning Guidance and study priorities.
  - (4) Establish guidelines for an annual withhold of reserve funds to apply to out-of-cycle and critical emergent analysis requirements.
  - (5) Provide guidance and direction for conducting senior level conferences focusing on current or special interest topics to the Army analytic community.
- d. *Principal HQDA officials, Army commands, Army service component commands, direct reporting units, directors, and agency heads within the Army.* The principal HQDA officials, ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, directors, and agency heads within the Army will—
  - (1) Serve as proponents for all matters pertaining to Army analysis within their areas of responsibility.
  - (2) Implement and monitor study activities for field operating agencies, staff support agencies, and any other activities under their purview.
  - (3) Appoint a study coordinator (SC) to advise on matters relating to Army analysis activities that are HQDA centrally funded programs.

(4) Establish an organizational environment that values quality analyses and promotes professional performance of studies.

(5) Submit to the DCS, G-8, ASPMO the annual report of Schedule 10 funded requirements, advisory and assistance services, and FFRDCs.

### **1-5. Overview**

The objective of an Army Study Program (ASP) is to provide senior Army leadership with timely, high quality insight on critical issues impacting the Army. A well-structured ASP eliminates unnecessary redundancy in analysis efforts and expands upon lessons learned and best business practices to achieve cost-effective stewardship.

### **1-6. Scope**

This regulation applies to the management of Army studies. Studies within the scope of this regulation can include, but are not limited to, the examples listed in appendix B. The HQDA study efforts, to include contracted efforts managed under AR 5-14, are governed by this regulation. Exclusions are cited in paragraph B-2.

## **Chapter 2 Army Study Program Management**

### **2-1. Army studies**

Army studies are analytic assessments undertaken to gain insight and/or evaluate complex issues in support of policy development, assessments of operations, decisionmaking, research and development (R&D) activities, and management. Studies result in conclusions, findings, and/or recommendations that will inform Army decisionmakers. Studies will be documented with required security classifications and restrictions and appropriately archived. Studies may include development and documentation of models, methodologies, and related software programs required to support complex analyses.

### **2-2. Program objectives**

The objectives of an ASP are to facilitate—

- a.* Identification of long- and short-term study requirements for senior leadership and the development of plans to address these issues.
- b.* Attention to critical Army issues as published annually in the Army Study Planning Guidance.
- c.* Study coordination through the ASPMO to ensure visibility and quality assurance of HQDA centrally funded Army-sponsored study efforts.
- d.* Minimum administrative procedures and controls for good business practices, consistent with the above objectives and Army regulations.

### **2-3. Performing organizations**

The ASP is composed of analyses provided by three types of supporting organizations:

- a.* Army analysis organizations—such as the Center for Army Analysis (CAA), the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command Analysis Center (TRAC), or the Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity (AMSAA).
- b.* The FFRDCs, such as RAND Arroyo Center, the MITRE Corporation, or the Institute for Defense Analysis.
- c.* Commercial firms through contract.

### **2-4. Policy**

The ASP policy is as follows:

- a.* Studies will be managed under a system of integrated controls characterized by planning guidance, review, coordination, and reporting. Management and administration of individual study efforts and command study programs remain decentralized.
- b.* Individual study efforts will be managed to ensure efficient and effective results or outcomes, cost control, implementation of results, and reporting in the appropriate Army and DOD information systems.
- c.* Studies will be undertaken only when there is a reasonable expectation of a significant contribution to decision-making, operations assessments, policy development, cost savings, cost avoidance, benefit to the warfighter, or management.
- d.* The funding requirement for studies to be performed by contract will be reflected in the program objective memorandum and/or budget estimate submission.
- e.* Studies should not unnecessarily duplicate other analytic work but may build on other work previously accomplished. A literature review is required for all studies. As a minimum, the literature review is to include the HQDA ASP online database and the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC).

*f.* Contract studies will be conducted and obligations reported according to the provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and other internal guidance to include AR 5–14.

*g.* Findings, conclusions, recommendations, and final reports resulting from Army studies will be submitted to the DTIC and/or other appropriate reporting archive as determined by the sponsor or head of the Army analysis organization, unless a study was exempt from reporting. All archived studies will be marked with appropriate security markings and distribution restrictions, as required.

## **2–5. Study Program Coordination Committee**

The SPCC—

*a.* Is co-chaired by the DCS, G–8 and the DCS, G–3/5/7.

*b.* Consists of general officers or senior executive service representatives from HQDA, ACOMs, and select ASCCs and DRUs with significant analytic assets and/or analytic missions. Members include the following:

- (1) Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology).
- (2) Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).
- (3) Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller).
- (4) Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Energy, and Environment).
- (5) Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).
- (6) Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, Test and Evaluation.
- (7) Office of Business Transformation.
- (8) U.S. Army Forces Command.
- (9) U.S. Army Materiel Command.
- (10) Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity.
- (11) U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.
- (12) U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command Analysis Center.
- (13) U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command.
- (14) Chief Information Officer/G–6.
- (15) Deputy Chief of Staff, G–1.
- (16) Deputy Chief of Staff, G–2.
- (17) Deputy Chief of Staff, G–3/5/7.
- (18) Deputy Chief of Staff, G–4.
- (19) Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8.
- (20) Center for Army Analysis.
- (21) Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management.
- (22) Chief of Engineers.
- (23) U.S. Corps of Engineers.
- (24) The Surgeon General.
- (25) U.S. Army National Guard.
- (26) U.S. Army Reserve.
- (27) U.S. Army Special Operations Command.
- (28) U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command.
- (29) Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation.
- (30) Director, Army Research Institute.
- (31) Department of the Army Chief of Chaplains.
- (32) Office of the Judge Advocate General.
- (33) Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison.
- (34) Office of the Chief Public Affairs.
- (35) U.S. Army Accessions Command.
- (36) U.S. Military Academy.

*c.* Provides senior leadership oversight of an ASP that is centrally funded under MDEP VSTD and approves the allocation of HQDA resources and the program of annual study efforts.

*d.* Meets biannually to release the annual Army Study Planning Guidance and to approve the proposed ASP for the upcoming fiscal year.

*e.* May be asked to review and coordinate requests to fund high priority unprogrammed studies and/or recommend adjustments in the ASP.

## 2-6. Senior Analyst Advisory Board

The SAAB—

a. Is chaired by the Assistant DCS, G-8 and includes senior analyst representatives from the Army's principal analytic organizations to include CAA; TRAC; AMSAA; Army Capabilities Integration Center; DCS, G-3/5/7 Capability Integration Division; Deputy Assistant Secretary Army for Cost and Economics; Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, Test and Evaluation; and U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command.

b. Provides guidance and oversight of critical and high priority analysis requirements across the Army. The SAAB also assists in developing annual Army Study Planning Guidance and policy related to analysis to ensure that planned studies address all critical Army issues. The SAAB also advises on funding for unprogrammed study funding requests.

c. Meets every 4 to 6 weeks or as required.

## 2-7. Centralized coordination

Coordination of HQDA centrally funded Army studies leverages Army study resources by ensuring the dissemination of individual study efforts. Coordination occurs by sharing and collaborating on planned, ongoing, and completed studies. To facilitate this goal, the following responsibilities have been assigned:

a. *Study technical review.* The ASPMO acts as a clearinghouse for proposed contracted studies to include add-on efforts designated for the RAND Arroyo Center not included in the core program. The ASPMO forwards each study proposal to the three principal Army analysis organizations for a preliminary technical review. This review serves to promote awareness of the effort across Army analysis organizations, to capitalize on existing Army expertise, and preclude duplication of studies. The CAA, AMSAA, and TRAC will conduct brief technical reviews of all studies proposed for HQDA central funding.

b. *Army Study Program Management Office.* Personnel within the ASPMO maintain the option to review all study submissions to—

- (1) Verify proper integration of the program.
- (2) Confirm adherence to program guidance.
- (3) Ensure the validity of proposed studies.
- (4) Prevent unnecessary duplication.
- (5) Evaluate the planned performance methods.

## Chapter 3

### Army Study Program Planning and Budgeting

#### 3-1. Introduction

This chapter provides information concerning annual planning, programming, and budgeting of Army studies and general guidelines for programmed study requirements.

#### 3-2. Planning

a. Developing a study program plan is an ongoing and evolving process beginning with continuing discussions between Army general officers and senior executive service level management with the senior management of the Army analytic community represented by the members of the SAAB. Requirements identified through this dialogue typically support major Army strategies and initiatives documented by the Army Campaign Plan. This document together with gap analyses conducted against Army programs identified in the Joint Capability Integration and Development System serve to inform the analytic community with framing the annual Army Study Planning Guidance.

b. A study proposal will typically be developed in a cooperative manner between the SS and an analysis activity possessing the required technical expertise to assess the study issue. This will include a problem description, a methodology (to include specific technical approaches for analyzing the problem), a listing of potential benefits to be realized from conducting the study, an estimate of the resources required for the project, and a milestone chart. Proposals should address detailed benefits to the Army, potential cost savings or cost avoidance, and the program decision points that may be influenced by the study results.

c. Building an overall study program plan is accomplished by consolidating individual study proposals supporting a specific program (for example, HQDA centrally funded programs under MDEP VSTD). The consolidated program will then be presented for review and approval by an appropriate approval body (for example, SPCC for MDEP VSTD).

d. Duplication of study efforts will be avoided unless there is a requirement to verify results of prior efforts specifically by having an independent assessment completed. In general, the risk of duplication will be avoided by the SS by conducting a thorough literature review.

### **3-3. Budgeting**

*a.* The SSs will develop budgets for supporting analysis requirements as part of their program objective memorandum and/or budget estimate submission. (Further details for budgeting HQDA studies are in DA Pam 5-5.)

*b.* The SSs intending to conduct projects under contract (through FFRDCs or commercial vendors) will submit their budget requests and required budget exhibits to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller), ATTN: Army Budget Office, 109 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0109 for incorporation in the Army budget as part of the Schedule 10 funding requirements.

*c.* The SSs intending to direct projects to Army analytic activities will establish an appropriate budget line supporting the requirement or will submit the project for funding consideration by an appropriate HQDA centrally funded program.

*d.* The SSs proposing efforts which support R&D activities (such as research, technology exploration and development, systems and equipment analyses, and development efforts), including development and test of initial tactics and doctrine, should be budgeted with research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) funds. In those cases where a clear determination based on the above is not possible, the guideline will be to attempt to fund such studies and analyses in RDT&E if the sponsoring organization is a part of the R&D community. In instances where a materiel system has reached the procurement stage and contract studies are required, funding from procurement funds is authorized if the study is directly related to a specific item of equipment for which procurement funds use is designated. All other studies will be budgeted in the operation and maintenance appropriations.

### **3-4. Annual study program**

An annual study program is developed and executed under a defined process designed to meet Army analysis requirements and to execute approved and assigned resources in a cost-effective manner.

*a.* Planning an annual study program begins when annual Army Study Planning Guidance has been developed and published. The HQDA centrally funded program, under MDEP VSTD, issues this guidance for the next fiscal year during the third quarter through the DCS, G-8. This guidance provides direction for commanders, agency heads, and SSs to allocate analysis resources and to prepare a coordinated, responsive, and executable program.

*b.* Individual ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, and analytic organizations will then use the annual Army Study Planning Guidance or a similar document to formulate their command's upcoming fiscal year study program and establish recommended priorities among individual study proposals.

*c.* The ASPMO with responsibility for gathering study requirements will consolidate recommended studies submitted by the ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, and analytic organizations. The HQDA centrally funded program funded under MDEP VSTD is supported by the ASPMO within the DCS, G-8.

*d.* The ASPMO will present the recommended annual study program for approval to an appropriate Army governing body. In the case of the HQDA centrally funded programs under MDEP VSTD, the respective governing body is the SPCC.

*e.* Upon approval, the ASPMO will execute the annual study program according to established fiscal guidance.

*f.* At the beginning of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, the ASPMO will coordinate with SCs to ensure that assigned funding has been executed. Unobligated or unexpended funds will be returned to the ASPMO for reassignment to priority efforts as identified by the SAAB.

### **3-5. Unprogrammed study requirements**

All proposed study requirements requiring HQDA central funding outside the normal planning cycle will be coordinated with the ASPMO for SAAB review and approval.

## **Chapter 4 Army Study Program Evaluation**

### **4-1. Requirements and procedures**

To ensure that the objectives of an ASP are met, this chapter prescribes evaluation requirements and procedures for HQDA agencies, ACOMs, ASCCs, and DRUs.

### **4-2. Headquarters, Department of the Army agency; Army command; Army service component command; and direct reporting unit program evaluations**

*a.* Each command or activity sponsoring a project under a HQDA centrally funded study program must prepare and forward to the ASPMO an evaluation of their program during the fiscal year. At a minimum, this evaluation will describe the results and impact of the previous fiscal year's studies and include, where possible, a quantification of benefits to the Army from implementing the study recommendations. This information will be used as the basis for an annual evaluation of the ASP and will be presented to the SAAB and other appropriate governance bodies.

b. The ASPMO may request evaluations from HQDA agencies, ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, and analytic activities by issuing a memorandum to the SCs. This request will provide a detailed format for submissions and will identify any specific information required beyond that stated above.

#### **4-3. Evaluation**

An annual evaluation of the results and uses of the studies is prepared at the ASPMO and reported for all projects completed during the fiscal year. This evaluation uses the HQDA agency, ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, and analytic activities submitted evaluations to develop a descriptive evaluation of the impact of the preceding fiscal year's program. This is conducted to evaluate guidance, identify areas for improvement, maintain continuity, and provide senior Army leaders with an assessment of the return on investment in study resources.

## **Chapter 5 Life Cycle Management of Individual Studies**

### **5-1. Study management**

This chapter prescribes the requirements for managing the life cycle of individual study efforts governed by the ASP. (For specific guidance, to include report formats and reporting frequency, see DA Pam 5-5.)

### **5-2. Study sponsor**

The SS is a "principal HQDA official, ACOM, director, or agency head" sponsoring a study. Study sponsors may delegate this authority within the sponsoring agency (persons with the grade of colonel or the civilian equivalent).

- a. The SS validates the need for the study and provides continuous management oversight of the study effort.
- b. The SS's overall objectives are to—
  - (1) Provide management oversight of the study effort from formulation through study closeout and implementation.
  - (2) Achieve the best product consistent with the resources expended (return on investment).
  - (3) Ensure study results fulfill the stated Army requirements.
  - (4) Implement study results on a timely basis.
  - (5) Identify and establish information assurance requirements for protecting sensitive or classified information.

### **5-3. Sponsor's study representative and the technical representative**

a. The sponsor's study representative (SSR) and/or technical representative (TR) is generally a member of the SS's organization and is appointed by the SS. This person, or persons, should be in the grade of major or civilian equivalent or higher. The SSRs and/or TRs overall objectives are usually administrative in nature. (The SSR was formally referred as the sponsor's study director.) The SSR and TR—

- (1) Represent the SS in establishing the requirement for the study.
  - (2) Provide direction and coordination to the organization performing the study and to the contracting officer representative (COR) (if contracted) and arrange for and provide guidance to the Studies Advisory Group (SAG), if required.
  - (3) Ensure that study objectives have been met.
- b. The TR is required for contract studies that are technical in nature. The TR monitors the technical performance and reports any potential or actual problems to the COR and/or contracting officer (KO).
- c. The SSR and/or TR is responsible for continued monitoring of the study and ensuring continuity by keeping all interested parties informed when any change in sponsorship occurs, especially if there is a change in study oversight.
- d. The SSR and/or TR performs actions during each phase of the study effort.

### **5-4. Study advisory group**

A study advisory group may be formed by a SS when the proposed study exceeds a million dollars in cost and/or the subject of the study focuses on critical issues potentially impacting the Army at large. The SAG consists of representatives from Army elements having a clear functional interest in the study topic or potential implementation of study results. The SAG is to advise and assist the SS on conducting the study; to provide assistance, coordination, and support to the organization performing the study; and to offer guidance on implementation strategies for study recommendations. The SAG can also play a major role in determining sources of data and identifying the most appropriate scenarios.

### **5-5. Council of colonels**

A council of colonels (COC) may be formed when a study involves multiple Army organizations or staffs. The COC is made up of subordinate representatives from SAG member organizations. The COC thoroughly examines study plans and execution, with a focus on technical and tactical aspects of the study (prior to their being presented to the SAG).

The COC could also include nonvoting representatives from the other Services or DOD staffs when the study involves Joint or intelligence community capabilities or Joint integration.

## **5-6. Approval to conduct a study**

Organization commanders must approve the commitment of resources for all command-sponsored and command-funded studies. They will also approve all studies recommended for funding under HQDA centrally funded programs (for example, MDEP VSTD).

## **5-7. Reporting requirements**

a. The SSRs and TRs must meet reporting requirements before, during, and after completing a study.  
b. The SSR and/or TR will prepare and/or manage the study proposal, performance work statement (PWS), or study directive for both contract and internal studies. These study documents will be uploaded to the ASPMO database. The performing organization prepares the study plan, interim results and final results briefings, the final report, and project evaluation. In addition to the following, the SSR and/or TR and performing organization will follow the guidance outlined in DA Pam 5-5.

(1) Prepare, review, publish, and distribute documents in accordance with AR 70-31 and AR 25-30. This also involves maintaining proper security measures found in AR 380-5.

(2) Manage personal data collected or assessed during the effort according to the Privacy Act of 1974 (Title 5, United States Code, Section 552(a) (5 USC 552(a)), as implemented in AR 340-21.

(3) Respond to FOIA requests according to 5 USC 522(b) and AR 25-55. Only the initial denial authority (as prescribed by AR 25-55) may deny information requested under the FOIA.

*Note.* Release of documents produced by an internal Army study is approved by the controlling authority (usually the SS).

(4) Disseminate information and/or materials produced by studies to interested parties consistent with security classification and proprietary information under the FOIA and the Privacy Act. If emerging results are requested under FOIA, but release would significantly impair Army performance of missions or cause confusion or misunderstanding about Army goals or policy, the information should be withheld by the appropriate initial denial authority until the effort has been completed and release has been approved by the controlling authority (see FOIA and AR 25-55).

## **5-8. Study phases**

In general, individual study efforts are characterized by the following phases:

a. *Phase 1-Formulation and/or Validation.* The primary objective of the formulation and validation phase is to determine if the study is required, and then to develop a study proposal, directive, and/or PWS for approval by the SS. (Further description of the duties of the SS and SSR during this phase is outlined in DA Pam 5-5.) This phase also determines whether the study will be performed with internal Army assets or by contract.

(1) The SS will—

(a) Establish a need for the study by relating planned results to solutions to Army problems, to include aligning study efforts to the current Army Study Planning Guidance, the Army Campaign Plan, the Quadrennial Defense Review, and the Strategic Planning Guidance.

(b) Determine the need to convene a SAG to assist in reviewing the study directive and other study documentation.

(c) In the event the study supports a materiel acquisition program, identify the milestone decision being supported.

(d) Determine if the study should be accomplished by an internal Army study organization, FFRDC, or by contract. If unsure, consult the ASPMO for guidance.

(e) Appoint a SSR to develop the initial study proposal, PWS, or study directive, as necessary.

(f) Identify resources required to complete the effort. This includes coordinating with the desired performing agency to identify resources required and/or determining the estimated cost and identifying funding required.

(g) Ensure ongoing coordination is maintained with the command SC.

(h) Obtain command approval for the study proposal, directive, and/or PWS. For studies conducted by a Government organization, approve the study directive approval document. For contract studies, approve the study proposal and sign the command approval document and the PWS (see DA Pam 5-5). Ensure that the study is forwarded to the ASPMO for program tracking and quality assurance.

(2) The SSR and/or TR will—

(a) Verify the requirement for the effort by coordinating with other agencies or commands and by conducting a literature review to ensure that a valid requirement for the effort exists and that there is no unnecessary duplication of effort.

(b) Determine the end product desired and the timeframe of the study effort.

(c) Justify the study by identifying potential uses for anticipated study results. Identify the use and users of the anticipated results.

(d) Estimate the benefits, costs, and risks associated with conducting the effort.

(e) Determine critical objectives.

- (f) Prepare a study proposal and/or a PWS clearly defining the problem and scope. For internal Army studies, SSRs may prepare a study directive.
- (g) Submit all approved contract studies to an Army contracting office for award. If the study will be funded through an Army HQDA centrally funded program, the proposed contract should be submitted to the appropriate HQDA Program Management Office (DA Pam 5-5). Include the PWS and a justification for not using internal Army analytic resources. Ensure that information assurance requirements for protecting sensitive and or classified information are included in the contract.
- (h) Establish and maintain a file of study reference papers and documentation.
- (i) In the event of personnel changes, ensure that the study is reassigned to another person designated as SSR by the SS to support continuity of efforts and to ensure that all deliverables have been met as scheduled.
- b. *Phase 2—Study Development and Conduct.* This phase begins after the SS approves the study proposal, PWS, and/or study directive and ends when the SS approves the final results or terminates the study effort. (The specific duties of the SS and SSR during this phase are outlined in DA Pam 5-5.)
- (1) The SS—
- (a) Will monitor study progress through formal progress reviews and informal discussions with the SSR.
- (b) In addition to the SSR, may also appoint a TR if the study is technical in nature. Although the TR is an unofficial designation, the TR should be technically competent in the subject matter. (A COR is officially appointed by the KO. The TR assists the COR in monitoring the technical aspects of contract studies.)
- (c) When appropriate, will request termination of the study contract before the scheduled completion date and de-obligation of remaining contract funds.
- (d) If necessary, will chair the SAG to provide advice, assistance, and direction to the organization performing the study.
- (e) Will approve the findings and recommendations of the study.
- (2) The SSR and/or TR will coordinate the following:
- (a) *Internal Army studies.* Coordinate with the performing agency in its development of a viable study plan and monitor study performance to ensure that the objectives of the SS have been addressed and that deliverables have been provided as planned.
- (b) *Contract studies.* Coordinate with the designated COR to ensure compliance with all governing FARs, Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and governing KO instructions. Only the KO may approve changes to a contract.
- (c) *In-progress reviews.* Coordinate an appropriate schedule of meetings with the SS to provide updates on the study progress and identify emergent results in draft reports.
- c. *Phase 3—Final Documentation and Closeout Activities.* Upon sponsor approval of the final study results, the performer will prepare a final report. The SS approves the final study report for further distribution and transmission to the DTIC. Unless the SS has explicitly restricted where study results will be archived, the SS will be responsible for maintaining all study results and findings; all study reports will be submitted to the DTIC according to DODD 3200.12. This phase includes documenting the study in written format and making the study appropriately accessible to inform interested parties of the results of the study and how the study was conducted. (The specific duties of the SS and SSR during this phase are outlined in DA Pam 5-5, chapter 5.)
- (1) The SSR will—
- (a) Coordinate with the performing organization when a study report has been submitted to the DTIC. The study report must include a completed SF 298 (Report Documentation Page). Included in each study may be a disclaimer statement, such as, "The views, opinions, and findings in this document are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation."
- (b) Submit the final study documents and completed SF 298 to Commander, Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218. The only exception will be when the SS has decided to restrict all study documents to an internal SS-designated archive.
- (c) For all HQDA centrally funded studies, submit an evaluation report within 12 months following study completion.
- (2) The SS, TR, and COR will assist the KO, as required, during contract closeout.
- d. *Phase 4—Implementation.* This phase occurs upon completion of a study and execution of approved recommendations. (Emergent study results may be implemented during the course of a study.)
- (1) The SS will—
- (a) Evaluate the results of the study and determine which results should be implemented.
- (b) Develop an implementation plan and monitor progress.
- (2) The SSR will—
- (a) Validate or revise the implementation plan according to the direction of the SS.

- (b) Coordinate execution of the implementation plan and ensure that appropriate follow-up actions are taken.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Related Roles and Activities**

These roles and activities foster communication, exchange information, and recognize high-quality work within the DOD analytic communities.

#### **6-1. Army Operations Research Symposium**

Operations research is the use of mathematical models, statistics, and algorithms to aid in decisionmaking. It is most often used to analyze complex real-world systems, typically with the goal of improving or optimizing performance. The first AORS, organized by the Army research office (Durham), occurred at Duke University in March 1962. Later it was established as an annual event. At this event, reports of new work are presented to the assembled analytic community, and senior analysts may provide critiques of presented works.

*a.* The DCS, G-8, through the ASPMO, designates the annual sponsor and furnishes guidance and information to assist the sponsor in conducting the symposium. The HQDA provides the funding annually to defray administrative expenses. The Director, CAA serves as the AORS manager and, as such, provides policy and oversight to the AORS.

*b.* Sponsorship for the annual symposium will rotate among principal Army analytic activities, as designated by the AORS manager on behalf of the DCS, G-8.

*c.* The designated symposium sponsor will follow the guide (the previous year's after action report) in all planning activities and brief the sponsor's operational plan to the AORS manager prior to 1 May each year. The designated symposium sponsor will develop a program consistent with furnished guidance and provide administrative support for attendees. The sponsor will determine, in coordination with the DCS, G-2, if proposed actions conform to the national disclosure policy set forth in AR 380-10. Sponsors will brief the AORS manager on the AORS after action report.

*d.* The Dr. Wilbur Payne Award for Excellence in Analysis is presented annually during the symposium. This award is given in two forms—one to acknowledge the best large and small group analysis conducted during the previous 12 months by Army analysts and one to acknowledge the best individual analysis during the same period. Selections are made by a panel of senior government analysts using objective criteria. The panel recommends selections to the DCS, G-8 who manages the award on behalf of the Secretariat.

#### **6-2. Military Operations Research Society**

The Military Operations Research Society (MORS) has served the DOD analytic community for over 40 years. Under the sponsorship of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Staff, the objective of the MORS is to enhance the quality and effectiveness of military operations research. The MORS sponsors a number of events throughout the year. One of these is the MORS Symposium for which HQDA provides partial funding annually to defray administrative expenses. (More information is available at <http://www.mors.org/>.)

## **Appendix A References**

### **Section I Required Publications**

#### **AR 5-14**

Management of Contracted Advisory and Assistance Services (Cited in paras 1-6, 2-4f.)

#### **AR 5-21**

Army Policies and Responsibilities for the Arroyo Center (Cited in para 1-4a(7)(c).)

#### **AR 25-55**

The Department of the Army Freedom of Information Act Program (Cited in paras 5-7b(3), 5-7b(4).)

#### **AR 25-30**

The Army Publishing Program (Cited in para 5-7b(1).)

#### **AR 70-31**

Standards for Technical Reporting (Cited in para 5-7b(1).)

#### **AR 340-21**

The Army Privacy Program (Cited in para 5-7b(2).)

#### **AR 380-5**

Department of the Army Information Security Program (Cited in para 5-7b(1).)

#### **AR 380-10**

Foreign Disclosure and Contacts with Foreign Representatives (Cited in para 6-1c.)

#### **DA Pam 5-5**

Guidance for Army Study Sponsors, Sponsor's Study Directors, Study Advisory Groups, and Contracting Officer Representatives (Cited in paras 1-4a(7), 3-3a, 5-1, 5-7b, 5-8a, 5-8b, 5-8c.)

#### **DODD 3200.12**

DOD Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program (STIP) (Cited in para 5-8c.)

#### **FOIA**

Freedom of Information Act (Cited in paras 5-7b(3), 5-7b(4).)

### **Section II Related Publications**

A related publication is merely a source of additional information. The user does not need to read them to understand this publication.

#### **AR 5-4**

Department of the Army Productivity Improvement Program

#### **AR 5-11**

Management of Army Models and Simulations

#### **AR 11-2**

Managers' Internal Control Program

#### **AR 11-18**

The Cost and Economic Analysis Program

#### **AR 11-37**

Army Finance and Accounting Quality Assurance Program

**AR 15-8**

Army Science Board

**AR 20-1**

Inspector General Activities and Procedures

**AR 25-1**

The Army Knowledge Management and Information Technology Management

**AR 25-55**

The Department of the Army Freedom of Information Act Program

**AR 36-2**

Auditing Service in the Department of the Army

**AR 70-1**

Army Acquisition Policy

**AR 70-8**

Soldier-Oriented Research and Development in Personnel and Training

**AR 71-9**

Material Requirements

**AR 71-11**

Total Army Analysis (TAA)

**AR 73-1**

Test and Evaluation Policy

**AR 200-1**

Environmental Protection and Enhancement

**AR 381-11**

Intelligence Support to Capability Development

**AR 570-5**

Manpower Staffing Standards System

**AR 600-46**

Attitude and Opinion Survey Program

**AR 602-1**

Human Factors Engineering Program

**AR 602-2**

Manpower and Personnel Integration (MANPRINT)

**AR 611-3**

Army Occupational Survey Program (AOSP)

**Army Campaign Plan**

(Available at <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/doc/21182300>.)

**Army Study Planning Guidance**

(Available at <https://secureapp2ako.hqda.pentagon.mil/ako/aspmo/index.aspx>.)

**DFAS-IN Manual 37-100**

Financial Management, the Army Management Structure

## **DODD 5105.73**

Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC)

## **Quadrennial Defense Review**

(Available at <https://secureapp2ako.hqda.pentagon.mil/ako/aspmo/index.aspx>.)

## **Strategic Planning Guidance**

(Available at <https://secureapp2ako.hqda.pentagon.mil/ako/aspmo/index.aspx>.)

## **5 USC 552(a)**

Privacy Act of 1974

## **5 USC 552(b)**

Open meetings

## **Section III**

### **Prescribed Forms**

This section contains no entries.

## **Section IV**

### **Referenced Forms**

#### **DA Form 11-2**

Internal Control Evaluation Certification

#### **SF 298**

Report Documentation Page

## **Appendix B**

### **Examples of Study Efforts**

#### **B-1. Included studies**

Examples of types of study efforts governed by this regulation are listed below.

- a.* Technology assessments and management and operations research studies to support RDT&E objectives.
- b.* Evaluation of foreign force and equipment capabilities, foreign threats, net assessments, and geopolitical subjects.
- c.* Evaluation of organizational structure, administrative policy, procedures, methods, systems, and distribution of functions.
- d.* Analyses of materiel, personnel, logistics, and management systems.
- e.* Studies to establish materiel requirements.
- f.* Studies to support assessments of operations.
- g.* Studies performed by internal Army (military and civilian) personnel that make a significant contribution to a body of knowledge, advance understanding of a phenomenon or process, serve as a building block for future efforts, or may be adapted to other functional areas, missions, or applications.
- h.* Efforts having the primary objective of developing or improving computerized models or games to be used solely to support studies are within the scope of this regulation. Such efforts will be managed according to this regulation and AR 5-11.

#### **B-2. Excluded studies**

Examples of types of study efforts that are not governed by this regulation are listed below.

- a.* Internal reviews (AR 11-2).
- b.* Army audits (AR 36-5).
- c.* Inspector general inspections (AR 20-1).
- d.* Advanced engineering development in support of specific RDT&E programs for materiel systems acquisition policy (AR 70-1).
- e.* Development test, operational test, and user test (AR 73-1).
- f.* Research and exploratory efforts under RDT&E Program categories 6.1 through 6.7 for DOD laboratories under the aegis of U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command and U.S. Army Research, Development, and Engineering Command.

- g. Security investigations (AR 380–5).
- h. Studies performed by internal Army (military and civilian personnel) requiring less than one-half of a professional staff year, unless they are expected to make a significant contribution to a body of knowledge, advance understanding of a phenomenon or process, serve as building blocks for future efforts, or may be adapted to other functional areas, missions, or applications.

## **Appendix C**

### **Literature Search Sources**

#### **C–1. Principal literature search sources**

- a. Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060–6218. (703) 767–8274. Web address: <http://www.dtic.mil/>.
- b. Army Study Program Management Office, 700 Army Pentagon, Room 3E393, Washington, DC 20310–0700, (703) 692–5356. The ASP Web addresses are as follows:
  - (1) Unclassified: <https://secureapp2ako.hqda.pentagon.mil/ako/aspmo/index.asp>.
  - (2) Classified: <http://classweb.hqda-s.army.smil.mil/aspmo>.
- c. Information on Army modeling and simulation is contained in the Army Modeling and Simulation Resources Repository at the following Web site: <http://www.msrr.army.mil/>. The host for the site is the Army Modeling and Simulation Office, ATTN: CSCA–MSO, 700 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310–0700.

#### **C–2. Additional sources**

Additional sources which may be useful can be found through the Army home page, references (Web address: <http://www.army.mil/references/>) and on the ASP database under “References.”

## **Appendix D**

### **Internal Control Evaluation**

#### **D–1. Function**

The function covered by this regulation is the management of Army studies and analyses.

#### **D–2. Purpose**

The purpose of this regulation is to assist SSs and study personnel in evaluating the key internal controls outlined below. This regulation contains internal control provisions and identifies key internal controls.

#### **D–3. Instructions**

Answers should be based on the actual testing of key internal controls (for example, document analysis, direct observation, sampling, simulation, and other). Answers that indicate deficiencies should be explained and corrective action indicated in supporting documentation. Certification that this evaluation has been conducted should be accomplished on DA Form 11–2 (Internal Control Evaluation Certification).

#### **D–4. Test questions**

- a. Is an annual study program established and implemented in accordance with AR 5–5?
- b. Has the study program undergone an annual review by the SAAB?
- c. Is there an approved annual study plan in place?
- d. Are study plans and/or PWSs sufficiently detailed to describe study requirements to include deliverables?
- e. Are independent government cost estimates developed based on market research (such as, for commercial contracts) or fully burdened government labor rates (such as, for internal studies)?
- f. Are final study evaluations submitted to the ASPMO or retained on file with local command when studies have been deemed sensitive?

#### **D–5. Supersession**

There is no previous checklist for this functional area.

#### **D–6. Comments**

Help to make this a better tool for evaluating internal controls. Submit comments to: Army Study Program Management Office, 700 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310–0700.

## **Glossary**

### **Section I Abbreviations**

#### **ACOM**

Army command

#### **AMSAA**

Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity

#### **AORS**

Army Operations Research Symposium

#### **AR**

Army regulation

#### **ASCC**

Army service component command

#### **ASP**

Army Study Program

#### **ASPMO**

Army Study Program Management Office

#### **CAA**

Center for Army Analysis

#### **COC**

council of colonels

#### **COR**

contracting officer representative

#### **DA**

Department of the Army

#### **DA PAM**

Department of Army pamphlet

#### **DAS**

Director of Army Staff

#### **DCS, G-2**

Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2

#### **DCS, G-3/5/7**

Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7

#### **DCS, G-8**

Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8

#### **DOD**

Department of Defense

#### **DODD**

Department of Defense directive

#### **DRU**

direct reporting unit

**DTIC**

Defense Technical Information Center

**FAR**

Federal Acquisition Regulation

**FFRDC**

Federally Funded Research and Development Center

**FOIA**

Freedom of Information Act

**HQDA**

Headquarters, Department of the Army

**KO**

contracting officer

**MDEP**

management decision evaluation package

**MORS**

Military Operations Research Society

**PWS**

performance work statement

**R&D**

research and development

**RDT&E**

research, development, test and evaluation

**SAAB**

Senior Analyst Advisory Board

**SAG**

Studies Advisory Group

**SC**

study coordinator

**SPCC**

Study Program Coordination Committee

**SS**

study sponsor

**SSR**

study sponsor's representative

**TR**

technical representative

**TRAC**

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command Analysis Center

**USC**

United States Code

**VARY**

management decision evaluation package for RAND Arroyo Center

**VSTD**

management decision evaluation package for HQDA studies

**Section II****Terms****Contract study**

A study performed through a contract. Contract studies are not conducted as isolated activities. There must be management and command commitment to support the contract effort and to integrate the results into their problem solving requirements and into the overall study requirements of the organization.

**Model**

A representation of an object, process, or activity by symbols or procedures such that the important relations are amenable to analysis. The application of a model to a study includes preparation of input data and computer runs if necessary, technical analysis of output for system and data errors, and interpretation of output for study analysis.

**Professional staff year**

A unit of measurement used to describe the level of effort of internal Army (military and civilian) personnel in performing, supporting, and monitoring a study. A professional staff year includes the normal duty hour services of one researcher or analyst, supported by a proportionate share of the management, clerical and administrative personnel, and appropriate overhead for 1 year.

**Programmed study**

A study submitted and approved as part of an agency or ACOM annual study program.

**Sponsoring agency**

The HQDA element, agency, or ACOM responsible for a study effort. Oversees study agency's work on the study and generally is responsible for implementation of study results.

**Studies and analyses**

Services that provide organized analytic assessments and evaluations in support of policy development, decisionmaking, management, or administration. Services include studies in support of R&D activities. Also includes models, methodologies, and related software supporting studies, analyses, or evaluations. Examples include, but are not limited to, cost benefit or effectiveness analyses of concepts, plans, tactics, forces, systems, policy, personnel management, methods, and programs; studies specifying the application of information technology and other information resources to support mission and objectives; technology assessments and management and operations research studies in support of RDT&E objectives; evaluations of foreign force and equipment capabilities, foreign threats, net assessments, and geopolitical subjects; analyses of material, personnel, logistics, and management systems; and environmental impact statements.

**Study advisory group**

An advisory group formed by a study sponsor. It consists of representatives from Army elements having a clear functional interest in the study topic or use of the study results. The SAG is to advise and assist the study sponsor on conduct of the study, and to provide assistance, coordination, and support to the study performing organization.

**Study agency**

The organization charged with conducting a study. It may be the sponsoring agency or ACOM, a contractor or consultant, an ad hoc group, or an Army study organization.

**Study coordinator**

An individual designated by the head of an agency or ACOM to provide advice on all matters related to Army studies.

**Study sponsor**

The person who is responsible for a study. The study sponsor will validate the need for the study and provide management oversight of the study effort.

**Statement of work**

The basic document that specifies the study work to be performed under a contract. The statement of work is (a)

prepared by the sponsor of a proposed study contract, (b) coordinated through appropriate agency approval channels, and (c) provided to the contracting officer representative who, in turn, forwards to the contracting officer for use in preparing the solicitation and resultant study contract.

**Unprogrammed study**

A study requirement initiated subsequent to approval of the annual study program.

**Section III**

**Special Abbreviations and Terms**

This section contains no entries.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**PIN 000244-000**