

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE ROBERT HALE, CHAIR
AND
THE HONORABLE ELLEN LORD, VICE CHAIR
COMMISSION ON PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING, AND EXECUTION REFORM
BEFORE THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
ON
THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PLANNING,
PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING, AND EXECUTION REFORM
MARCH 20, 2024

Chairman Reed, Ranking Member Wicker, and Members of the Committee – thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) Reform to discuss the findings and recommendations contained in the Commission’s Final Report. Following this short introduction, this written statement provides the Executive Summary from that Final Report.

As the United States faces significant strategic adversaries and a rapidly changing technological landscape, the Department of Defense (DoD) must be able to allocate its resources in a responsive and agile manner. Today’s PPBE process is not always adequate to meet those demands. Even with substantial reforms to the DoD’s acquisition and requirements processes, the DoD cannot compete if the resourcing processes that are foundational to delivering capability to the warfighter are not reformed.

The PPBE process is how the Department plans, budgets, and executes resources to fund its missions. First established in 1961, this complex process involves personnel across the DoD, Congress, and private sector. The scale, complexity, and resources involved far exceed that of any U.S. company. The initial process to build, deliver, and pass a budget can take at least two years, and spending those funds occurs over the next one to ten years or more, enabled by the DoD acquisition processes.

While the PPBE process does allow a variety of stakeholders to inform the budget and identify and analyze key budget issues and alternatives, the lack of agility and time-consuming process make it difficult to adapt to new threats and adopt new technologies. These weaknesses are particularly evident compared to the private sector, which emphasizes flexible budgeting to prioritize innovation and delegated authority and accountability to enable quick decisions, supported by modernized business systems. Budget instability due to continuing resolutions also hampers budget execution, complicating the DoD’s ability to start new programs or accelerate programs in order to respond to emerging threats and incorporate innovative technologies.

These shortcomings contrast with the resourcing approach of U.S. strategic competitors. China consistently invests in priority programs over the long term, while providing flexibility and decision-making authority at lower levels to adapt to changes. Differences in the Chinese and Russian political systems also reduce friction in allocating resources for strategic and modernization investments and make moving resources easier as compared to the U.S. system of government. However, these strategic competitors also face challenges that limit the effectiveness of their defense resourcing processes, including corruption, a lack of transparency and oversight, and technical and industrial base limitations.

To address these challenges, the Commission proposes 28 actionable recommendations in five critical areas designed to transform all aspects of the PPBE process to improve the DoD’s and Congress’ ability to deliver resources and capability with greater speed to the

warfighter in support of national security. These recommendations form a new Defense Resourcing System that enables leaders throughout the DoD to better align budgets to strategy; foster innovation and adaptability by improving the ability to react to changing threats and requirements through streamlined processes and changed rules; significantly improve and render more transparent the communication between Congress and the DoD through the use of modernized systems; and further strengthen the capabilities of the defense resourcing workforce. Reforming the PPBE process by implementing the Commission's recommendations is a generational opportunity to enable the DoD to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Executive Summary

The Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) Reform has concluded that a new approach to the defense resourcing process is required to better maintain the security of the American people. For many years the current PPBE process has ably supported United States (U.S.) national security. However, the security environment is rapidly evolving, and the current PPBE process is not capable of responding as quickly and effectively as needed to support today's warfighter. The Department of Defense (DoD) needs a new process, one that enables strategy to drive resource allocation in a more rigorous, joint, and analytically informed way. The new process should also embrace changes that enable the DoD to respond effectively to emerging threats while leveraging technological advances.

Two persistent trends affecting U.S. national security drive a need for transformational change to the current PPBE process.

First, the emergence of the People's Republic of China (PRC) as a large, technologically advanced strategic adversary with corresponding global reach has profoundly threatened the rules-based order advocated by the U.S. in conjunction with partners and allies. After 30 years of focus on regional, asymmetric threats, the U.S. now faces strategic challenges with the PRC as a pacing threat while simultaneously contending with immediate threats from Russia, North Korea, Iran, and instability in the Middle East. This ever-evolving security environment demands rapid and large-scale evolution of current military capabilities. Over the last decade it has become increasingly clear that the current PPBE process does not provide the Department's senior leadership with the ability to implement change at the scale and speed the DoD requires. In response to these near-term challenges and existential threats, the Commission is recommending a fundamental restructuring of the process for converting strategy into a budget along with improvements in analytic methodology that enable DoD resourcing decisions. While these changes are primarily internal to the Department, they require close partnership with Congress for successful implementation.

Second, the pace of global technological innovation only continues to accelerate. The defense laboratories and the defense industrial base no longer lead technological change as they did during the Cold War. Instead, commercial technology enables today's militarily-relevant modernization in multiple applications like robotics and space, utilizing advances in areas such as artificial intelligence and cyber. Strategic adversaries are operationalizing this rapid technological change as they seek to overmatch U.S. military capabilities. The current budgeting and execution phases of the PPBE process, particularly in some key interfaces with Congress, do not provide the agility required to adopt technological advances at the speed of relevance.

The U.S. risks losing more of its already diminishing technological edge without immediate transformational changes in resourcing, especially in the year of execution. The Commission's recommendations include much-needed changes to the period of availability of funds, account structures, reprogramming processes, and data sharing with Congress. These reforms also leverage modern business systems and data analytics to better manage resourcing and communications. PPBE reform can only be implemented through sustained collaboration between the legislative and executive branches.

This Final Report provides a detailed review of the Commission's findings and recommendations as well as the transformational change the recommendations will produce.

Commission on PPBE Reform

Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 created an independent Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) Reform," within the legislative branch, and directed the Commission to conduct a comprehensive assessment of all four phases of the PPBE process that governs how the DoD creates its resourcing strategy for the following five years and provides the framework and input for the President's Budget request. The law directs a specific focus on budgetary processes that affect defense modernization.

This Final Report documents the Commission's findings, reflecting 24 months of research and formal meetings. The Commission's staff carried out extensive quantitative research and also contracted with several outside research organizations. More than 400 interviews were conducted with experts in PPBE and related fields, including personnel from Congress, the DoD, industry, academia, and research organizations. The findings of this Final Report also draw on the expertise and experience of its 14 Commissioners and staff (see biographies in Section XI).

Overview of Key Findings

Since the inception of the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS), now known as the PPBE process, the DoD has had a structured repeatable process enabling senior leaders to guide the course of the DoD. The PPBE process has allowed leadership to identify key resourcing issues and bring analytic information to bear on budgetary decisions. The PPBE process has ensured that a wide variety of stakeholder voices are heard, which helps build proposals that can be defended before Congress, and allows senior leaders to drive change. It has also ensured that multi-year budgetary impacts are considered to counterbalance tendencies toward short-term views. The Commission's reforms preserve these advantages and other positive aspects of the current PPBE process.

However, as noted above, the U.S. is experiencing a dramatic change in its national security environment. Responding to this increasingly complex global security challenge requires large-scale and rapid changes in strategic objectives, posture, readiness, force structure, and capabilities. Meeting these challenges requires addressing limitations in the current

PPBE process. For example, the Commission is concerned that current strategic and resource allocation guidance documents are frequently consensus-driven, often late to need, and sometimes fail to provide actionable direction to the DoD Components. Although there has been much progress in recent years, the key analytic offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Joint Staff do not have sufficient capacity and assessment tools, nor appropriate training programs and time, to provide the level of analytic support required to inform senior leader decision-making on so many high-stakes issues. As a result, major issues are often elevated to senior leadership too late in the process, limiting the available trade-space and analytic support, which forces compression of the essential subsequent steps in budget development.

These strategic challenges are further compounded by the increasing pace of technological change. Moore's Law—the prediction that the number of transistors on a microchip will double every two years – is perhaps the best-known example of rapidly accelerating technological change. U.S. adversaries are taking advantage of this rapid technological change to build overmatch against U.S. military forces, putting the Department's ability to execute the National Defense Strategy (NDS) at risk.

One of the most consistent concerns the Commission heard over the past two years is that the current PPBE process lacks agility, limiting the Department's ability to respond quickly and effectively to evolving threats, unanticipated events, and emerging technological opportunities. This message has been repeatedly articulated in statements from current and former congressional Members and staff, from senior DoD officials, from program budget and acquisition officials at all levels, and from both traditional and non-traditional DoD industry partners. For example, a current DoD leader told the Commission that the amount of time it takes to approve and distribute funding through the current PPBE process to address a national security problem provides U. S adversaries with an innovation advantage. Another official added that the time-consuming nature of the PPBE process makes it difficult to influence a modification or an upgrade to an existing product design or to counter new threats.

Late enacted budgets, and long Continuing Resolutions (CR), pose another critical challenge to resource allocation. The CRs generally include a provision prohibiting new start activities, which can slow efforts to insert innovative technology in both new and current programs. Not knowing what the final appropriations will be until well into the fiscal year further hinders effective budget execution and the timely delivery of capabilities to the warfighter. Compounding this challenge, under current appropriation rules, operating funds must be fully obligated in the year they are appropriated which can result in a year-end spending spree that can allocate funding to lower-priority programs so that funding is not lost. The Commission also heard concerns that, under the current PPBE process, budgets presented to Congress cannot easily be linked to the defense strategy, in part because the budgets are presented in terms of appropriation title and DoD Component rather than by capability areas. While the Department has been modernizing its systems for over a decade, the current PPBE process still depends on some antiquated information technology

systems that make it difficult to quickly access and analyze validated data and effectively share information between the DoD and Congress.

Vision

To address these challenges, the Commission established a vision for a new resourcing process, drawing from the original set of six principles that guided creation of the original PPBS,¹ and modifying and expanding them to meet today's changing strategic environment. The new process should:

1. Closely align budgets to strategy for the Joint Force “based on explicit criteria of national interest,”² with the ultimate goal of faster delivery of capability to the warfighter.
2. Base resource decisions on “choices among explicit, balanced, and feasible alternatives.”³
3. Formulate and assess budget alternatives and consequences over multiple years before making major decisions, and use analysis to compare costs and benefits.
4. Enable accountable leaders in acquisition, operational, and support organizations to foster innovation and agility by improving their ability to react to changing threats and requirements, while ensuring the best technology and capabilities are fielded for the warfighter.
5. Use common modern business systems with shared and accessible data to support decision- making, reduce duplicative efforts, and better communicate information inside the DoD and to Congress.
6. Provide a dedicated, appropriately skilled, and resourced staff to support the Secretary of Defense and other senior leaders throughout the DoD.
7. Appropriately signal near- and long-term technological and infrastructure priorities to the industrial base, enabling both non-traditional and traditional vendors to supply capabilities to the DoD.
8. Meet budget timelines while ensuring that stakeholders have a voice in the process.
9. Provide Congress, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the American people appropriate visibility into and understanding of key defense resource decisions.

Transformational Change: The Defense Resourcing System

To implement this vision, the Commission recommends creating a new **Defense Resourcing System (DRS)** to support U.S. national security in an increasingly dangerous world. This new system builds on PPBE's many strengths while also addressing the weaknesses that have emerged. The new DRS fundamentally strengthens the connection between strategy and resource allocation while creating a more flexible and agile execution

¹ Enthoven, Alain and Wayne Smith. *How Much is Enough: Shaping the Defense Program, 1961-1969*. 1971, republished by the RAND Corporation 2005. https://www.rand.org/pubs/commercial_books/CB403.html

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

process and preserving congressional oversight. The proposed DRS replaces what was known as the PPBE process and consists of three processes: Strategy, Resource Allocation, and Execution.

Strategy: The new system employs analytics at the start of the Strategy process to determine priorities and direction for the forthcoming budget while establishing the overall guidance for key budget decisions. The Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) is the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)). The key documents remain the National Security Strategy (NSS), NDS, and National Military Strategy (NMS). The DRS strategy process remains focused on these enduring, multi-year documents.

Resource Allocation: This is where the most significant process changes are proposed. In place of the current PPBE process the following steps occur within the Resource Allocation process:

1. *Guidance.* Instead of the current process of circulating a lengthy document for coordination (the current Defense Planning Guidance or DPG), the new approach brings the results of wargaming and analytical efforts into established senior leadership forums to inform discussions that can lead to specific guidance or at least provide direction for budgetary debates. Development of the new guidance document involves existing leadership forums, including the Senior Leadership Council and the Deputy's Management Action Group, and concludes by February of the year before the budget submission. The OPR for the Guidance process is the Analysis Working Group (AWG), under the leadership of the Director, Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) as the Executive Secretary. The key document resulting from this process is the Defense Resourcing Guidance (DRG), issued in February that now includes both the integrated program priorities and Fiscal Guidance (FG). A new continuous analytic process overseen by the AWG supports the development of the DRG and will focus debate throughout the new resourcing process.
2. *Build.* This step centers around the Services and DoD Components and their construction of a strategically-informed Resource Allocation Submission (RAS) proposal in compliance with the DRG. The OPRs for this step are the Services and DoD Components. The RAS replaces the current Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and Budget Estimate Submission (BES) as the single submission to the OSD for review. The DoD Components will likely start their RAS well in advance of the DRG, much like they do today, but will be guided by the actionable direction established during the Guidance step.
3. *Decision.* This final step involves the OSD review of the RASs (formerly POM/BES), then issuance of Resource Allocation Decisions (RAD) and incorporation of OMB Passback changes, all of which culminate in a final DoD budget request. After approval by the OMB, this budget request becomes the DoD portion of the annual

President's Budget submission to Congress. The OPR is the Under Secretary of Defense for Comptroller (USD(C)), who establishes the necessary timelines and assigns the workload for review. The CAPE and USD(C) organizations will continue to perform their respective tasks, with CAPE focused on DRG compliance and strategic or programmatic issues and USD(C) focused on budget year issues to include pricing, executability, most single-Service or Combatant Command requests, and late breaking or conflict-related issues. The USD(C), working with CAPE, will also maintain a single database documenting all decisions.

Execution: With the USD(C) as the OPR, this process involves distribution of funding, as authorized and appropriated by Congress, and execution of those funds by the Services and DoD Components to meet national security needs. Many Commission recommendations described below will significantly improve the execution process, providing significant mechanisms to allow the DoD to respond to emerging issues more quickly and effectively. Of particular note, this process will also establish a feedback loop to evaluate overall fiscal, program, and operational performance, as well as alignment with strategic and planning goals. Key documents governing this process include budget execution reports, acquisition and operational reports, and other information useful to Congress, the DoD, and other stakeholders for carrying out oversight and analysis.

Naming the New System

The Commission recommends a new name for this process—the Defense Resourcing System—to emphasize the streamlining and combination of several discrete steps and phases of the former PPBE process. The new name, along with changed names for key documents and roles, also emphasizes the extent of the changes recommended by the Commission. Figure 1 depicts the processes and steps in the new DRS.

Figure 1 – Defense Resourcing System Structure

Process	Step	Key Document(s)	OPR(s)
Strategy		NDS	OUSD(P)
Resource Allocation	Guidance	Defense Resourcing Guidance (DRG) <i>(replaces DPG and Fiscal Guidance)</i>	AWG (CAPE as executive secretary)
	Build	Resource Allocation Submission (RAS) <i>(replaces POM/BES)</i>	Service/Component Resourcing Staffs
	Decision	Resource Allocation Decision (RAD) <i>(replaces PDMs/PBDs)</i>	OUSD(C)
Execution		President’s Budget Omnibus Reprogramming Request Execution/Obligation Reports	OUSD(C) and Service/Component FMs
The new DRS is enabled throughout the process with continuous analysis and evaluation.			

Key Recommendations:

To shape the Commission’s focus on critical areas for reform, the Commission organized its research and identified recommendations designed to:

1. **Improve the Alignment of Budgets to Strategy;**
2. **Foster Innovation and Adaptability;**
3. **Strengthen Relationships Between DoD and Congress;**
4. **Modernize Business Systems and Data Analytics; and**
5. **Strengthen the Capability of the Resourcing Workforce.**

Key Recommendations that Improve the Alignment of Budgets to Strategy

The Commission consistently heard that the current PPBE process does not show a clear alignment between DoD budget requests and overall defense strategies as articulated in the NSS and NDS. This remains a critical shortcoming in matching resources to the DoD’s strategic vision and requirements of the Services, DoD Components, and the Joint Force. Under the current PPBE process, the programmed budgets are typically developed by the DoD Components before the appropriate strategic documents like the DPG have been finalized, and fact-of-life changes can easily overwhelm strategic choices. To address this, in addition to the DRS, the Commission recommends two key reforms and changes:

- **Strengthen the Defense Resourcing Guidance through Continuous Planning and Analysis:** As was noted earlier, the effectiveness of the DRG is bolstered by continuous analysis including threat analyses, wargaming, and cost benefit assessments. Beginning these key analyses earlier, and holding leadership decision

meetings that consider analytic results from November through February, will produce a timelier guidance document with a regular analytic cadence used to inform the Build step and shape resourcing decisions.

- Transform the Budget Structure:** An effective and properly stratified budget structure is a crucial underpinning of any resource allocation process, whether in the current PPBE process or the new DRS. The current budget structure begins with the designated life cycle phases (i.e., Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E), Procurement, and Operation and Maintenance (O&M)). It then further aligns these to the separate Services and DoD Components before finally presenting data for specific accounts and programs. These top-level appropriations reflect the phases of traditional industrial production, but this is not how the Department or Congress consider the budget when making decisions today. Instead, today’s decision-makers focus primarily on capability. Under the current budget structure, this requires pulling data from disparate sections of the budget in order to see the whole program. The Commission’s reimagined structure starts with the Services and DoD Components, flows to Major Capability Activity Areas (MCAA) areas under their purview (examples might include ground maneuver units or tactical aviation), then to specific programs and systems, and finally to the relevant life cycle phases. Figure 2 below depicts these changes.

Figure 2 – Current and Reimagined Budget Structure

Current Structure	Proposed Structure
Life Cycle Phase	Service/Component
Service/Component	Major Capability Activity Area
Budget Line Item	System/Program (BLI)
Project (if applicable)	Life Cycle Phase

The Commission believes this budget transformation will enhance congressional oversight by transmitting program and budgetary information to Congress in a way that combines related funding for a capability under a single program and/or portfolio. This change will increase transparency across all types of funding requested and more clearly link decision-making and resource allocation. Moreover, the new budget structure will improve visibility and understanding of the resource allocations across the Services and for similar portfolios in the Joint Force. It also better matches 21st century Digital Age technological developments that no longer fit into the traditional Industrial Age categories of research, procurement, operation, and sustainment.

Key Recommended Changes that Foster Innovation and Adaptability

The Commission recommends the following important changes to foster innovation and improve agility in the allocation and execution of resources. The combination of these key recommendations has the goal of significantly increasing industry involvement and providing emergent technology to the warfighter more quickly and easily.

- **Increase Availability of Operating Funds:** The Commission recommends allowing a small portion (five percent) of operating funds to be carried over for obligation in a second year of availability, a type of flexibility that is already available to some non-DoD federal agencies. This change will reduce the high levels of year-end spending that hamper effective execution of funds, especially after a CR, as well as prevent the funding of lower-priority programs just to avoid losing the money.
- **Update Thresholds for Below Threshold Reprogrammings (BTR):** Raising these thresholds to keep pace with historical budget increases will increase flexibility for Program Managers (PM), Program Executive Officers (PEO), and others while also streamlining the decision-making process. Ultimately the Commission proposes eliminating BTRs and allowing a small percentage of an entire appropriation to be realigned with appropriate congressional briefings and oversight.
- **Mitigate Problems Caused by CRs:** This recommendation mitigates the adverse impacts of increasingly commonplace CRs by allowing the Department to proceed with new starts and increased program quantities under CRs in carefully delineated circumstances.
- **Review and Consolidate Budget Line Items (BLI):** This consolidation streamlines the current resourcing and execution processes, retains and increases transparency for Congress, ends unnecessary duplication in the existing budget structures, and eliminates redundancies. Consolidation will also increase the DoD's ability to adjust rapidly to changing circumstances in the year of execution and inject innovation or adopt new technology to address changing threats.
- **Address Challenges with Colors of Money:** This recommendation aligns colors of money with the way in which programs are actually executed, enabling the Department to better meet mission needs through the funding of software programs, continuing improvements to hardware, and program office accounts.

Key Recommended Changes to Strengthen Relationships Between DoD and Congress

The Commission remains mindful of the need to strengthen and improve relationships and communications between DoD and Congress regarding the President's Budget submission and throughout the resource allocation and execution phases. The Commission offers

several recommendations to improve these critical relationships with a focus on data driven communications.

- **Encourage Improved In-Person Communications:** The DoD should work with Congress to determine the best time to offer in-person updates that deal with execution-year issues as well as the budget proposal under review by the Congress. Updates should be informed by execution reviews and timed to support conference negotiations held by the authorization and appropriations committees.
- **Establish Classified and Unclassified Communication Enclaves:** This recommendation will enable more robust communication between DoD and Congress. It will include but not be limited to a common set of reports and budget material that can be readily searched, sorted, and retrieved for analysis across all security classification levels. Enclaves will enable efficient and effective communications across the government, increasing trust, transparency, and relevancy.

Key Recommended Changes to Modernize Business Systems and Data Analytics

The systems DoD uses to manage data do not always allow searching or sorting of shared information, nor can data be easily used or shared for analysis and decision-making. This is a serious impediment to making DoD resourcing more effectively agile, as well as more coherent and transparent. The Commission makes a number of recommendations designed to improve data analytics, including this key recommendation:

- **Create a Common Analytics Platform:** This will make information readily available and provide streamlined access to best of breed analytic capabilities and authoritative data across functional sectors, ensuring that all DoD organizations are leveraging the same authoritative, transaction-level business and warfighting data. A single common platform will, for example, provide the capability to integrate prior year execution and operational data, thereby improving assessments of cost, schedule, and performance.

Key Recommended Changes to Strengthen the Capability of the Resourcing Workforce

The workforce that carries out defense resourcing tasks must be of adequate size, sufficiently trained, and enabled with the tools and resources to support leadership and decision-making. The Commission makes a number of recommendations designed to improve the workforce, including these key recommendations:

- **Continue the Focus on Recruiting and Retention:** Both the Offices of the USD(C) and CAPE need to improve recruiting and retention to ensure they have staffs of sufficient size and skill to carry out their specified duties.

- **Improve Training for Personnel Involved in Defense Resourcing:** Improved training for personnel who support the DRS will ensure the Department has appropriately trained personnel who understand how their role supports the DRS in a number of ways. Training on preparation of the budget justification books, data analytics, and private sector practices represent key areas to empower the DoD workforce.

Additional Recommendations

In addition to the key recommendations described above, the Commission makes a number of additional recommendations that will, if implemented, significantly improve the Department's resourcing processes. Some of these recommendations may be interim steps before the implementation of the broader transformational changes identified above, but many will pay dividends for the long run. A full list of the Commission's recommendations, each of which is described in detail in the report, can be found at the end of this section.

Implementation

The Commission commends the DoD for establishing implementation plans for the 13 Recommendations contained in the Commission's Interim Report that could be implemented prior to this Final Report.⁴ Full implementation of all the Commission's recommendations in this Final Report will require substantial effort on the part of Congress and the DoD, especially its resource management community. The Commission recommends that the DoD establish an implementation team that reports directly to the Deputy Secretary of Defense. This temporary team would be made up of experts from various functional areas and, for the next three to five years, provide staff support to implement the Commission's recommendations. The Commission further recommends that the Department engage with Congress on these recommendations and provide regular updates on implementation.

Commission Recommendations

Improve the Alignment of Budgets to Strategy

- 1. Replace the PPBE Process with a new Defense Resourcing System**
- 2. Strengthen the Defense Resourcing Guidance**
- 3. Establish Continuous Planning and Analysis**
- 4. Transform the Budget Structure**
5. Consolidate RDT&E Budget Activities

⁴ "Implementation Plan for the Recommendations from The Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform's Interim Report." Department of Defense. Provided to the Commission. Public release forthcoming.

Foster Innovation and Adaptability

- 6. Increase Availability of Operating Funds**
7. Modify Internal DoD Reprogramming Requirements
- 8. Update Values for Below Threshold Reprogrammings**
- 9. Mitigate Problems Caused by Continuing Resolutions**
- 10. Review and Consolidate Budget Line Items**
- 11. Address Challenges with Colors of Money**
12. Review and Update PPBE-Related Guidance Documents
13. Improve Awareness of Technology Resourcing Authorities
14. Establish Special Transfer Authority for Programs Around Milestone Decisions
15. Rebaseline the OSD Obligation and Expenditure Benchmarks
16. Encourage Use of the Defense Modernization Account

Strengthen Relationships Between DoD and Congress

- 17. Encourage Improved In-Person Communications**
18. Restructure the Justification Books
- 19. Establish Classified and Unclassified Communication Enclaves**

Modernize Business Systems and Data Analytics

- 20. Create a Common Analytics Platform**
21. Strengthen Governance for DoD Business Systems
22. Accelerate Progress Toward Auditable Financial Statements
23. Continue Rationalization of the OSD Resourcing Systems
24. Modernize the Tracking of Congressionally Directed Actions

Strengthen the Capability of the Resourcing Workforce

- 25. Continue the Focus on Recruiting and Retention**
26. Streamline Processes and Improve Analytic Capabilities
- 27. Improve Training for Personnel Involved in Defense Resourcing**
28. Establish an Implementation Team for Commission Recommendations

Conclusion

The Commission concludes that the recommendations in this Final Report will enable the Department to more effectively meet national defense needs, while preserving the insight required for congressional oversight. Today, the U.S., its allies, and partners face multiple challenges and threats amid the most complex geopolitical environment since World War Two. The DoD must have an agile and responsive resourcing architecture and system, one that promotes innovation, agility, and speed, best harnesses defense resources, and supports timely and accurate senior leader decisions. Time is short, the need for change is increasingly urgent. The Commission calls upon Congress and the Department to adopt these recommendations that will better enable the DoD to continue to preserve U.S. national security in light of the ever-changing landscape.