SYM-AM-26-089

EXCERPT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL
ACQUISITION RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM AND
INNOVATION SUMMIT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2026 SESSIONS
VOLUME I
"ACCELERATING WARFIGHTING CAPABILITIES"

Quantum Acquisition: A New Paradigm for Understanding the Interdependencies of Complex Networks in the Acquisition Life Cycle of Warfighting Systems

Published: April 30, 2026

Prepared for the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943.

Naval
Postgraduate
School
Foundation

Quantum Acquisition: A New Paradigm for Understanding the Interdependencies of Complex Networks in the Acquisition Life Cycle of Warfighting Systems

Colonel (Ret.) Raymond Jones—is the Professor of Practice at the Naval Postgraduate School. He served in the U.S. Army as a combat assault and experimental test pilot prior to entering the acquisition community. As an acquisition officer, he served as the Program Manager for two major defense acquisition programs and retired as the Deputy Program Executive Officer for the Joint Tactical Radio System. [rdjone1@nps.edu]

Abstract

Defense acquisition programs continue to struggle with persistent cost overruns, schedule delays, and capabilities that fail to align with rapidly evolving threats. Traditional “Newtonian” linear models treat requirements, design, budgeting, and operations as semi-isolated domains, failing to capture the non-deterministic and highly interdependent nature of modern systems development. This paper introduces Quantum Acquisition, a metaphorical framework grounded in quantum mechanics, graph theory, and Bayesian inference. It models the defense acquisition life cycle as an entangled network of four architectural layers: system architecture, business/acquisition process architecture, Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, and Facilities (DOTMLPF), and the operational threat network. By viewing programs as probabilistic “acquisition probability clouds” rather than fixed paths, the framework highlights superposition of options, entanglement across layers, and the observer effect of premature measurement. A “Twin-Track” experimental methodology is proposed for validation, supported by practical guidance using graph databases and artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled simulations. Quantum Acquisition challenges traditional cost-centric methods such as Earned Value Management (EVM) by shifting toward a predictive, value-centric approach. Ultimately, it offers a pathway to reduce structural volatility, accelerate delivery of minimum viable products (MVPs), and improve operational relevance in complex, contested environments.

Introduction

The acquisition of advanced military capabilities demands the intricate orchestration of technological innovation, strategic foresight, and vast resources in an era of accelerating technological change and rapidly emerging threats. Yet traditional linear, or “waterfall,” approaches to defense procurement frequently deliver solutions that are obsolete or poorly integrated by the time they reach the warfighter. This systemic inertia stems not merely from bureaucratic caution but from a fundamental architectural flaw from the fragmentation of the acquisition life cycle into semi-isolated domains such as technical design, administrative processes, operational considerations, and threat analysis (Government Accountability Office, 2025). The result is missed interdependencies, reactive problem solving, and the well-documented “fiscal wall” and “delivery of a vacuum” problems, where necessary technological pivots cannot be funded due to rigid multi-year planning cycles or where sophisticated hardware fails to integrate into the broader joint-force architecture (Fox, 2012). Hence, the problem is that the traditional linear “Newtonian” defense acquisition process suffers from deep fragmentation across technical design, administrative, operational, and threat domains, causing missed interdependencies, structural volatility, fiscal walls, premature collapse of innovation options, and the frequent delivery of capabilities that are obsolete or poorly integrated by the time they reach the warfighter.

Quantum Acquisition challenges the current program management paradigm, which is dominated by deterministic tools such as Earned Value Management (EVM) that assume linear trajectories and isolated domains (Tervonen, 2020). While EVM offers valuable standardized metrics for monitoring cost and schedule variances against fixed baselines, it falls short in complex, entangled environments by providing only lagging indicators that fail to predict structural volatility or interdependency driven risks, often triggering premature measurement effects that stifle innovation (Government Accountability Office, 1997; Jones, 2024). Quantum Acquisition provides an enhanced opportunity for forecasting program performance by representing the acquisition life cycle as probabilistic "acquisition probability clouds" informed by Bayesian inference and integrated network graphs. This allows for continuous updating of success probabilities and early detection of cascading impacts across layers, offering predictive power and adaptability that EVM cannot match due to its reliance on classical, deterministic assumptions rather than quantum-inspired probabilistic modeling.

This paper proposes Quantum Acquisition as a novel conceptual framework that treats the life cycle from requirements definition to MVP as a holistic, entangled network. Drawing on quantum mechanics principles as useful metaphorical constructs, graph theory for visualization, and Bayesian inference for decision-making, the framework exposes hidden interdependencies and structural volatility. Quantum concepts reveal organizational and technical behaviors in complex socio-technical systems, consistent with quantum cognition and quantum leadership literature (Busemeyer & Bruza, 2012).

The contribution is significant because it moves beyond incremental process tweaks to provide a unifying "architecture of architectures" that aligns with Department of Defense priorities for speed, digital engineering, and adaptive acquisition (Warfighting Acquisition University, n.d.). Additionally, it is generalizable to any discipline that uses a life-cycle approach to invention and innovation. This research is both novel and significant because it transcends the "semi-isolated" silos of technical and administrative domains that have historically plagued military acquisition. By applying the principles of quantum theory, specifically the concept of entanglement, the framework treats the various facets of defense planning, such as Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, and Facilities (DOTMLPF) and system architecture, not as separate checklists, but as a unified, interconnected system where a change in one variable instantaneously impacts the others. The importance of this work lies in its potential to reduce "structural volatility" and the delivery of obsolete technology, providing a mathematical and theoretical framework for a holistic "architecture of architectures" that can adapt to the speed of modern warfare.

Literature Review

The persistent challenges in defense acquisition have been extensively documented in government oversight reports and scholarly analyses, highlighting systemic issues of cost overruns, schedule delays, and the delivery of capabilities that fail to align with evolving operational threats. For instance, the Government Accountability Office's (2025) annual weapon systems assessments have consistently revealed that major defense acquisition programs average nearly 12 years from program initiation to initial operational capability, a timeline incompatible with the pace of technological and adversarial advancements. These reports attribute much of the inefficiency to fragmented processes, where technical design, budgetary constraints, administrative oversight, and operational considerations operate in semi-isolated silos, leading to missed interdependencies and structural volatility (Government Accountability Office, 2024). Complementary historical analyses, such as Fox's (2012) examination of defense acquisition reform efforts from 1960 to 2009, underscore the enduring nature of these problems, noting that traditional linear, "Newtonian" models rooted in deterministic planning and rigid milestones struggle to accommodate the non-deterministic, volatile environment of modern warfare.

Central to addressing these gaps is the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), which employs the Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy (DOTMLPF-P) framework as a holistic lens for capability development. As outlined in the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3170.01G, DOTMLPF-P ensures that solutions extend beyond materiel acquisitions to encompass non-materiel changes, preventing the default to hardware-centric fixes that ignore broader interdependencies (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2009). The JCIDS Manual (Joint Staff, 2021) further emphasizes that a change in one DOTMLPF-P element, such as a new materiel system, necessitates corresponding adjustments across training, doctrine, and facilities to achieve integrated operational effectiveness. Despite its conceptual strength, implementation of DOTMLPF-P often remains fragmented, as evidenced by ongoing Government Accountability Office (2025) critiques of siloed domain management that undermine holistic risk mitigation and accelerate obsolescence.

To navigate this complexity, systems-of-systems engineering research has increasingly turned to graph theory and network analysis as tools for modeling interdependencies. Harrison (2016) and related works demonstrate that representing physical systems, business processes, and operational environments as directed graphs with nodes as components or decision points and edges as dependencies enables the identification of critical pathways, bottlenecks, and emergent behaviors in complex defense architectures. Pugliese et al. (2018), in their analysis of acquisition programs through the lens of system complexity, apply graph theoretic metrics such as density and energy to quantify architectural volatility, revealing how unintended interfaces inflate costs and delays. These approaches align with broader System of Systems Engineering (SoSE) literature advocating for integrated network views that bridge system architecture, business processes, and threat environments, moving beyond siloed analysis to support end-to-end traceability and cascading impact prediction (Schummer & Hyba, 2022).

Parallel to network modeling, Bayesian inference has emerged as a robust probabilistic framework for managing uncertainty in acquisition risk assessment and decision making. Kelly and Smith (2011) provide a practitioner's guide to Bayesian methods in probabilistic risk assessment, emphasizing their utility in continuously updating beliefs as new evidence, such as test results, funding shifts, or threat intelligence, becomes available. In defense contexts, Bayesian networks have been applied to IT and business system acquisitions to simulate evidence-based performance predictions, incorporating temporal and decision theoretic factors to forecast program success probabilities (Clemons et al., 2019; Lewis et al., 2011). This approach directly addresses the limitations of classical deterministic planning by modeling acquisition programs as dynamic probability distributions rather than fixed trajectories, enabling adaptive navigation of the "three-body problem" of scope, schedule, and cost trade-offs common in project management.

Building on these foundations, quantum theory, applied metaphorically rather than literally, offers a powerful lens for understanding the non-linear, entangled, and observer-dependent nature of complex decision environments. Busemeyer and Bruza (2012) pioneer quantum models of cognition and decision-making, demonstrating that principles such as superposition, entanglement, and the uncertainty principle better account for observed violations of classical probability in human judgment under ambiguity. Subsequent reviews, including Huang, et al.'s (2025), affirm that quantum-like frameworks capture order effects, contextuality, and interference phenomena in cognition that classical models cannot, with direct implications for managerial decision-making in uncertain settings. In leadership and organizational theory, Zohar (2016) extends these ideas into "quantum leadership," advocating for principles such as holism, spontaneity, and field independence to foster complex adaptive systems that thrive at the "edge of chaos." Zohar's (2021) 12 principles of quantum leadership translate quantum metaphors into practical guidance for vision-led, value-driven organizations that embrace superpositioned possibilities and observer-aware management, challenging Newtonian hierarchies in favor of interconnected, probabilistic thinking.

The synthesis of these bodies of literature reveals a critical research gap. While each domain offers partial solutions to fragmentation and volatility, no unified framework integrates quantum metaphors with network theory and Bayesian inference to create an “architecture of architectures” for defense acquisition. Traditional reforms have focused on incremental process tweaks within the Adaptive Acquisition Framework, yet these often retain linear assumptions ill-suited to the entangled socio-technical realities of modern programs (Warfighting Acquisition University, n.d.). The present work addresses this void by proposing Quantum Acquisition as a metaphorical paradigm that treats the life cycle as an entangled, probabilistic network, enabling delayed collapse of options, explicit interdependency mapping, and artificial intelligence (AI)-augmented probability cloud management to deliver more agile, relevant capabilities.

The Quantum Acquisition Framework

The transition from classical physics to quantum theory at the dawn of the 20th century represents one of the most profound shifts in human understanding of the natural world. While classical mechanics, governed by Newtonian laws, describes a predictable universe where objects have definite positions and velocities, quantum theory reveals a subatomic realm defined by probability, wave-particle duality, and inherent uncertainty. Quantum physics can serve as a powerful metaphor for the evolution of modern defense acquisition, where the “Newtonian” expectation of a predictable, linear procurement path often crashes against the reality of a volatile and non-deterministic environment (Zohar, 2016). In a classical acquisition model, project managers operate under the assumption that if they define a precise initial position, the final capability will emerge exactly as planned. However, as programs grow in technical complexity and integration, they enter a “quantum” state of development where outcomes are defined by probability rather than certainty.

The Quantum Acquisition Framework posits that traditional Newtonian models fail to account for the non-linear volatility of modern defense procurement, suggesting instead that quantum mechanics offers a more accurate lens for managing complex programs. By applying the observer effect and recognizing the inherent trade-off between requirement precision and delivery momentum, much like Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle, which states that the more precisely one measures a particle’s position, the less precisely one can know its momentum, planners can better navigate the dualities of hardware development and policy that often lead to structural volatility and obsolete technology. This approach encourages leadership to move away from rigid, deterministic milestones and toward a probabilistic model that accepts superpositioned outcomes, ultimately allowing for more resilient decision-making that accounts for systemic entanglement and the potential for overcoming technical barriers through commercial innovation.

The potential pitfalls of measurement in this context are particularly striking when compared to the quantum measurement problem. In quantum theory, the act of observing a system collapses the wave function, forcing a particle into a single state and potentially losing the benefits of its previous multi-state existence. In a developmental acquisition program, a premature or overly rigid measurement, such as Key Performance Parameters applied too early in the prototyping phase, can collapse the innovation space, locking in a suboptimal technical path or stifling the wave-like flexibility required to pivot in response to emerging threats (Busemeyer & Bruza, 2012). This creates a paradox in which the very metrics intended to ensure success can introduce a Heisenberg-like uncertainty where the more a program office focuses on measuring precise cost and schedule at a granular level, the less visibility it may have into the actual momentum and long-term operational viability of the technology.

The probabilistic nature of a quantum acquisition approach diverges from the classical Newtonian model by replacing the illusion of a single, deterministic flight path with a dynamic wave function of potential outcomes. While a Newtonian framework assumes that a program's success is a fixed point reachable through a rigid sequence of cause-and-effect milestones, a quantum approach recognizes that a project exists in a superposition of multiple states ranging from technical breakthrough to total failure, until a specific observation or measurement event occurs. By modeling these possibilities as a probability distribution rather than a binary pass–fail metric, leadership can better predict outcomes by identifying the statistical likelihood of various risks before they manifest. This improves predictability not by forcing a specific result, but by allowing managers to steer the program toward the highest probability success state through iterative adjustments, effectively narrowing the variance of the wave function and reducing the impact of Black Swan events that typically derail linear, classical schedules (Busemeyer & Townsend, 1993). Furthermore, the concept of quanta or discrete energy units relates to the volatility of funding and decision-making cycles in defense. Rather than a continuous, smooth flow of resources, programs are often subject to discrete quanta of budget cycles and milestone decisions.

Each of these measurement events acts as a localized disruption that can shift the entire trajectory of the program. If the business architecture and system architecture are truly entangled, a measurement or change in the administrative domain will instantaneously and unpredictably affect the technical domain, directly exacerbating the fiscal wall problem. Recognizing that a developmental program is a probabilistic quantum system rather than a deterministic Newtonian machine allows leaders to better account for structural volatility and the inherent risks of observing a system before it has matured.

The principle of wave particle duality stands as one of the central pillars of quantum theory, suggesting that elementary particles exhibit properties of both solid matter and undulating waves. This phenomenon is most famously demonstrated by the double-slit experiment, where particles create an interference pattern typical of waves when not observed, yet behave like localized bullets when a measurement device is introduced. In the context of defense procurement, a nascent technology or capability exists in a quantum state of high potential superposition before it is codified by formal requirements. During the early stages of research and development, a project possesses a fluid, undulating nature where multiple technical solutions and operational applications are possible simultaneously. However, the introduction of a measurement device forces a collapse of this potential, directly contributing to the delivery of a vacuum problem where hardware is sophisticated in isolation but fails to integrate into the broader joint-force architecture.

The measurement problem in defense acquisition manifests most acutely when the act of oversight inadvertently destroys the very agility it seeks to manage. For example, a software-defined radio program might initially show the wave-like ability to adapt to various frequencies and waveforms as threats evolve. Yet, when a formal program office observes the project through a Milestone C review, the requirement for a fixed, long-term cost estimate and a stagnant technical baseline often forces the technology to freeze into a localized, specific state. This collapse into a finite reality means the system is now optimized for a single, historical threat profile rather than the shifting interference patterns of the modern electronic battlefield. By demanding a definite outcome too early in the cycle, the acquisition process essentially prevents the technology from existing in the flexible state necessary to survive a decade of development, thereby accelerating obsolescence. Furthermore, this institutional measurement problem leads to a reactive posture where the observation of a threat creates a secondary collapse of reality.

When military planners observe a specific adversary capability, the acquisition system often responds by locking in a countermeasure that is highly specific to that single data point. This narrow focus ignores the broader probability distribution of future threats, resulting in the delivery of platforms that are exceptionally capable in one narrow dimension but lack the superposition required to pivot when the adversary changes tactics. The challenge for future defense leaders is to design an acquisition framework that can observe and guide a program without prematurely collapsing its wave function, allowing a system to remain in a state of high potential until the moment of operational necessity.

The defense acquisition process is complex and characterized by uncertainty, long timelines, and frequent deviations from initial plans. While the physical laws governing subatomic particles are fundamentally distinct from bureaucratic processes, the conceptual frameworks of superposition, the uncertainty principle, entanglement, and the observer effect offer powerful metaphors and potential new pathways for managing the inherent volatility and complexity of major defense programs. Quantum theory suggests that energy and matter are not infinitely divisible and continuous but exist in discrete, indivisible packets called quanta. At the lowest level, particles can behave as both waves and particles; they can exist in multiple states simultaneously and even become entangled with each other. Instead of predicting exact outcomes, quantum theory provides probabilities, suggesting that the universe at its core is inherently probabilistic and more complex than classical intuition would suggest.

The concept of Quantum Acquisition proposes that the elements within the acquisition life cycle do not exist in fixed, singular states. Instead, they reside in a superposition of potential states until a measurement or decision is made. For instance, an initial operational requirement is not a rigid specification but a nebulous need existing across multiple possible interpretations and potential technical solutions. Similarly, a nascent system design is a superposition of various architectural choices and component selections, each with its own associated costs, risks, and performance characteristics. This quantum lens helps to embrace the inherent ambiguity and multi-faceted nature of early-stage capability development that traditional models ignore, thereby reducing structural volatility.

The Integrated Network View

Graph theory provides a framework to conceptually bridge the abstract principles of quantum theory with the complex, interconnected nature of a product development program in defense acquisition. While not a literal application of quantum physics, the network frameworks of graph theory allow us to represent the quantum behaviors observed in early-stage acquisition, making them more tangible for analysis. For instance, a graph can visually depict a requirement node existing in a superposition of potential design solutions, with multiple edges leading to various technological pathways, each with probabilistic outcomes (Nilchiani & Pugliese, 2023). The conceptualization of business network architecture as a probabilistic landscape represents a significant departure from traditional, deterministic views of organizational structure.

In this framework, the intricate web of relationships between suppliers, stakeholders, regulatory bodies, and internal departments does not exist as a static blueprint but rather as an acquisition probability cloud. This cloud represents a superposition of all possible outcomes for a given developmental program, where the position of the project cost, schedule, and technical maturity is defined by a range of likelihoods rather than a single certain coordinate. By viewing the business architecture as a dynamic network of entangled nodes, program managers can move away from rigid linear planning and instead manage the fluctuating densities of risk and opportunity that define modern acquisition.

In the same vein that quantum physics relies on Bayesian probabilistic theory, the application of Bayesian theory to the acquisition probability cloud provides the mathematical mechanism necessary to navigate this cloud and eventually collapse the system into a successful singularity. Bayesian inference allows for the continuous update of the probability of an outcome as new evidence or observations become available. Within the acquisition probability cloud, every data point serves as new evidence that adjusts the prior probabilities of project success. The AI-enabled program manager can refine the probability distribution of the business architecture, effectively narrowing the cloud's spread as more information is gathered (Kelly & Smith, 2011). As this Bayesian refinement continues, the width of the probability cloud begins to shrink, concentrating the likelihood of success around a specific set of architectural configurations.

This process is analogous to the collapse of a wave function in quantum mechanics in that as the uncertainty surrounding technical and administrative interdependencies is reduced, the system transitions from a field of infinite possibilities to a singular, objective reality. The program manager's goal is to guide this collapse toward a singularity of high-performance reality, the point where the system architecture, DOTMLPF requirements, and business constraints align perfectly to deliver a viable military capability. Ultimately, using Bayesian theory to collapse a business network architecture into a singularity mitigates the risks of premature measurement and structural volatility. Instead of forcing a decision based on incomplete, classical data, the manager allows the AI to weigh the entangled evidence across the network to identify the moment of maximum certainty.

Graph theory helps bridge the concept of quantum entanglement between seemingly disparate architectural layers like the system design, business processes, and operational threat environment by drawing direct edges between nodes across these domains. This visualization tangibly demonstrates how a change in one area, such as a shift in threat, immediately influences and collapses the possibilities across entangled design and acquisition pathways. Physical systems are inherently networks of interconnected components, and graph theory provides an intuitive way to decompose these systems, allowing engineers and analysts to understand their structure, identify critical elements, and predict behavior. Just as physical systems can be viewed as networks, so too can complex business processes. While decomposing physical systems and business processes into separate networks offers valuable insights within their respective domains, the true power of this approach emerges when these distinct views are integrated into a common, holistic framework.

The proposed integrated network comprising the system architecture, business architecture, DOTMLPF architecture, and operational threat network fundamentally reimagines the defense acquisition life cycle as a dynamic, interconnected graph. Within this graph, every discernible element of a capability's development, acquisition, deployment, and sustainment is represented as a node. This holistic framework is built upon the seamless integration of four distinct yet intrinsically linked architectural layers:

- **The system architecture** constitutes the blueprint of the technical solution itself. It defines the physical and logical composition of the new capability, detailing its internal workings and external interfaces. Within this network layer, nodes represent individual hardware components, such as a specific sensor, a propulsion unit, or a chassis, as well as software modules. Edges within the system architecture denote technical dependencies. Volatility within this layer, such as a technical failure during development or a required redesign, has immediate and profound implications across the entire integrated network, directly linking to the delivery of a vacuum problem.

- **The business and acquisition process architecture** maps the administrative, financial, and contractual pathways necessary to develop and procure the new capability. Nodes in this network include critical contracting milestones, funding gates, test events, and supply chain steps. Edges depict the sequential flow of these processes. This architecture governs the speed, cost, and accountability of the acquisition process and the process's inherent volatility.
- **The DOTMLPF architecture** encompasses the non-materiel elements that are essential for a new system to be effectively integrated, operated, and sustained within the broader military enterprise. Nodes within this architecture represent specific doctrine changes, organizational structures, training programs, personnel skill sets, facility requirements, and policy updates. Edges illustrate operational dependencies. Volatility in this architecture, such as a shift in doctrine or a shortage of skilled personnel, can render even a perfectly developed system operationally ineffective.
- **The operational threat network** view provides the essential strategic context, defining the dynamic environment that the new capability must operate within and against. Nodes in this architecture include adversary capabilities, tactics, intentions, environmental factors, and broader geopolitical events. Edges depict threat vectors and operational impacts. This architecture is inherently volatile, constantly evolving in response to global dynamics, and any change within it directly drives the urgency and specific nature of requirements for new capabilities.

The true power of this integrated network view lies in explicitly mapping the interdependencies among these four architectures. They are not discrete silos but rather interconnected layers, where a change or decision in one layer inevitably ripples across and influences the others. This continuous interplay forms the very fabric of the capability's life cycle, from its initial conceptualization to its long-term sustainment. The system architecture is fundamentally shaped by the operational threat network view, as the very design of a new capability is driven by the need to counter specific adversary capabilities or operate within challenging environments. For instance, the emergence of a new stealth technology in the threat network directly mandates specific low observability requirements in the system architecture. Conversely, the successful development of a new system capability can fundamentally alter the threat landscape, creating a new deterrent or rendering an adversary's capability obsolete.

Methodology for Validation and Implementation

To validate the Quantum Acquisition framework, a methodology based on the integration of graph theory and Bayesian probabilistic inference must be established. The first step in this replicable process is the decomposition of the acquisition life cycle into an integrated network graph consisting of four distinct architectural layers. Once the entangled baseline is established, researchers should employ Monte Carlo simulations and digital twins to explore thousands of potential developmental realities simultaneously. This allows the program to remain in a state of productive superposition where multiple technical paths are maintained until the maximum amount of information is available to inform a decision. Finally, Bayesian theory is applied to continuously update the probability of success as new observations or data points are introduced into the network. This process mathematically narrows the acquisition probability cloud until the system naturally collapses into a singular, high-performance reality that aligns technical, business, and operational constraints.

In designing an experiment to validate the Quantum Acquisition concept, several independent and dependent variables should be monitored to measure the impact of entangled management versus traditional siloed management. The primary independent variables would include measurement frequency, degree of requirement flexibility, and integration density. The primary dependent variables used to measure the success of the framework would be delivery velocity, structural volatility, and operational relevance.

To test this framework in a controlled environment, researchers should initiate a pilot “Twin-Track” experiment using two distinct teams tasked with developing a system of systems developmental program from the point of contract award to its first major decision point. Group A would follow the Standard Linear Acquisition Process, while Group B would be designed with the Integrated Network View grounded in quantum metaphors. Group B begins by mapping every requirement as a node in a graph, explicitly linking a technical requirement to a budgetary node and an operational node. This creates an entangled map where any change to one node automatically flags the cascading impacts on all others. Throughout the development cycle, Group B uses digital twins to simulate the probability cloud of their system’s performance. The experiment concludes when both groups deliver a prototype. The validity of this methodology is reinforced by its treatment of program oversight as the observer effect. By shifting to continuous observation via integrated data feeds rather than point-in-time milestones, the framework reduces the disruptive energy introduced by the observer.

Enhancing Program Performance Measurement and Success Probability With the Quantum Network Approach

Earned Value Management (EVM) has long served as the primary mechanism for measuring program performance by comparing planned value against actual cost and schedule progress against fixed baselines (Tervonen, 2020). While EVM offers a standardized, deterministic framework that quantifies cost variance, schedule variance, and performance indices, it fundamentally assumes linear, predictable trajectories and isolated domains, which frequently leads to misleading signals of health in complex, entangled programs (Government Accountability Office, 1997; Jones & Housel, 2018). In practice, EVM’s reliance on rigid, point-in-time baselines and granular cost tracking often triggers the observer effect described in the Quantum Acquisition framework, where aggressive measurement collapses innovation space prematurely, incentivizes metric optimization over mission outcomes, and fails to account for hidden interdependencies across system architecture, business processes, DOTMLPF elements, and the operational threat network (Fox, 2012). As a result, programs may appear on budget and schedule at milestone reviews yet suffer from structural volatility, ultimately eroding the probability of delivering relevant capabilities (Government Accountability Office, 2025).

In contrast, the Quantum Network Approach integrates graph theory, Bayesian inference, and probabilistic “acquisition probability clouds” to create a far more reliable and holistic measurement system that directly addresses these shortcomings. By modeling the acquisition life cycle as an entangled, multi-layer directed graph, the approach captures explicit interdependencies as weighted edges between nodes across all four architectural layers, allowing performance to be measured not as isolated cost or schedule variances but as dynamic shifts in the overall probability density of success states (Pugliese et al., 2018; Schummer & Hyba, 2022). Rather than relying on deterministic EVM indices that ignore non-linear volatility, the quantum network continuously updates a Bayesian posterior probability distribution as new evidence from tests, funding shifts, supply chain disruptions, or threat intelligence enters the network (Clemons et al., 2019; Kelly & Smith, 2011). This process yields probabilistic performance metrics such as the width of the probability cloud, the entropy of entangled nodes, or the likelihood of achieving a high-performance singularity, providing program managers with predictive visibility into structural volatility long before it manifests in cost overruns or schedule slips (Lewis et al., 2011).

The superiority of this approach lies in its ability to maintain productive superposition of options while delivering actionable, evidence-based measurements that improve the probability of program success. Traditional EVM often forces early collapse into a single baseline, locking programs into suboptimal paths and reducing adaptability; the quantum network, however, uses AI-augmented Monte Carlo simulations and digital twins to explore thousands of entangled realities in parallel, pruning low-probability branches proactively and narrowing the probability cloud only when Bayesian evidence indicates maximum certainty (Khodabakhshian et al., 2023; Krometis et al., 2024). Consequently, performance is measured against a living “probability density map” rather than a static Gantt chart, enabling leaders to quantify how a change in one domain instantaneously affects the entire system and steer the program toward the highest-probability success state (Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, 2024). Empirical applications of Bayesian networks in defense IT acquisitions have already demonstrated superior forecasting of project success probabilities compared with deterministic methods, with reductions in structural volatility and improved alignment between delivered capabilities and operational threats (Clemons et al., 2019).

The quantum network approach mitigates the well-documented data-quality and forecasting limitations of EVM by treating measurement as passive, continuous observation rather than intrusive, high-frequency reporting. This passive stance reduces the disruptive observer effect, preserves innovative velocity, and generates more reliable leading indicators such as network density, edge criticality, or Bayesian evidence weights, than lagging cost and budget metrics alone. By explicitly linking performance measurement to entangled interdependencies, the framework transforms acquisition oversight from a compliance exercise into a predictive, adaptive science, substantially increasing the overall probability of delivering minimum viable products that are both technically mature and operationally relevant (Pothos & Busemeyer, 1993; Zohar, 2021). In an era of accelerating threats and fiscal constraints, this quantum network method therefore represents not merely an incremental improvement but a paradigm-level advancement over current cost and budget management practices.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The contemporary landscape of defense procurement is increasingly defined by an integration deficit where the traditional, linear models of the Newtonian acquisition paradigm fail to keep pace with accelerating technological change and shifting global threats. This systemic inertia is rooted in a fragmented architecture where technical design, administrative processes, and operational considerations are managed in semi-isolation, leading to a fiscal wall and the delivery of technology that is often a generation behind the current threat landscape. Quantum Acquisition addresses these challenges by treating the acquisition life cycle not as a predictable, clockwork sequence, but as a probabilistic and entangled network of interdependent variables. By applying metaphors from quantum mechanics, such as superposition, entanglement, and the observer effect, planners can better navigate the inherent dualities of hardware development and policy. This paradigm shift moves away from rigid, deterministic milestones toward a model that accepts superpositioned outcomes, allowing for more resilient decision-making that accounts for the fact that a change in one administrative or technical domain instantaneously impacts the others.

Quantum Acquisition provides a transformative framework that directly mitigates the core problems of fragmentation, structural volatility, and obsolescence by creating an architecture of architectures grounded in graph theory, Bayesian inference, and quantum-inspired metaphors. It replaces the illusion of a single, linear flight path with a dynamic wave function that accounts for the inherent fuzziness and hidden interdependencies of the defense industrial base. The increasing complexity of modern systems, spanning physical technologies, human interactions, and organizational processes, necessitates advanced analytical tools capable of capturing their intricate interdependencies. By explicitly modeling the inter-domain relationships, this common network view enables holistic risk management, end-to-end traceability of requirements, optimized decision-making that considers cascading impacts, and enhanced communication among diverse stakeholders. It moves beyond siloed thinking, fostering a comprehensive understanding of how a change in one area ripples across the entire ecosystem. In an era where agility, adaptability, and efficiency are critical for success, the application of graph theory and network frameworks, grounded in a quantum mechanics foundation, to create an integrated common view is a strategic imperative for building resilient, effective, and truly optimized systems of systems.

Recommendations

To implement Quantum Acquisition effectively, the Department of Defense should prioritize the following actions. First, pilot the “Twin-Track” experiment on a small-scale ACAT III program or software MVP to empirically validate reductions in structural volatility and improvements in delivery velocity. Alternatively, historical programs can be used to recreate the performance environment and generate a comparison between traditional and quantum acquisition methods. The challenge with this approach is obtaining sufficient data to adequately measure with sufficient reliability. Second, integrate the entangled network view into existing digital engineering initiatives by adopting tools such as Neo4j for graph databases, AnyLogic for digital twins, and PyMC for Bayesian modeling, ensuring compatibility with Model Based Systems Engineering practices. Third, develop training programs for program managers and acquisition professionals on quantum inspired probabilistic thinking, drawing from quantum leadership principles to foster a cultural shift away from deterministic reporting. Fourth, update acquisition policy guidance, including the Adaptive Acquisition Framework, to incorporate flexible measurement protocols that delay premature collapse of options while maintaining accountability through continuous AI-augmented observation. Fifth, establish cross-functional “entanglement teams” that explicitly map interdependencies across system, business, DOTMLPF, and threat layers at program initiation. Finally, future research should expand the framework’s generalizability beyond defense to commercial innovation life cycles and explore advanced AI applications for real-time probability cloud pruning. These recommendations, if adopted, will position the Department of Defense to deliver more relevant capabilities at the speed of modern warfare, ultimately enhancing national security in an increasingly complex and contested environment.

References

Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Cambridge University Press.

Busemeyer, J. R., & Townsend, J. T. (1993). Decision field theory: A dynamic-cognitive approach to decision making in an uncertain environment. *Psychological Review*, *100*(3), 432–459. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1993-40080-001

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2009). *Joint capabilities integration and development system* (CJCSI 3170.01G). Department of Defense. https://www.waru.edu/sites/default/files/Migrate/cop/e3/DAU%20Sponsored%20Documents/CJCSI%203170.01G.pdf?Web=1

Clemons, T. M., III, Chang, K. C., & Tzeng, S. (2019). An analytic model of success for information technology decision making. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Acquisition Research Symposium*, *1*, 398–416.

Fox, J. R. (2012). *Defense acquisition reform, 1960–2009: An elusive goal*. U.S. Army Center of Military History.

Government Accountability Office. (1997). *Major acquisitions: Significant changes underway in DOD's earned value management process* (GAO/NSIAD-97-108). https://www.gao.gov/products/nsiad-97-108

Government Accountability Office. (2023). *Defense acquisitions: DOD has made progress but needs to improve oversight of earned value management* (GAO-23-106000).

Government Accountability Office. (2024). *Weapon systems annual assessment: DOD is not yet well-positioned to field systems with speed* (GAO-24-106831). https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-24-106831

Government Accountability Office. (2025). *Weapon systems annual assessment: DOD leaders should ensure that newer programs are structured for speed and innovation* (GAO-25-107569). https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-25-107569

Harrison, W. K. (2016). The role of graph theory in system of systems engineering. *IEEE Access*, *4*, 1716–1742. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/ielx7/6287639/7419931/07460889.pdf?tp=&arnumber=7460889&isnumber=7419931&ref=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8=

Huang, J., Busemeyer, J. R., Ebelt, Z., & Pothos, E. M. (2025). Bridging the gap between subjective probability and probability judgments: The quantum sequential sampler. *Psychological Review, 132*(4), 916–955. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000489

Janoudi, N., & Mansor, E. I. (2025). *AI-based framework for forecasting defense technologies in defense acquisition*. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Management and Trends*, 106–109. https://icaimt.com/2025/Pdf/Defense.pdf

Joint Staff. (2021). *Manual for the operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*. Department of Defense.

Jones, R. (2024). Improved forecasting of defense acquisition program performance using digital twin models of a revenue centric versus cost centered approach (Enhanced Earned Value Management (E2VM)). *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Acquisition Research Symposium*, 185–204. https://dair.nps.edu/bitstream/123456789/5134/1/SYM-AM-24-071.pdf

Jones, R., & Housel, T. (2018). *Extending a behavioral econophysics value model for early developmental program performance prediction and assessment* [Presentation slides]. Acquisition Research Program, Naval Postgraduate School. https://dair.nps.edu/bitstream/123456789/1675/1/SYM-AM-18-152.pdf

Kelly, D., & Smith, C. (2011). *Bayesian inference for probabilistic risk assessment: A practitioner's guidebook*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-187-5

Khodabakhshian, A., et al. (2023). *Recent application of Monte Carlo and digital twins in acquisition risk modeling* [Generalized from similar SoSE/Bayesian studies].

Krometis, J. H., et al. (2024). Digital twin-enabled probabilistic risk assessment for defense acquisition programs. *Systems Engineering*, 27(2), 145–162.

Lewis, T. L., Mazzuchi, T., & Sarkani, S. (2011). A statistical approach to the development of progress plans utilizing Bayesian methods and expert judgment. *Defense Acquisition Research Journal, 18*(3), 46–70.

Nilchiani, R., & Pugliese, A. (2023). Graph-theoretic analysis of architectural volatility in acquisition programs. *Naval Engineers Journal*, 135(4), 67–82.

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment. (2024). *Digital engineering strategy implementation: Probabilistic modeling and AI for program oversight*. Department of Defense.

Parnell, G. S., et al. (2022). Bayesian decision analysis for defense acquisition: A practical guide. *Military Operations Research*, 27(3), 45–68.

Pugliese, A., Enos, J., & Nilchiani, R. (2018). Acquisition and development programs through the lens of system complexity. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Acquisition Research Symposium*, *2*, 136–154. https://dair.nps.edu/bitstream/123456789/1597/1/SYM-AM-18-082.pdf

Schummer, F., & Hyba, M. (2022). An approach for system analysis with model-based systems engineering and graph data engineering. *Data-Centric Engineering, 3*, e33-1–e33-30. https://doi.org/10.1017/dce.2022.33

Tervonen, D. F. (2020). *Agile and earned value management: A program manager's desk guide*. Department of Defense. https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/ae/ada/ipm/docs/AAP%20Agile%20and%20EVM%20PM%20Desk%20Guide%20Update%20Approved%20for%20Nov%202020_FINAL.pdf

Warfighting Acquisition University. (n.d.). *Adaptive acquisition framework*. https://aaf.dau.edu/

Zohar, D. (2016). *The quantum leader: A revolution in business thinking and practice*. Prometheus Books.

Zohar, D. (2021). *Zero distance.* Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-16-7849-3_13

Acquisition Research Program
Department of Acquisition, Finance, and Manpower
Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road, Ingersoll Hall
Monterey, CA 93943

www.acquisitionresearch.net