OVERVIEW

• Why an ISR Roadmap?
• How much do we need?
• ISR Capability Terminology
  …names matter
• Investing in Tactical Capability
• …the other 20%
• What do we need help with?
• Where are we headed?
WHY AN ISR ROADMAP?

• Understand increasing demand for ISR support to SOF
• Describe current inventory, gaps and way ahead
• Guide investment strategy and ISR initiatives
  – Align with National, DoD and overall SOCOM strategy
• Key issues identified in the Roadmap:
  – Investment in Tactical/Organic Airborne ISR and PED
  – Future manned Airborne ISR platform
  – Mitigating gaps in ISR support required from Services
SOF ISR Data Call conducted
- Showed insatiable demand for permissive Airborne ISR
- Demand for platform type vs. capability didn’t match
  - Strategic “want” vs. Tactical/Organic “need”
  - Overlap in mission areas
- Result: More specific criteria needed to spell out actual requirements
  - Drive efficiency, effectiveness, budgetary responsibility

Increasing Demand, Decreasing Capacity
## ISR Capabilities – Names Matter...

### Theater/Operational

**Find, Fix, Finish, Exploit, Assess, and Disseminate (F3EAD) (“Cadillac”)**

- Capable of simultaneous multi-INT sensor operations
- Line-of-sight and beyond line-of-sight operations capable
- Data transport infrastructure supports forward based and reach-back PED

### Tactical

**Support to Precision Engagement, Force Protection, Building Partner Capacity (“Ford”)**

- Capability meets DoD/USSOCOM sharing agreements with partner nations
- Line-of-sight or beyond line-of-sight operations capable
- Data transport infrastructure supports forward based or reach-back PED

### Focused

**Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Target Acquisition (RSTA) and Situational Awareness (SA) (“Yugo”)**

- Capability meets DoD/USSOCOM sharing agreements with partner nations
- Line-of-sight operations capable
- Data transport infrastructure supports data exfil to forward based or reach-back PED
INVESTING IN TACTICAL CAPABILITIES

• Requirements driving investment in “Ford” UAS
  – Group II UAS platform – light, flexible, share with partners
  – Group III UAS platform – deployable multi-INT but not “Cadillac”
  – Emphasis on providing ISR for SOF tactical commanders

• On track to build Tactical PED for TSOCs/Components
  – Empower with tools and training; no additional manpower
  – Cannot afford (and don’t need) more Cadillac PED

• Pursue a Next Gen Manned ISR Aircraft
  – Remain aggressive on timeline (ICD, AoA, CDD, etc.)
• Need to *decrease reliance* on Airborne ISR

• Enhance Ground-based ISR capabilities
  – Vehicle-mounted and body-worn equipment
  – Leave-behind provides solutions to endurance challenges

• Grow Maritime ISR portfolio
  – Matching ISR capabilities to current/future NSW platforms
  – UUVs and leave-behind systems for long-dwell times

• Space, Cyber ISR support to SOF
  – Scope areas for growth and collaboration
WHAT DO WE NEED HELP WITH?

- Sensors
- Communications and data compression
- PED efficiency
- Runway independence/deployability
- Size, weight, power and cooling (SWaP-C)
- Range and endurance
- Partner Nation affordability
WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

• Focused investment of SOF dollars for ISR
• Cross-pollinating SOF-unique capabilities to improve DoD inventory
• ISR Foreign Internal Defense (FID) capacity growth
• Common solutions to ISR data transport problems
• Close partnership with Geographic Combatant Commands (GCCs) and Services
  – Requirements and resource solutions
• Work closely with industry
  – Revolutionary, not incremental advances in ISR
QUESTIONS?