

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY/NSS EXHIBIT



FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2003 BUDGET ESTIMATES

FEBRUARY 2002

UNCLASSIFIED

This page is intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page #</u>
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY/NSS OVERVIEW (IT/NSS OV)	5
REPORT LIST OF MAJOR PROGRAMS SUBMITTED	29
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXHIBIT IT-1 INDEX	31
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXHIBIT IT-1 REPORT	37
IT-SUMMARY APPENDIX A - NSS ANNEX	53
NSS ANNEX INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXHIBIT IT-1 INDEX	55
NSS ANNEX INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXHIBIT IT-1 REPORT	59

This page is intentionally left blank

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

The Budget reflects the Army's efforts to implement a vision for an uncertain strategic environment. We articulated a transformation of the Army to a new force that would be more strategically responsive and dominant across the spectrum of operations. This force will be built around capabilities, not potential threats. The events of 11 September 2001 have validated that direction and provided impetus to accelerate development of those capabilities. We've been preparing to fight this first war of the 21st century for the past two years. We need help to move faster.

Soldiers On Point for the Nation"...Persuasive in Peace, Invincible in War"... Our Army, its priorities -- People, Readiness, and Transformation. Our soldiers are the centerpiece of our formations, of our Army. We train soldiers and grow leaders. Leadership is our stock-in-trade. Our Nation's security and well-being depend on our investments in our Army, our soldiers, civilians, retirees, and their families. We will fully man the force to support our current missions. We will support well-being for our soldiers, civilians, retirees, and their families. We will fully authorize and fund Transformation: Supporting the Objective Force, the Legacy Force, and the Interim Force. Readiness is our top priority. We will maintain our non-negotiable contract with America to fight and win the Nation's wars as we transform to support the National Military Strategy (NMS) and Commander-in-Chief (CINC) requirements. All the while, we will Transform our Army to be more strategically responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of military operations. With our soldiers as our centerpiece, we will Transform the Army to the Objective Force while maintaining readiness to execute the NMS. Concurrently, we are realigning resources to more adequately fund AT/FP issues as part of our support to the President's campaign against terrorism, and an increased focus on Homeland Defense.

Operational doctrine has shifted to accommodate planning for small-scale contingencies in which the United States is confronted with global hot spots requiring a range of responses. To accommodate this shift it has been determined that heavy forces are difficult to deploy and must be transformed to more fully support the National Military Strategy. The Chief of Staff has challenged the status quo and initiated a process to transform the Army into a more lethal, lightweight, strategically relevant and deployable force that will be better suited to meet future defense challenges. The Army's Transformation Concept was supported by the FY01 Congressional

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Budget. To be successful in the near-term in transforming to an interim force and in the long term to the objective force, a critical enabler is a robust command, control, communication, computers (C4), and information technology (IT) program.

Army Knowledge Management (AKM) is the Army strategy to transform itself into a network-centric knowledge-based force. This effort is an integral part of the Army Transformation. AKM will improve decision dominance by our warfighters and business stewards – in the battlespace, in our organizations, and in our mission processes. The Army CIO will oversee the implementation of Knowledge Management within the Army.

Information superiority is a key enabler for achieving the Army's Transformation goals and supporting its modernization into the objective force. Our information superiority goals plus our efforts with Computer Network Attack and Computer Network Defense (CAN/CND) work together to enhance our Force Protection capabilities. In order to achieve information superiority, the Army must make several substantial investments. By establishing split-based operations and improving reach back capabilities the Army will be able to obtain supplies and equipment more rapidly, moving them onto the battlefield quickly and, thus, reducing the requirement for forward equipment stockpiles. Command and control (C2) systems must provide a more concise, timely, accurate and secure view of the battlefield. The Army can accomplish these capabilities by enhancing communications throughput with improved C4/IT infrastructure. OSD assisted the Army in meeting several key information superiority goals by providing additional funding in FY03 and across FYs 04-07 to support C4/IT infrastructure, Command and Control Center upgrades, and information assurance initiatives for the Army supported CINCs. In addition to information superiority, the ability to recruit and retain quality soldiers is paramount. Recruiting is one of the Army's greatest challenges in today's competitive environment. Laptops, supported with the latest information, are allowing recruiters to present the Army story better and more comprehensively. While people are an indispensable component of readiness, the new recruits must be trained. The Army is capable of training soldiers both at home and in the tactical environment through Distance Learning and Computer Based Training.

The **Army Chief Information Officer (CIO)**, Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Computers and Communications (DISC4) and his staff continue to aggressively implement the Clinger-Cohen Act (CCA).

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

The Army CIO has been tasked to oversee the implementation of Army Knowledge Management (AKM) that is an integral part of the Army Transformation. The Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, Army has identified the five strategic AKM goals for the Army:

- Goal 1: Adopt governance and cultural changes to become a knowledge-based organization.
- Goal 2: Integrate knowledge management and best business practices into Army processes.
- Goal 3: Manage the infostructure (the information technology piece of infrastructure) at the enterprise level.
- Goal 4: Scale Army Knowledge On-line as the enterprise portal.
- Goal 5: Harness human capital for the knowledge organization.

This is the thrust of the Army CIO's efforts to support Army Transformation – to institute best business practices, managing our infostructure at the enterprise level, tapping Army talent, and encouraging innovation as we Transform our Army into a more lethal and agile force.

The Army CIO works closely with senior Army leadership to ensure the Army's scarce information technology dollars are appropriately spread between the operational forces and sustaining base - across the functional business areas – personnel, logistics, medical - that support the warfighter and ensure maximum mission accomplishment – Persuasive in Peace – Invincible in Battle.

The CIO and his staff continue to implement Clinger-Cohen across the ten core CIO competencies identified by the CIO council: policy, architecture, capital planning and investment, information resources and strategic planning, technology assessment, acquisition, process improvement, IT workforce training and professional development, performance and results based management, and security. A quick assessment of the Army's CIO accomplishments in these areas follows.

POLICY

Army Regulation 25-1, Army Information Management, was published February 2000. This publication is the Army's capstone document for information management and technology. It promulgates requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act throughout the

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of Army. Interim policy memoranda provided Army-wide visibility for information technology policy through a central repository on the Chief Information Officer web site. A change to the AR 25-1 is being staffed which will provide new guidance on electronic mail, web management, and the Army Knowledge Online (AKO). In addition, a forthcoming pamphlet will provide procedures to implement to Clinger-Cohen and other DoD mandates down to the installations and operation levels of the Army.

ARCHITECTURE

Army Enterprise Architecture (AEA) has evolved to the point that its impact is being felt on the development, acquisition, and fielding of Information Technology systems under Army modernization. The Chief Information Officer developed a master plan to synchronize architecture development, established architecture requirements within Army Regulation 25-1, and developed a guidance document to set standards for Army architecture products. These steps supported the achievement of a major Army Enterprise Architecture milestone – the release of the 1st Digitized Force Systems Architecture and the use of that architecture data to influence fielding numbers for war-fighter radio systems in the 4th Infantry Division. Use of this data ensures the most effective allocation of limited information technology resources, as well as architectures to support Joint Contingency Force Advanced War-fighting Experiment and Initial Brigade Combat Team (IBCT). The Army Enterprise Architecture also established working-level programs to enhance information technology interoperability with allied and coalition forces.

Installation Information Infrastructure Architecture is a major element within the Army Enterprise Architecture. Over a period of three years, the architecture program has established a coordinated and cohesive approach for architecture modernization at all Army installations. The program developed target architecture models, including costs, and applied them to installations. This effort resulted in an unprecedented comprehensive database and uniform approach to modernization for active Army, CONUS and OCONUS installations. This achievement gave OSD the confidence to increase funding for Army installation information infrastructure modernization by a half a billion dollars.

A major achievement in the data management arena was the work with Department of Defense, Joint, and Service communities to establish the Core Architecture Data Model as a standard data structure enabling interchange and interoperability of architecture data.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

The Army established detailed extensions of the model and has developed architecture data repositories that can be used to support complementary efforts such as modernization of tactical units and the installations on which they reside.

CAPITAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENT

The Army Chief Information Officer Investment Strategy complies with the implementation of the Clinger-Cohen Act and Executive Order 13011 by providing framework and process to select key technology investments supporting the Army's strategic mission areas.

THE CIO INVESTMENT STRATEGY IS A STRUCTURED, RIGOROUS PROCESS THAT ENGAGES A BROAD COMMUNITY OF STAKEHOLDERS WHO SELECT AND PRIORITIZE INVESTMENTS SUPPORTING THE CIO STRATEGIC MISSION AREAS AND CORE COMPETENCIES.

The Investment Strategy shapes this FY 03 President's Budget Information Technology Budget (ITB) as it did the four previous Army budgets to carefully balance its priority investment requirements to "Transform" the Army while maintaining our current readiness and providing for our soldiers – their salaries, their families, and their health care needs.

The Army CIO's Investment Strategy has been in place for four years and has proven to be a corporate success. It is based on strategic objectives outlined in the Army Plan (TAP) that provides the Army's strategic framework. The TAP includes the Army direction, required operational capabilities, and the programmatic guidance that ultimately produces the C4/IT investment program and budget.

The CIO Investment Strategy is developed through the collaborative efforts of the Army's multi-functional community of C4/IT stakeholders, to include Joint representation, that collectively determine the "best value" investment solutions for the Army's most critical C4/IT capability shortfalls. Last year we incorporated performance measures into the process. This year we are incorporating risk management factors into the overall schema for determining the "best value" potential of selected investments.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

The Army investment strategy is composed of the following investment areas: Architecture, Information Assurance, Battlefield Communications & Network Management, Satellite Communications, C4/IT Infrastructure, Soldier Training, Focused Logistics, Force Management Modernization & Integration, Battle-space Awareness, and Army Knowledge Management issues.

Currently, the Army's top FY03 Investment Strategy gaps that require support from Congress are Modernized Battlefield Communications and Network Management, C4/IT Infrastructure, Information Assurance, Satellite Communications, and Battle-space Awareness - all key enablers to accomplish the Army's mission through the rapid transmission of secure information to ensure information and decision superiority. It is important not only to our future, but also in the current heightened threat environment, that we are able to transmit, protect, and manage our information/intelligence.

To remain an information dominant force and to achieve the Army's Transformation goals while supporting its modernization and recapitalization as we move toward the objective force, it is imperative that the following systems remain in the forefront and remain supported by Congress.

C4/IT systems that have direct impact on **Transformation** are: Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS), Enhanced Position Locating and Reporting System (EPLRS), Near Term Digital Radio, Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2), Maneuver Control System (MCS), Global Combat Support System-Army (GCSS-A), Standard Installation Division Personnel Reporting System 3 (SIDPERS 3), Transportation Coordination-Automated Information Management System II (TC AIMS II), and Installation Information Infrastructure Master Plan (I3MP).

Modernization is the development and/or procurement of new systems with improved war-fighting capabilities. Those major C4/IT systems that are being modernized are: Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS), War-fighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-Tactical), Secure Mobile Reliable Anti-jam-Terminal (SMART-T), Army Battle Command System (ABCS), GCSS-A, and Global Broadcast System (GBS).

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Recapitalization is the rebuilding and selected upgrade of currently fielded systems to ensure operational readiness. The major C4/IT systems that are being recapitalized are Army Common User System Modernization (ACUS MOD), I3MP, Global Command and Control System-Army (GCCS-A), Single Channel Anti-jam Manportable Terminal (SCAMP), ABCS, and Army Tactical Command and Control System (ATCCS).

We are also **maintaining** and upgrading our priority software applications to improve business practices and/or functionality, replenishing our outdated hardware, and enhancing security. The major C4/IT systems that must be maintained are: EPLRS, Defense Satellite Communication system (DSCS), SINCGARS and SPITFIRE (not an acronym, a small radio).

Within the C4/IT Infrastructure investment area – the Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) is the initiative to replace outdated switching and information transport technology with efficient state of the art commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) equipment. It provides high-speed data and voice connectivity at Army installations worldwide. I3MP uses a suite of competitive indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) contracts that leverage competition to provide cost effective engineering, integration, installation, training, logistics and life cycle sustainment products and services. It provides troops deployed around the world with instantaneous mission reach back power projection platforms. I3MP digitizes the sustaining base installations to enable transformation in such areas as multimedia applications, image processing for intelligence, maneuver control, telemedicine and telemaintenance. OSD provided assistance to the Army in this area by providing significant increases in FY03 to improve C4/IT infrastructure at European Command (EUCOM) and Pacific Command (PACOM) installations.

With increased emphasis to provide better services to soldiers, civilians, and contractors who support the day-to-day mission, it is imperative that the Army becomes a knowledge based organization and streamlines its business processes, lowers total cost of ownership and reduces cycle times. Technology has matured in recent years and enables dispersed offices to bring greater intellectual assets to bear on organizational decision making. The increased sophistication of web technologies allows us to conduct business from various geographic locations, leveraging corporate intellectual assets from any location, at anytime, to improve mission accomplishments. Improved search engines and portal technology provides an opportunity for the Army to capture, filter and disseminate pertinent information. The Army's answer to this expanding requirement is **Knowledge Management**.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Information Assurance

The Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Army fully recognize that in this time of lethal asymmetrical threats, protecting the Army's networks and systems protects the force by ensuring secure and reliable command and control of combat operations. The goal of Army Information Assurance (IA) is to secure the Army portion of the Global Information Grid (GIG) and to provide secure information and information based system protection to the force. Securing the GIG and protecting information and information systems is accomplished through implementing a Defense-in-Depth strategy. The Defense-in-Depth approach integrates the capabilities of people, operations, and technology to establish multi-layer, multi-dimension protection. The Army's strategy for implementing Defense-in-Depth in accordance with DoD policy and guidance is the Army Information Assurance Program.

The Army's Information Assurance Program is a comprehensive agenda of innovative policies and procedures, state-of-the-art hardware/software enabling technologies (e.g., firewalls, intrusion detection systems, proxy technologies, and biometrics), and new training and retention initiatives designed to protect the Army's critical information infrastructure from the sustaining base to the deployed force. The Army's Information Assurance Program integrates IA security solutions into the C4I architectures of both sustaining base installations and the digitized tactical force structure under the Force XXI Protection Plan. Quality training is the key to success and Army System Administrator and Network Manager security training has been expanded from one laboratory with 240 spaces annually in April of 1998 to 12 laboratories with 2,760 spaces annually.

Army led the way in exploring the application of new commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technologies such as biometrics (the use of fingerprints, retinal and iris scanning, hand geometry, voice and facial pattern recognition) to provide definitive access control to critical information and weapons systems in all environments. This leadership was recognized on July 13, 2000, when the President signed Public Law 106-246 naming the Army as Executive Agent chartered to lead, consolidate, and coordinate all biometrics IA activities for the Department of Defense (DoD). The Army Chief Information Officer established the Biometrics Management Office to serve as the center of gravity over the full spectrum of biometric systems and technologies.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

The Army has established a management structure and process to support the Army's implementation of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) to enable authentication, data integrity, nonrepudiation and confidentiality for Army networks, system and electronic business processes through the use of digital signatures and public key encryption technologies. The Army has synchronized the PKI program with the DoD Common Access Card (CAC) Program and the CAC will serve as the Army's standard implementation of PKI. The Army published interim policy and procedures for implementation of CAC and PKI in December 2000 and established Army Registration Authorities and Local Registration Authorities to conduct face-to-face registration for approved Army PKI software-based pilots pending implementation of the CAC.

A detailed description of Army Information Assurance by Defense-in-Depth follows:

The Army Information Assurance Program provides the Warfighter, to the greatest extent possible; secure communications from the foxhole to the sustaining base. The capability of commanders to prepare, send, store, retransmit and acknowledge communications is a cornerstone of combat from ancient times to the present. The commander's capability to send timely and secure messages, to collect intelligence and reset the status of his forces (numbers, locations, dispositions) to garner facts about the adversary and to order engagements are all exploitable in the modern electronic battlefield. The Army Information Assurance Program addresses vulnerabilities and seeks to stay ahead of emerging technologies that could be used against our forces. The capability to provide voice/data confidentiality, data integrity, authentication, access control and non-repudiation are accepted security requirements addressed in the Army Information Assurance Program. There are ten Defense-in-Depth areas of focus and the following details the major IA activities that contribute to each category.

Defend the Computing Environment. At the forefront of defending the computing environment is the integration of biometric technologies. In 2000 the Biometrics Management Office (BMO) was created to serve as the coordination and development center over a full spectrum of biometric systems and technologies. Effective use of biometrics provides the DoD a decisive edge in all operational environments with the best and most reliable security access control for information and weapons systems.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Major Army efforts to defend the computing environment include Public Key Infrastructure (PKI). In support of DoD's PKI activities, the Army backs the Common Access Card (CAC)/PKI and is actively involved in supporting the implementation timelines. Under PKI, the Army has issued certificates to implement encryption and enhance security on over 1200 web servers, and the numbers increase daily, that are restricted to the conduct of only Army business.

Defend the Enclave Boundary. To protect our posts, camps, and stations, Army developed a Top Level Architecture (TLA) overlay that employs technical solutions to the maximum extent possible to implement a defense-in-depth strategy. The TLA overlay incorporates a suite of hardware and software, that will:

- Defend against unauthorized modification or disclosure of data.
- Ensure that physical and logical enclaves are adequately protected.
- Provide a risk-managed means to selectively allow essential information to flow across enclave boundaries.
- Ensure that local defense-in-depth infrastructures support local operational needs while feeding data to Army level activities, allowing rapid, coordinated actions Army-wide, regardless of the scale of the intrusion.
- Support centralized, perimeter level dynamic throttling of services due to changes in risk posture.

Defend the Networks and Infrastructure. Army incorporates several facets of protection in defending the networks and infrastructure. First is an extension of the TLA to protect Army networks beyond the enclave. This network defense is established between the enclave and DISN and is one element in implementing a defense-in-depth strategy. The TLA overlay network defense incorporates a suite of hardware and software that will:

- Provide boundary defenses for unprotected systems within the Army domain.
- Ensure an acceptable level of availability by defending against denial of service attacks.
- Provide the Army's gateway protection/detection/response capability and the locus of sensors in the Army's Attack Sensing and Warning (AS&W) sensor grid.
- Enable rapid detection of and response to intrusions.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

- Provide Common Operational Picture (COP) of networks and systems.
- Provide technical capability to maintain strict configuration management of the Army's perimeter defenses.

TACLANE provides in-line network encryption capability, which allows secure communications in a dynamic Tactical Packet Network, in the Defense Information Systems Network or over the Internet. KIV-7HS provides link encryption capability to protect a broad spectrum of point-to-point, netted, and broadcast data links. Secure Terminal Equipment (STE) is the next generation of secure voice and data equipment for advanced digital communications networks. The Army is on track in replacing mission critical STU-III with STEs.

Global Centralized Network Monitoring and Configuration Management implements DoD mandated Defense-in-Depth requirements to "Defend the Networks (Perimeter Defense) and the Enclave Boundaries." The focus is on people and licenses for the tools necessary to:

- Maintain centralized network monitoring and configuration management of the Top Level (security) Architecture (TLA), the Army's "Perimeter Defense" of all NIPRNet connections.
- Maintain the reengineered protected Army Domain Name Service (DNS) architecture; to include license updates of the host based security devices on the DNS servers.
- Maintain/upgrade licenses for all the IA tools that the Army centrally manages, to include over 2,500 Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) and approximately 700 firewalls, proxy and servers, and 40 plus scanners that the RCERT/ACERT manage.

Defensive Information Operations. The heart of the Army's Computer Network Defense (CND) capability is the Army's Computer Emergency Response Team (ACERT) working in close coordination with the Army Network Operations and Security Center (ANOSC). Each Regional CERT (RCERT) and co-located Theater NOSC (TNOSC) provides a mutually supportive "911" capability to Army users to sort through network outages and anomalies and identify and react to cyber attacks. These co-located RCERT and TNOSC centers are at Ft. Huachuca, Arizona; Mannheim, Germany; Ft. Shafter, Hawaii; and Camp Walker, Republic of Korea. The RCERTs and TNOSCs work together to monitor IDS installed at all Army gateways to the Nonsecure Internet Protocol Router

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Network (NIPRNET) and on critical servers. Together, they are the Army's capability to provide a fully coordinated Common Operational Picture (COP) of the health of the Army's systems and networks and provide Attack Sensing and Warning (AS&W) support to Army users worldwide in protecting against and responding to cyber attacks.

The Army is in the forefront in verifying that the DoD Information Assurance Vulnerability Alert (IAVA) "positive control" process is being fully implemented. The Army created and dispatches an IAVA Compliance Verification Team (CVT) to conduct short-notice on site inspections of units. Units are randomly selected and verification performed to determine if vulnerabilities identified in IAVA messages have been corrected. The CVT consists of security technicians, Army Criminal Investigation, and Army Audit Agency personnel who not only inspect, but also provide on site support, assistance, and recommendations for improving security. The IAVA CVT has inspected over 25 units worldwide and its findings require a reply by endorsement to the Army Chief Information Officer (CIO) on follow-up action. Results are also provided to the Senior Army Leadership, as required. The presence of the IAVA CVT and the knowledge that the Army's Senior Leadership is actively involved in reviewing the findings has proven to be a most valuable tool in improving the security of Army systems and networks.

IA for the Tactical Environment. Protecting tactical command and control communication and data networks is a key enabler to mission success. Army communications and network security products provide communication security, crypto-security, transmission security, emission security, computer security, and information assurance in protecting telecommunications and information systems that process classified, mission sensitive, national security, and related sensitive information. Communication and network security products prevent exploitation through intercept, unauthorized electronic access, or related technical intelligence threats. They ensure authenticity, integrity, protection and availability of information transmitted by information and communication systems. Products supporting the tactical environment include, KY-100 AIRTERM, KIV-19, TACLANE, and KIV-7HS.

IA Management and Operations. Army will intensify its Management Oversight effort to identify, categorize, and eliminate or secure "back doors" into the Army's information and information-based systems infrastructure and increase DEPSECDEF mandated "positive control" overlaying systems and networks. Management Oversight has been and will continue to focus on the process of

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

identifying and applying new and evolving technologies to accomplish the DoD-mandated defense-in-depth strategy to use technical solutions to the maximum extent possible.

IA Security Management. Major Command (MACOM) security management activities implement mandated DoD and Army Information Assurance standards within the MACOM. MACOM security management activities include:

- Training: System administrator certification training (IA workshops and resident level 2 and 3 training) and Information System Security Manager (ISSM), Information System Security Officer (ISSO), and Department of Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP) Mobile Training Team (MTT) training.
- IA Technology Insertion: IA Tools include firewalls, IDS, scanners, vulnerability, and purge tools that are available on the Army Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) and Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) tools not listed on the IA BPA obtained in accordance with Army guidance. IA tools will not be purchase without a plan to train personnel to install, configure, and audit the tools.
- Information Assurance oversight and IAVA compliance and verification.

The Army's COMSEC Logistics Activity (CSLA) and Tobyhanna Army Depot manages, supports, sustains, and maintains over 588,000 INFOSEC and COMSEC systems used by soldiers in the field. CSLA has responsibility as the COMSEC / InfoSec National Inventory Control Point (NICP) and manages the worldwide acquisition, fielding, distribution, and lifecycle support of COMSEC / InfoSec products. As the National Maintenance Point (NMP), CSLA manages the maintenance engineering and maintainability support performed by the depot for COMSEC / InfoSec products.

Army's implementation of the Electronic Key Management System (EKMS), the Army Key Management System (AKMS), will enhance standardization of communications security and reduce vulnerabilities associated with physical key. The AKMS will provide the Army with the capability for distributing electronic key to COMSEC devices and the capability for automated ordering, generation and production, storage, replication, and accounting for electronic key.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

IA Supporting Infrastructures. Provides for centrally managed COMSEC/INFOSEC equipment replacement, upgrades, and enhancements for all Army-supported EKMS Tier 1 sites, both CONUS and OCONUS. Tier 1, the centerpiece of EKMS, increases communications security, ensures standardization and interoperability among the services and Civil Agencies, and minimizes lead-time for securing communications.

IA System Security Methodology. Information Assurance development projects integrate National Security Agency (NSA) developed security technology into Army information systems. Project objectives are to provide systems security mechanisms through encryption, trusted software or standard operating procedures to protect the information and to integrate these mechanisms into specified systems so secure operations are as transparent as possible to the users. This entails performing architecture studies and modeling, development models, system integration and testing, installation kits and certifications and accreditation of Automation Information Systems. Project will also assess, develop, integrate and demonstrate C2 Protect Common Tools (hardware and software) that will provide protection for fixed infrastructure for post, camps, and station networks as well as efforts on tactical networks.

IA Training. Army has implemented a robust training and certification program. Training targets System Administrators, Network Managers, Information Assurance Security Officers / Managers, and user level personnel. It includes IDS and firewall courses in the Windows and UNIX environments. Information Assurance workshops, hosted by the Army CIO provide a focus for Army Systems Administrators and Network Security Managers with hacking demonstrations, threat briefs, and cyber crime information. More than 200 students attend each workshop. The Systems Administrators courses are preparing program of instruction to teach security of Windows 2000. An updated information assurance user awareness CD ROM will become available in November 2001. This training will be distributed within the Army during FY02.

INFORMATION RESOURCES STRATEGIC PLANNING

The Army CIO and staff play an active role in all levels of resource allocation forums at HQDA in the Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution System (PPBES) process. Senior CIO staff officers participate in the resource deliberations for all Title X missions and associated C4/IT enablers: manning, training, equipping, sustaining, organizing, and installations. The VDISC4/DISC4

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

acting as Integrators represent the CIO at the two and three star level forums that prioritize Army wide programs. The Army CIO works closely with the DoD and other Service CIOs to ensure CIO interests are appropriately addressed in Defense Planning Guidance and other defense-wide planning documents. The CIO is establishing an executive level Strategic Planning Group that will guide the CIO and the Army as it transforms itself into its Objective Force.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

The CIO/DISC4 has established the Chief Technology Office (CTO) as a Center of Excellence to ensure the Army moves from a state of “information overload” to a Knowledge Centric organization leveraging Enterprise Knowledge to improve our decision-making. This will ensure we can correctly interpret knowledge on the battlefield – make better and quicker decisions than our adversaries and achieve Information Dominance. Additionally, the CIO oversees the Army Research, Development, and Engineering Center (RDEC) at Fort Monmouth, NJ and the Army Battle Lab at the Signal School, Fort Gordon, GA. The CIO/DISC4 leads Army participation in the Joint Warrior Interoperability Demonstrations (JWID) conducted annually with the other Services and our coalition partners. Each of these efforts focuses on leading edge technology and putting that technology into the hands of the war-fighter as quickly as possible.

ACQUISITION

The Chief Information Officer serves as Army lead on the Enterprise Software Initiative and played a key role in developing and implementing the first Department of Defense Enterprise Software Initiative software agreement. In implementing the initiative, the Army:

- Created the standard for agreements for achieving significant discounts.
- Developed and implemented the first Enterprise Software Initiative financial concept on use of Department of Defense and Army Working Capital Funds to forward fund software procurements for Department of Defense.

**Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates**

- Conducted the first Department of Defense legal review of the Working Capital Fund and Enterprise Software Initiative concepts for signature by the Secretary of the Army for use by the Under Secretary of Defense.
- Consistently achieved 60% to 80% discounts on software database, enterprise management, desktop, engineering and record management software for both Department of Defense and the Army.
- Achieved DoD savings to date totaling more than \$690 million.

Serving as the Military Deputy for C4/IT to the Army Acquisition Executive, the Army CIO assures programs meet requirements as outlined in the Clinger-Cohen Act. The Chief Information Officer assesses all special interest programs and Category I and II acquisitions. These assessments are performed prior to all milestone decisions. Three assessments were completed in FY01 Army Recruiting Information Support System (ARISS), the Bradley Upgrade and the Blackhawk Utility Helicopter (UH –60L) Upgrade. There are two in-progress, the Reserve Component Automation system (RCAS) and the Multiple Launch Rocket system (MLRS) Launcher (M270A1). There are approximately ten remaining.

The Army has approximately four programs going through the CIO certification process this year. They are Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS), Joint Computer Aided Logistics and Acquisition Support (JCALS), Global Combat Support System-Army (GCSS-A), and Global Command and Control System-Army (GCCS-A).

This certification requirement was introduced in the FY 2000 Appropriation's Bill and since has been carried forward into future years with the FY 2001 Appropriation and Authorization Bills.

PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

The DISC4/CIO has reminded all Army elements of the CCA requirements to prepare a business process improvement review (BPR) of a function before applying IT to it. The CIO has also established a web-accessible database to provide BPR assistance, guidance, tools, and a repository to collect and share process improvement initiatives. Additionally, the recent reorganization of the Army's CIO

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

established a Strategic Outreach Office that leverages lessons learned and best business practices from our corporate partners, academia, and DoD and other government agencies.

IT WORKFORCE TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

To ensure adequacy of agency personnel knowledge and skills in achieving information resource management performance goals, the Chief Information Officer has:

- Promoted techno-business university programs in Information Technology Management.
- Provided Army-wide distance learning in information technology and Chief Information Officer practices (leadership, business, and technical competencies).
- Implemented Training with Industry program with top-tier companies.
- Promoted the Advanced Management Program and the Chief Information Officer Certificate programs offered at the Information Resources Management College of the National Defense University.
- Advertised executive development through Chief Information Officer University consortium.
- Provided *Implementing Clinger-Cohen* course for Information Technology Management (ITM) professionals at field sites.

The Chief Information Officer computer-based training initiative was the first such initiative for all Army soldiers on active duty, Reserve and National Guard components and Army civilian employees. In less than two years the program achieved over 130,000 registered students using over 1,100 computer based training courses. This program is considered to be the largest Internet computer based training program in the world. Students have completed rigorous training leading to certifications in areas such as Microsoft Certified Systems Engineering. The student reaction is very positive.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT

The Chief Information Officer instituted a requirement for performance measurements in information technology investment programs, established an installation-level information technology Metrics Program, and developed Strategic Action Plan/Guidance for development and implementation of Army Enterprise Architecture performance measurement. Performance measurement criteria are an integral part of the Army Strategic Investment selection and evaluation process. Concurrently, the CIO is actively involved with its DoD counterparts, and the C4/IT Program Executive Offices (PEOs) to develop performance measures to use to ascertain the performance based and results-based management of C4/IT systems.

SECURITY

To ensure adequate Information Security policies, procedures, and practices, the Chief Information Officer has completed the following actions:

- Established a Biometrics Office with the help of Congress to provide definitive access control to critical information and weapons systems.
- Acquired universal Information Assurance tools for System Administrators and Network System Managers.
- Completed all Non-secure Internet Protocol Router Network points of presence security technology overlays.
- Developed and implemented Army Defense In Depth, a detailed description of Army Defense-in-Depth can be found in the National Security Agency (NSA) Information Assurance Congressional Justification Book.
- Represented the Army on the GSA Chaired Government Interoperability Smart Card Committee.
- Chaired a sub-committee on Information Assurance specification for Government Smart Card.
- Restructured the Public Key Infrastructure Program to incorporate Common Access Cards.
- Represented the Army on the DoD Smart Card Senior Steering Group on all functional and technical matters pertaining to planning and implementation of the DoD Common Access Card.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

- Established the Army Computer Emergency Response Team infrastructure and central reporting process to protect information technology systems across the full spectrum of military operations.
- Developed a comprehensive information assurance training and certification program and twelve training laboratories with 2,760 spaces annually.

CONCLUSION

As we face these uncertain times with heightened threats from international terrorists as well as terrorist activity originating here in America, we are positioning ourselves to transform ourselves into network-centric, knowledge-based force. Army Knowledge Management is the Army's strategy to accomplish this Transformation. As we move into this new millennium, our challenge is to build the appropriate force and support structure that will provide the Nation with a 21st Century Army trained and equipped to fight and win – Persuasive in Peace, Invincible in War. The Chief Information Officer's (CIO) challenge continues to be to provide Command, Control, Communications and Computers/Information Technology (C4/IT) capabilities to support the Army's Vision: People, Readiness, and Transformation. Currently, the Army's top FY03 Investment Strategy gaps that require support from Congress are Modernized Battlefield Communications and Network Management, C4/IT Infrastructure, Information Assurance, Satellite Communications, and Battle-space Awareness - all key enablers to accomplish the Army's mission through the rapid transmission of secure information to ensure information and decision superiority. It is important not only to our future, but also in the current heightened threat that we are able to transmit, protect and manage our information/intelligence. Army Knowledge Management is the Army strategy to transform itself into a network-centric, knowledge based force. This is an integral part of Army Transformation. Army Knowledge Management provides value-added information and knowledge transfer at the right time and place that is critical to the Army enterprise allowing it to maximize its limited resources to achieve more productivity and better advance its whole enterprise. The benefits we will derive from these investments will assist the Army to meet its vision. The Army's CIO has reorganized itself to better facilitate the Army transition to the network-centric, knowledge-based enterprise.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

CHANGES SINCE THE FY02 AMENDED PRESIDENT’S BUDGET

There have been three major areas of change since the FY 02 Amended President’s Budget: a realignment of funds emphasizing Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection, the Army Knowledge Management Guidance Memorandum Number 1 signed jointly by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, Army, and the reorganization of the Army CIO to better implement the Army Knowledge goals.

The events of 11 September led the Army to put an increased emphasis on Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection as the Army refocuses on Homeland Defense. This realignment of funds included plus-ups to continuity of operations for information technology, information assurance, and biometrics. It also includes additional funds received from OSD to support CINC C4/IT requirements.

The Army Knowledge Management Guidance Memorandum Number 1 spells out clear goals for the Army to use information technology to transform itself into a network-centric, knowledge-based force. Army Knowledge Management is intended to improve decision dominance by our war-fighters and business stewards – in the battle-space, in our organizations, and in our processes. New policies, management structures, and strong leadership at all levels will be necessary to manage knowledge and infostructure at the enterprise level. The Army CIO was tasked to lead change across a broad spectrum of AKM goals including a review of all non-centrally managed IT related programs.

The Army published its Knowledge Management Strategic Plan that outlines how the Army will make the collective information, expertise, and experience of the Army Enterprise available to each individual knowledge worker, i.e., to leverage the intellectual capital of our most important assets, our soldiers, our leaders. Several important things must happen before we can fully implement Knowledge Management throughout the Army. We must develop our infostructure to accommodate faster processing capabilities and increased dissemination requirements, develop an easily accessible enterprise portal, employ content management tools to organize and structure the Enterprise information, and finally we need to share knowledge across the Enterprise by using enabling techniques such as collaborative tools and expertise locators.

**Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates**

Dollars in \$000	Funding				Difference	
	President's Budget 02		President's Budget 03			
	FY02	FY03	FY02	FY03	FY02-FY02	FY03-FY03
Procurement	1,426,029	1,590,991	1,570,285	1,695,743	144,256	104,752
Military Pay	93,822	94,421	107,177	101,325	13,355	6,904
Operation and Maintenance	1,904,936	1,929,487	1,871,009	2,185,941	-33,927	256,454
Research and Development	981,493	670,312	1,035,630	927,058	54,137	256,746
Family Housing	3,990	4,398	3,346	2,800	-644	-1,598
Defense Working Capital Funds	243,128	224,206	254,059	254,914	10,931	30,708
Total	4,653,398	4,513,815	4,841,506	5,167,781	188,108	653,966

The FY 2003 President's Budget totals, depicted in the chart, for FY02 and FY03 include increases over the FY02 Amended President's Budget submission (4% and 14.5%, respectively). Notable increases in the FY03 funding include Base Level Communication Infrastructure - \$227.5M, Information Assurance (IA) - \$124.2M, Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data Systems - \$60.4M, Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS) - \$48.2M, Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT) - \$36.8M, Global Combat Support System – Army (GCSS-A) - \$30.4M, and Global Command and Control System – Army (GCCS-A) - \$22.1M.

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

These increases are attributable to Transformation goals, which support modernization and the increased focus on anti-terrorism and force protection. Reporting changes from the FY02 Amended President's Budget include a new Information Technology initiative created for Secure Mobile Anti-Jam Reliable Tactical Terminal (SMART-T) - \$41.9M, which is an existing Army program, i.e., not new resources. A portion of The Army Distance Learning Program was segregated into a Distance Learning-Supporting initiative to better align the visibility of the resources reported in the 300 Capital Investment Exhibit and funding was realigned to the Defense Personnel Data System initiative (funding depicted in these two initiatives are not new resources).

ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE THE FY02 AMENDED PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Information Assurance (IA) – the Army implemented a proxy server installation program, which protected over one hundred Army websites from thousands of attempted defacements without a single successful attack. All Army connections to the NIPRNet are protected by the Top Level Architecture, which consists of security devices protecting the post, camp, station, or installation circuit, and also the rest of the DISN, as well. The Army increased the number of circuits protected from 190 to 216 with a projected increase to over 250 circuits within the next year. The Army has installed and staffed twelve IA training classrooms at locations around the world to bring up-to-the-minute training to soldiers while minimizing travel/TDY costs. We have published policies on wireless technology, malicious mobile code, personal electronic devices, hard-drive wiping technologies, and a host of others. Responding to requirements to bolster secure communications worldwide following the September terrorist attack, Army purchased and shipped 6,000 secure wired and wireless devices. In addition, Army reinforced its COMSEC maintenance to increase availability and put critical COMSEC equipment in the hands of our front-line soldiers.

The Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, Army, sent out the Army Knowledge Management Guidance Memorandum Number 1 on 8 August 2001, which stated that Army Knowledge Management is the Army strategy to transform itself into a network-centric, knowledge-based force. The Army Knowledge Management Guidance Memorandum tasked the CIO to oversee the implementation of Knowledge Management within the Army, to lead change across a broad spectrum of AKM goals: reviewing all non-centrally managed IT related programs, withdrawing IT dollars from the MACOMs, and managing them centrally with the assistance of the CIO Executive Board, establishing collaborative work environments and innovative ways to doing business to

Department of the Army
Information Technology Portfolio Assessment and Overview
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

improve Army decision making and operations, sharing information across boundaries, best business practices, and the most successful knowledge management initiatives, managing the infostructure at the enterprise level, scaling Army Knowledge Online as the enterprise portal for accessing information, conducting business, and managing operations with every Active Duty, Army National Guard, Army Reserve, and Army civilian having an online account. Finally, the Army CIO will provide our Army's military and civilian personnel with learning opportunities, career-building tools and mentoring relationships to improve their value to the Army and the Nation – continuing to grow our human capital with innovative ideas and initiatives for reshaping our workforce into a network-centric knowledge based force.

The Army CIO reorganized itself in late FY 2001 to maximize limited resources, and to become a knowledge-based organization capable of leading the transition of the Army to a world class, knowledge-based, network-centric enterprise. The benefits realized and envisioned include efficiencies in our business processes, improvements in the quality of our work, elimination of duplication of effort with resulting cost savings and the ability to better facilitate the Army transition to a network-centric, knowledge-based force.

The Army CIO issued initial implementing instructions for Army Knowledge Management September 2001. More specific execution guidance is being finalized and will be completed soon. Successful implementation of Army Knowledge Management will require new policies, management structures, and strong leadership at all levels will be necessary to manage knowledge and infostructure at the enterprise level.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Report List of Major Programs Submitted**

Title	Initiative	Acquisition Agent	Business Executive Agent
ADVANCED FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	2166		Army
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	0108		Army
ARMY DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAM	0688	Army	Army
ARMY ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE	2103	Army	Army
ARMY RECRUITING INFORMATION SUPPORT SYSTEM	6040	Army	Army
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	5053	Army	Army
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM	2210		Army
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND BRIGADE AND BELOW	6185	Army	Army
FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	2212		Army
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM - ARMY	6491	Army	Army
GLOBAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM - ARMY	5070	Army	Army
INSTALLATION SUPPORT MODULES	5046		Army
INSTALLATION INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2180	Army	Army
JOINT COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT	1039	Army	Army
JOINT SIMULATIONS SYSTEM	2148	Army	Army
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - GROUND	6190	Army	Army
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	6430		Army
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	2213	Army	Army
MEPCOM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION REPORTING SYSTEM	1191		Army
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYSTEM	1640	Army	Army

Report List of Major Programs Submitted
Page 1 of 2

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Report List of Major Programs Submitted**

Title	Initiative	Acquisition Agent	Business Executive Agent
SITE R	3028		Army
STANDARD INSTALLATION DIVISION PERSONNEL SYSTEM - 3	1783	Army	Army
STRATEGIC LOGISTICS PROGRAM	1823		Army
TRANSPORTATION COORDINATORS' AUTOMATED INFORMATION FOR MOVEMENTS SYSTEM II	1935	Army	Army
WARFIGHTER SIMULATION 2000	5047	Army	Army
WHOLESALE LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION	6298	Army	Army

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
ACQUISITION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	SYSTEMS ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	40
ADP SERVICES FROM DISA	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	49
ADP SUPPORT PERSONNEL (NON-DATA PROCESSING INSTALLATION/NON-DIRECTOR OF IM)	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	40
AIR LOAD MODULE	LOGISTICS	40
ALL OTHER (FAA) LOGISTICS	LOGISTICS	40
ARMY DISTANCE LEARNING - SUPPORTING	OTHER COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	49
ARMY DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAM	USER PRODUCTIVITY TOOLS	48
ARMY ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE	TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES	52
ARMY FOOD MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	41
ARMY MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	41
ARMY PERSONNEL CENTER INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PLAN	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	41
ARMY RECRUITING INFORMATION SUPPORT SYSTEM	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	38
AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	LOGISTICS	41
BASE LEVEL COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE	OTHER COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	49
CIDC IMS	POLICY	41
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	38

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
COMMODITY COMMAND STANDARD SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	41
COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK AND SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	49
DCSIM/DOIM STAFF OPERATIONS COSTS	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	49
DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DATA SYSTEM-SUSTAINMENT	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL	42
DISTRIBUTIVE TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	42
ELECTRONIC COMMERCE/ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE	USER PRODUCTIVITY TOOLS	48
ENGINEERING & INSTALLATIONS	TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES	52
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY	42
FORCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (REPLACES TADDS-R)	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	42
GLOBAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM - ARMY	OTHER COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	48
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY	42
HOUSING OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	ECONOMIC SECURITY	42
INSTALLATION SUPPORT MODULES	ECONOMIC SECURITY	39
INSTALLATION INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	49
INTEGRATED COMPUTERIZED DEPLOYMENT SYSTEM	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	42

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
INTEGRATED FACILITIES SYSTEM	ECONOMIC SECURITY	42
JOINT COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT	LOGISTICS	39
JOINT SIMULATIONS SYSTEM	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	39
KEYSTONE	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	43
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	43
LEASED TELECOMMUNICATIONS (NON-SYSTEM SPECIFIC)	OTHER COMMUNICATION	50
LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT	INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	
LOGISTICS DII SUPPORT	INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	50
LOGISTICS SUPPLY SYSTEMS	LOGISTICS	43
LONG HAUL	LOGISTICS	43
	OTHER COMMUNICATION	50
	INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	
MATERIEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	LOGISTICS	43
MEDICAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	HEALTH	43
MEPCOM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION REPORTING SYSTEM	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	43
MILITARY ENTRANCE PROC CMD JOINT COMPUTER CENTER	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	50
MILITARY POLICE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	43

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
OFFICE AUTOMATION (NON-SPECIFIC)	INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	50
OFFICE AUTOMATION HARDWARE & SOFTWARE UPGRADES	INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	50
OPERATING & SUPPORT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM	OTHER (NOT OTHERWISE SPECIFIED)	44
OPTEC FIELD TESTS	TEST AND EVALUATION	44
PENTAGON RENOVATION	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	49
PERSONNEL ELECTRONIC RECORD MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	44
PERSONNEL ENTERPRISE SYSTEM-AUTOMATION	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	44
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYSTEM	RESERVE AFFAIRS	39
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS - HQ DEPT OF ARMY	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	44
SCIENTIFIC & ENGINEERING RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	44
SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY/WARGAMING	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	45
STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	51
STAND-ALONE MAINFRAME COMPUTERS OPERATING COSTS	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	51
STANDARD ARMY AMMUNITION SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	45
STANDARD ARMY MAINTENANCE SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	45

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
STANDARD INSTALLATION DIVISION PERSONNEL SYSTEM - 3	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	39
STANDARD INSTALLATION-DIVISION PERSONNEL SYSTEM	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	45
STANDARD ARMY AUTOMATION CONTRACTING SYSTEM	PROCUREMENT/CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION	45
STANDARD ARMY RETAIL SUPPLY SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	45
STANDARD DEPOT SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	45
STRATEGIC LOGISTICS PROGRAM	LOGISTICS	45
SUPER COMPUTER	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	51
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT OPERATIONS	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	51
TOTAL ARMY PERSONNEL DATA BASE	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	45
TOTAL DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM	LOGISTICS	39
TRANSPORTATION COORDINATORS' AUTOMATED INFORMATION FOR MOVEMENTS SYSTEM II	LOGISTICS	40
UNIT LEVEL LOGISTICS SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	46
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AUTOMATION	MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	46
US ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL LOGISTICS INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	46
USAREUR COMMUNITY AUTOMATION SYSTEM	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	51
VIDEO TELECONFERENCING	USER PRODUCTIVITY TOOLS	51

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
WARFIGHTER SIMULATION 2000	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	40
WHOLESALE LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION	LOGISTICS	46
WHOLESALE LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM - EXPANSION	LOGISTICS	46
WORLDWIDE PORT SYSTEM	LOGISTICS	46

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
IT Resources Summary			
Army Exhibit Total, IT Investments	3,178,198	3,043,584	3,345,111
Development Modernization	957,392	1,063,913	1,094,364
Current Services	2,220,806	1,979,671	2,250,747
Army Exhibit Total, Major	795,711	925,270	863,960
Development Modernization	663,234	705,675	609,868
Current Services	132,477	219,595	254,092
Army Exhibit Total, Non-Major	2,207,031	1,936,764	2,260,911
Development Modernization	260,807	336,211	445,346
Current Services	1,946,224	1,600,553	1,815,565
Army Exhibit Total, All Other	175,456	181,550	220,240
Development Modernization	33,351	22,027	39,150
Current Services	142,105	159,523	181,090

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Functional Area Applications			
Total, IT Investments for FAA	1,215,814	1,123,697	1,121,935
Development Modernization	563,180	505,534	439,368
Current Services	652,634	618,163	682,567
Total, Major, FAA	451,360	480,835	438,806
Development Modernization	361,498	337,851	262,008
Current Services	89,862	142,984	176,798
Total, Non-Major, FAA	691,158	578,162	587,928
Development Modernization	168,331	145,656	138,210
Current Services	522,827	432,506	449,718
Total, All Other, FAA	73,296	64,700	95,201
Development Modernization	33,351	22,027	39,150
Current Services	39,945	42,673	56,051
Major for FAA			
ARMY RECRUITING INFORMATION SUPPORT SYSTEM (6040)	16,173	44,590	55,432
Development Modernization	13,699	27,362	27,767
Current Services	2,474	17,228	27,665
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER (5053)	71,282	67,637	83,063
Development Modernization	48,234	41,494	57,541
Current Services	23,048	26,143	25,522

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
INSTALLATION SUPPORT MODULES (5046)	13,498	13,721	12,948
Development Modernization	3,808	4,656	1,740
Current Services	9,690	9,065	11,208
JOINT COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT (1039)	130,692	100,136	37,417
Development Modernization	108,973	71,739	5,059
Current Services	21,719	28,397	32,358
JOINT SIMULATIONS SYSTEM (2148)	0	37,625	32,521
Development Modernization	0	30,727	24,230
Current Services	0	6,898	8,291
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYSTEM (1640)	115,285	112,306	93,732
Development Modernization	97,902	88,633	68,273
Current Services	17,383	23,673	25,459
STANDARD INSTALLATION DIVISION PERSONNEL SYSTEM - 3 (1783)	14,643	13,766	14,316
Development Modernization	12,526	12,388	11,244
Current Services	2,117	1,378	3,072
TOTAL DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM (1924)	30,166	38,420	43,486
Development Modernization	19,121	19,827	19,889
Current Services	11,045	18,593	23,597

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
TRANSPORTATION COORDINATORS' AUTOMATED INFORMATION FOR MOVEMENTS SYSTEM II (1935)	31,537	42,534	29,485
Development Modernization	29,151	35,125	21,759
Current Services	2,386	7,409	7,726
WARFIGHTER SIMULATION 2000 (5047)	28,084	10,100	36,406
Development Modernization	28,084	5,900	24,506
Current Services	0	4,200	11,900
Non-Major for FAA			
ACQUISITION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (0007)	824	5,684	6,002
Current Services	824	5,684	6,002
ADP SUPPORT PERSONNEL (NON-DATA PROCESSING INSTALLATION/NON-DIRECTOR OF IM) (2221)	189,724	122,906	134,971
Development Modernization	28,337	8,149	5,154
Current Services	161,387	114,757	129,817
AIR LOAD MODULE (2104)	2,442	2,561	2,541
Development Modernization	314	383	349
Current Services	2,128	2,178	2,192
ALL OTHER (FAA) LOGISTICS (5010)	49,828	48,367	45,148
Development Modernization	33,810	36,446	33,090
Current Services	16,018	11,921	12,058

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
ARMY FOOD MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (0147)	3,376	2,424	2,398
Development Modernization	2,356	0	0
Current Services	1,020	2,424	2,398
ARMY MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (0154)	3,400	3,294	3,102
Development Modernization	510	678	515
Current Services	2,890	2,616	2,587
ARMY PERSONNEL CENTER INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (0162)	4,998	6,055	4,746
Development Modernization	1,604	1,811	1,702
Current Services	3,394	4,244	3,044
AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY (0199)	6,941	8,244	7,707
Development Modernization	6,843	8,149	7,707
Current Services	98	95	0
CIDC IMS (0364)	1,884	3,110	2,116
Current Services	1,884	3,110	2,116
COMMODITY COMMAND STANDARD SYSTEM (0414)	33,898	31,928	32,865
Development Modernization	4,340	4,900	6,001
Current Services	29,558	27,028	26,864

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DATA SYSTEM- SUSTAINMENT (6517)	28,485	21,181	18,293
Development Modernization	10,653	8,346	6,174
Current Services	17,832	12,835	12,119
DISTRIBUTIVE TRAINING TECHNOLOGY (6306)	56,116	38,228	15,501
Current Services	56,116	38,228	15,501
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE (3068)	1,341	1,347	1,347
Current Services	1,341	1,347	1,347
FORCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (REPLACES TADDS-R) (0851)	6,416	5,000	5,773
Current Services	6,416	5,000	5,773
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (0908)	61	63	65
Current Services	61	63	65
HOUSING OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (0934)	6,126	4,747	3,863
Development Modernization	397	455	468
Current Services	5,729	4,292	3,395
INTEGRATED COMPUTERIZED DEPLOYMENT SYSTEM (0982)	1,363	1,663	2,405
Development Modernization	157	192	175
Current Services	1,206	1,471	2,230
INTEGRATED FACILITIES SYSTEM (0986)	3,250	3,029	3,060
Current Services	3,250	3,029	3,060

IT-1 Report
 As of February 2002
 Page 6 of 16

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
KEYSTONE (1063)	4,942	4,163	5,184
Current Services	4,942	4,163	5,184
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (6430)	18,485	7,435	17,745
Development Modernization	2,846	0	0
Current Services	15,639	7,435	17,745
LOGISTICS DII SUPPORT (6041)	14,349	10,762	10,808
Current Services	14,349	10,762	10,808
LOGISTICS SUPPLY SYSTEMS (2199)	17,651	17,515	17,476
Current Services	17,651	17,515	17,476
MATERIEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (1165)	408	408	408
Development Modernization	408	408	408
MEDICAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE (1175)	5,055	13,162	9,952
Development Modernization	4,810	12,294	8,682
Current Services	245	868	1,270
MEPCOM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION REPORTING SYSTEM (1191)	23,299	15,928	19,510
Development Modernization	6,449	2,202	6,710
Current Services	16,850	13,726	12,800
MILITARY POLICE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (1217)	3,262	3,159	3,428
Current Services	3,262	3,159	3,428

IT-1 Report
As of February 2002
Page 7 of 16

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
OPERATING & SUPPORT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (1464)	4,317	2,626	3,943
Current Services	4,317	2,626	3,943
OPTEC FIELD TESTS (2185)	15,225	13,761	15,353
Development Modernization	4,341	4,437	4,535
Current Services	10,884	9,324	10,818
PERSONNEL ELECTRONIC RECORD MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (1516)	8,700	12,372	14,163
Development Modernization	2,299	5,761	5,466
Current Services	6,401	6,611	8,697
PERSONNEL ENTERPRISE SYSTEM-AUTOMATION (1517)	18,423	24,918	24,551
Development Modernization	7,519	7,960	7,143
Current Services	10,904	16,958	17,408
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS - HQ DEPT OF ARMY (2194)	9,429	8,854	9,228
Current Services	9,429	8,854	9,228
SCIENTIFIC & ENGINEERING RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT (2183)	7,215	6,939	7,063
Development Modernization	388	388	388
Current Services	6,827	6,551	6,675

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY/WARGAMING (3073)	49,805	41,868	45,117
Development Modernization	7,276	3,414	5,000
Current Services	42,529	38,454	40,117
STANDARD ARMY AMMUNITION SYSTEM (1763)	541	0	0
Current Services	541	0	0
STANDARD ARMY MAINTENANCE SYSTEM (1769)	884	0	0
Current Services	884	0	0
STANDARD INSTALLATION-DIVISION PERSONNEL SYSTEM (6160)	8,902	2,326	2,355
Current Services	8,902	2,326	2,355
STANDARD ARMY AUTOMATION CONTRACTING SYSTEM (1764)	4,125	2,977	11,580
Current Services	4,125	2,977	11,580
STANDARD ARMY RETAIL SUPPLY SYSTEM (1770)	13,380	8,836	8,215
Current Services	13,380	8,836	8,215
STANDARD DEPOT SYSTEM (1780)	1,485	7,215	7,222
Development Modernization	574	6,300	6,300
Current Services	911	915	922
STRATEGIC LOGISTICS PROGRAM (1823)	1,500	1,500	1,500
Current Services	1,500	1,500	1,500
TOTAL ARMY PERSONNEL DATA BASE (1923)	3,711	819	829
Current Services	3,711	819	829

IT-1 Report
 As of February 2002
 Page 9 of 16

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
UNIT LEVEL LOGISTICS SYSTEM (2003)	884	0	0
Current Services	884	0	0
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AUTOMATION (2186)	2,039	2,266	2,269
Development Modernization	2,039	2,266	2,269
US ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL LOGISTICS INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (2011)	6,018	6,138	6,261
Current Services	6,018	6,138	6,261
WHOLESALE LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM - EXPANSION (6505)	0	0	0
Development Modernization	0	0	0
WHOLESALE LOGISTICS MODERNIZATION (6298)	45,503	50,827	50,651
Development Modernization	38,913	29,160	28,760
Current Services	6,590	21,667	21,891
WORLDWIDE PORT SYSTEM (2076)	1,148	1,557	1,214
Development Modernization	1,148	1,557	1,214
All Other for FAA			
All Other for GIG FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING	35	36	36
Current Services	35	36	36

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
All Other for GIG INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	22,020	11,430	11,535
Development Modernization	18,599	8,139	8,228
Current Services	3,421	3,291	3,307
All Other for GIG MILITARY PERSONNEL AND READINESS	15,970	18,224	49,334
Development Modernization	1,897	1,961	19,315
Current Services	14,073	16,263	30,019
All Other for GIG OTHER (NOT OTHERWISE SPECIFIED)	13,083	13,353	15,170
Current Services	13,083	13,353	15,170
All Other for GIG POLICY	250	661	640
Current Services	250	661	640
All Other for GIG SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	502	510	513
Development Modernization	50	50	50
Current Services	452	460	463
All Other for GIG SYSTEMS ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	21,436	20,486	17,973
Development Modernization	12,805	11,877	11,557
Current Services	8,631	8,609	6,416

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Communications and Computing Infrastructure			
Total, IT Investments for CCI	1,869,728	1,842,288	2,143,158
Development Modernization	360,164	529,989	633,950
Current Services	1,509,564	1,312,299	1,509,208
Total, Major, CCI	295,745	399,513	387,672
Development Modernization	267,688	339,434	326,814
Current Services	28,057	60,079	60,858
Total, Non-Major, CCI	1,496,125	1,342,581	1,647,511
Development Modernization	92,476	190,555	307,136
Current Services	1,403,649	1,152,026	1,340,375
Total, All Other, CCI	77,858	100,194	107,975
Current Services	77,858	100,194	107,975
Major for CCI			
ARMY DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAM (0688)	42,894	50,514	47,162
Development Modernization	25,014	22,020	12,776
Current Services	17,880	28,494	34,386
ELECTRONIC COMMERCE/ELECTRONIC DATA INTERCHANGE (0731)	391	733	779
Current Services	391	733	779
GLOBAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM - ARMY (5070)	90,542	150,669	136,239
Development Modernization	84,162	122,713	116,531
Current Services	6,380	27,956	19,708

IT-1 Report
 As of February 2002
 Page 12 of 16

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
INSTALLATION INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (2180)	129,641	164,250	188,991
Development Modernization	126,235	161,354	183,006
Current Services	3,406	2,896	5,985
PENTAGON RENOVATION (1499)	32,277	33,347	14,501
Development Modernization	32,277	33,347	14,501
Non-Major for CCI			
ADP SERVICES FROM DISA (0023)	25,471	40,063	42,272
Current Services	25,471	40,063	42,272
ARMY DISTANCE LEARNING - SUPPORTING (6507)	49,879	38,781	36,233
Development Modernization	17,954	6,234	6,457
Current Services	31,925	32,547	29,776
BASE LEVEL COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE (0254)	148,855	235,878	479,741
Development Modernization	25,963	107,383	223,009
Current Services	122,892	128,495	256,732
COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK AND SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (2207)	59,400	71,189	94,205
Development Modernization	5,101	12,576	20,332
Current Services	54,299	58,613	73,873
DCSIM/DOIM STAFF OPERATIONS COSTS (0553)	310,039	252,499	245,609
Current Services	310,039	252,499	245,609

IT-1 Report
 As of February 2002
 Page 13 of 16

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
LEASED TELECOMMUNICATIONS (NON-SYSTEM SPECIFIC) (5077)	451,045	313,234	343,965
Development Modernization	7,609	3,185	1,843
Current Services	443,436	310,049	342,122
LIFECYCLE REPLACEMENT (2215)	67,829	47,791	50,247
Development Modernization	0	0	278
Current Services	67,829	47,791	49,969
LONG HAUL (1095)	50,724	49,522	51,208
Development Modernization	4,939	4,964	5,091
Current Services	45,785	44,558	46,117
MILITARY ENTRANCE PROC CMD JOINT COMPUTER CENTER (2181)	3,468	3,904	3,598
Development Modernization	678	1,166	803
Current Services	2,790	2,738	2,795
OFFICE AUTOMATION (NON-SPECIFIC) (2218)	243,058	201,902	213,621
Development Modernization	2,106	9,845	5,221
Current Services	240,952	192,057	208,400
OFFICE AUTOMATION HARDWARE & SOFTWARE UPGRADES (2214)	42,138	40,202	41,520
Development Modernization	23,149	37,541	37,475
Current Services	18,989	2,661	4,045

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (2182)	8,206	14,029	11,154
Development Modernization	4,542	7,661	6,580
Current Services	3,664	6,368	4,574
STAND-ALONE MAINFRAME COMPUTERS OPERATING COSTS (2222)	7,565	7,354	6,646
Current Services	7,565	7,354	6,646
SUPER COMPUTER (1836)	10,647	7,282	7,170
Development Modernization	417	0	0
Current Services	10,230	7,282	7,170
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT OPERATIONS (2216)	3,428	3,684	3,685
Current Services	3,428	3,684	3,685
USAREUR COMMUNITY AUTOMATION SYSTEM (2102)	1,228	1,261	1,214
Current Services	1,228	1,261	1,214
VIDEO TELECONFERENCING (2045)	13,145	14,006	15,423
Development Modernization	18	0	47
Current Services	13,127	14,006	15,376
All Other for CCI			
All Other for GIG OTHER COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITIES	2,596	2,575	2,597
Current Services	2,596	2,575	2,597
All Other for GIG COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE	75,262	97,619	105,378
Current Services	75,262	97,619	105,378

IT-1 Report
 As of February 2002
 Page 15 of 16

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Related Technical Activities			
Total, IT Investments for RTA	92,656	77,599	80,018
Development Modernization	34,048	28,390	21,046
Current Services	58,608	49,209	58,972
Total, Major, RTA	48,606	44,922	37,482
Development Modernization	34,048	28,390	21,046
Current Services	14,558	16,532	16,436
Total, Non-Major, RTA	19,748	16,021	25,472
Current Services	19,748	16,021	25,472
Total, All Other, RTA	24,302	16,656	17,064
Current Services	24,302	16,656	17,064
Major for RTA			
ARMY ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE (2103)	48,606	44,922	37,482
Development Modernization	34,048	28,390	21,046
Current Services	14,558	16,532	16,436
Non-Major for RTA			
ENGINEERING & INSTALLATIONS (6349)	19,748	16,021	25,472
Current Services	19,748	16,021	25,472
All Other for RTA			
All Other for GIG SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT	24,302	16,656	17,064
Current Services	24,302	16,656	17,064

IT-SUMMARY APPENDIX A - NSS ANNEX

This page is intentionally left blank

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category (NSS Annex)
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
ADVANCED FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	60
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	INTELLIGENCE	60
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
ARMY DIGITIZATION	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
ARMY OPERATIONS CENTER	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
BATTLEFIELD COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	60
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
COMBAT TERRAIN INFORMATION SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	USER PRODUCTIVITY TOOLS	64
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND BRIGADE AND BELOW	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM - ARMY	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
IA DCE BIOMETRICS-ISSP	DEFENSE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	65
IA DCE COMMON ACCESS CARD-ISSP	DEFENSE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	65

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category (NSS Annex)
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
IA DCE-ISSP	DEFENSE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	65
IA DEB-ISSP	DEFENSE ENCLAVE BOUNDARY	65
IA DIO-ISSP	DEFENSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS	65
IA DNI-ISSP	DEFENSE NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	66
IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT-ISSP	IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT	66
IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT-NON ISSP	IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT	66
IA OTHER MGMT & OPERATIONS-ISSP	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS	66
IA SECURITY MANAGEMENT-ISSP	SECURITY MANAGEMENT	66
IA SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURES-ISSP	SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURES	66
IA SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURES-NON ISSP	SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURES	66
IA SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY-ISSP	SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY	66
IA SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY-NON ISSP	SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY	66
IA TRAINING-ISSP	TRAINING	66
IA-DCE COMMON ACCESS CARD-NON ISSP	DEFENSE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	67
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	62
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - GROUND	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61
MODERN AIDS TO PLANNING PROGRAM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	61

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category (NSS Annex)
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate**

Initiative	GIG Title	Page Number
OTHER COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63
SECURE MOBILE ANTI-JAM RELIABLE TACTICAL-TERMINAL	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63
SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RADIO SYSTEM	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63
SITE R	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63
SOUTHCOM INTEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	INTELLIGENCE	63
WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TERRESTRIAL	COMMAND AND CONTROL	63

This page is intentionally left blank

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
IT Resources Summary			
NSS Annex			
Army Exhibit Total, IT Investments	1,975,676	1,797,922	1,822,670
Development Modernization	1,605,674	1,472,390	1,456,719
Current Services	370,002	325,532	365,951
Army Exhibit Total, Major	802,910	765,057	821,504
Development Modernization	708,514	687,091	763,721
Current Services	94,396	77,966	57,783
Army Exhibit Total, Non-Major	1,172,766	1,032,865	1,001,166
Development Modernization	897,160	785,299	692,998
Current Services	275,606	247,566	308,168

Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Functional Area Applications			
Total, IT Investments for FAA	1,725,160	1,578,227	1,547,347
Development Modernization	1,564,339	1,439,448	1,415,046
Current Services	160,821	138,779	132,301
Total, Major, FAA	742,348	705,134	774,669
Development Modernization	689,288	667,402	736,892
Current Services	53,060	37,732	37,777
Total, Non-Major, FAA	982,812	873,093	772,678
Development Modernization	875,051	772,046	678,154
Current Services	107,761	101,047	94,524
Major for FAA			
ADVANCED FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM (2166)	161,579	141,108	185,626
Development Modernization	161,509	139,776	183,924
Current Services	70	1,332	1,702
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM (0108)	120,194	92,961	109,990
Development Modernization	120,153	92,915	109,943
Current Services	41	46	47
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM (2210)	43,158	38,415	36,832
Development Modernization	40,583	35,698	35,678
Current Services	2,575	2,717	1,154

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
 As of February 2002
 Page 2 of 9

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND BRIGADE AND BELOW (6185)	134,369	121,738	123,273
Development Modernization	134,369	121,738	123,273
FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (2212)	51,764	35,663	57,772
Development Modernization	51,336	35,190	57,294
Current Services	428	473	478
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM - ARMY (6491)	73,715	58,988	73,054
Development Modernization	24,068	26,208	39,044
Current Services	49,647	32,780	34,010
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM (6189)	637	777	977
Development Modernization	637	777	977
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - GROUND (6190)	87,261	165,638	129,369
Development Modernization	87,261	165,638	129,369
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (2213)	68,512	47,667	55,437
Development Modernization	68,213	47,283	55,051
Current Services	299	384	386
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (6177)	1,159	2,179	2,339
Development Modernization	1,159	2,179	2,339

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
 As of February 2002
 Page 3 of 9

Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Non-Major for FAA			
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS (6330)	66,810	53,130	74,835
Development Modernization	66,810	53,130	74,835
ARMY DIGITIZATION (6172)	254,332	219,694	177,474
Development Modernization	241,610	213,166	176,449
Current Services	12,722	6,528	1,025
ARMY OPERATIONS CENTER (2191)	5,696	7,546	7,614
Development Modernization	862	2,433	2,410
Current Services	4,834	5,113	5,204
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (6173)	140,904	131,571	117,090
Development Modernization	140,904	131,571	117,090
BATTLEFIELD COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (6174)	29,229	18,705	286
Development Modernization	29,229	18,705	286
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (6340)	0	12,622	16,879
Development Modernization	0	12,622	16,879
COMBAT TERRAIN INFORMATION SYSTEM (2211)	26,688	28,980	23,323
Development Modernization	26,688	28,980	23,323
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SYSTEM (5074)	8,709	4,398	10,647
Development Modernization	1,755	1,896	3,417
Current Services	6,954	2,502	7,230

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
 As of February 2002
 Page 4 of 9

**Department of Defense
 Department of the Army
 Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
 FY 2003 Budget Estimate
 (Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
MODERN AIDS TO PLANNING PROGRAM (1236)	3,359	3,477	3,727
Current Services	3,359	3,477	3,727
OTHER COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (2224)	55,130	57,498	58,031
Development Modernization	69	64	74
Current Services	55,061	57,434	57,957
SECURE MOBILE ANTI-JAM RELIABLE TACTICAL- TERMINAL (6506)	48,233	40,732	41,865
Development Modernization	48,233	40,732	41,865
SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RADIO SYSTEM (6196)	59,261	29,813	30,141
Development Modernization	51,918	20,528	30,141
Current Services	7,343	9,285	0
SITE R (3028)	12,250	15,072	16,278
Development Modernization	1,852	5,224	5,175
Current Services	10,398	9,848	11,103
SOUTHCOM INTEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (1738)	5,711	5,295	5,229
Current Services	5,711	5,295	5,229
WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TERRESTRIAL (6198)	266,500	244,560	189,259
Development Modernization	265,121	242,995	186,210
Current Services	1,379	1,565	3,049

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
 As of February 2002
 Page 5 of 9

Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Communications and Computing Infrastructure			
Total, IT Investments for CCI	36,402	35,261	42,132
Development Modernization	19,226	19,689	26,829
Current Services	17,176	15,572	15,303
Total, Major, CCI	36,402	35,261	42,132
Development Modernization	19,226	19,689	26,829
Current Services	17,176	15,572	15,303
Major for CCI			
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (0615)	36,402	35,261	42,132
Development Modernization	19,226	19,689	26,829
Current Services	17,176	15,572	15,303

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Information Assurance Activities			
Total, IT Investments for IAA	214,114	184,434	233,191
Development Modernization	22,109	13,253	14,844
Current Services	192,005	171,181	218,347
Total, Major, IAA	24,160	24,662	4,703
Current Services	24,160	24,662	4,703
Total, Non-Major, IAA	189,954	159,772	228,488
Development Modernization	22,109	13,253	14,844
Current Services	167,845	146,519	213,644
Major for IAA			
IA DCE COMMON ACCESS CARD-ISSP (6452)	24,160	24,662	4,703
Current Services	24,160	24,662	4,703
Non-Major for IAA			
IA DCE BIOMETRICS-ISSP (6480)	18,496	19,485	24,427
Development Modernization	0	0	5,986
Current Services	18,496	19,485	18,441
IA DCE-ISSP (6407)	4,326	0	0
Development Modernization	4,326	0	0
IA DEB-ISSP (6404)	711	4,131	4,511
Current Services	711	4,131	4,511
IA DIO-ISSP (6419)	2,640	23,496	45,288
Current Services	2,640	23,496	45,288

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
As of February 2002
Page 7 of 9

**Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
IA DNI-ISSP (6400)	30,444	19,913	56,856
Current Services	30,444	19,913	56,856
IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT-ISSP (6410)	31,478	17,636	13,118
Current Services	31,478	17,636	13,118
IA FOR THE TACTICAL ENVIRONMENT-NON ISSP (6411)	670	1,298	1,519
Current Services	670	1,298	1,519
IA OTHER MGMT & OPERATIONS-ISSP (6413)	8,803	5,891	6,694
Current Services	8,803	5,891	6,694
IA SECURITY MANAGEMENT-ISSP (6422)	65,876	44,877	58,134
Current Services	65,876	44,877	58,134
IA SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURES-ISSP (6416)	2,500	0	0
Current Services	2,500	0	0
IA SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURES-NON ISSP (6417)	0	0	2,298
Current Services	0	0	2,298
IA SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY-ISSP (6425)	9,783	13,253	8,858
Development Modernization	7,783	13,253	8,858
Current Services	2,000	0	0
IA SYSTEM SECURITY METHODOLOGY-NON ISSP (6426)	10,000	0	0
Development Modernization	10,000	0	0
IA TRAINING-ISSP (6401)	4,227	2,746	2,800
Current Services	4,227	2,746	2,800

IT-1 Report (NSS Annex)
As of February 2002
Page 8 of 9

Department of Defense
Department of the Army
Information Technology Resources by GIG Category For NSS Annex
FY 2003 Budget Estimate
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
IA-DCE COMMON ACCESS CARD-NON ISSP (6456)	0	7,046	3,985
Current Services	0	7,046	3,985

This page is intentionally left blank

Department of Defense
Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
All Source Analysis System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

This document is a higher classification. See CJB Volume III (TIARA) for details.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP)

Budget Initiative Number: 0688

IT Registration System Number DA01315 (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: No

Information Technology Project or National Security System: IT

Program Activity/Mission Area: Communications and Computing Infrastructure/Distance Learning Systems

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: 17 April 1991 as TRADOC Distributed Training Program (TDTP), re-authorized as Total Army Distance Learning Program, 28 April 1997 (renamed The Army Distance Learning Program- December 1999)

Projected Date for Completion of Phase: September 2003 and of Project August 2008

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

PM submits Monthly Acquisition Program Review (MAPR) reports to the Army Acquisition Executive and quarterly Defense Acquisition Executive Summary (DAES) reports through the Army Acquisition Executive to the Defense Acquisition Executive. In

0688/The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

addition, the OSD Chief Information Officer as TADLP Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) periodically conducts review of the TADLP acquisition and formally approves major system milestones.

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): 5 Dec 2000

Project is in Block III milestone for Block 1 and 2 and milestone I/II for Block 3 PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: 5 December 2000 Phase as of current review.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 1.1%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance?
1st QTR of FY 2000

Yes No

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes.

The change occurred between Budget Activities for FY 2002 and was corrected in the Army Funding Letter process.

Were they pricing changes or program changes? No

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? Component level
How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? N/A

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? ___N/A_____ (Talk to your FM)

What percentage is financial ___N/A_____, for your component?

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Project Activity/Mission Area: Logistics

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full Acquisition							
OMA	47.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.0
OPA	40.9	20.4	19.9	12.8	14.8	59.2	168.0
RDTE	0.0	4.6	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
Total Dev Mod	87.9	25.0	22.0	12.8	14.8	59.2	221.7
Current Services/Maintenance							
Mil Con, Army	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OMA	10.8	17.9	28.5	34.4	37.4	162.9	291.9
Total Current Services	10.8	17.9	28.5	34.4	37.4	162.9	291.9

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Total Resources by FY	98.7	42.9	50.5	47.2	52.2	222.1	513.6
------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	--------------

PART II. Justification and Other Information

A. Description/Performance Characteristics:

TADLP will provide standard automation and supporting infrastructure to improve Army's ability to train service members and supporting civilian workforce in all Army components (Active, Guard, and Reserve). It is a critical component of Army Training Modernization, Army's objective training strategy. The modernized training delivery system will link Army service schools with the Army in the field through common-user telecommunications' networks which will deliver standardized individual, collective, and self development training to soldiers, civilian employees, and units using multimedia approach to training delivery. It will allow trainers of the future to reach more remote training locations, such as installation classrooms, offices, and students' homes. It will aid the Army to properly train all components to a single Army standard. TADLP supports readiness by acquiring a modernized training delivery system that leverages technology which will provide anywhere, anytime training to each service member, both active and reserve. The Army is leveraging industry and academia-proven Distance Learning (DL) techniques to improve the quality of Army training and reduce training costs. Maximum use is being made of Commercial-off-the Shelf (COTS) Information Technologies (IT) to support training related and administrative processes. Emerging technologies provide the capability to move from a synchronous, instructor-centered instruction to an asynchronous, student-centered learning delivered at the students' locations. This is being accomplished through technology that allows the instructor and students to be geographically separated and rely on electronic transmission, storage, delivery, and assessment of training products.

TADLP will help Army meet the DoD mission need to provide a flexible, ready, and sustainable military force structure capable of conducting joint operations to execute the national military strategy. It will do this by establishing a comprehensive worldwide network of DTFs and training support facilities to provide mission critical training to all Army components. The system will facilitate mobilization training by allowing for just-in-time training for deploying military personnel. It will also improve overall military skill levels of Army personnel by making training more economical and improving training access. The system is being designed to comply with emerging Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) and Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

(DII COE) standards. The use of these standards also helps assure that TADLP system architecture is flexible and capable of accommodating additional system requirements, technological improvements, and new functionality.

TADLP is based on a TRADOC effort, the TRADOC Distributed Training Program (TDTP) that was initiated in 1989. TDTP began with numerous discussions with industry leaders such as IBM, Bell Laboratories, and General Motors as well as top leaders in academia including Carnegie Mellon University, University of Pennsylvania, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. TDTP evolved into a five-year test pilot program in which both controlled and field experiments were conducted to determine the validity of a variety of DL media. These efforts resulted in a solid foundation of theoretical and practical applications upon which to base TADLP acquisition. Pre-Milestone (MS) I/II planning activities began with establishment of the Program Management Office (PMO) at Fort Monroe, Virginia in May 1997. The PMO, the Acquisition Executive Agent (Program Executive Officer, Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS formerly PEO Standard Army Management Information Systems (STAMIS)), the functional proponent (HQDA DCSOPS), and the Combat Developer (TRADOC) jointly developed an Operational Requirements Document (ORD), Mission Needs Statement (MNS) and Critical Operational Issues and Criteria (COICs). It was during this period that the incremental block approach for implementing TADLP was conceptualized and outlined ensuring the program conformed to the CIO certification. The technical architecture (TA) engineering process was then implemented and Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) were established to develop the Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) and Economic Analysis (EA).

TADLP infrastructure acquisition efforts are based on the comprehensive Army Distance Learning Plan and are a major component of Army Training Modernization. TADLP supports the Army training community's efforts to redesign existing military training courses, incorporating DL techniques and capabilities. In April 1999, TADLP submitted the Economic Analysis (EA) to the U.S. Army Cost and Economic Analysis Center (USACEAC) for review. A Sufficiency Review (SR) was completed by USACEA and a revised EA was provided by TADLP in May 1999. In 3rd Qtr FY 2000 design and testing of TADLP Block 2 and an updated full program EA demonstrating ROI of 5.1 was completed. Army OIPT conducted a successful MS III Review of TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 in September 2000 and the Block 1&2 Full-Rate Production Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) was approved and signed on 5 December 2000. As currently funded and supported by the Army Cost Position (ACP), TADLP full implementation Blocks 1,2, and 3 of this effort will be completed in 2008 contingent on favorable Milestone III review of Block 3 anticipated in 4th Qtr, FY2003.

0688/The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Outsourcing the Army's mission to train soldiers was considered, however, it was determined that this is an inherently governmental function for the following reasons. Under Title 10, USC, the services are responsible for training forces for use by the National Command Authority (NCA). DL DTF design, development, management and operations have been outsourced and are under the direction of the PM TADLP. DL courseware development has also been outsourced and is under TRADOC direction. Business practices that supported a predominantly institutional training environment have required significant re-engineering to accommodate the DL environment. Required changes are reflected in DoD documentation prescribing common development standards for DL courseware and Learning Management Systems (LMS); in Army Regulation 350-1, *Army Training and Education*, and Department of the Army Distance Learning Policy Letter prescribing Army guidance for program implementation; and in TRADOC Regulation 350-70 prescribing how DL courseware will be developed. All of these regulatory documents are directed at establishing a common set of standards and goals for program implementation.

Historically, Military Occupational Skill (MOS)-qualifying training is provided in residence at designated service schools. This requires student population movements between home base and training sites. At the training sites, instructor personnel provide traditional classroom instruction and practical hands-on exercises in field conditions. Under DL, the training delivery process has been re-engineered so students can train at home station without instructor moderation using self-paced Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI) or web-based training.

A re-engineered training development (i.e., course conversion) approach will focus on standardized lesson plan formats using multimedia content. One common Program of Instruction (POI) will serve the entire Army [Active, Guard, Reserve, and Department of the Army Civilian (DAC)]. Training media is being developed to meet the student's time and location. Training products will be "pre-packaged" and "on-the-shelf," ready to support diverse operational requirements. There will be no distinction or differentiation on course completion documents or diplomas.

At the program level, Business Process Re-engineering is also aggressively seeking to increase training and readiness mission effectiveness within the program's approved funding. Focusing on the priorities directed by the GOSC, a TADLP Working Group 0688/The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

and TADLP DTF Fielding Committee, [comprised of Army Staff, Major Commands, Army National Guard, and U.S. Army Reserve, functional and technical experts, as well as TADLP Project Management Office (PMO) staff] seeks to simplify or redesign work processes to improve mission effectiveness and make maximum use of COTS/Government-off-the-Shelf (GOTS) technologies.

B. Program Management/Management Oversight:

TADLP process owner is the Army training community represented by HQDA DCSOPS as TADLP functional proponent and U.S. Army TRADOC as TADLP Combat Developer and Army Executive Agent (AEA). The acquisition executive agent is PEO EIS . TADLP project manager is assigned to PEO EIS who reports directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE). The current Contracting Office for the acquisition of TADLP Block 1, 2, and 3 is the General Services Administration (GSA), Region 10, Bremerton, Washington.

The Army OIPT conducted a successful MS III Review of TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 in September 2000 and the Block 1&2 Full-Rate Production Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) was approved and signed on 5 December 2000. Block 3, Learning Management System, Milestone II was also approved and exit criteria defined. Exit criteria for a successful Milestone III for Block 3 will include a favorable Economic Analysis and approved Army Cost Position, a favorable PA&E Affordability Assessment and a favorable Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Operational Evaluation.

In addition to the OIPT, PM TADLP has established Working IPTs for Testing, Cost Analysis and Evaluation, Functional Requirements/Architecture, and Communications. The primary system cost drivers requiring intensive management are those associated with DTF classroom manager, communications, VTT, hardware and software, the Training Access Center (TAC)/Enterprise System Management (ESM), maintenance, program management, facility modernization, and design and testing. For TADLP Blocks 1 and 2, PM, TADLP controlled these costs through aggressive use of appropriate IPTs to evaluate and select affordable solutions. The PM developed a formal performance monitoring system based on standard product management practices and Earned Value that is now used for TADLP Blocks 1 and 2.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

C. Acquisition Strategy:

Major contract names; prime contractor: ACS Systems & Engineering, Inc., Virginia Beach, Virginia, is providing integration, equipment and fielding services to support establishment of TADLP Block 1 and 2 DTFs. Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) Block 1 DTF components are acquired from various vendors using existing Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quality contracts and/or GSA schedule. The Army's Information Systems and Engineering Command (ISEC) is assisting PM TADLP to manage the integration and fielding of Block 1 and 2 DTF components.

PM TADLP requested competitive bids for Block 2 design/prototype development in FY 1999. Five vendor teams submitted bids for this effort. ACS Systems & Engineering, Inc. was selected for this effort based on government analysis that theirs was the responsive bid that provided "Best Value" for the work requested. Although the contract awarded to ACS allows the government to exercise options to have ACS perform future Block 2 tasks, the government may, at its discretion, assign these tasks to other vendors based on "Best Value" considerations. ISEC is also assisting PM TADLP with management of Block 2 tasks performed by ACS and/or other commercial vendors.

PM TADLP competed, through CECOM Acquisition Center-Washington (CAC-W), contract services for the development and fielding of a Learning Management System (LMS) for Block 3. In the 4th Qtr FY2001, Block 3 contract was awarded to Pricewaterhouse Coopers LLP for development and deployment. The intent of this acquisition is to provide TADLP with an LMS that is integrated with Block 1, Block 2 and other requisite Army training systems. The end product of this acquisition is operational hardware and software to provide a TADLP Block 3 capability that meets the high level operation requirements specified in the ORD, MNS and COICs. The acquisition will issue multiple task orders for Block 3.

The contract is not performance-based.

D. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

0688/The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

In April 1999, TADLP submitted the Economic Analysis (EA) to the U.S. Army Cost and Economic Analysis Center (USACEAC) for review. A Sufficiency Review (SR) was completed by USACEAC and a revised EA-I was provided by TADLP in May 1999. In 3rd Qtr FY 2000 Design and testing of TADLP Block 2 and an updated full program EA demonstrating ROI of 5.1 was completed in 3rd Quarter FY 2000 and the Army OIPT will conducted a successful MS III Review of TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 in September 2000 and the Block 1 & 2 Full-Rate Production Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) was approved and signed on 5 December 2000. The MS III Review was changed from June 2000 to September 2000 due to an incorporated design change related to new security requirements. As currently funded and supported by the Army Cost Position (ACP), TADLP full implementation of Blocks 1,2, and 3 of this effort will be completed in FY2008 contingent on favorable Milestone III review of Block 3 anticipated in 4th Qtr, FY 2003.

There are three materiel alternatives presented in the EA-II analysis: Alternative 1 is the Status Quo, Alternative 2A is the cost of Blocks 1 through 3 with a Block 3 COTS solution; and, Alternative 2B is the cost of Blocks 1 through 3 with a Block 3 GOTS solution. The Army has reviewed and approved the EA. The estimate for the selected alternative, adjusted for affordability, has been approved as the Army Cost Position forming the cost baseline for the program. The EA will be updated prior to each Block MS III review.

TADLP will operate under the following assumptions:

- a) Total life-cycle costs were calculated from FY 1997-FY 2015. These included sunk costs and costs for the operational life of the system. Any costs prior to October 1999 are considered sunk. Sunk costs are shown but not considered in the decision process.
- b) Funds will be available without delay for the continuation of development, production, fielding, and implementation of TADLP.

Risks are managed through a program of risk mitigation. PM TADLP chairs a Risk Management Board. All risks, resolved and unresolved, are reviewed and documented in a Risk database. The Risk Management Board analyzes and determines a strategy to mitigate each risk.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

E. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

OSD has issued a directive that all new Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) systems and other systems that interface to C4I systems shall be in compliance with the JTA. The JTA in turn mandates use of the DII COE. Reference is specifically made to C4ISR Architecture Framework, Certified Information System Auditor (CISA)-0000-104-96, Version 1.0, 7 June 1996, C4I Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Integration Task Force (ITF) Integrated Architectures Panel. This document presents an innovative definition of levels of interoperability. The DII COE adopts these levels of interoperability and maps DII compliance to interoperability levels. The COE defines eight progressively deeper levels of integration for the Runtime Environment Category. These levels are directly tied to the degree of interoperability achieved. True integration begins at Level 4. TADLP is being designed to achieve Level 8 integration as platform-specific tools and the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) puts test environments in place.

All direct infrastructure is included in the PM managed acquisition. Selected communications capabilities will be achieved through a combination of TADLP funded leased communications assets and existing DoD/Army owned circuits. All TADLP hardware requirements are included in the funding.

A combination of methods will be used to satisfy transport requirements. Intra-installation (on a post, base, or camp) transport requirements will be supported by a combination of dedicated system transport assets and existing installation level circuits. Inter-installation (between posts, bases, or camps) transport requirements will be supported by a combination of leased circuits from commercial vendors and existing DoD/Military Service long haul communications assets (DISN). Dedicated assets and leased circuits will only be used when existing installation circuits and long haul communications assets cannot provide data transport levels required to properly support TADLP data transport requirements.

TADLP DTFs will be located on active Army installations and at U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) sites. TADLP will be responsible for DTF infrastructure and necessary automation/communications infrastructure installation/enhancements for USAR and
0688/The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

OCONUS Army structures containing these DTFs. It will also provide for the necessary long haul communication capability required for data transport between DTFs (through leased lines or reimbursement to DISA and other Army/DoD/Government telecommunications providers). However, it will be dependent on existing and future base level telecommunications capabilities for data transfer between the DTF and long haul circuits.

TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 consist entirely of Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) components. TADLP Block 3 contractor shall perform all non-recurring engineering required to interface and integrate the LMS with existing system components and to develop system architecture. Engineering tasks include architectural designs, trade studies, production of engineering data, data modeling, design reviews and compliance with MANPRINT, Safety, and Security requirements. TADLP Block 3 must be compliant to the Electronic Assurance Level (EAL) -3 to handle Privacy Act and Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) data. TADLP Block 3 Contractor shall also provide descriptive documentation of the proposed Security Architecture for Block 3.

F. Security and Privacy:

On 2 March 1999, PEO STAMIS, as the Army's Designated Approving Authority (DAA), approved security accreditation for Block 1 in accordance with AR 380-19 and the Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). On 3 May 1999, TADLP Block 2 DITSCAP was initiated. Interim Approval to Operate (IATO) was granted on 12 August 1999. TADLP security strategy is traceable through requirements, design, implementation, and operating procedure documents. This strategy is documented in TADLP System Security Authorization Agreement (SSAA).

The SSAA, System Security Policy Statement, Automated Information System Security Plan, Initial Risk Assessment Survey (IRAS), Trusted Facility Manual and Security Users Features Guide address the specific security features of TADLP and establish the integration of all the security disciplines and how these features will be implemented, tested and certified. An IRAS was performed covering Computer, Administrative, Physical, Communications and Network Security to identify risks and support the acquisition and implementation of appropriate security countermeasures. Countermeasures identified were necessary to support an EAL-3 Trusted Computing Base operating in a System High mode of operation. The DAA, or his designated representative, will continue to validate

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

all security requirements and certification and accreditation plans, approve the system security authorization agreement, and provide accreditation, as necessary.

On 11 May 2000, TADLP Block 2 successfully completed Security Certification Testing necessary for Block 2 Security Accreditation. TADLP successfully completed Development Test and Evaluation (DT&E) on 2 June 2000, and entered Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) on 10 June 2000. The PEO accredited the TADLP Block 2 on 18 Jul 2000.

Currently the program does not use the DOD Common Access Card. The DOD requirement for TADLP to be compliant is NLT October 2002.

G. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

Electronic signature is not applicable to TADLP.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

A. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

TADLP Key Parameters (KPP) thresholds and objectives are documented in TRADOC ORD for a Modernized Training System (Revised) dated 27 August 1999 and in the APB. Management of these requirements is realized through the System Subsystem Specification (SSS) and the System Requirements Specification (SRS). Progress against these performance goals is tracked.

Examples of performance measures follow:

Performance-based acquisition management has been integrated into program management through the use of earned value management and software metrics management techniques. All work is planned, budgeted, and scheduled in “time-phased”

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

increments constituting a cost, schedule, and performance measurement baseline. The approach encourages the prime contractor to employ internal cost and schedule management control system and to permit the PMO to rely on timely data produced by those systems for determining product-oriented contract status.

B. Original Baseline:

TADLP began formal acquisition efforts in FY 1998. However, limited preparation and set up efforts were performed in FY 1997. \$0.8 million OMA was spent on TADLP in FY 1997. Army established a formal TADLP APB upon validation and acceptance of the EA and approval of the Army Cost Position for the Army OIPT MS III review for TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 completed in September 2000.

The Army Program Baseline was established 5 Dec 00 therefore, there was no previous baseline established prior.

TADLP Cost Baseline was established based on the results of the EA prepared for and reviewed by the Army OIPT. This baseline reflects changes in TADLP size and scope resulting from establishment of the ACP, which retained Blocks 1-3 as threshold requirements and reflected Blocks 4-6 as objective requirements.

There have been no milestone slippages since the last president's budget.

C. Current Baseline Information:

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	99.3	45.7	51.5	42.4	52.4	214.5	505.8
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	98.7	42.9	50.5	47.2	52.2	222.1	513.6
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	(0.6)	(2.8)	(1.0)	4.8	(.2)	7.6	7.8
Schedule Goals (months)							

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? No
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. N/A
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. N/A
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A

D. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:

TADLP began formal acquisition efforts in FY 1998. However, limited preparation and set up efforts were performed in FY 1997. \$0.8 million OMA was spent on TADLP in FY 1997. Army established a formal TADLP APB upon validation and acceptance of the EA and approval of the Army Cost Position for the Army OIPT MS III review for TADLP Blocks 1 and 2 completed in September 2000.

TADLP Cost Baseline was established based on the results of the EA prepared for and reviewed by the Army OIPT. This baseline reflects changes in TADLP size and scope resulting from establishment of the ACP, which retained Blocks 1-3 as threshold requirements and reflected Blocks 4-6 as objective requirements.

Results – based (I.e., mission –oriented). TADLP Key Parameters (KPP) thresholds and objectives are documented in TRADOC ORD for a Modernized Training System (Revised) dated 27 August 1999 and in the APB. Management of these requirements is realized through the System Subsystem Specification (SSS) and the System Requirements Specification (SRS). Progress against these performance goals is tracked. Examples of performance measures follow:

Baseline (Milestone) Schedule	Approved	Achieved
-------------------------------	----------	----------

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Army MAISRC IPR	2 nd Qtr FY98	2 nd Qtr FY98
Army Milestone III (Block 1)	4 th Qtr FY00	1 st Qtr FY01
Army Milestone I/II	2 nd Qtr FY99	2 nd Qtr FY99
Army Milestone III (Block 2)	4 th Qtr FY00	1 st Qtr FY01

A successful Milestone III for Blocks 1 and 2 and a Milestone I/II for Block 3 was approved 5 December 2000. Measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative are as follows:

FY2001: Upgraded 114 Block 1 DTFs worldwide incorporating fully operational TADLP Block 2 capabilities. Over 23 additional DTF site surveys were completed which will facilitate continuation of the acquisition and implementation of ground up DTFs fully incorporating Block 1 and Block 2 functional capabilities. Students trained using DTFs exceeded 69,500.

FY2002: 1st Qtr FY02, PM TADLP has acquired and deployed 194 DTFs worldwide incorporating TADLP Block 1 and 2 capabilities. During FY 2002 an additional 47 DTFs will be acquired and deployed.

FY2003: Procurement of additional infrastructure to support Army training at remote sites for a major subset of existing Army courses. This supports implementation of synchronous and asynchronous training tools to augment and enhance existing Army training instruments. Also planned is the continued procurement of Block 3, Learning Management system, software that supports automated student administration and management. An additional 34 DTFs will be acquired and deployed.

FY2004-2007: Will continue to acquire and implement DTFs incorporating Block 1 and 2 capabilities and will implement Block 3 training management enhancements.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions:

None required.

Department of Defense
Army Enterprise Architecture
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

As of 5 March 2002 DoD D, CIO continues to assess this capital investment business case requirement.

Department of Defense
Army Recruiting Information Support System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

As of 5 March 2002 DoD D, CIO continues to assess this capital investment business case requirement.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT)

Budget Initiative Number: 5053

IT Registration System Number NSS (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: Yes

Information Technology Project or NSS

Program Activity/Mission Area: Function Area Applications Area/Science and Technology

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: April 1991

Projected Date for Completion of Phase: FY07 is final year of production with deliveries in FY08 for Project CCTT.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes; CCTT is reviewed by STRICOM's MDA and a monthly MAPR is reviewed by the AAE.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): 14 Dec 1998

Project is in III MILESTONE, Approval Dated: 14 Dec 1998, Production Phase as of current review.

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations? No

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements? Yes No

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: less than 1%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes
If Yes, when, and what is Status? November 1998, system deemed compliant.

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or record keeping? No

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes, program dollars increased in the outyears.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? Component level.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?
 Cost is based on the Army Cost Position established at the Milestone III ASARC, approved in November, 1998, and subsequent results of LRIP and Firm Fixed Price, Full Rate Production.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? N/A

What percentage is financial for your component? 0%
 (In FY 2003) 0%

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

	Dollars in Millions						
Department of the Army	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
	201.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	201.3
Total Dev Mod	201.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	201.3

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Full Acquisition							
OPA	364.9	41.6	36.5	52.5	44.2	273.7	813.4
MCA	52.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	52.0
RDTE	43.0	6.6	5.0	5.1	4.8	36.6	101.1
Total Dev Mod	459.9	48.2	41.5	57.6	49.0	310.3	966.5
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	49.6	23.0	26.1	25.5	33.0	135.0	292.2
Total Current Services	49.6	23.0	26.1	25.5	33.0	135.0	292.2
Total Resources by FY	710.8	71.2	67.6	83.1	82.0	445.3	1460.0

PART II. Justification and Other Information

B. Description/Performance Characteristics:

1. Description. Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT) will be a networked system of manned simulators (Tank, Bradley, FIST-V, HMMWV, M113A3) supported by emulators and semi-automated forces that provide combat support, combat service support, and both friendly and opposing forces. It will train crew through battalion level combat elements of close combat units of both the Reserve Component (RC) and Active Component (AC) in their collective tasks as defined in the Mission Training Plan (MTP) for those units. The Army will field simulator modules to 10 fixed company-level production sites and 12 mobile platoon-level sites. Each fixed system will contain a maximum of 45 simulator modules, which is based on the locations of AC division and regiments, and will service both AC and RC units. The CCTT fixed site facility contains: a simulation bay sized to accommodate from 27 to 40 manned modules; Observer Control (OC) and a Tactical Operations Center (TOC); five After Action Review (AAR) Rooms; two Semi-Automated Force (SAF) Rooms (Blue and Red) each containing five SAF workstations; Maintenance Control Console (MCC) Room; and a Master Console (MC). The mobile platoon systems contain 4 simulators in the tank platoon version

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

and 5/7 simulator modules in the infantry/cavalry platoon version. Dedicated to the RC, these mobile systems will be based out of AC installation Training Support Centers (TSC) but will travel to RC unit armories for training at home station. The CCTT Fixed Sites will be updated to stay concurrent to include digitization with the weapons systems represented at each site.

2. CCTT is being developed to meet a HQDA-approved Training Device Requirement, dated 14 June 1991, Catalog of Approved Requirements Documents (CARDS) Number: 0222R. This project trains Army units to meet readiness requirements.
3. This program developed a networked system of interactive computer driven simulators, emulators, and semi-automated forces that replicate combat vehicles and weapon systems to create a fully integrated real-time collective task training environment. CCTT trainer allows soldiers to repetitively practice techniques too hazardous, time-consuming and expensive, if performed on real equipment. These trainers enhance realism and allow soldiers and units to learn tactical combat lessons on maneuver, command and control and improved teamwork for increased survivability.
4. CCTT is a training system designed to support training of collective, combined arms tasks for Armor and Mechanized Infantry units from Platoon through Battalion Task Force level (both active and reserve). CCTT development and fielding is in response to a HQDA-approved Training Device Requirement (TDR).

C. Program Management/Management Oversight:

CCTT is managed by the Program Manager (DSN 970-3600) for Combined Arms Tactical Trainer (PM-CATT); US Army Simulation Training and Instrumentation Command (STRICOM); US Army Materiel Command (AMC).

This project uses Integrated Project Teams approach. CCTT was developed using an IPT approach. A spiral development was performed with the Materiel Developer, User, Testers, Contractor, and Sub-Contractors working as an Integrated Development Team in Orlando, FL. Several IPTs were formed to address specific development aspects of the project as well as IPT/Concurrent Engineering Teams to manage cross-IPT issues and processes. Development testing was accomplished with the same IPT approach.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

CCTT used Earned Value Management (EVM) throughout the development. The Contractor submitted Cost Performance Reports identifying Budgeted Cost of Work Scheduled (BCWS), Budgeted Cost of Work Performed (BCWP), Actual Cost of Work Performed (ACWP), variances and explanation of variances. The PM met frequently with the contractor to address cost issues throughout the development phase. The Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract for full rate production will not require EVM reporting; however, the Prime Contractor will be using EVM internally.

D. Acquisition Strategy:

Naval Air Warfare Center – Training Systems Division Contract Office, Orlando, FL 32826.
Contract Name: Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT)
Contract Number: N61339-93-C-0004 (Signed: 30 November 1992)
Prime Contractor: Lockheed Martin Information System Division
City/State: Orlando, Florida

Type of contract: The development phase of the CCTT system utilized a Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) contract structure. Low Rate Initial Production was a Fixed Price Incentive Fee (FPIF) contract with Earned Value Management (EVM) reporting requirements. Full Rate Production (FRP) is a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract.

The contract for development was a hybrid of Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF), Cost Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF), and Time and Materials (T&M) clauses. PM CATT selected a CPAF contract for the development phase based on the risks associated with the development and testing of the complex software that is the heart of CCTT.

Development and QUICKSTART production were not performance-based contracts. LRIP was a performance-based contract but used a Prime Item Development Specification based on waiver. During the LRIP contract, the contractor provided the necessary resources, equipment and facilities to modify, fabricate, verify, deliver and install CCTT systems which met the performance criteria specified in the 116865 Prime Item Development Specification (PIDS). The current FRP contract is a full performance based contract. Performance goals are to field modules and site equipment at various site locations.

5053/Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

F. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

1. Cost/benefit. A Cost and Training Effectiveness Analysis (CTEA) was prepared in May 91 as part of the MS I/II decision.
2. Analysis of alternative options. Alternative options compared in the CTEA were the current training strategy, improvements to SIMNET-T, fielding a degraded version of CCTT, incorporating embedded training devices and fielding fully capable CCTT.
3. Underlying assumptions. OPTEMPO of 800 miles per tank and Bradley per year for the AC and 288 OPTEMPO miles per tank per year for the RC was programmed to obtain T1 Readiness level for the battalions utilizing CCTT.
4. Estimate of Risks. Currently CCTT is a low risk system.

G. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

CCTT is a Distributed Interactive Simulation (DIS) based system which uses standard DIS Protocol Data Units (PDU) for communication in accordance with Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) Standard 1278. CCTT will migrate to High Level Architecture (HLA) Compliance. As such, CCTT will comply with the Modeling and Simulation requirements of the JTA. CCTT is an open, ADA based Virtual Simulation system. It utilized the principles of COE, but is not based on reuse of COE components. The CCTT is a complex simulation of equipment, behaviors, and environments not currently addressed as components of the DII COE. Hardware requirements are included in this funding. Information/data transport, to meet system requirements and equipment transportation, are being met by the Prime contractor. CCTT has no direct dependencies. It uses COTS and custom items. The contractor developed make/buy analyses for the system components and utilized COTS to the maximum extent possible. Items such as the fiberglass mockup of a weapon system are not available as COTS.

H. Security and Privacy:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth). C2 Level Achieved.

Privacy assessments for this initiative. None

Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? N/A

G. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) Program is included in the GPEA.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

A. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Earned Value used in Development, Quickstart Production, and LRIP. Full Rate Production is Firm Fixed Price contract and requires no earned value.

B. Original Baseline: Original Acquisition Program Baseline was approved 16 Nov 1992 for 497 modules in production.

<u>Base Year \$ (FY92)</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Threshold</u>	<u>Objective - Then Year \$</u>
Total RDTE	\$196.98M	\$226.52M	\$223.97M
Total Procurement	\$371.92M	\$390.52M	\$488.96M
Total Milcon	\$82.68M	\$95.08M	\$108.28M

A revised APB that was approved on 13 Dec 1998 for 359 production modules based on reducing the number of HMMWV modules and replacing them with more complex tank and Bradley modules. It is based on the Army Cost Position established at the Milestone III ASARC approval in Nov 98 and did not include new requirements for digitization. The revised APB reflects the following:

5053/Close Combat Tactical Trainer (CCTT) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

<u>Base Year \$ (FY92)</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Threshold</u>	<u>Objective - Then Year \$</u>
Total RDTE	\$265.3M	\$270.4M	\$289.3M
Total Procurement	\$523.9M	\$541.9M	\$641.9M
Total Milcon	\$45.9M	\$52.8M	\$52.1M
Total O&M	\$812.7M	\$894.0M	\$1188.3M

Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget? No.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 And prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	637.0	88.7	30.3	10.7	10.2	10.2	787.1
Schedule Goals (milestones)	24	24	24				
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	710.8	71.2	67.6	83.1	82.0	445.3	1460.0
Schedule Goals (months)	24	24	24	24			
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	73.8	(17.5)	37.3	72.4	71.8	435.1	672.9
Schedule Goals (months)							

Previous Baseline and Current Estimate reflect development and production only.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Cost Goals – The Acquisition Program Baseline (APB based on MS III ASARC decision and approved Army Cost Position) is being updated to reflect the increase in Army requirements for CCTT modules and to incorporate the CCTT digitization efforts. The APB includes visual system and processor upgrades after ten years of operation. Since the FY02 President’s Budget, the production module requirement increased from 359 to 450. The Current Estimate is based on the new quantity requirement which extended the production schedule. Cost projections are based on the FFP production contract options and the estimate of Pre-Planned Product Improvements identified by the user community. Variance (increased requirements) was briefed through the Training Mission Area reviews, which includes the TRADOC and FORSCOM users, Army Materiel Command and Department of the Army.

E. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline

CCTT is on schedule to the revised, approved Acquisition Strategy. No barriers to successful execution have been identified. The CCTT program uses an IPT process and has initiated a Partnering Relationship with the Contractor using the AMC Partnering Model. Issues are identified and resolved at the lowest level or raised to the next level for resolution in accordance with a Conflict Resolution procedure. The PM identifies program status and issues in a Monthly Acquisition Program Report (MAPR). Breach of APB thresholds is briefed to the AAE through the ASARC Management channels.

Performance Goal Summary (Primary Performance Criteria from Revised APB):

System	Open Architecture
Simulated Weapons	Replicate Actual
Popped Hatch	Simulate Visual Aspects
Module Compartment	+/- 2.5 Inches of Actual
Replicated Components	+/- 0.25 Inches of Actual
Simulated Terrain	100 x 150 KM
Atmosphere	Clouds, Rain, Fog, Haze, Clear Day
Dismounted Infantry	Scout Section, Infantry Squad, Platoon HQ
Semi- Automated Force	Individual Platform to Battalion Size Units
Capabilities	Both Friendly and Threat Tactical Doctrines

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Availability 90%

2. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.

FY 2001: Fielding of Fort Carson and Fort Riley

FY 2002: Fielding of USAEUR site #1 and Korea

FY 2003: Fielding of various fixed site additional modules and mobiles to Texas

FY 2004-07: Fielding of remaining fixed sites and National Guard mobiles

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions

Currently meeting goals.

CCTT has completed Hardware Design, Software Development and Integration. Technical Testing of the system is complete. Formal IOT&E ended on 15-May 98. FOT&E 1a was completed March 99 and FOT&E 1b was completed August 00. LRIP was approved, awarded, and delivered ahead of schedule. The fourth year of Production efforts are on schedule.

The CCTT baseline is the APB for Cost, Schedule, and Performance. The only significant performance variance from the original APB is in Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF). The user has reassessed the required MTBF with HQDA assistance. A formal requirement change has been approved. The new requirement specifies a 90% availability requirement versus the reliability component availability as this better reflects the users need given the use and support structure for CCTT. The latest APB revision contains this baseline change. CCTT is meeting the availability requirement, in an operational environment.

There are no identified barriers to meeting CCTT performance requirements. Where applicable, the PM and TRADOC Systems Manager address requirements versus technology and funding. Where applicable a CAIV is used to determine the course of action. There are no outstanding performance issues or deviations from the baseline other than the requirement change from MTBF to Availability.

Department of Defense
Combat Service Support Control System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Electronic Commerce/Electronic Data Interchange

Budget Initiative Number: 0731

IT Registration System Number NA (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status:

Information Technology Project or National Security System:

Program Activity/Mission Area: Communications and Computing Infrastructure, Electronic Commerce

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was initiated: FY 98

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; NA and of Project _____.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

This is not an acquisition project; it is setting policy for the Army in electronic business/electronic commerce.

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): IF NO ADM, EXPLAIN WHAT

Project is in _____ PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: _____, _____ Phase as of current review.

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: _____

The e-Army strategy will incorporate information assurance.

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status? The 1998 Army EC Strategic Plan and Implemented was coordinated, date unknown. The updated strategic and implementation plans, when completed, will also be reviewed for CCA Compliance.

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months?

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)? Yes

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Were they pricing changes or program changes? No.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? No.
How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? Resources costs were based on the deliverables and activities required in the current Army EC Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? NA

What percentage is financial 0%, for your component? (In FY 2003)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Component	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
RDT&E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Dev Mod							
Full Acquisition							
OPA	11.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.9
Totals Dev Mod	11.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.9
Maintenance/ Current Services							
OMA	30.1	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.8	5.1	37.9
Totals Current Services	30.1	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.8	5.1	37.9
Totals Resources by FY	42.0	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.8	5.1	49.8

Department of Defense
Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Forward Area Air Defense Command and Control System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Global Combat Support System-Army/Tactical (GCSS-A/T)

Budget Initiative Number: 5070

IT Registration System Number: DA01333 (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: No

Information Technology Project or National Security System: IT

Program Activity/Mission Area: Logistics Functional Area

PROJECT STATUS: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: MS 0/I/II 28 May 97 as Integrated Combat Service Support System (ICS3)
General Officer Working Group (GOWG) changed name to GCSS-Army in December 1997

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; Aug 02 and of Project 1st Qtr FY07.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

PM submits Monthly Acquisition Program Review (MAPR) reports to the Army Acquisition Executive and quarterly Defense Acquisition

Executive Summary (DAES) reports through the Army Acquisition Executive to the Defense Acquisition Executive.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): MS 0/I/II 28 May 98

Project is in Milestone II, Approval Dated: 28 May 97, Design & Engineering & Development Phase as of current review.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: .004

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance?

Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? August 2002

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review?

Program reductions in FY02 include -\$13M OPA and -\$9M RDTE.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions?

Changes were congressionally directed adjustments.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

Program delay.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process?

Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System?

Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? N/A

What percentage is financial _____, for your component? N/A

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

	Dollars in Millions						
Department of the Army	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full Acquisition							
OMA	75.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.7
OPA	32.6	17.4	40.7	47.2	49.6	224.7	412.2
MPA	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
RDTE	0.0	66.7	82.0	69.3	80.5	311.6	610.1
Total Dev Mod	108.4	84.1	122.7	116.5	130.1	536.3	1098.1
Current Services/Maintenance							

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

OMA	5.4	1.4	11.2	14.9	14.0	62.0	108.9
OMAR	0.0	2.0	4.2	1.2	4.0	0.6	12.0
OMNG	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.0	1.0	22.0	26.9
MPA	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.9
RPA	0.0	2.9	9.6	2.5	8.2	23.6	46.8
Total Current Services	5.4	6.4	28.0	19.7	27.3	108.7	195.5
Total Resources by FY	113.8	90.5	150.7	136.2	157.4	645.0	1293.6

PART II. Justification and Other Information

C. Description/Performance Characteristics:

GCSS-A/T, as the number one enabler for the Army CSS transformation, will provide a seamless, integrated, modular, and interactive Combat Service Support (CSS) information management and operations system at all force support levels. The databases and processes of the application programs will accommodate system operations in network/information-centralized environments. The software will be Web-based capable. The system will operate on state-of-the-art commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) operating systems and databases and run on COTS hardware. Over time, the operating systems, databases, and hardware are likely to change as computer technology continues to rapidly advance. The modular design of GCSS-A/T will allow the system to accommodate CSS missions and organizations as required. Since all the requirements for GCSS-A/T cannot be built into a single software module and, as in legacy systems, these requirements continue to evolve over time, the project will be divided into multiple module developments, which must be integrated and will have iterative builds to ensure the most current requirements of the users are continuously being met.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

GCSS-A/T will be the system to provide the integrated capabilities of logistics “stovepipe” Standard Army Management Information Systems (STAMIS) and the Integrated Logistics Analysis Program (ILAP). The system will take advantage of interfaces with automatic identification technology (AIT) devices, single source data entry, and relational databases. These features will enable users to have a common view of the battlefield and to distribute the requisite CSS support when and where needed. The command and control (C2) link to the Army Battle Command System (ABCS) will be made through an interface between GCSS-A/T and systems such as the Combat Service Support Control System (CSSCS) and Forward Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2). The principal Logistics STAMIS, and variants thereof, to be functionally integrated, include: the Unit Level Logistics System (ULLS); Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS); Standard Property Book System – Redesign (SPBS-R); Standard Army Ammunition System (SAAS); and the Standard Army Maintenance System (SAMS). ILAP, which has transitioned to project management control, will now be managed as a STAMIS until incorporation into GCSS-A/T. Planned enhancements to ILAP will continue to be developed and fielded. Communications interfaces and protocols will be integral to GCSS-A/T so that external transmissions will be initiated from within the functional applications.

This requirement is based on an Operation Desert Shield/Storm finding. It was Issue Number 5.0 in the 27 May 1992 Total Distribution Action Plan. The issue was “lack of a multifunctional STAMIS using a common shared relation database”. The objective fix is to “develop and field a multifunctional STAMIS using a Shared Relational Database that provides shared access for all functional CSS systems”.

The Mission Needs Statement, approved 23 May 1995, established a need for single, integrated and interactive CSS automated and communication system.

The Operational Requirements Document, approved in Army 5 February 1997, states GCSS-Army will be the Army’s seamless, integrated modular and interactive CSS information management and operations system at all force support levels.

The Information System Cost and Economic Analysis (ISCEA) for Milestone 0/I/II included a cost benefit analysis. While there were numerous productivity improvement benefits noted, the cost analysis did not identify hard dollar or manpower savings. The ISCEA, including the benefits, will be updated prior to Milestone III.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

GCSS-A/T will develop a CIO (8121) Certification to support their next MDR. After review by a DA sponsored IPT, it will be provided to the DA CIO for endorsement.

Per the GCSS-Army Prime Directive, management of GCSS-A/T is comprised of the General Officer Working Group (GOWG), Executive Agent, and the Council of Colonels (COC). The GCSS-A GOWG guides and directs the vision, conceptualization, redesign, and integration for all Army CSS information systems in order to enhance responsiveness to warfighting requirements through information dominance. The Director of the GOWG is the Commanding General, US Army Materiel Command and the final decision authority for the GOWG and reports to the Army Vice Chief of Staff. The Deputy Director of the GOWG is co-chaired between the CG US Army Combined Army Support Command (CGUSACASCOM) who also executes the responsibilities as Executive Agent and the Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (DISC4), the Army's Chief Information Officer. The Deputy Directors have both directive and review authority and represent the Director as required. The Executive Agent is responsible for the day-to-day management as directed by the GOWG as well as development and analysis of CSS business rules, concepts, training, and the procedures to enhance the operation and joint linkage of Army CSS automation systems. The GOWG Executive Agent also ensures integration of all approved Business Process Reengineering (BPR) initiatives. The COC is co-chaired by the Director, Information Systems Directorate, USACASCOM, and the Director of the AMC GCSS-Army Integration Office. The COC ensures that all items are fully coordinated prior to being briefed to the GOWG. To provide a basis for the GCSS-A/T application modules, the COC Director employs project teams of senior functional subject matter experts (SME) to gather all available documentation and gain knowledge about both as the "as is" logistics systems and any approved engineering change proposals (ECP). In addition, the project teams conduct Joint Application Design (JAD) and Integrated Product Team/Integrated Concept Team (IPT/ICT) sessions with "business experts" and users to flesh out details not apparent in the documentation. As the process takes place, BPG is developed. The focus of the GCSS-A/T BPR during the sessions is on streamlining processes by detecting and eliminating non-value added process time and costs, and incorporating best practices in whole or in part. In conjunction with the WLMP, joint tactical and strategic IPT work BPR to align common processes to be supported through new technology and software.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

D. Program Management/Management Oversight:

The process owner is Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DCSLOG). GCSS-A/T is managed by the Project Manager, Global Combat Support System – Army (GCSS-Army). PM, GCSS-Army is assigned to the Program Executive Officer (PEO), Enterprise Information Systems (EIS) who reports directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE).

The incumbent PM is an Acquisition Corps member, certified Level III in the career fields of Program Management and Communications/Computers.

Integrated Process Teams are used to formally manage the acquisition process and continue to be used for requirements definition through the Joint Application Development (JAD). The software developers hold numerous JAD meetings bringing the users to a central location, discussing user needs, Business Process Redesign, and develop system requirements.

The Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) documents all cost, schedule, and technical performance criteria. Performance goals are defined as task performance of Mission Essential Tasks (METs) and non-METs. Controls are in place to monitor the technical performance of matrix support organizations, including periodic reviews at all management levels. Reports are used to monitor program cost and schedules. Development, system qualification, and operational and evaluation testing is conducted. The Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) established management oversight over the testing program.

GCSS-A/T has developed a Risk Management Plan that identifies risk descriptions, their initiating events and appropriate mitigation/contingency strategies. The risks are ranked using the probability of occurrence, impact and timeframe. Reviews are conducted regularly to review, add or close risks.

E. Acquisition Strategy:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Government Research Corporation International, Inc. (GRCI), McLean, Virginia was the prime contractor for GCSS-Army. PM GCSS-A/T awarded a new contract to TRW in April 2001 to be the prime system integrator/system developer.

The STAMIS Computer Contract II (SCC II) with Government Technology Services, Inc. (GTSI), Chantilly, Virginia is a competitive Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract and is the primary acquisition vehicle. Since all Non-Developmental Item (NDI) hardware and COTS software is JTA compliant, performance-based contracting does not apply for the SCC II contract.

H. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management:

The 5 Mar 1997 ISCEA for the MS 0/I/II decision did not contain a complete benefit analysis section; therefore, no ROI's were required at that point in time. The ISCEA that is in the process of being completed for the MS C/III will contain a benefit analysis section as well as ROI information. While there were numerous productivity improvement benefits noted, the cost analysis did not identify hard dollar or manpower savings.

The 1997 ISCEA had several alternatives proposed in the CSS automation arena at the retail level. The alternatives included continuing with the base case (status quo), upgrading existing systems, combining and integrating functionality of existing CSS STAMIS into a single baseline (ICS3) or developing an entirely new system. It was determined that the ICS3 alternative was the preferred alternative based on comparison of cost and benefits.

At the time of the 1997 ISCEA, the underlying assumptions were: alternatives must be capable of initial fielding by FY99; costs were based on peacetime operations; the economic life of the hardware is five years and software is 20 years, commencing upon full fielding. Costs for hardware replacements are projected to occur every five years during the economic life and that hardware disposal costs will be equal to its salvage value.

I. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

OSD has issued a directive that all new C4I systems and other systems that interface to C4I systems shall be in compliance with the Joint Technical Architecture (JTA). The JTA in turn mandates use of the Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE). Reference is specifically made to C4ISR Architecture framework, CISA-000-104-96, Version 1.0, 7 June 1996, C4ISR Integration Task Force (ITF) Integrated Architectures Panel. This document presents an innovative definition of levels of interoperability. The DII COE adopts these levels of interoperability and maps DII compliance to interoperability level. The COE defines eight progressively deeper levels of integration for the runtime Environment Category. These levels are directly tied to the degree of interoperability achieved. True integration begins at Level 4. GCSS-Army is being designed to be initially compliant to achieve Level 5/6 integration as platform-specific tools and test environments are put in place by DISA.

GCSS-A/T satisfies transport requirements by utilizing existing Army infrastructure.

Compliant as designed or currently operating. GCSS-A/T will be compliant with mandates of the Joint and Army Technical Architecture (JTA/ATA) and the Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) Common Operating Environment (COE). GCSS-A/T will be initially compliant with Level 6.

GCSS-A/T will be a mix of COTS, GOTS and custom. The custom components are required to implement Army specific business rules and training requirements.

I. Security and Privacy:

GCSS-A/T follows the DOD DITSCAP process for Certification and Accreditation. This includes the development of the System Security Authorization Agreement (SSAA) and covers the system life cycle. The ISEC Technology Integration Center (TIC) at Ft Huachuca provides the Certification Agent (CA). The system requirements were derived from relevant JTA-A and DII COE
5070/Global Combat Support System-Army/Tactical - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

technical architecture requirements, and AR 380-19 (29-IA also in draft form) security requirements. The system will be accredited at the SBU (EAL 4) level.

All security requirements are tested for in various scenarios to ensure that all of the requirements are met, to include system penetration testing.

The system does not currently have a requirement for implementing DOD Common Access Card, but expects to in the near future.

J. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

Electronic signature is not applicable to this program

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

D. Performance Based Management System (PBMS).

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress?

Extensive management oversight combined with earned value is used to monitor achievements or deviations from goals.

E. Original Baseline:

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

- The Total Life Cycle Cost (LCC) for GCSS-A/T is projected to be \$2,449.8M. This will include the completion of all six modules: Supply Property (SPR), Maintenance (MNT), Management (MGT), Supply Support Activity (SSA), Ammunition (AMMO), and Integrated Materiel Management (IMM).
- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? The system was rebaselined in 2000 due to the original prime contractor failing to deliver the system within timeframes established.
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget? Following the National/World Emergency of 9/11/01, the Software Qualification Test (SQT), which had been scheduled for November 2001, was rescheduled until December 2001 due to lack of MACOM user testers.

F. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	113.8	116.7	163.0	106.0	144.1	597.6	1241.2
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	113.8	90.5	150.7	136.2	157.4	645.0	1293.6
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	0.0	(26.2)	(12.3)	30.2	13.3	47.4	52.4
Schedule Goals (months)							

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? Yes
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives?
 - FY01 change reflects Service year of execution adjustment
 - FY02 change reflects FY02 Congressional Appropriation adjustments
 - FY03-07 changes reflect FY03 BES and POM adjustments

F. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:

FY 2001: Awarded Prime Integrator/Developer Contract to TRW 19 April 2001.

FY 2002: Conducted successful Software Qualification Test (Dec 01-Jan 02); conduct a Software Acceptance Test (SAT); Limited Deployment Decision for the SPR Module schedule for 2nd Qtr FY02 with Fielding Approval (Milestone III) for the remainder of SPR scheduled for 4th Qtr FY02.

FY 2003: Obtain fielding approval of the Management and Build 1 of the Maintenance Modules.

FY 2004-07: Obtain fielding approval for Build 2 of the Maintenance Module.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions:

FY2002 Congressional action reflects the program restructuring.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Global Command and Control System – Army (GCCS-A).

Budget Initiative Number: 6491

IT Registration System Number _____(Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: Yes

Information Technology Project or National Security System: No

Program Activity/Mission Area: Functional Area Applications Area/Command and Control

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing X

Date Project was initiated: Jul 95

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; Ongoing and Project 2016.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes X No

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)? OSD OIPT is now the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA).

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): If No ADM, explain what. December 1994

Project is in Production and Deployment Phase or Milestone III, Approval Dated: December 1994, Production and Deployment Phase as of current review.

6491/Global Command and Control System - Army - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed. (Describe, BRIEFLY).
Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations? No

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 5%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? 4QFY02

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document? Were they pricing changes or program changes? No. However, GCCS-A did receive supplemental funding in FY02 in support of DA mandated fieldings.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Mandated fieldings were directed at the Component Level.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

Resource costs were determined by the Product Management Office based on in-house historical estimates and actual costs associated with replacement of existing systems.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Component	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Full Acquisition							
OPA	97.7	10.3	12.8	21.1	32.8	120.9	295.7
RDTE	94.0	13.8	13.4	17.9	8.4	30.7	178.2
Totals Dev Mod	191.7	24.1	26.2	39.1	41.2	151.6	473.9
Maintenance/ Current Services							
OMA	151.6	47.8	30.6	31.8	31.5	126.5	419.8
MPA	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.2	2.2	8.0	18.2
Totals Current Services	153.4	49.6	32.8	34.0	33.7	134.5	438.0
Totals Resources by FY	345.1	73.7	59.0	73.1	74.9	286.1	911.9

PART II. Justification and Other Information

D. Description/Performance Characteristics:

1. Description.

Global Command and Control System-Army (GCCS-A) provides critical automated warfighting command and control tools for Army Strategic, Theater and Tactical Commanders executing ARFOR responsibilities in support of joint and combined operations. GCCS-A provides the Army's interface to Joint Staff Global Command and Control System (GCCS) program. GCCS-A is the Army's Strategic and Theater Command and Control (C2) System, primarily providing readiness information, planning, mobilization and deployment capability for the strategic commanders; and providing force employment (receipt of forces, intra-theater planning, readiness, force tracking and other theater level mission applications) for the theater commanders.

2. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan).

The Global Command and Control System-Army (GCCS-A) is an integrated command and control (C2) system that supports the Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) for the Warrior objectives set forth by the Joint Staff in June 1993. GCCS-A adheres to the programming guidance set forth in The Army Plan for FY 2000-2015, dated 24 March 1998 and addressed by the Horizontal Integration of the Battlefield (HIBC) Mission Needs Statement (MNS). GCCS-A will exploit state-of-the-art computing systems to provide the Army with technical advantages to meet the battlefield command and control challenges of the 21st century. GCCS-A is the Army's extension of the Joint Global Command and Control System (GCCS) to meet Defense Planning Guidance.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

3. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches.

GCCS-A is the HQDA directed consolidation of the Army Worldwide Military Command and Control System (WWMCCS) Information System (AWIS), the Standard Theater Army Command and Control System (STACCS), and the Theater Automated Command and Control Information Management System (TACCIMS). Development direction was provided in HQDA memorandum SUBJECT: Army Support to Global Command and Control System (GCCS), dated 17 November 1993, signed by LTG Peter A. Kind. CINCs, sub-unified commands, Commanders of Joint Task Forces, their respective service components, and coalition forces require automated C2 systems to support force projection doctrine and respond rapidly to contingencies. GCCS-A satisfies the MNS for the HIBC, also known as Battlefield Digitization, dated 10 January 1995 and the MNS for the GCCS. GCCS-A supports the identified need for “a horizontally and vertically integrated C2 system that provides commanders with the means to make timely battlefield decisions.” GCCS-A supports, or is supported by, the following documentation: “The Army Digitization Master Plan”; “Force Projection Army C4I Support,” CG TRADOC, February 1992; “The Army Enterprise Strategy,” Army Chief of Staff, January 1993; “The U.S. Army 1998 Modernization Plan,” Secretary of the Army, April 1998; Army Battle Command Systems (ABCS) Capstone Requirements Document (CRD) Revision 1b, dated 30 June 1999; and the Capstone Requirements White Paper for Joint Tactical Command, Control, Communications and Computers (C4) to Meet the Needs of Joint Vision 2020 and Beyond.

4. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness.

GCCS-A was the result of a Migration Plan that was selected as the most cost-effective solution to evolve, replace and/or migrate the AWIS and STACCS systems as well as implement TRADOC approved GCCS-A ORD requirements. The requirement was expanded to include the migration of USFKs TACCIMS functionality. GCCS-A also satisfies Army required C2 functionality that is Common Operating Environment (COE) compliant and is interoperable with GCCS. COTS are used to the maximum extent possible and reuse candidates are evaluated and adapted wherever possible prior to new development.

6491/Global Command and Control System - Army - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

E. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner.
Program Executive Office for Command, Control, and Communications (Tactical) (PEO C3T)
Project Manager, Ground Combat Command and Control (PM GCC2)
Product Manager, Global Command and Control System - Army (GCCS-A)
Contracting Office, CECOM Acquisition Center, Washington Operations Office (CACWOO)
Management Approach, Integrated Product Team (IPT)
2. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? Yes

F. Acquisition Strategy:

1. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.
Lockheed Martin, Springfield, VA
2. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.
Cost Plus Award Fee
3. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.
The contract is performance based. The Goals are as follows:

6491/Global Command and Control System - Army - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Technical Management Goals

- a. IPT support
- b. GCCS-A and ABCS program reviews, methodologies/process cost/schedule reductions
- c. Technology improvement
- d. Integrated Logistics Support
- e. Software Support
- f. Fielding

Cost Goals

- a. Establish discipline with all personnel in recording their charges for work completed to include travel charges.
- b. Cost Variance resolution
- c. Application of Earned Value Management in providing a measure of progress against plan of work.

Schedule Goals

- a. Schedule Variances reflected in the Cost Performance Report will be assessed on the contractor's ability to quickly recommend, pursue corrective actions and plan for recovery.
- b. Ability to meet schedules
- c. Ability to deliver required deliverables in accordance with schedules.

J. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

1. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify. None

2. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.) N/A
3. Underlying assumptions. N/A
4. Estimate of Risks. N/A

K. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

1. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)

GCCS-A has been developed to ensure Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) compliance. The GCCS-A mission includes dissemination

of mission operation plans to the Army from the joint GCCS system. This critical interface demands GCCS-A maintain interoperability

compliance with Joint GCCS and Army Battle Command Systems (ABCS) Battlefield Functional Areas (BFA)'s.

Interoperability

certification testing has been conducted at the Joint Interoperability Test Center (JITC), Ft. Huachuca, AZ in 2000 to verify system

interoperability. GCCS-A also uses United States Message Text Format (USMTF) messaging to ensure successful message exchanges

between systems.

2. Infrastructure Strategy:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Closely linked with the infrastructure strategy established within the ABCS Family of Systems, and those established within the SIPRNet.

3. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided?

Yes. Hardware is purchased through PM CHS to ensure interoperability.

4. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?

Closely linked with the infrastructure strategy established within the ABCS Family of Systems, and those established within the Siprnet.

5. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?

ABCS and GCCS Family of Systems.

6. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?

GCCS-A is a mixture of COTS/GOTS. It is primarily composed of COTS products (i.e., Sun Solaris and Microsoft Windows NT

Operating Systems and the Informix database, which provide the commercial backbone of the system. A number of GOTS products

are taken from the Joint DISA Global Command and Control System (GCCS). GCCS-A is the Army's extension of the GCCS. GOTS

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

includes the Unified Build Software which provides the Common Operating Picture (COP), which has no commercial equivalent,
requiring GOTS product development.

7. Describe the Data Architecture approach? Relational databases.
8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach?
Mission applications written on DISA's Common Operating Environment (COE).

K. Security and Privacy:

1. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

GCCS-A is a secret high system that operates over the SIPRNET. The SIPRNET provides the first layer of defense. Only users with a secret clearance are allowed access to the GCCS-A system, providing the next layer of defense. In addition, the GCCS-A system provides for positive Identification and Authentication (I&A) of each user. Once authenticated, each individual user will have access only to those functions and data required for his/her mission (concept of least access). Finally, auditing provides audit reports to allow analysis of user actions.

2. Privacy assessments for this initiative.

A privacy assessment for GCCS-A is not applicable. GCCS-A is a secret high command and control system. It does not contain personal data, such as personnel or medical records that would be subject to privacy restrictions. Access to the logon

ID and passwords of users is restricted, for security reasons. Part of the security policy for GCCS-A is that the actions of each user can be positively identified/audited when needed.

3. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?

Common Access Cards (CAC) have not been fielded to GCCS-A. GCCS-A is a secret high system. The draft Material Fielding Plan for Common Access Cards, dated Apr 01, provides for fielding the CAC only to the unclassified sustaining base environment. Fielding CAC to either the tactical environment or secret and above environments was unfounded as the date of the MFP. The Product Manager, GCCS-A annually reviews the costs required to PK-enable the system and provides the information to high headquarters. The system would have to be PK-enabled in order to use CAC.

L. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) .

If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why.

GCCS-A is a command and control system that posts information to an Army and Joint database.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

G. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

Earned Value tracked by Cost Performance Report (CPR).

H. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

As a directed program cost of ownership was based on replacing existing system, completing requirements development and fielding GCCS-A.

Costs were estimated to be \$550 Million to meet threshold level requirements and \$940 Million to meet objective level requirements. Minimum performance benefits were established as maintaining interoperability, providing automatic database replication, recovery from the loss of a system server and protection from data loss.

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment. If so, when and why. No
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? No

C. Current Baseline Information: The GCCS-A program was never baselined. Planned and actual costs by FY are used to provide data for the following chart:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Cum Total FY 2004-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Estimate (PB02):						

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Cost Goals (\$M)	345.1	70.7	56.8	50.9	219.8	743.1
Schedule Goals (milestones)						
b. Current Estimate:						
Cost Goals (\$M)	345.1	73.7	59.2	73.1	361.0	911.9
Schedule Goals (months)						
c. Variance from Prev Estimate:						
Cost Goals (\$M)	0	3.0	2.2	22.1	141.2	168.5
Schedule Goals (months)						

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? Yes.

What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? Increases are planned to purchase equipment for the technology sustainment of the GCCS program. This is part of a five-year refreshment/replacement of GCCS-Army equipment.

- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. N/A
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). N/A
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. N/A
- If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

G. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline: Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —

No details are available because the GCCS-A program was never baselined. No approved baseline available.

1. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.
3. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.
FY 2001: Maintained Joint interoperability for Army C2.
FY 2002: Maintain interoperability and reduce number of supported baselines.
FY 2003: Maintain interoperability, reduce number of supported baselines, and increase use of load automation.
FY 2004-07: Maintain interoperability, improve ease of use, and reduce support requirements.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

Yes, the performance goals are on track since the last president's budget submission.

1. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

A negative variance will cause a significant impact on the Army's ability to maintain joint C2 connectivity. Corrective actions entail prioritizing the criticality of various functions of the software system. Once the prioritization is completed, remaining resources will be applied to mitigate the risk associated with the inability to post Army specific data to the Army Database and the joint common database. After prioritization, corrective actions will be implemented based on the users most critical requirements.

2. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.

Corrective actions will mostly affect schedule and cost. Any change will require the reallocation of limited developers and testers. This reallocation will prevent planned activities from being accomplished or cause delays. Restarting this development effort will increase time to completion. Additionally, costs will likely increase because of increased overtime or increased time required to conduct corrective actions.

3. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

The greatest risk to meeting funding/cost goals is unplanned changes from GCCS family of systems or from the Army Battle Command System. Risk reduction occurs by maintaining awareness of planned interoperability updates because of infrastructure changes. There are two key methods available to reduce this risk. First, the staff has to stay informed on technology initiatives or actions that may serve as sources of changes. The second method to mitigate risk is to plan and budget for sufficient updates to applications and database schema to incorporate myriad changes in the COE, ABCS and GCCS.

Department of Defense
Installation Support Modules
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

As of 5 March 2002 DoD D, CIO continues to assess this capital investment business case requirement.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP)

Budget Initiative Number: 2180

IT Registration System Number N/A (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: N/A

Information Technology Project

Program Activity/Mission Area: Communications and Computing Infrastructure/Mid Tier Processing

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: 1994

Projected Date for Completion of Phase: N/A and of Project N/A .

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes

The I3MP is a Department of the Army centrally funded infrastructure program that is not subject to milestone reviews. DISC4, acting as the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA), in conjunction with the Project Manager, Defense Communications and Army Switched Systems (PM DCASS), the MACOMs and DCSOPS continually review both formally and informally all efforts under I3MP.

2180/Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): N/A.

Project is in N/A PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: N/A , Phase as of current review.

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed.

The I3MP is a synchronized effort involving four components (Digital Switched Systems Modernization Program (DSSMP); Common User Installation Transport Network (CUITN); Outside Cable Rehabilitation (OSCAR) program; and Army Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) Router Program (ADRP) for modernization of the outside cable, telephone switch, campus area network and long haul gateway of each Army installation. I3MP employs a synchronized approach in upgrading the Telecommunications / Information Infrastructure on Army installations in the CONUS, European and Pacific Theaters. It is a Department of the Army centrally funded infrastructure program that is not subject to milestone reviews. However, the Project Manager, MACOMs, DISC4 (as I3MP MDA) and HQDA DCSOPS (prioritizes fieldings) continually review both formally and informally all efforts under I3MP.

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?

No.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: Less than 1%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? Yes No

The I3MP is a synchronized effort involving four components (Digital Switched Systems Modernization Program (DSSMP); Common User Installation Transport Network (CUITN); Outside Cable Rehabilitation (OSCAR) program; and Army Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) Router Program (ADRP) for modernization of the outside cable, telephone switch, campus area network and long haul gateway of each Army installation. I3MP employs a synchronized approach in upgrading the Telecommunications / Information Infrastructure on Army installations in the CONUS, European and Pacific Theaters. As an infrastructure effort, I3MP provides no specific functional capabilities. Rather, it facilitates the effective transmission of data between individual Automated Information Systems (AIS) and improves the ability of Army activities to transfer data on the installation. Individual AIS that access and use I3MP provided infrastructure would obtain required CIO approvals in accordance with the CCA.

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (FY 2002 Budget)? Yes.

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review?

The program received additional funding in FY03-07 as a result of an OSD decision to provide expanded I3MP capabilities to EUCOM Command, Control, Communications and Computers (C4).

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? DoD level.
How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

2180/Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The Installation Target Architecture Model (TAM), takes into account historical costing information, and details an installations total information technology requirements and associated costs for data, voice, switching, and premise wiring information transfer requirements. Subsequent field collected data also supports this costing model.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial Management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

<i>Department of the Army</i>	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full Acquisition							
OPA	576.4	126.2	161.4	183.0	145.2	875.2	2067.4
Total Dev Mod	576.4	126.2	161.4	183.0	145.2	875.2	2067.4
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	46.3	3.4	2.9	6.0	6.0	24.4	89.0
Total Current Services	46.3	3.4	2.9	6.0	6.0	24.4	89.0
Total Resources by FY	622.7	129.6	164.3	189.0	151.2	899.6	2156.4

PART II. Justification and Other Information

E. Description/Performance Characteristics:

2180/Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The I3MP is a synchronized effort involving four components (Digital Switched Systems Modernization Program (DSSMP); Common User Installation Transport Network (CUITN); Outside Cable Rehabilitation (OSCAR) program; and Army Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) Router Program (ADRP)) for modernization of the outside cable, telephone switch, campus area network and long haul gateway for Army installations in three theaters. The mission and purpose of I3MP is to synchronize the upgrade of the Telecommunications / Information infrastructure on Army installations. This synchronized approach achieves funding efficiencies by reducing duplication, minimizing impact on the receiving installation and by engineering a total site solution. Through the use of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) products and contract installers, I3MP provides base level infrastructure solutions at Army Post, Camps and Stations in accordance with a DISC4 / DCSOPS approved Installation Sequence List (ISL). This base infrastructure is capable of supporting Defense Reform Initiatives (Paperless Contracting, Electronic Travel Management, Internet Base Publishing, Electronic Commerce, Distance Learning, Revolution In Logistics), Transformation and Army Knowledge Management (AKM). This infrastructure is critical for reach back and power projection of the digital division and employment of advanced technology for an agile combat force. The implementation of I3MP OCONUS in the European and Pacific Theaters will begin in FY02.

5. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan).

The installed base infrastructure will support Defense Reform Initiatives (DRI), Transformation and Army Knowledge Management (AKM). The infrastructure is critical for reach back and power projection of the digital division and employment of advanced technology for an agile combat force.

6. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches.

The I3MP program is not subject to milestone reviews. Site selection is based on a DISC4 / DCSOPS approved Installation Sequence List (ISL)

7. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Process selection is based on input from the MACOM / DISC4 / DCSOPS and incorporated into an approved Installation Sequence List (ISL). The concept of synchronization for installation infrastructure programs was first mandated by memo, SARD-RP, dated 14 Sep 94, signed by Army Acquisition Executive.

F. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?

The business process owner or functional proponent is the Army installation/sustaining base community represented by the Army's Chief Information Officer (CIO)/G6 (DISC4) as their functional executive agent. The project is managed by the Project Manager (PM), Defense Communications and Army Switched Systems (DCASS). PM DCASS is assigned to the Program Executive Officer for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS) who reports directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE). The contracting office for the I3MP acquisition is the US Army Communications Electronics Command (CECOM) Acquisition Center – Washington.

2. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.

PM DCASS uses an Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) approach to properly manage the I3MP acquisition. IPTs are on-going in the areas of architecture development, configuration control, total systems design and at all levels of project implementation and contract

management. Each individual site also has an IPT Leader, responsible for an overall systems site solution. The IPT maintains total

management of site implementations by employing empowerment, cross-functional talents and expertise, and the involvement of contractors and site customers as equal team members.

G. Acquisition Strategy:

4. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.

Digital Switched Systems Modernization Program (DSSMP) contract. DSSMP is a multi-vendor contract. Contractors include Harris Corporation, Melbourne FL., Southwestern Bell, Saint Louis, MO., Halifax Corporation, Alexandria VA., Verizon Federal, Washington, DC, Telecom Italia, Napoli, Italy, Engineering & Professional Svcs, Inc., Tinton Falls, NJ., Litton/PRC, Inc., McLean, VA., General Dynamics Worldwide Telecom Systems, Needham, MA., Williams Communications, Herndon, VA., Lucent Technologies, Inc., Greensboro, NC., Siemens Corporation, Vienna, VA., Lockheed Martin, Greenbelt, MD.

5. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.

The programs under I3MP use the competitively awarded Digital Switched Systems Modernization Program's (DSSMP), Indefinite

Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) contracts and other existing competitively awarded open-use vehicles. The flexibility and multi-award feature of the DSSMP contracts insures that competition is present with each Task Order (TO). Secondary competition

among ID/IQ contract holders continues to force prices downward, using the "competition after award" concept.

6. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.

All contracts under the DSSMP umbrella are Firm Fixed Price and are not performance based. However, before government acceptance of final contractual deliverables, the integrated product is tested and its effectiveness for intended use is validated.

L. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

N/A. See Part II: Justification and Other Information A. Description/Performance Characteristics:

5. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI)), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify. N/A.
6. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.) N/A.
7. Underlying assumptions. N/A.
8. Estimate of Risks. N/A.

M. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

7. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)

Extensive testing is performed in accordance with CJCSI 6215.01 for voice interoperability and Joint Technical Architecture-Army (JTA-A) for data interoperability.

8. Infrastructure Strategy: All installed infrastructures comply fully with the JTA-A.
9. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided? This is a HW project. HW requirements are included in this funding.

2180/Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

10. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means? I3MP provides installation level transport networks.

11. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?

I3MP is the base level information infrastructure program. Successful implementation of infrastructure modernization is dependent

on accurate requirements from the applications programs which the infrastructure supports (i.e. Army Knowledge Management (AKM), Standard Army Management Information Systems (STAMIS), telemaintenance and telemedicine, Distance Learning and base level environmental and property management applications). All implementations utilize Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) equipment and services.

12. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components? COTS.

13. Describe the Data Architecture approach?

All components of the I3MP comply with JTA-A, Defense Information Infrastructure / Common Operating Environment (DII/COE), CJCSI 6215.01, Installation Information Infrastructure Architecture (I3A) and the Army Installation Information Infrastructure Design Guidance. The Joint Interoperability Test Center (JITC) and the USAISEC-Technology Integration Center (TIC), certify that components when integrated into the proposed solution or design for each installation modernization, are compliant with the applicable standards and controls.

8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach? N/A.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

M. Security and Privacy:

The I3MP, in and of itself is not subject to security requirements. Security requirements are achieved when the I3MP modernization is incorporated into the installation network and the Designated Approval Authority (DAA) accredits the network for operation. Security is engineered in, as part of the base level design and is in accordance with the Network Security Design Document. The installed base of equipment and associated software provides the required level of network security.

4. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

Defense in Depth is the responsibility of each individual installation. The I3MP provides the tools, capability and network design to assist the installation in meeting their security requirements.

5. Privacy assessments for this initiative. N/A.

6. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?

N/A. I3MP provides base level infrastructure and it is not an application program.

N. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why.

I3MP provides base level infrastructure and it is not an application program.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

2180/Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I3MP) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

I. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

Management oversight: The cost, schedule and performance of each installation is continuously reviewed by the Product Managers and is subject to quarterly reviews by the Project Manager. Earned Value (EV) metrics are not applicable, as all contracts are awarded on a firm, fixed price basis.

J. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

Full life-cycle costs are dependent on the size and complexity of each individual site. Full life cycle costs include the initial installation, training, maintenance, warranty and associated software upgrades.

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? If so, when and why.

The I3MP is “rebaselined”, when funding decrements / increments are incurred and sites are repositioned on the Installation Sequence List.

- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? N/A.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	622.7	95.6	245.6	296.8	209.2	1199.7	2669.6
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	622.7	129.6	164.3	189.0	151.2	899.6	2156.4
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	0.0	34.0	(81.3)	(107.8)	(58.0)	(300.1)	(513.2)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? N/A.
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A.
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance.
The I3MP funding was increased in FY 03-07 to implement EUCOM C4 requirements.
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means).
The increase in funding was a result of OSD direction.
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance.
The variance resulted from the I3MP being increased to implement EUCOM C4 requirements as directed by OSD.
- If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A.

H. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline: Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent.

2. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.

10 CONUS sites on the ISL have been completed and work at the next 18 sites is ongoing. PM DCASS has one or more of the I3MP infrastructure programs working at over 20 CONUS sites. PM DCASS has established offices in the European and Pacific Theaters for the I3MP OCONUS effort. Although redirection of funding during FY98-99 impacted the rate of implementation, plus-ups beginning with FY00 for I3MP CONUS (CUITN/OSCAR) will provide for

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

implementation through site #44 (FY 03 site) on the Installation Sequence List. PM DSSMP will undertake 52 modernization efforts with one effort ADAS (Automated Directory Attendant System) covering multiple sites in FY02-03.

2. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.

	DSSMP		CUITN/OSCAR		I3MP EUR		I3MP PAC		ADRP		Total	
	Funding	Sites	Funding	Sites	Funding	Sites	Funding	Sites	Funding	Sites	Funding	Sites
FY 2001:	27.020	9	64.879	7	0.000	0	0.000	0	4.168	Var	96.067	16
FY 2002:	51.309	23	105.152	17	39.000	3	44.830	2	4.893	Var	245.184	45
FY 2003:	49.723	29	127.244	20	155.180	14	44.858	4	6.039	Var	383.044	67
FY 2004-07	198.361	TBD	577.848	56	531.750	41	157.947	20	25.400	Var	1,491.306	117

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president’s budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

4. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.
5. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.
6. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The ability to adhere to the approved Installation Sequence List (ISL) is based on the receipt of funds. A funding decrement results in a reduction in the level of effort at an individual site or sites, or a reduction in the number of Army sites modernized in any given year.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Joint Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistic Support (JCALS)

Budget Initiative Number: 1039

IT Registration System Number DA00499 (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: No

Information Technology Project

Program Activity/Mission Area: Functional Area Applications Area/Logistics

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: Joint Technical Manual Effort initiated in Jun 92.

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; February 2002 and of Project December 2005.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)? PM submits Monthly Acquisition Program Review (MAPR) reports to the Army Acquisition Executive and quarterly Defense Acquisition Executive Summary (DAES) reports through the Army Acquisition Executive to the Defense Acquisition Executive. In addition, the OSD Chief Information Officer as JCALS Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) periodically conducts review of the JCALS acquisition and formally approves major system milestones.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): 14 February 2001

Project is in II PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: Oct 1993, System Development & Demonstration

JCALs is being implemented incrementally. ADM issued 5 August 1998 authorized deployment of Software Package (SWP) 2 capabilities to Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. ADM issued 7 December 1999 authorized deployment of SWP 2 to Air Force.

No significant weaknesses were identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 5%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance?

Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? March/April 2002 in conjunction with MS III review for JCALS SWP 3.1

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (FY 2002 Budget)? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes. JCALS was reduced \$57.7M in FY03, \$58.4M in FY04, and \$16.6M in FY05. Separately, Congress directed a \$10.2M RDTE increase in FY02. Were they pricing changes or program changes? Portions of the FY03-FY05 reduction were a result of anticipated cost savings to be generated from regionalization of JCALS data processing (pricing changes). Much of the anticipated savings were misidentified, as they applied to lower life cycle costs to be borne by the Services rather than direct JCALS program savings. The majority of reduction reflects movement of resources from JCALS to higher priority Army requirements that will necessitate program changes. Portions of the originally estimated reductions in life cycle costs for the Services will not be fully realized at current JCALS funding levels.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? FY03-FY05 reductions were directed at the component level.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? Resource costs and required adjustments to the JCALS acquisition strategy are still being developed. Army is still evaluating JCALS restructure options to mitigate impacts of the FY03-FY05 reduction. Shortfalls may necessitate delaying full JCALS Joint Technical Manual (JTM) implementation until FY06. Software components will be degraded due to truncation of SWP 3.3 development. Selected legacy systems that were to be replaced by JCALS (Air Force ATOS and Army STARPUBS) in FY 2003 will not be replaced until FY 2006 or beyond. This will result in costly legacy system maintenance. Operational readiness will be degraded at approximately 200 Air Force and 50 Army National Guard sites. In FY 2003, the completed JCALS software baseline could be deployed to nine of 18 required regional processing sites. This would allow internet access to JCALS for less than 60% of currently identified Joint Technical Manual (JTM) users. In FY 2003/2004, available OMA resources are insufficient to maintain existing levels of user support for the deployed JCALS capability. Options being evaluated to accommodate limited FY 2003/2004 OMA resource availability include reduction in helpdesk availability

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

from current 16 hour per day, seven day per week availability to eight hour per day, five day per week availability during FY 2003/2004, a two year freeze on Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) software upgrades, a two year moratorium on modifications to custom JCALS software (software maintenance drops would be reduced from four per year to one per year, with associated impacts to software reliability and currency) , reductions in resources allocated to engineering and program management functions until FY 2005, and obtaining customer reimbursement for selected support functions such as system administration in FY 2003/2004. The JCALS acquisition would resume in FY 2005 and user support would be restored to FY 2002 levels. Automation equipment required to implement the final nine regional sites will be acquired in FY 2005 and deployed in FY 2006. Necessary adjustments will be made to the JCALS capability beginning in FY 2006 to accommodate business process changes that occurred from FY 2003-FY 2005. The updated baseline will be fully implemented and the JCALS JTM acquisition will conclude in FY 2007.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
OMA	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.7
Total Dev Mod	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.7
Full Acquisition							
DBOF Capital Budget	143.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	143.7
OMA	455.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	455.9
OPA	170.3	64.9	24.8	2.4	2.5	229.1	494.0
RDTE, Army	0.0	44.1	46.9	2.6	2.2	17.4	113.2
Total Dev Mod	769.9	109.0	71.7	5.0	4.7	246.5	1206.8
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	36.6	21.6	28.3	32.3	30.6	127.6	277.0
MPA	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.0
Total Current Services	36.8	21.7	28.4	32.4	30.7	128.3	278.0
Total Resources by FY	830.4	130.7	100.1	37.4	35.4	374.8	1508.8

PART II. Justification and Other Information

F. Description/Performance Characteristics:

8. Description. JCALS provides automated tools to support improved methods of managing, acquiring, improving/updating, publishing, stocking and distributing Technical Manuals (TM). JCALS infrastructure is based on a distributed, open systems environment that makes extensive use of commercial standards, using Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) hardware and software in conjunction with developed software to provide global data management in a distributed environment. JCALS automated tools to support TM functions include a workflow manager, reference library, generic authoring, and electronic signature. JCALS is a designated target system, and can be easily adapted and expanded to support other weapon system acquisition and logistics management processes.
9. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan). JCALS addresses Joint Service requirements for management of integrated digital technical data in support of weapon system acquisition and logistics business processes. JCALS also establishes a powerful and robust enterprise to provide accurate and up to date technical data to personnel who maintain weapons systems and maintain operational readiness. Potential benefits to be derived include:
 - Improved/reengineered business processes.
 - A more timely and efficient flow of technical, logistic and acquisition data between Government and industry.
 - A reduction in the time required to develop weapon systems technical data.
 - A reduction in use of bulky paper, to include reduced storage requirements.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- A reduction in Operation and Support costs through interfaces to and replacement of existing legacy systems.

These long-term benefits will provide enhanced information technology capabilities to the DoD resulting in increased war fighting capabilities. JCALS will help maintain US qualitative superiority in support of national defense in key war fighting capabilities (e.g. information warfare, logistics).

10. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches. Army developed the initial plan for a comprehensive Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistics Support capability in 1987. The Milestone 0 for Army CALS was conducted in 1988. An Army specific Milestone I was conducted in January 1991. In October 1991, OSD directed that the Army program be converted to a Joint program. Based on this decision, a Joint Mission Needs Statement (MNS) was developed and approved for JCALS in 1992. In addition, a more detailed Technical Manual Functional Description (TMFD) was prepared and approved in 1992 that identified specific functionality desired for Joint Technical Manuals (JTM), the first functional business process to be automated through JCALS. JTM functional requirements have been repeatedly updated and refined as interim releases of JCALS have been implemented and the JTM community has updated their business processes to reflect availability of new technology and updated and improved business processes. In addition, the JCALS MNS was revised, updated, and reapproved in 1998. An Operational Requirements Document (ORD) is not required for the JCALS JTM acquisition. JCALS was already being developed with well defined functional requirements when ORDs were added to the information systems acquisition process. As a result, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) (ASD(C3I)), the JCALS Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) waived the ORD requirement for JCALS
11. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. JCALS is a designated target system. Two cost alternatives were developed and validated as the basis for selecting the JCALS Technical Manual (TM) Program alternative. The first alternative was to continue using manual, paper-based methods. The second (preferred) alternative was to automate/re-engineer the six TM business processes to provide a modernized environment (JCALS) for TM users. JCALS will be certified and accredited to process information up to the Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) level,

commensurate with the DoD Common Criteria Controlled Access Protection Profile (CAPP) Evaluation Assurance Level 3 (EAL3), formerly known as C2, in the Systems High mode of operation.

G. Program Management/Management Oversight:

3. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?
The process owner for the Technical Manual (TM) business process is the joint logistics community led by the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense (Logistics and Materiel Readiness) (DUSD(L&MR)). Army is the Executive Agent for JCALS. . The functional Executive Agent within Army is Army's Logistics Integration Agency, The project is managed by the Project Manager (PM). PM JCALS is assigned to the Program Executive Officer for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS), who reports directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE). The contracting office for the JCALS acquisition is the US Army Communications Electronics Command (CECOM) Acquisition Center – Washington.
4. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.

JCALs uses an Integrated Product Team (IPT) approach to properly manage the JCALS effort. An Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) (ASD(C3I)) led Overarching IPT provides oversight of the total program. The OIPT membership includes: ASD (C3I), DUSD(L&MR), OSD Director for OT&E, OSD PA&E, functional representatives of each military service, Army's Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications and Computers (DISC4), and the PEO and PM.

Action officers from these organizations constitute an Integrating IPT (IIPT), co-chaired by ASD(C3I) and DUSD(L&MR). The IIPT meets frequently to review the progress of the program to attain the goals set forth in the 14 February 2001 ADM, and to facilitate attainment of the upcoming Milestone III Decision Review for JCALS SWP 3.1.

PM JCALS has also established Working Level IPTs to help continuously monitor the overall program status and manage various facets of JCALS. These IPTs include: Integrating, Supportability, Training, Deployment, Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA), Telecommunications, Security, Configuration Management, Transition/Cutover and Data Loading, Testing, and Functional Requirements Clarification.

PM JCALS employs regular meetings of a Configuration Control Board (CCB) to track user requirements and maintain controls over user Change Requests and Earned Value Management.

H. Acquisition Strategy:

7. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.
 - a. Phase III (Development), DAHC94-89-C-0008, Computer Sciences Corporation, Moorestown, New Jersey.
 - b. Defense Acquisition Logistics Information Management System (DALIMS) (Deployment and Sustainment), Computer Sciences Corporation, Moorestown, New Jersey.
8. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.
 - a. Phase III Development, DAHC89-C-0008. Design, development, and testing tasks are paid through a mix of Cost Plus Award Fee, Firm Fixed Price and Time and Materials based on the task performed. Decision on type of reimbursement for tasks performed was based on Best Value considerations with higher risk tasks allocated to Cost Plus portions of the contract and lower risk tasks for well defined requirements or Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) products allocated to Fixed Price portions of the contract.
 - b. DALIMS. Contract type is Firm Fixed Price Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity. Decision on contract type was based on the fact that DALIMS is a follow on contract to support continuation of ongoing deployment and sustainment tasks. There will be little change in the type of tasks or mix of tasks to be performed. Given that a well defined set of tasks with

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

known costs were being performed, the government selected a Firm Fixed Price instrument as providing Best Value to the government for these efforts.

9. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.
 - a. Phase III Development, DAHC89-C-0008 is performance based. Performance goals are timely completion of individual Software Packages (SWPs).
 - b. DALIMS is not performance based.

N. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

9. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify. The life cycle cost for the JCALS program, based upon a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) cost excursion, dated June 1999, is \$3,208.9M in current year dollars. The benefits associated with the JCALS TM Program are classified into quantifiable and non-quantifiable benefits. Quantifiable benefits include increased management productivity; reduced storage, printing, and mailing costs; and lower costs for TM change and review processes. The CBA cost excursion, dated June 1999, estimated that TM quantifiable benefits would total \$1,801M (FY98 constant dollars). Benefits were categorized as savings, productivity enhancements and cost avoidance. Projected savings resulting from JCALS supported improvements to technical manual business processes have already been harvested from individual military service budgets. The JCALS TM Program provides a benefit-investment ratio or Return on Investment (ROI) of 1.6 to 1 in constant FY98 dollars (CBA). The entire cost of JCALS Infrastructure was included when calculating the TM ROI. The ROI is estimated to be 4.1 to 1.0 for the TM application only. As additional functionality is incorporated into JCALS, benefits should increase significantly with only moderate increases in costs, resulting in a significantly higher ROI. JCALS costs and benefits in the CBA were based on a decision to automate and re-engineer the six TM business processes to provide an enhanced TM environment for users, with a fully distributed open system architecture, including required hardware, software, communications and support capabilities.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PM JCALS completed a Regionalization study in July 2001. Based on the results of this study, the program has adopted a revised acquisition strategy to improve JCALS affordability and expand the availability of JCALS to TM and other users. The revised acquisition strategy calls for JCALS data processing to be accomplished at up to 18 regional sites with users accessing the system via the internet. The EA being prepared for the SWP 3.1 Milestone III will include an estimate of the costs and benefits resulting from such an approach based on the limited data currently available. These costs and benefits will be refined in the EA for the SWP 3.3 Milestone III based on the more detailed data that will be available at that time. PM JCALS ability to fully regionalize JCALS data processing and adopt an internet based access approach is contingent on completion of SWP 3.3 and replacement of the JCALS Global Data Management System (GDMS)and other custom software components with COTS products. PM JCALS is completing the Economic Analysis (EA) to support the SWP 3.1 Milestone III. Cost and benefit data will be updated once the EA has been validated and presented to the JCALS Milestone decision Authority (MDA).

10. Analysis of alternative options.

The current EA was initiated to compare a status quo state of pre-JCALS initiation, versus the full deployment of JCALS servers to all potential users. During EA preparation, the PM received approval to pursue a regionalization strategy, under which JCALS servers would be fielded to a limited number of regional sites, and “thin client” versions would be fielded to most users. The users would link to the regionalized processing centers in an internet-based network. This regionalized approach was incorporated into the EA, and is the preferred alternative.

11. Underlying assumptions.

The underlying assumptions for the 1999 CBA are:

- a. The cost estimate is prepared in FY 1998 constant \$ and in then year (inflated) \$
- b. JCALS will be deployed to a total of 440 sites and more than 31,000 users.
- c. The Life Cycle is FY 1999 - FY 2014
- d. The FOC is in FY 2004

12. Estimate of Risks.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

A description of the top five program risks is provided as follows:

1. Adjusted JCALS budgets in FY 2003 – FY 2005 could delay full implementation of the JCALS enterprise until FY 2006 or beyond and potentially force delays in completion of currently defined JCALS Software Package (SWP) 3.3 capabilities or reductions in JCALS SWP 3.3 functionality (risk is currently RED for delayed JCALS enterprise completion and yellow for JCALS SWP 3.3)
2. Testing issues could delay the SWP 3.1 Milestone III decision beyond February 2002. The impact would be to delay services' transition/cut-over from legacy systems. These systems are suffering performance degradations and are costly to maintain. (Risk is currently yellow).
3. Delays in completing program documentation could delay the SWP 3.1 Milestone III decision and or OSD CIO certification beyond February 2002. The impact would be to delay services' transition/cut-over from legacy systems. These systems are suffering performance degradations and are costly to maintain. (Risk is currently yellow)
4. Delays in completion of JCALS SWP 3.1 may require diversion of resources from SWP 3.3. This would delay the SWP 3.3 Milestone III decision beyond December 2002. The impact would be to delay services' transition/cutover from legacy systems not replaced by SWP 3.1. These systems are suffering performance degradations and are costly to maintain. (Risk is currently yellow).
5. Unforeseen technical or functional issues could preclude replacement of the JCALS GDMS and other custom software components with COTS products. This would increase the sustainment cost for JCALS and increase the risk that a regional processing approach with web based user access could be implemented in an optimum manner. (Risk is currently green)

O. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

14. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)

OSD has directed that new C4I systems and systems that interface to C4I systems be in compliance with the Joint Technical Architecture (JTA). The JTA in turn mandates use of the Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE). Reference is specifically made to C4ISR Architecture Framework, CISA-0000-104-96, Version 1.0, 7 June 1996, C4ISR Integration Task Force (ITF) Integrated Architectures Panel. This document presents an innovative definition of levels of interoperability. The DII COE adopts these levels of interoperability and maps DII compliance to interoperability levels. The COE defines eight progressively deeper levels of integration for the Runtime Environment Category. These levels are directly tied to the degree of interoperability achieved. True integration begins at Level 4. JCALS has been certified at Level 5 by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA). A migration strategy has been developed to achieve Level 8 integration as DISA puts platform-specific tools and test environments in place. This strategy will be predicated on funding availability for implementation.

15. Infrastructure Strategy:

Infrastructure Strategy: The majority of infrastructure supporting JCALS application software is acquired by PM JCALS using JCALS funds. Exceptions to this include user-provided desktop PCs/user workstations and most communications assets.

16. Are HW requirements included in this funding?

Hardware requirements for all JCALS data processing above the user desktop are included in this funding, including regionalized server requirements. End user organizations are responsible to furnish desktop PCs/user workstations for connection to JCALS. JCALS leverages existing communications assets where appropriate to support system data transport. Selected communications infrastructure to augment existing assets is included in JCALS hardware requirements where needed to support high volume intra-site data transport.

17. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The JCALS system uses the Defense Information Systems Network (DISN) as the primary means to route traffic among JCALS sites. Local Area Networks (LANs) provide the intra-site transport of data from users to the JCALS server. The JCALS acquisition strategy mandates the reuse of existing assets where feasible and augments these assets with JCALS acquired communications capabilities where necessary to assure adequate system responsiveness.

18. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?
JCALS uses existing infrastructure assets at sites that receive the JCALS capability. Where infrastructure needed to support JCALS is not available, PM JCALS provides this infrastructure during the JCALS deployment.
19. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?
JCALS is based on a mix of COTS and custom. However, the vast majority of JCALS software consists of COTS products. When COTS products are not available to satisfy functional requirements, custom components have been developed. PM JCALS and the prime contractor are constantly evaluating new COTS products to determine if these products can satisfy JCALS requirements and replace existing custom components. This helps assure that COTS products are used to the maximum extent possible in the development of JCALS. PM JCALS has initiated a contractual action to replace the developed JCALS middleware software and other custom components with COTS products to achieve better supportability and interoperability, which will substantially expand the JCALS functionality accommodated with COTS products.

Each JCALS site node runs an instance of GDMS and hosts a portion of the distributed database for the JCALS enterprise. Each of the site nodes that are part of the enterprise communicate with the other site nodes through a JCALS virtual private network (VPN) built on top of the NIPRNET. This VPN supports all database management server peer-to-peer communications and any remote administration from the contractor-operated central support facility. Each site node also contains one or more local application servers to support the site's JTM users. At very small site nodes, the data management server and application server would be physically merged. Otherwise, the local application servers will include one or more workstation servers to support user login, and may also include a JCALS Web server to support remote JTM users, a dedicated transaction processor, a dedicated page composition engine for production-level publishing, and may include various legacy

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

technical manual systems for which JCALS must provide external information exchange. Although JCALS was given the mandate to provide the entire JTM solution, JCALS was also directed to incorporate legacy systems where it was cost effective to do so rather than replace them.

In a future regionalized architecture, JTM users will gain full functional capability for login to a remote workstation server. Remote user login is currently supported but only at significant additional cost for hardware encryption add-ons to the PC-Client workstation, or with some loss of functional capability when using the alternative web browser interface. The current plan for the JCALS Next Generation Infrastructure Technology Insertion calls for full Web-based capability for all JTM functions at completion of the initial phase of next-generation development. This will give JTM users full thin-client access to regional workstation servers across the wide area network (WAN) via encrypted links using SSL-secured web browsers, in the standard configuration for E-Commerce. This regional concept is a shift in the WAN/LAN boundary. The existing capabilities for local PC-Client login will not change.

7. Describe the Data Architecture approach?

The applicable technical standards applied for JCALS information exchange rests upon TCP/IP in particular and modern internet standards in general. Where the interface to an external legacy applications server offers a workable API, JCALS will endeavor to implement the data exchange using the provided interface. Where the scope of the transfer is limited to exchange of formatted data and transaction files, JCALS will implement the interface using FTP. However, in those instances where JCALS must interface to a legacy system which does not comply with common internet standards, the inherent technical flexibility of JCALS allows for development of a workable interface based on the standards of the legacy system. This flexibility has been achieved through active JCALS initiatives to insert up to date technologies and refresh underlying JCALS COTS software products.

8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach? Part of the overall Log Architecture.

O. Security and Privacy:

7. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

The JCALS Information Assurance (IA) strategy focuses on properly securing JCALS data while providing ready access to required capabilities by authorized JCALS users and complying with applicable DoD Information Security regulations/policies. JCALS is currently accredited in accordance with the DoD Information Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). JCALS is currently certified and accredited to process information up to the Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) level and will migrate to the new DoD Common Criteria Controlled Access Protection Profile (CAPP) Evaluation Assurance Level 3 (EAL3), formerly known as C2, in the Systems High mode of operation. JCALS complies with DoD security advisory requirements and processes. JCALS participates in and closely monitors DoD efforts to enhance security through initiatives such as Defense-in-Depth, Public Key Infrastructure (PKI), Common Access Card (CAC), and Biometrics. As these technologies mature, they will be incorporated into the JCALS enterprise, enhancing JCALS security and providing a cost effective means to keep JCALS synchronized with evolving DoD security policy.

The JCALS Information Assurance Manager uses a collection of core "living" documents - the JCALS Security Document Set - to define IA objectives and requirements. The JCALS Security Document Set includes the following:

- The JCALS Security Policy. The overarching policy document that outlines IA objectives and requirements and spawns all subordinate documents.
- The JCALS Security SOP (JSSOP). Defines IA prerequisites, behaviors, and practices that must be conducted by all personnel affiliated with the JCALS Enterprise from user to JIAM.
- The JCALS Security Sustainment Architecture and Design (SSAID). Defines the JCALS sustaining base at the mid-level view, from the general to the specific, to clearly identify the components in JCALS that impact security and how they operate.
- The JCALS Configuration Guides. A series of documents, individually targeted for each JCALS server operating system, that define the configuration necessary to maintain and sustain the JCALS Security Policy.
- Security Sustainment Letters of Agreement (SSLOA). Executed with each JCALS site prior to Enterprise "merge", the SSLOA establishes the IA rules of engagement in terms of responsibilities to operate on the Enterprise.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Insertion Documentation. Consists of a series of documents used to add or change software or products as part of the development cycle. All of the documents in this insertion series require the same verbiage to explain the security that will be enacted, which enables the JISE and JIAM to effectively assess the IA validity of additions and changes before the insertion process starts.
 - The System Security Authorization Agreement (SSAA). IAW the DoD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP), this document is delivered to the JCALS Designated Approving Authority (DAA) on an iterative basis that outlines what JCALS is, what IA consists of, how certification is conducted, and the results of certification in the form of risk analysis with recommendations by the certifiers as to whether a DAA Authorization to Operate for continued sustainment should be granted.
8. Privacy assessments for this initiative.
There is no storage or exchange of personnel data in JCALS.
9. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?
JCALS, as a Public Key Interface (PKI) enabled application, is enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card (CAC). As such, JCALS is dependent on DoD and the Services to provide the necessary PKI infrastructure, CACs, and CAC readers to support access restrictions. JCALS has been developed based on the assumption that the DoD issued PKI certificate will be stored on a physical token in some form of externally provided Smart CAC. When JCALS regionalizes data processing and completes the ongoing migration from custom software components to COTS software products, access to the enterprise via the web will also be controlled via the credential stored in the externally provided CAC and associated CAC reader linked to the computing device from which each user accesses the internet.

P. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

System is designed to be consistent with GPEA goals.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

JCALs implementation is yielding large reductions in paper-based operations; however, the JCALS program is not specifically mentioned in the DoD Strategic GPEA Plan. The underlying JCALS infrastructure also provides a built in capability for electronic signature. However, implementation of this capability and its incorporation into the DoD Strategic GPEA Plan is the responsibility of the functional user community that implements such capabilities when desired.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

K. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

PM JCALS uses an Earned Value method of measuring performance. The JCALS Program is being implemented in blocks of functionality. These blocks are called Software Packages (SWPs). Following contract award the development contractor has 55 days to establish an Earned Value baseline. Schedule and cost performance are measured against that baseline and reported by the development contractor in the Cost/Schedule Status Report (C/SSR) on a monthly basis.

The prime development contractor is also required to report cost data by individual delivery order contract for the deployment phase of the program. This data is structured by site location. This data is used to validate that the Cost Plus type contract efforts for each deployment are managed to the value negotiated in the delivery order and to provide a monthly status of each JCALS deployment.

L. Original Baseline:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

The life cycle cost for the JCALS program, based upon a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) cost excursion, dated June 1999, is \$3,208.9M in current year dollars. This estimate is being updated in the Economic Analysis (EA) being prepared for JCALS SWP 3.1 MS III.

Performance benefits/goals are:

- Support weapon system life cycle processes from initial acquisition through logistic support to deactivation.
 - Modernize Service and DLA processes for the capture, management, interchange, and processing of acquisition and logistic technical information.
 - Automate the basic DoD CALS technical manual (TM) information infrastructure supporting processes of manage, acquire, improve, publish, stock, and distribute technical manuals.
 - Provide an integrated support environment through an Integrated Weapon System database (IWSDB) in which the user can perform all required functions from a single workstation.
 - Develop a basic infrastructure to provide interconnectivity and distributed data management.
- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment. If so, when and why.
The JCALS program was established as a joint DoD program in 1992. PM JCALS developed an initial APB when AIS programs transitioned to the DoD 5000 series of regulations. However, this draft APB was never finalized.

JCALs has never been formally baselined. The initial Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) was approved by the Services but the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) requested that the document be updated with the latest schedule information before final approval. The MDA issued an additional Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) in February 2001. Based on direction in that ADM, the APB is again being revised. The final APB based on approved CBA data for the JCALS SWP 3.1 Milestone III will be provided in conjunction with this Milestone.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Milestone III for SWP 3.1 is scheduled for March 2002. An initial JCALS capability (SWPs 1 and 2) has been completed. OSD issued an Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) on August 5, 1998 granting authority to field SWP 2 to Army, Navy, and Marine Corps sites. A separate ADM was issued on 7 Dec 99 to authorize deployment of SWP 2 to Air Force sites. The Air Force G022 Technical Order system was turned-off on 19 July 1999 and the Air Force began operational use of JCALS on 19 August 1999. Air Force is now using JCALS to manage all Technical Orders (Technical Manuals).

A lesson learned during the Air Force cut over from G022 was that both PM JCALS and the customer underestimated the level of effort needed to properly cut over TM functions from service specific legacy systems to JCALS. Given this, additional time has been allocated to move supported Army, Navy, and Marine Corps business processes from service specific legacy systems.

- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? Yes. Proposed Milestone C’s for SWP 3.1 and SWP 3.3 have been changed to Milestone III’s. Milestone III for SWP 3.1 has slipped from September 2001 to March 2002. Milestone III for SWP 3.3 has slipped from June 2002 to December 2002.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	830.5	120.3	89.4	95.3	93.9	395.2	1624.6
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	830.4	130.7	100.1	37.4	35.4	374.8	1508.8

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	(0.1)	10.4	10.7	(57.9)	(58.5)	(20.4)	(115.8)
Schedule Goals (months)							

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President’s Budget submission? Yes.
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives?
 FY 2001 and FY 2002 increases resulted from Congressional increases to JCALS. The FY 2001 increase allowed the PM to address revised functional requirements that surfaced during development and testing of SWP 3.1. Although increased funding mitigated the impact of the required SWP 3.1 adjustments, it was necessary to delay final testing of SWP 3.1 products in order to implement the required changes. Although this decision delays SWP 3.1 and SWP 3.3 MS III approvals by six months, it will result in a higher quality product that properly addresses user requirements and better supports user defined business processes. FY 2002 Congressional increase will be used to evaluate extension of improved technical data to the warfighter/tactical user and to facilitate greater support and training for the user community. It will also be used to facilitate efforts to evolve JCALS into a more open, Internet-based architecture.
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance.
 Decreases in FY 2003 reflect movement of resources by Army from JCALS to higher Army priorities and pricing changes (savings) attributable to the JCALS regionalization initiative. Since the final JCALS developmental milestone (MS III for SWP 3.3) will occur in December 2002, these changes should not impact any developmental milestone. JCALS was reduced \$57.7M in FY03. Resource costs and required adjustments to the JCALS acquisition strategy are still being developed. Army is still evaluating JCALS restructure options to mitigate impacts of the remainder of the FY 2003 reduction. Remaining

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

shortfalls may necessitate delaying full JCALS Joint Technical Manual (JTM) implementation from FY 2004 to FY 2006 or beyond. In FY 2003, a limited capability JCALS SWP 3.3 software baseline could be deployed to nine of 18 required regional processing sites. This would allow internet access to JCALS for less than 60% of currently identified Joint Technical Manual (JTM) users. In FY 2003, available OMA resources are insufficient to maintain existing levels of user support for the deployed JCALS capability. Options being evaluated to accommodate limited FY 2003 OMA resource availability include reduction in helpdesk availability from current 16 hour per day, seven day per week availability to eight hour per day, five day per week availability, a freeze on Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) software upgrades, a moratorium on modifications to custom JCALS software, reductions in resources allocated to engineering and program management functions, and customer reimbursement for selected support functions such as system administration.

- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means).
Upon completion of ongoing analyses to determine impact of these reductions on the currently defined JCALS baseline, PM JCALS will brief the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT at the upcoming Milestone III review for SWP 3.1. The PM will adjust program schedule and establish a revised APB based on currently available funding and present his plans for adjusting system functionality and program schedule to assure an executable acquisition strategy.
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance.
Decreases in FY 2004 – 2005 reflect movement of resources by Army from JCALS to higher Army priorities and pricing changes (savings) attributable to the JCALS regionalization initiative. JCALS was reduced \$58.4M in FY 2004 and \$16.6M in FY 2005. Resource costs and required adjustments to the JCALS acquisition strategy are still being developed. Army anticipates that a portion of the FY 2004 reduction and the entire FY 2005 reduction can be accommodated through regionalization of JCALS data processing. Army is still evaluating JCALS restructure options to mitigate impacts of the remainder of the FY04 reduction. Remaining shortfalls may necessitate delaying full JCALS Joint Technical Manual (JTM) implementation until FY 2006. FY 2004 resources would support internet access to JCALS for up to 60% of currently identified Joint Technical Manual (JTM) users. In FY 2004, available OMA resources are insufficient to maintain existing levels of user support for the deployed JCALS capability. Options being evaluated to accommodate limited FY 2004 OMA

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

resource availability include reduction in helpdesk availability from current 16 hour per day, seven day per week availability to eight hour per day, five day per week availability, a freeze on Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) software upgrades, a moratorium on modifications to custom JCALS software, reductions in resources allocated to engineering and program management functions, and customer reimbursement for selected support functions such as system administration. The JCALS acquisition would resume in FY 2005 and user support would be restored to FY 2002 levels. Automation equipment required to implement the final seven regional sites will be acquired in FY 2005 and deployed in FY 2006. Necessary adjustments will be made to the JCALS capability beginning in FY 2006 to accommodate business process changes that occurred from FY 2003-FY 2005. The updated baseline will be fully implemented and the JCALS JTM acquisition will conclude in FY 2007.

- If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe.
Portions of the FY03-FY05 reduction were a result of anticipated cost savings to be generated from regionalization of JCALS data processing (pricing changes). Current projections are that movement to a regional processing structure will allow us to deploy and sustain the defined JCALS enterprise at a significantly lower cost in FY 2003 and beyond.

- I. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:** Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work, what you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent.
3. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule. The JCALS Mission Needs Statement (MNS) and TM Functional Description (TMFD) identify requirements for the4 JCALS JTM acquisition effort. The program office is executing an evolutionary acquisition strategy to achieve these capabilities. JCALS will be developed and fielded in three Software Packages (SWPs). The first two SWPs have already been deployed to 117 JCALS sites. SWP 3 has been subdivided into two increments SWP 3.1 and SWP 3.3. IOC will be achieved upon the completion of SWP 3.3 and its implementation to regional sites that can be implemented in FY 2003. FOC will be achieved in

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

FY 2006 when the remaining regional processing sites are implemented to allow support of the entire defined JCALS JTM user population

4. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.
FY 2001: Complete development of SWP 3.1 and begin full scale testing of SWP 3.1. Complete design of SWP 3.3 and commence SWP 3.3 development. Begin implementation of JCALS GOTS to COTS software cut over. Begin design of JCALS regionalized data processing initiative.
FY 2002: Complete testing of SWP 3.1, obtain SWP 3.1 deployment approval, and implement SWP 3.1 as a software release to users/sites to whom SWPs 1 and 2 have already been deployed. Complete SWP 3.3 development and begin full scale testing of SWP 3.3. Continue implementation of JCALS COTS to GOTS software cut over. Complete design/development of JCALS regionalized data processing initiative and begin load analysis, infrastructure sizing, and testing of internet based JCALS enterprise.
FY 2003: Complete testing of SWP 3.3. Complete implementation of JCALS GOTS to COTS software cut over. Complete testing of internet based JCALS enterprise. Concurrently obtain deployment approval for JCALS SWP 3.3, updated COTS software baseline, and regionalized data processing initiative. Deploy regionalized JCALS data processing infrastructure, updated COTS software baseline and SWP 3.3 to up to 11 regional sites. Move all existing JCALS users from client/server access of SWP 3.1 on installation based processors at 117 sites to internet access of JCALS SWP 3.3 on regional processors. Provide internet access to additional JCALS users based on available capacity of nine regional data processing sites. Shut down JCALS acquisition and sustain deployed enterprise.
FY 2004-07: Sustain deployed JCALS enterprise in FY 2004. Restart JCALS acquisition in FY 2005. Begin required enhancements to accommodate improved JTM business processes. Ramp up and train acquisition work force in FY 2005. Acquire remaining regional processing infrastructure required to support JCALS enterprise in FY 2005-2006. Deploy remaining regional JCALS data processing capacity in FY 2006. Shutdown JCALS acquisition in FY 2007 and sustain deployed JCALS JTM enterprise.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

7. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.
SWP 3.1 is currently being operationally tested. All indications are that it will be finished on schedule. There are three major development/acquisition efforts planned for FY 2002. In the event that there is a negative cost or schedule variance in any of these initiatives, the PM will use the existing CCB and IPT structures to assess alternatives to modify remaining JCALS functionality to fit within available resources and schedule. Options will be presented to the JCALS IIPT and where appropriate the JCALS OIPT for final adjudication.
8. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.
These actions will allow the PM to use Cost as an Independent Variable (CAIV) to control schedule and achieve optimal performance based on available resources.
9. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.
Primary risk is obtaining consensus from the functional user community, the CIO/acquisition oversight community, and testing community on a common set of goals for the JCALS acquisition effort. Aggressive use of the existing CCB and IPT structure coupled with early involvement of the MDA and the OIPT to resolve contentious issues is the preferred method to mitigate these risks.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Joint Simulation System (JSIMS).

Budget Initiative Number: 2148

IT Registration System Number 069 (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: Yes No

Information Technology Project or National Security System: Yes No

Program Activity/Mission Area: C&CI Science and Technology (Modeling and Simulation)

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: July 1995

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; _____ and of Project _____.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): December 16, 1999

Project is in EMD PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: October 9, 1998 Phase as of current review.

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed. (Describe, BRIEFLY).

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: N/A

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months?

JSIMS is currently processing the CIO assessment through the Army ODISC4

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review

Were they pricing changes or program changes? Yes No

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? Yes No

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

An Acquisition Program Baseline was signed March 21, 2001. A new Program Office Estimate (POE), including a new life cycle cost estimate, is scheduled for completion in March 2002. A Cost and Economic Analysis Center (CEAC) review of the POE is scheduled for March 2002. The CAIG will review the POE prior to an Army Systems Acquisition Review Council (ASARC) review, and the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) are scheduled for completion by late May 2002.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial Management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Part I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
RDTE	110.8	0.0	30.7	24.2	27.4	106.5	299.6
Total Dev Mod	110.8	0.0	30.7	24.2	27.4	106.5	299.6
Full Acquisition							
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	0.0	0.0	6.9	8.3	8.0	32.1	55.3

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Total Current Services	0.0	0.0	6.9	8.3	8.0	32.1	55.3
Total Resources by FY	110.8	0.0	37.6	32.5	35.4	138.6	354.9

Part II. Justification and Other Information

G. Description/Performance Characteristics:

12. Description. JSIMS is a next-generation Modeling and Simulation (M&S) tool to support training for commanders in chiefs (CINCs), their components, joint task force (JTF) staffs, other Joint organizations, DoD agencies, and the Services. JSIMS will provide the ability to jointly train, educate, develop doctrine and tactics, formulate and assess operational plans, assess warfighting situations, define operational requirements, provide operational input into the development of new weapon systems and perform mission planning and mission rehearsal.

13. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan).

JSIMS will support training in all phases of military operations and military operations other than war (OOTW). JSIMS will allow warfighters to train as they intend to fight by interfacing into the simulation through their real-world C4I systems. JSIMS is key in supporting the operational concepts of Joint Experimentation and will improve the interoperability and efficiencies of the Services. JSIMS helps to meet DoD mission, long-term strategic goals and objectives as a key training and exercise component of JV2010. It will be the centerpiece of future Joint and Service training. JSIMS will greatly improve training efficiency by allowing for distributed, joint, and interoperational training based on the latest doctrine. JSIMS also plays an important role in fulfilling DoD’s Modeling and Simulation Master Plan, DoD 5000.59-P. DoD is phasing out legacy M&S programs in favor of flagship programs, which share common architectures, standards, and protocols. JSIMS is the

flagship program for all future training M&S. JSIMS receives technical and acquisition guidance from the Defense Modeling and Simulation Office (DMSO), the Director, Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E), and training guidance from the DoD EXCIMS Training Council

14. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches.

Each Service at the two-star level and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) Secretariat reviewed the JSIMS Mission Need Statement (MNS) dated 20 July 1994. On 23 June 1999, the JSIMS Operational Requirements Document (ORD), version 3.0, was approved by the JROC and the ORD's Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) were validated.

15. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. In accordance with DoD Regulation 5000.2R and CJCSI 3170.01, the System Performance paragraph (paragraph 4.1) of the current ORD outlines four key performance parameters (KPPs). The objectives of the KPPs are: (a) Tailorability–Operational Tasks and Conditions: Support the full range of Universal Joint Task List (UJTL) tasks and conditions described in the CJCS Manual 3500.04 series; (b) Composability–Trainer User C4I Systems Interface: Full integration with all Joint, Service, and Special Operations C4I systems; (c) Composability–Distributed Simulation Environment: JSIMS should support Service distribution to deployed platforms and units to allow collaborative exercises at geographically remote sites; and (d) Other–Simulation System Uptime Ration: Achieve 95 percent system availability during a 14-day, 24-hour-per-day computer-assisted exercise.

H. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

JSIMS receives oversight and management from several forums. The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) oversees the operational requirements of JSIMS including KPPs. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, USD(AT&L), designated JSIMS an Acquisition Category (ACAT) 1D program on 16 December 1999. Effective 1 October 2001 BG Stephen M. Seay, USA, was designated the Program Manager (PM) for JSIMS. The program is currently being restructured as a result of these decisions with major revisions required to the JSIMS memorandum of agreement (MOA) between OSD, Service and agency partners, the Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) and architecture.

2. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.
As a result of being designated an ACAT 1D program, an overarching integrated process team (OIPT) and integrating integrated process team (IIPT) with associated working integrated process team (WIPTs) were established.

I. Acquisition Strategy:

10. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded. Since the rebaseline, the JSIMS Alliance Executive (AE), (a Senior Executive Service position provides by the Navy), performs the day-to-day management activities for the Alliance. Officers and civilians primarily staff the AE Office (AEO) with additional support from Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) technical experts and other contractor organizations. The AEO provides both program and system integration across the Alliance.
11. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen. N/A
12. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract. N/A

P. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

13. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify.
14. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.)
An AoA will be performed in preparation for the May ASARC and DAB Program Review, in order to determine the most cost-effective solution for a Version Release (VR) schedule after VR 1.0.
15. Underlying assumptions. Meeting the Services requirement to provide Title X functionality as quickly as possible, and thus transition away from the more expensive legacy simulation system
16. Estimate of Risks.
Moderate risk exists between JSIMS VR functionality and delivery schedule meeting the Services Title X functionality and delivery requirements. The JRCB is currently reviewing and validating JSIMS requirements to ensure Service needs are met on the right timeline. Cost and schedule trades will be reviewed in the AoA.

Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

20. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)
The JSIMS System Segment Description Document (SSDD) lays out the Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) compliance.
21. Infrastructure Strategy:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Per JTA 1.0 Modeling and Simulation Annex, JSIMS will be fully High Level Architecture (HLA) compliant IAW DoD policy. Effective in December 1999, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology, DUSD (S&T), directed a change from the current JSIMS architecture from a High Level Design (HLD) to a more open, interoperable federated HLA. This would include mandated common components, thus enhancing interoperability, scalability and extensibility, and leverage the investment already made in the current JSIMS developments (domain models, simulation engine, mission space objects).

22. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided?
The individual Services and CINCs will purchase hardware or they will use what they currently have in place. Hardware specifications are being developed and will call for commercially available open systems.
23. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?
JSIMS will utilize the Defense Information Infrastructure to link training locations.
24. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?
None. JSIMS is being designed to function within the existing base level infrastructure.
25. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?
JSIMS is based on a mix of COTS and custom built software. RDTE funds are for development of software and related efforts.
26. Describe the Data Architecture approach?
JSIMS will utilize the High Level Architecture internal to the simulation across a TCP/IP backbone, and will utilize the SIPRNET to pass simulation communications between training facilities
27. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach?
2148/Joint Simulation System (JSIMS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

JSIMS will employ the DoD High Level Architecture (HLA) for Modeling and Simulation. The HLA is a framework for the interoperability of simulations. Its purpose is to reduce the cost of simulation interoperability and thereby encourage broader use of a given DoD simulation investment. As a DoD program, JSIMS will only use DoD accepted versions of the HLA Specification. Version 1.3 is the current and only DoD accepted HLA Specification.

Q. Security and Privacy:

10. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

JSIMS will employ DII COE, AFDI and NSA C2 Configuration Guide, supplied by NSA SCC team, as the standard JSIMS OS configuration. Each JSIMS alliance federation will provide the functional security capabilities and assurance as defined in DCID 6/3 to meet the protection level two (PL2) security requirements necessary for each federation to operate at System High and protection level four (PL4) security requirements for trusted interfaces (SFC) between the SECRET and SCI Federations.

11. Privacy assessments for this initiative.

Controllers, commanders, staff, and training support personnel set up and execute JSIMS exercises. All users and observers will possess a clearance commensurate with their access and participation level. That is, TS/SCI (additional accesses may be required) for the TS/SCI federation, and SECRET for the Secret and below federation. JSIMS users will not necessarily have need-to-know privileges to access all data or functionality for JSIMS as a whole or for their federation. System-High mode is required for the TS/SCI and Secret federation exercises.

12. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?

The JSIMS Security team plans to establish a viable DoD Common Access Card hardware solution for VR 2.0 in FY04. Given the Joint application of JSIMS, it is cost effective to wait until each of the services are fully converted prior to JSIMS producing a hardware solution.

R. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

2148/Joint Simulation System (JSIMS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why. JSIMS is not an application program.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

M. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

An Earned Value (EV) Management System is used within the JSIMS Alliance. Reports are submitted on a monthly basis to PM JSIMS. Several of the partner programs are rebaselining their programs resulting from the JSIMS program changes.

N. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment. If so, when and why. Yes.

In December 1999, Dr. Gansler, USD(AT&L), signed a JSIMS Program Acquisition Decision Memorandum that designated the program as an Acquisition Category (ACAT) 1D. In addition the memorandum directed changes in technical approach and management structure. This Acquisition Strategy incorporates changes resulting from implementation of the changes directed in the memorandum. Additional changes will be forthcoming as the program initiates and moves to a “block” strategy. In

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

approving this strategy, the USD(AT&L) as the milestone decision authority (MDA) is authorizing continued development of JSIMS in accordance with the development methodology and management structure described herein.

- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? Yes.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	110.8	42.3	37.6	32.5	35.4	137.2	395.8
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	110.8	0.0	37.6	32.5	35.4	138.6	354.9
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	0.0	(42.3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	(40.9)

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President’s Budget submission? No.
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance.
The Variance from Baseline goals is based upon the current President's Budget and the Program Office Estimate (POE). The POE is currently being completed and is scheduled for review with the Army Cost and Economic Analysis Center in March 2002. Also, the OSD/CAIG has not completed its Cost Assessment on the program that will affect the variances listed above.
 - Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means).
The variance will be reviewed by the MDA/IPT during the May 2002 DAB Program Review.
 - If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance.
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe.
- J. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:** Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —
4. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.
The JSIMS ORD and Concept of Operations (CONOPS) were reviewed and coordinated with the program requirements sponsor, the US Joint Forces Command Warfighting Center (USJFCOM-JWFC) in FY97. The updated ORD recommends four KPPs with threshold and objective values. Both were staffed and reviewed by the JSIMS Executive and Development Agents (EAs and DAs). These KPPs, as well as the Joint Universal Capabilities List (JUCLs), were used as the basis for the preparation and approval of the APB document. An evaluation of the status of the program's success against these KPPs and JUCLs will be reported by USJFCOM-JWFC in conjunction with the approved APB. The rebaselined JSIMS will not deviate

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

from the KPPs and JUCLs. The revised APB will reflect funding required to meet the KPPs reflected in the current ORD approved by the JROC on 23 June 1999.

5. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.
FY 2001: Federation Integration Events (FIE) 1 and FIE2
FY 2002: FIE 3, FIE4, and FIE5; Joint Functional Assessment; Version Release Milestone 1.0
FY 2003: VRM 1.0 Operational Test, Initial Operational Capability.
FY 2004-07: VRM 2.0, VRM 3.0, and VRM 4.0.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

10. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.
The JSIMS Requirements Control Board (JRCB) and JROC will CAIV functionality from one VR to the next or adjust the VR delivery schedule out to accommodate the negative variance.
11. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.
Reducing the cost variances will require the VR delivery dates to slip or functionality traded to later VRs or some combination of both.
12. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The toughest barrier to working the funding/cost goals is communications across nine development agents and the four Service and Joint executive agents. The JSIMS Risk Management Board will work funding risks through the Cost and Acquisition WIPT as well as the JSIMS IIPT. The JRCB and JROC will also determine the acceptable level of functionality, which will allow JSIMS to meet cost goals.

Department of Defense
Joint Tactical Radio System - Ground
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Army Knowledge Management (AKM)

Budget Initiative Number: 6430

IT Registration System Numbers: Army: DA03112 DOD: AB101527

Mission Critical Status: Yes.

Information Technology Project or National Security System: IT System

Program Activity/Mission Area: Functional Area Application, Science and Technology

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: 1996

Projected Date for Completion of Phase: N/A and of Project: N/A.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)? AKM is not an acquisition project.

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): IF NO ADM, EXPLAIN WHAT: AKM is not an acquisition project, it is a strategic plan. Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Army approval of AKM Strategic Plan in August 2001, and CIO/G6 Investment Strategy Working Group (ISWG) Approval, Fall 2001)

Project is in O&M PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: 08 August 2001 Phase as of current review.

6430/Army Knowledge Management- IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed.

Reviewed annually as part of the CIO/G6 Investment Strategy Working Group (ISWG) process and the CIO Executive Board.

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations? No

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 15-20%

The events of 9-11-01 caused us to establish a fail-over hot-site for continuity of operations to support Homeland Defense and Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). AKM is an integral part of the IA program and works in conjunction with IA support from other IA programs.

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance?

Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status? AKM is a strategy to help the Army meet the requirements of the CCA.

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months?

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G? (Done, see part 2, Section G.)

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)? Yes.

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes. DERF Funding. Based on FY02 Amended Budget.

Were they pricing changes or program changes? Program Changes.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? Component Level.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? Standard costing procedures.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? N/A (Talk to your FM)

What percentage is financial N/A, for your component? (In FY 2003) (Determine this with your FM.)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

ARMY	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
RDTE	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Total Dev Mod	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Full Acquisition							
OPA	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Totals Dev Mod	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
Maintenance/ Current Services							
OMA	30.5	15.6	7.4	17.7	22.4	97.7	190.8
Totals Current Services	30.5	15.6	7.4	17.7	22.4	97.7	190.8
Totals Resources by FY	33.7	18.4	7.4	17.7	22.4	97.7	196.8

PART II. Justification and Other Information

H. Description/Performance Characteristics:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

1. Description. Army Knowledge Management (AKM) is a Chief of Staff / Secretary of the Army strategy to transform the Army into a network-centric, collaborative, knowledge-based force. It includes Army Knowledge Online (AKO), which is the Army's enterprise portal to data, information and knowledge. AKM strategy includes moving from decentralized C4/IT investment management to an enterprise portfolio management focus. It includes changing policies and governance mechanisms to ensure program integration, implementation of best business practices, provision of web-enabled business solutions, and improved IT infrastructure management capabilities. The Chief of Staff of the Army and the Secretary of the Army endorsed the AKM strategy on 8 August 2001 in a formal guidance memorandum.
2. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan). AKM is an integral part of the on-going Army Transformation. It intends to improve decision dominance by warfighters and business stewards--in battlespaces, organizations, and mission practices. Supports QDR Goal 6, Leveraging information technology and innovative concepts to develop an interoperable, joint C4ISR architecture and capability that includes a tailorable joint operational picture. Supports QDR Tenet 7, Transforming Defense.
3. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches. Pilot application of the AKO Portal; development of the AKM Strategic Plan and its subsequent endorsement by SECARMY & CSA and approval by the Army CIOEB.
4. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. The AKM / AKO approach was selected based on proven commercial and Government benchmarks related to enterprise infostructure management, e-business, the principles of organizational collaborative effort and knowledge management were employed with specific software tools implemented in a network-centric IT environment.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

B. Program Management/Management Oversight:

5. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?

Process Owner: HQDA, Chief Information Officer (CIO) and G6.

Executive Agent: Director, Army Enterprise Integration

Program Manager: Director, Army Knowledge Management

Contracting Office: Defense Contracting Command – Washington (DCC-W) (formerly DSS-W)

6. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.
IPT approach is used. Resources are reviewed by the Army CIO Executive Board, in the Investment Strategy Working Group (ISWG), a structured process using the “Equity” model to validate various requirements relative to risk and dependencies on other efforts.

J. Acquisition Strategy: N/A, AKM / AKO is not an acquisition program.

13. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.
14. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.
15. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.

Q. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

17. Cost/benefit analysis, including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify. AKM offers strong intangible mission returns, which are hard to quantify. ROI's are included in the individual system programs.
18. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.) n/a
19. Underlying assumptions. AKM principles are compatible with best business practices of Government and industry. The web-basing of information systems, networks and portals will remain the dominant technology for the foreseeable future.
20. Estimate of Risks. AKM's linkage to QDR, DOD and Army transformation efforts minimizes risk. The AKO Portal employs commercially available hardware and software, minimizing the technological risks.

R. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

28. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)
Yes. Fully compliant with the JTA, JTA-A, GIG, and evolving Army objective force architectures.
29. Infrastructure Strategy: A fully compliant, compatible, robust, available, ubiquitous enterprise presence for the Army, within a Joint environment.
30. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided? Yes.
31. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?
Underlying transport is provided by the NIPRNET and SIPRNET.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

32. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)? AKM / AKO Portal are fully dependent on many other acquisitions and programs, as the AKO Portal rides atop the DISA networks, the base-level communications infrastructure, the local organization-level desktop OA environments, and the functional application systems.
33. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?
COTS.
7. Describe the Data Architecture approach? N/A. AKM / AKO Portal is not a data system, but rather a portal capability that quickly guides users to sources of data contained in various data systems and information repositories that are distributed across the Army enterprise.
8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach? Implement a portal capability as the keystone piece of the enterprise architecture to be Army's single entry point; to authenticate users; to provide users expeditious access to data, information, training and knowledge.

S. Security and Privacy:

13. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth). All standard DOD security approaches.
14. Privacy assessments for this initiative. N/A. Privacy issues are dealt with by the various systems of record themselves. AKO portal does not contain any Privacy Act data, rather it links users to data sources that have already been made compliant with Privacy Act requirements.
15. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when? Single sign-on with the CAC is to be implemented as part of the Army roll-out of the DOD CAC.

T. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) #If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why.

The AKO portal is not a data processing system with volumes of records, nor does it serve a repository function. It is a web portal that functions as the Army's single internal access gateway whereby Army personnel and employees enter a private electronic domain. The AKO Portal validates the user to be in this domain, and once validated, users are linked to official sources of Army data and records. The systems to which the AKO Portal links the user is where the aspects of GPEA have been addressed by their respective owners.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

O. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

- Weekly progress/status reviews within CIO / G6.
- Monthly progress/status reviews with key Army participants.
- AKO Portal metrics being established for technology side (number of users, repeat users, uploads, downloads, uptime, response time, etc.)
- AKM metrics being established for functional side (best practices posted, best practices implemented, cycle time reductions, etc)
- Quarterly review and approval by the Army CIO Executive Board.

P. Original Baseline:

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? If so, when and why. N/A.
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget? N/A.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	Cum Total FY 2004-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline: (PB02)						
Cost Goals (\$M)	33.7	10.8	8.4	8.4	42.5	103.8
Schedule Goals (milestones)						
b. Current Estimate:						
Cost Goals (\$M)	33.7	18.4	7.4	17.7	97.7	190.8
Schedule Goals (months)						
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:						
Cost Goals (\$M)	0.0	7.6	-1.0	9.3	55.1	87.0
Schedule Goals (months)						

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? N/A, this is our first submission.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives?
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance.
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means).
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance.
Changes in AKM / AKO Portal are due to internal Army program changes owing to the SECARMY / CSA memo of 8 August 2001 that compressed milestones from 5 years down to 2 years while greatly expanding AKO's user population, and the events of September 11, 2001, which necessitated the AKO Portal immediately providing help desk support on a 24/7 basis plus the development of a COOP site fail-over capability to support both Homeland Defense and Global War on Terrorism needs.
- If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe.

K. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline: Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —

5. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule. Goal of AKM/AKO Portal is to support the transformation of the Army to a network-centric basis, where business and tactical environments are transparent, where access to data, information and knowledge is readily available, and where the larger institution becomes a self-learning organization. To date Army has: implemented governance controls; established the CIO Executive Board for centralized oversight of the Army C4ITM Budget; developed numerous Army and non-Army partnerships; developed an infostructure management plan; established the AKO Portal; and devised a human capital

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

framework for knowledge workers. We have achieved over 830,000 AKO portal user accounts out of the target population of 1.2 million persons and are piloting AKM across the Military District-Washington this year.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

6. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.
FY 2001: Ensure that 1.2 million soldiers, civilian employees and selected contractor personnel have accounts on the AKO portal.
FY 2002: Assure hot-site fail-over capability to support Homeland Defense and Global War on Terrorism. Achieve 99.999% uptime.
FY 2003: Assure that Mission Critical and Mission Essential systems are webified and accessible via AKO Portal, unless waived.
FY 2004-07: 100% of CIO Assessment initiatives incorporate AKM principles; number of systems consolidated or eliminated.

13. **Cost and Schedule Corrective actions:** Not Applicable.

Department of Defense
Maneuver Control System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: MEPCOM INTEGRATED RESOURCE SYSTEM (MIRS).

Budget Initiative Number: 1191

IT Registration System Number _____(Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status:

Information Technology Project or National Security System: MEPCOM Integrated Resource System

Program Activity/Mission Area: Military Personnel and Readiness

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing .

Date Project was Initiated: 1984

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; _____ and of Project _____.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)?

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM):

Project is in IV PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated: June, 1995 Phase as of current review.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed..

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations? No

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW
Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 2%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? Sept. 2002

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document?

Were they pricing changes or program changes?

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions?

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? _____

What percentage is financial ____0%_____, for your component?

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Full Acquisition							
OPA	41.4	6.5	2.2	6.7	5.2	3.7	65.7
Total Dev Mod	41.4	6.5	2.2	6.7	5.2	3.7	65.7
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	29.6	16.6	13.5	12.6	14.4	71.3	158.0
MPA	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.1	1.9
Total Current Services	29.6	16.8	13.7	12.8	14.6	72.4	159.9
Total Resources by FY	72.5	23.3	15.9	19.5	19.8	76.1	227.1

PART II. Justification and Other Information

I. Description/Performance Characteristics:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) is comprised of the hardware and software required to support the DoD mission of qualifying enlisted applicants into the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard. The system includes hardware and software at HW, two Sector HQ, and 65 Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS).

The application software provides an extensive level of support to the mission functions: Applicant Flow and Control Management, Testing Processing, Medical Processing, Operations Processing, Service Recruiter and Counselor Support, Applicant Tracking, Communications, and System Administration. The overall system provides information automation and communication capabilities for the Command to meet both its currently projected peacetime and mobilization military manpower accession missions. Specific objectives of the system are:

- Allows data sharing at all three levels of the Command (HQ, Sector HQ, and MEPS) through a distributed architecture.
- Provides extensive data base querying through the use of Structured Query Language (SQL).
- Provides the capability for each MEPS to maintain all their own applicant information on their data bases through a system sized to offer adequate data storage and processing capability.
- Provides accurate information needed to plan, prepare, and execute applicant processing.
- Employs an open systems environment (OSE) to support outside agency interfaces.

The foregoing capabilities are maintained by using automation and communication technology to create a comprehensive, integrated system that distributes information processing and information storage in the most effective manner. The system supports and provides data to other defense applications. Between 1994 and 1996, MIRS was deployed to the MEPS. With this deployment, the MIRS acquisition was completed and the system was transitioned to continued operation and sustainment. As a result of this transition and the completion of the MIRS acquisition, formal reporting of MIRS concludes with this IT Capital Investment Exhibit submission.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

USMEPCOM uses the MIRS capability to continuously improve accession business processes to allow the military services to meet their accession goals in this time of reduced resources and a shrinking pool of applicants for military service. The infrastructure supporting MIRS allows applicant data to be validated at the point of entry during qualification at a MEPS. The system supports establishment of standard personnel data elements in consonance with DoD Corporate Information Management (CIM) / Business Process Review (BPR) policies. Electronic interfaces are currently in place with each of the Military Services, the Army Accounting and Finance Center, Army Personnel Information Systems Command, Army Research for Behavioral/Social Sciences, Defense Security Service, Defense Manpower Data Center, Military Traffic Management Command, Selective Service System, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Navy Drug Screening Lab, ViroMed, Office of Personnel Management, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Total Army Personnel Data Base, and others. USMEPCOM also works closely with the Navy as they develop the proposed Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) to assure that the necessary protocols are implemented to allow MIRS to successfully interface and integrate with DIMHRS.

MIRS provides the critical software tools and associated automation and communications infrastructures to support the DoD's enlisted accessioning mission. Each MEPS has an appropriately sized suite of hardware and software to support business process improvements and to serve as client infrastructure to communicate with the HQ and outside interfaces.

MIRS supports the accession community's mission requirements at the HQ, Sector HQ, and 65 MEPS throughout the continental U.S., Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. This supports the ability to provide applicant qualification data to meet Active, Reserve, and National Guard recruiting requirements. Processing consists of aptitude testing, medical examining, security background screening, administrative processing, enlistment, and shipping of applicants to training sites. During mobilization, USMEPCOM processes registrants of the Selective Service System. When directed, USMEPCOM supports medical and aptitude testing of other federal agencies.

I. Program Management/Management Oversight:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

In January 1992, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel (ASD(FM&P)), designated the area of Military Personnel as a Corporate Information Management (CIM) initiative. In the following weeks the staff of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Resource and Requirements (DASD(R&R)) developed the overall comprehensive plan for implementing CIM in the military personnel arena. The first CIM initiative to be undertaken under this plan was identified as a review of the military entrance processing function, a departmental activity managed by USMEPCOM. Subsequently, FM&P identified and assembled a team of functional area representatives from USMEPCOM HQ, selected MEPS, and FM&P staff to attend a CIM workshop and provide the input for a functional economic analysis. DISC4 directed that Major Automated Information Systems Review Council (MAISRC) oversight be delegated to the Program Executive Officer, Standard Army Management Information Systems (PEO STAMIS). In support of the Integrated Project Teams approach, USMEPCOM entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Sustaining Base Automation (SBA) Program Management Office for oversight and integration with the Sustaining Base Information Services (SBIS) contract. The PM SBA served in an advisory capacity on MIRS/SBIS issues, assisted in resolving all potential conflicts of interest, and supported the MIRS System Manger. After SBIS contract award PM SBA prepared task orders and delivery orders; accepted the proof-of-concept application, providing further software development; provided testing, fielding, and post-deployment contractual support.

K. Acquisition Strategy:

The acquisition strategy to implement MIRS was to purchase hardware, software, and services from competitively awarded Requirements Contracts to the greatest extent possible. These contracts satisfied the existing contractual requirements, and also meet the specifications of the Information Technology Management Reform Act (ITMRA) of 1996, known as the Clinger-Cohen Act. In line with these directives, throughout the implementation of MIRS the Command was compliant with the MAISRC, working with the Office of the ASA(RDA) to streamline that development and acquisition process.

Under the auspices of PEO STAMIS, USMEPCOM used the Army's SBIS program which combined the experience and competence of the industry. SBIS introduced a networked approach that allows direct communication among military installations through distributed, cooperative data processing, requiring fewer resources to operate and maintain than the dedicated systems that

1191/MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

were in use at that time. The strategy used an OSE solution that was fully National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and CIM compliant over Wide Area and Local Area Networks. At that time it was already C2 secure, providing a migration path to increased levels of security.

The SBIS contract is an Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ), firm-fixed price contract that allows rapid acquisition and support of leading edge information systems by DoD customers around the world. The U.S. Army Information System Management Activity (USAISMA) Small Computer Program (SCP) at Fort Monmouth, NJ was designated as the ordering agency in administering all SBIS IDIQ ordering for the Army and all other DoD components.

D. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

The analysis of potential process improvements in the military accessioning process was the first initiative identified as part of the Military Personnel Corporate Information Management (CIM) initiative. This information was summarized in the Functional Economic Analysis (FEA); several potential improvements were bundled into selected alternatives to the then current way of doing business. The FEA was performed with the contractor support services of Systems Research and Applications Corporation (SRA) and D. Appleton and a team of representatives from USMEPCOM HQ, selected MEPS, and FM&P staff. With the alternatives as input, the team: (1) established performance measures and targets to track and measure the success or failure of the selected alternatives; (2) defined the baseline in terms of costs by allocating resources consumed to each of the MEP activities; (3) estimated the investment costs and benefits associated with each alternative; and (4) evaluated each alternative against the baseline to determine if the estimated return-on-investment warranted making an investment.

During the analysis, several process deficiencies became apparent. Benefits that resulted from investing in the improvement of the military entrance process fell into the following three groups: (1) Cutting MEPS costs directly: DoD could save money by shortening the processing time and thereby reducing the consumption of resources needed to process applicants (e.g., reduce the number of medical exams through stronger prescreening, reduce the number of meals and lodgings required through reduced processing time). (2) Cutting costs of related operations outside the MEPS: through improved system interfaces, the Services

1191/MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

would save money by (a) having easier access to applicant data as the applicant moves through processing and (b) having the applicant's electronic file feed directly to the Services' master files. (3) Savings which are not quantifiable: with access to an improved system with increased capacity, USMEPCOM would be able to (a) meet both its peacetime and wartime mission and (b) screen applicants more effectively through better predictive data (e.g., computer-assisted testing) that might increase individual job performance.

Three low-cost opportunities that could be implemented through a change in policy or procedures, and without outside budget approval, were identified. These included: (1) Standardizing testing reports and test forms. At that time each Service had unique, special mission requirements that necessitate service-specific aptitude testing and medical examinations. (2) Replacing fee-basis physicians with Physician Assistants and Nurse Practitioners. At that time, all aspects of the medical examination were performed by physicians. It was frequently difficult to hire physicians to perform this function which generally does not require an M.D. (3) Strengthening the medical prescreen program. Policy at that time did not mandate prescreening by recruiters although some occurred. The nationwide disqualification rate was about 6 percent from all medical exams. A strong prescreen program was estimated to reduce the rate to approximately 2 percent for a potential net savings of up to \$1.5 million per year.

There were three levels of major investment opportunity that required a significant investment of resources and therefore would have required budget approval from outside the organization:

a. Replace the aging System 80. The existing System 80 hardware had exceeded its projected life cycle. The hardware was no longer manufactured and there were few trained staff to maintain or repair the failing hardware. Further, the System 80 configuration did not have the surge capacity to meet USMEPCOM's wartime mission. Therefore, it was necessary to establish a "new" baseline with the minimum resources to both replace and upgrade the System 80 hardware.

b. Implement five improvements that would reduce processing time and lead to a reduction in meals and lodging as well as staff positions. These included: (a) One-time data entry. (b) Enhanced medical data entry. (c) Storing all applicant and student test data at the MEPS. (d) Providing the Services direct access to applicant/student data. (e) Eliminating manual processing.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

c. Implement improvements from other studies. There were other potential improvements that could be made, e.g., automating the aptitude test (CAT-ASVAB) or consolidating MEPS, but there was too little extant information available to make meaningful recommendations at that time.

Alternatives.

Before considering the implementation of any improvements, it was necessary to adjust the POM baseline by adding the minimum resources necessary to purchase replacement hardware. There were two reasons this adjustment was critical. First, the current System 80 hardware had exceeded its projected life cycle. As this equipment failed, USMEPCOM--to meet its peacetime mission--was faced with replacing equipment on a one-for-one basis or reverting to a slower and more costly manual processing system. The POM baseline did not allow for this added expense. Second, in DOD's effort to streamline and scale back during peacetime, it was crucial to retain a wartime capacity to screen large influxes of registrants (draftees) or applicants quickly in the event of mobilization. The existing System 80 configuration, as described in the POM baseline, was taxed to its fullest capacity and did not have the surge capacity to meet USMEPCOM's wartime mission.

In addition to the new baseline, two alternatives were selected. The alternatives built on each other and offered an increase in benefits, albeit at higher investment cost, beyond simply replacing the aging System 80 hardware. The alternatives are described below:

a. "New" Baseline - Replace aging System 80 hardware. At that time, the MEPS were equipped with Unisys System 80 minicomputers with 2.5 megabytes (MB) of random access memory (RAM) and 282 MB of disk storage. The new baseline configuration would allow for the installation of the Unisys System 80 model 7E with 16 MB of RAM. Disk storage would be increased to 2.4 gigabytes (GB) at large MEPS and 1.2 GB at small and medium MEPS. The software would be modified only enough to incorporate the new equipment. These changes provided some modest savings in

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

system maintenance; however, the primary benefit of the new baseline is that it allowed USMEPCOM, with a least-cost investment, to meet its mission. The "new" baseline represented the least costly way to meet the mandatory requirement for processing applicants in both peacetime and wartime. It would add \$10.64 million to the POM baseline costs for new MEPS hardware to be purchased in FY95.

b. Enhanced Alternative I - Complete replacement of hardware and software at the MEPS and software modifications at the USMEPCOM mainframe to accommodate MEPS changes. This alternative would have replaced and upgraded the Unisys System 80 hardware with IBM RS/6000 Power Station network servers and 33 MHZ 80386 PCs. The applicant processing software running at the MEPS would be completely rewritten to automate additional functions and would run under the UNIX environment in conjunction with a flexible, modern, relational data management system. The USMEPCOM HQ mainframe computer equipment would remain unchanged and software would be modified only as required to accommodate MEPS software changes. This alternative would reduce processing time through the implementation of one-time entry of applicant information, rapid retrieval of applicant data, electronic access to an applicant's file as he/she moved through the MEPS, and digital input of test results and medical exam results. The system was to be deployed at 3 MEPS in FY93, at an additional 25 MEPS in FY94, and at the remaining 37 MEPS in FY95. Net investment cost would be \$37.38 million more than the "new" baseline.

c. Enhanced Alternative II - Expansion of Enhanced Alternative I to include a complete rewrite of the HOST mainframe software to conform to DoD standards. This alternative incorporated all changes in Enhanced Alternative I and included additional upgrades to the HQ software. The existing HQ software would be converted from the COBOL programming language to Ada, to comply with DoD standards for new development and major rewrites. Also, the HQ hierarchical data base management system would be replaced with a relational data base management system. This alternative would have provided USMEPCOM with a more flexible capability for accessing data bases and writing reports. The system would have been deployed at 2 MEPS in FY93, at 24 additional MEPS in FY94, at 24 more MEPS in FY95, and at the remaining 15 MEPS in FY96. Net investment would be \$61.74 million more than the "new" baseline.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Performance measures were used as the basis for evaluation of the selected alternative to achieve the objectives of the strategic plan. They were financial measures that were quantifiable and verifiable for assessing progress toward the stated objective. The performance measures identified as the most appropriate for measuring improved military enlisted processing are: (1) The number of meals and lodgings per accession. (2) The number of USMEPCOM full-time equivalents (FTEs) per accession. (3) Unit cost per accession.

E. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

The MIRS meets current Government wide, DoD and Army interoperability and OSE requirements. OSD had issued a directive that all new C4I systems and other systems that interface to C4I systems shall be in compliance with the Joint Technical Architecture (JTA). The JTA in turn mandates use of the Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE). Reference is specifically made to C4 Intelligence Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Architecture Framework, CISA-0000-104-96, Version 1.0, 7 June 1996, C4ISR Integration Task Force (ITF) Integrated Architectures Panel. This document presents an innovative definition of levels of interoperability. The DII COE adopts these levels of interoperability and maps DII compliance to interoperability levels. The COE defines eight progressively deeper levels of integration for the Runtime Environment Category. These levels are directly tied to the degree of interoperability achieved. True integration begins at Level 4, MIRS was designed to be no less than JTA/COE Level 6 compliant.

Infrastructure Strategy: All data processing infrastructure was part of the MIRS acquisition. Communications infrastructure strategy is delineated in the Transport paragraph below.

All MIRS hardware requirements for data processing are included in this funding. Hardware requirements for data transport are being satisfied through a combination of system specific products and leveraging existing Army/DoD communications assets.

Transport. A combination of methods is used to satisfy transport requirements. Inter-installation (MEPS) transport requirements are supported by dedicated system transport assets. Inter-installation (between HQ, Sectors, and MEPS) transport requirements are supported by dedicated system transport assets. Inter-installation (between HQ, Sectors, and MEPS) transport requirements are supported by dedicated system transport assets. Inter-installation (between HQ, Sectors, and MEPS) transport requirements are supported by dedicated system transport assets.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

supported by the existing DoD/Military Service long-haul communications assets. The MEPS have access to the Recruiting Services Network (RSN), a private communications infrastructure that is maintained and operated by the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC). The information within the RSN community is of a highly personal, sensitive nature, and must be protected from access or interception by unauthorized persons. USAREC uses secure Virtual Private Network (VPN) technology. Secure VPN allows an unsecured public network to be used as though it was a secure, isolated LAN, by encrypting data sent over the Internet Service Provider network. The VPN solution provides internet access control to the RSN and allows for secure transmission of sensitive but unclassified data (SBU).

Interdependencies with other acquisitions. Other than Top of System Interface Protocols (TOSIP) interfaces, MIRS has minimal interdependencies with other systems.

The MIRS is a mix of COTS software, custom applications developed using COTS CASE tools, and software provided as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE). Office Automation, report generating software, and data base capabilities are examples of COTS products integrated in the total MIRS capability. MIRS custom components were developed where COTS products do not readily support the business process. This combination of methodologies has helped ensure that the MIRS technical solution adequately supports the military accessioning business: processes needed to both reduce costs and improve the effectiveness of enlistment qualification in a cost effective and economical manner.

The data architecture approach was to utilize the COTS products to document the defined logical and physical data models. These data models are linked to the process model, also documented with COTS products. Participants from across the Command were brought in to verify and redefine, where necessary, the business rules. The data models were developed using the DoD Personnel Data Model, V18.0 as the defining standards requirement. These sections comprise the top levels of the MIRS data architecture.

The Functional Mission or Component Architecture approach

F. Security and Privacy:

1191/MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The security program has been managed in accordance with the requirements of DA Memorandum 25-3, "HQDA Life Cycle Management Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures". The security aspects of these phases are synopsized below:

- a. Concept Development Phase. (1) Identified basic security requirements and evaluated alternative methods. (2) Conducted testing of security measures on a prototype model or at a prototype/testbed site to assess high risk, critical components, and subsystems. This provided data for security concept evaluation, assisted in selecting preferred alternatives, and facilitated the assessment of the operational impacts of security approaches. (3) Developed preliminary security test plans and computer security certification plans. (4) Evaluated system development environment needs.
- b. Design Phase. (1) Fully defined the system security requirements. (2) Identified and analyzed computer security alternatives, and designed the resulting recommendations into the system architecture. (3) Updated the vulnerability and security risk management reviews. (4) Updated the security test plans and developed security procedures for certification test and evaluation.
- c. Development Phase. (1) Developed, integrated, tested, and evaluated the security requirements to prepare them for deployment. (2) Testing and Evaluation was conducted on prototype systems, to include the security design. (3) Identified site security needs through the use of the MEPS site surveys and the analysis of the trip reports. (4) Updated the plans as appropriate.
- d. Deployment Phase. (1) The security testing during this phase provided for follow-on testing after systems installation. (2) The baseline configuration was determined, recognizing that changes to the baseline will require additional certification testing to ensure design integrity is maintained. (3) Testing will be performed throughout the system life cycle. (4) The security certification will be applied for and obtained. (5) The final vulnerability and risk assessment was prepared.
- e. Operations Phase. (1) Continue the life cycle of the system in the field. (2) Provide security engineering support for validating current security measures and in developing and deploying product improvements for the system. (3) Review and update risk assessment and certification packages.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

It was imperative that security was an integral part of the system development from project inception. This ensured that the planned security approaches satisfied the performance, design, and user requirements and that automation security was been fully addressed per DoD and Army directives. The system meets the minimum security requirements dictated by a risk assessment conducted in accordance with DoD Directive 5200.28 (Security Requirements for Automated Information Systems (AISS)) and FIPS Pub 41 (now expired).

The MIRS satisfies all security and Privacy Act requirements. The information processed by and for HQ activities and the end users is designated “highly sensitive” due to its personal nature and is protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 (PL 93-579, United States Code 552A and AR 340-21). All information is designated SBU and safeguarded in accordance with the security measures in DoD Directive 5200.28. The MIRS Minimum Security Requirements for Multi-User Operating Systems is documented in the USMEPCOM Security regulations and procedures. These requirements include technical measures that are incorporated into multi-user, remote-access, resource-sharing, and information-sharing computer systems. The contents are based on the Trusted Computer System Evaluation Criteria Controlled Access protection (C2) criteria class, with additions from current computer industry practice and Federal security specifications.

The system is not used with the DoD Common Access Card at this time. The integration has not been definitely scheduled.

G. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

USMEPCOM is in compliance with the provisions of the GPEA by: (1) Providing direction and oversight for the acquisition and use of information technology, to include alternative information technology solutions that provide for electronic submission, maintenance, or disclosure of information and for the use of electronic signatures. (2) USMEPCOM has developed procedures for the use of and acceptance of electronic signatures. (3) The Command developed procedures to permit storage and filing of electronically filed forms containing information pertaining to employees. (4) Provided for the option of electronic maintenance, submission or disclosure of information as a substitute for paper, and for use and acceptance of electronic signatures.

1191/MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Likewise, the MIRS is compliant in following the statutes of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The system uses information technology to improve service delivery and program management, increase productivity, enhance the quality of decision making, and reducing fraud and waste. In accordance with OMB policy, every attempt is made to improve administrative efficiency through the use of electronic mail and electronic document storage (imaging). The Command adheres to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3505 and 3506, which requires the Command to establish and abide by a computer security program that recognizes OMB policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on security.

USMEPCOM is compliant with the responsibilities of the Paperwork Reduction Act which include managing information resources to improve the integrity, quality, and utility of information to all users within and outside the agency, including capabilities for ensuring protections for privacy and security; implementing and enforcing applicable policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines on privacy, confidentiality, security, disclosures and sharing of information collected or maintained by or for the agency; assuming responsibility and accountability for compliance with and management of sections 552 and 552a of title 5, the Computer Security Act of 1987, and related information management laws; and identifying and affording security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the loss, misuse, or unauthorized access to or modification of information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

Q. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

R. Original Baseline:

1191/MEPCOM Integrated Resource System (MIRS) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment. If so, when and why. NO
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget? NO

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2004-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	72.5	23.3	15.9	19.5	19.8	76.1	227.1
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	72.5	23.3	15.9	19.5	19.8	76.1	227.1
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schedule Goals (months)							

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? NO
 - What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A
 - Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. N/A
 - Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). N/A
 - If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. N/A
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A
- L. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:** Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —
6. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.
 7. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.
FY 2001: Reduce attrition due to insufficient FBI background checks by implementing electronic fingerprinting capability
FY 2002: Reduce Enlistment Accession processing times
FY 2003: Full electronic transfer of accession qualification information with recruiting and training commands
FY 2004-07: Remote processing through the use of WEB technology

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? **YES** Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

14. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance. N/A
15. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance. N/A
16. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk. N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Information Management And Telecommunications, Pentagon Renovation

Budget Initiative Number: 1499

IT Registration System Number __N/A_____

Mission Critical Status: N/A

Information Technology Project or National Security System: Secure Information Technology Infrastructure.

Program Activity/Mission Area: Pentagon Common Information Technology (CIT)

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: 1996

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; (Phoenix, W1, Spring 2003 end of Project 2010.)

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No X . The Project is reviewed by the PEO, Enterprise Information Systems and a MAIS quarterly report is submitted to ASD C3I.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

1499/Pentagon Renovation – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Yes X

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: __Less than 2%__

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No X

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months? Not scheduled, but project is closely coordinated DoD with the D, CIO for integration with Continuity of DoD and standard architecture/and infrastructure

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No X

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document?

Were there pricing changes or program changes? Yes, Congress mandated an acceleration schedule completion date of 2010 vice 2013.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? N/A

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? Extensive cost analysis done. Estimates are based on actual costs incurred for renovation of Wedge 1 and subsequent post 9-11 assessments.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No X

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No X

Part I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod							
Full Acquisition							
Working Capital fund Pen Ren.	123.8	32.3	33.4	14.5	14.7	61.9	280.6
Totals Dev Mod							
Maintenance/ Current Services							

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Totals Current Services							
Totals Resources by FY	123.8	32.3	33.4	14.5	14.7	61.9	280.6

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Part II. Justification and Other Information

J. Description/Performance Characteristics:

16. Description.

The Pentagon Renovation, Information Management and Telecommunications Project has been designated as a Major Special Interest Initiative.

The Project Manager, Information Management and Telecommunications, Pentagon Renovation (PM IM&T, PR) has been assigned the specific mission of managing the planning, programming, designing, integrating, and testing of all IM&T efforts involved with the Pentagon Renovation program. These efforts include modernization of unclassified and classified voice, data and video backbones, consolidation of all building technical controls, modernization and relocation of all voice switching, movement of all user servers, movement of 12 ADP Centers, implementation of a Network Management Center and movement and relocation of all IT assets of the 25,000 tenants. The objective is to provide cost-effective voice, data and video services and capabilities that will best serve the needs of the DoD senior leadership by leveraging technology advancements and designing and developing integrated systems, well into the 21st century.

17. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan).

Updates, upgrades and modifies all IT assets of the Pentagon, coordinated with the Pentagon Renovation Program.

18. Describe the pre-milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

In 1991 the Army was directed by the office of the Secretary of Defense to establish the PM, IM&T office to oversee the implementation of the information management and telecommunication initiatives associated with the Pentagon renovations. In 1996 DoD Senior Leadership established an Army managed procurement appropriation funding line to accomplish this mission

19. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. Project changes are based on Secretary of Defense decisions.

J. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?

The two organizations responsible for renovating the Pentagon are Washington Headquarters Service's Pentagon Renovation Program Office, and PM IM&T. Each organization has specific assigned missions and functions for the Pentagon Renovation/Modernization Program and work closely together to manage and implement requirements, using Integrated Product Teams to optimize coordination action. Early in the project, the importance of information management and telecommunication (IM&T) within the Pentagon was recognized and the U.S. Army was tasked with establishing a project office for IM&T modernization tasks. The Pentagon IM&T Project Office was established in 1992. The mission of the PM IM&T, working in concert with the Pentagon Renovation Program Manager, is to provide oversight for all IM&T initiatives associated with the Pentagon Renovation/Modernization Program. The PM IM&T has an established formal review process for all IM&T requirements and provides monthly status of projects to tenant organizations. The requirements were initially reviewed and validated by the Joint Information Management Telecommunications Advisory Group (JIMTAG) in 1992. A new board structure, the Pentagon Area Information Services Executive Board (PEB), replaced the JIMTAG in January 2000.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The requirements were revalidated in January 1996 when the DepSecDef approved establishing the Army OPA funding line to execute PM IM&T requirement. PM IM&T requirements were again revalidated in December 1997 upon the appointment of a consolidated Pentagon Renovation Program Manager to oversee the Renovation construction efforts.

PM IM&T and WHS (Pentagon Renovation) use an integrated program schedule to monitor program cost and schedule. The two organizations work closely together to manage and implement the Renovation requirements, using Program Office Integrated Product Teams to optimize coordination of actions. Monthly program reviews have been established to provide the Pentagon Renovation PM status and comprehensive insight into the numerous projects associated with the renovation program. In addition PM IM&T, as an ACAT IIIA, Program Reports through the Army Acquisition Executive chain and has OSD oversight.

7. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed. Yes

L. Acquisition Strategy:

16. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.

To date the only PM IM&T unique contract has been the open competition of the Above Ground Telecommunications Backbone (ATB) to purchase, install, integrate and implement the voice, data, and video communications infrastructure in the above ground Pentagon. The contract is a multi-year Hybrid Fixed Price Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Award Fee contract awarded in August 98 to General Dynamics, Needham Heights, MA. The potential exists for additional IM&T unique project contracts to support initiatives for Basement Segments 2 and 3, Total Switch Architecture, and the Radio Room/Alternate Technical Control Facility. PM IM&T will continue to make maximum use of existing competed contracts, small business, or 8(a) contracts to satisfy other telecommunications requirements for the Pentagon Basement, Mezzanine, and Swing Space; procurement of Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) hardware; and, relocation of existing IT/IS assets into consolidated or co-located facilities.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

17. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.

Renovation and Modernization of Wedge 1 used a Fixed Price ID/IQ with Award Fee Acquisition Strategy.

The redo of Wedge 1 (Phoenix Project) necessitated by the September 11 terrorist attack uses a cost plus award fee with zero base acquisition strategy using a letter contract. It is anticipated that the Pentagon Renovation/Modernization for future Wedges will be performance based and competitively awarded.

18. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.

It is anticipated that Performance Based Contracts will be used for future Wedges.

S. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

21. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify. N/A

22. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.) N/A

23. Underlying assumptions. N/A

24. Estimate of Risks. N/A

T. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards: N/A

34. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Yes, PM IM&T is providing the infrastructure backbone, under auspices of DoD Technical Architecture, on which user specific applications run.

35. Infrastructure Strategy: Design and implement in compliance with Joint Technical Architecture (JTA).

36. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided?

Yes, selected modernization hardware is included in this funding, but no end user hardware is included.

37. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means? This project is designed to utilize and integrate with the DISA NIPR and SIPRnet standard teleport capabilities. Other classified networks will comply with the transport requirements set by the proponent of that level of classification.

38. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?
PM IM&T is providing the infrastructure backbone on which user specific applications run.

39. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?
The Pentagon Renovation Modernization is COTS based.

40. Describe the Data Architecture approach?

Based on Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) and Global Information Grid (GIG).

8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach?

The functional/architecture approach is based on current DoD regulations, C4ISR, GIG, and OSD approved Pentagon architectures. Global Information Grid (GIG)

U. Security and Privacy:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

16. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

Based on GIG and Joint Technical Architecture. Security complies with GISR and Defense In Depth requirements.

17. Privacy assessments for this initiative.

Official Government use system. Privacy requirements are addressed by applications.

18. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?

Not yet. Enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card. Based on network switches and Common Access Card, integration schedule will be determined.

V. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) N/A, Infrastructure.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

S. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress?

This project utilizes the same Management oversight as the Pentagon Renovation program and is under frequent review by the highest levels of DoD Senior Leadership.

B. Original Baseline: Proposed APB is being prepared and will be submitted within 90 days. (NLT May02)

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

A renovated Pentagon with telecommunication modernization that will last for the next 50 years.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

It is anticipated that the total cost of the IM&T modernization as a part of the overall Pentagon renovation will be \$ ___ 440.3M ___.

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment. If so, when and why. Yes, IM&T is currently undergoing “re-baselining” due to September 11 attack and subsequent mandate from Congress to complete the Pentagon Renovation/Modernization by the year 2010 vice 2015
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? No, since September 11th, the schedule has been accelerated with a completion date of 2010 vice 2015 mandated by Congress.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:	123.8	32.3	33.4	14.5	14.7	61.9	280.6
Cost Goals (\$M)							
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:	123.8	32.3	33.4	14.5	14.7	61.9	280.6
Cost Goals (\$M)							
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Cost Goals (\$M)							
Schedule Goals (months)							

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President’s Budget submission? No (will be updated w/DERF activities at a later date).
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. No
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). N/A
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. N/A
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe.

M. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline: Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent.
 Accomplished the planned completion of Wedge 1 Information Technology Services (\$157.5M) and poised to initiate Wedge 2 Modernization. The September 11 attack destroyed this work as well as Wedge 2 area which must now be redone IAW congressional mandate to accelerate the schedule completion –now 2010 Vice. 2015.

7. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. N/A IM&T is the

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

“FOLLOWER” in a Leader/Follower effort in the renovation/modernization of the Pentagon. There is an Integrated Master Schedule.

8. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative. See discussion above.
FY 2001: Complete telecommunications modernization of Wedge 1.
FY 2002: Redo Wedge 1 (Phoenix Project) due to September 11th terrorist attack. Redo cutover of circuits to black and Red Command and Control Switches and the Optical Remote Administrative Switch. Re-installation of the Pentagon Consolidated Technical Control Facility (PCTCF). Implementation, reinstallation and cutover of the above ground telecommunications backbone in the Phoenix Project (Wedge 1). Reinstallation and cutover of the integrated switching systems in General Purpose Switch Room. Initiating the modernization of Wedge 2 telecommunications.
FY 2003: Continue modernization of Wedge 2
FY 2004-07: Continue on Wedge 2, while initiating modernization of Wedge 3 November of 2004 and initiating Wedge 4 in November of 2006.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president’s budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk. N/A

17. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance. N/A
18. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance. N/A
19. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk. N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS)

Budget Initiative Number: 1640

IT Registration System Number DA00063 (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: Mission-Essential

Information Technology Project or National Security System: Information Technology (IT) Project

Program Activity/Mission Area: Functional Area Applications Area/Reserve Affairs

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: Restructured Jan 96

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; N/A and of Project Mar 03.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)? The Milestone (MS) Decision Authority (MDA) is the Office of the Secretary of Defense/Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (OSD/C3I).

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): MS IIIId, 2 Jul 01

Project is in Production/Deployment PHASE or MILESTONE IIIId, Approval Dated: 2 Jul 01. MS IIIe (Oct 01) pending a signed ADM.

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed. (Describe, BRIEFLY).

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?

Yes. Despite a fully funded acquisition phase, systemic Army-wide shortfalls in support of information infrastructure have delayed the fielding of Increment 6 (MS IIIe). The RCAS Project Management Office (PMO), Army Reserve Component (RC), and United States Army continue efforts to balance sustainment requirements against Fiscal Year (FY) funding in order to establish a formal Army Cost Position (ACP).

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW
Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 1%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If Yes, when, and what is Status? The Project completed Army CIO program assessment for MS IIIb (Dec 97), MS IIIc (Dec 99), and MS IIIId (May 01); and received DoD Chief Information Officer (CIO) Certification for MS IIIc (Mar 00) and Re-certification for MS IIIId (Jul 01).

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months?

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping?

Yes No

If Yes, was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan?

Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project?

Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources (BASELINE MEANS FY 2002 Budget not FY 2003 PR)? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document?

Were they pricing changes or program changes? Yes. However, sustainment funding (FY 03-07) for the Total System has increased due to the redirection of Army resources to correct chronic IT infrastructure shortfalls. RCAS infrastructure refreshment funding is now reflected as part of the Program.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? No. Changes were directed based on Army-level decisions.

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

An Army Cost Review Board (CRB) approved an ACP for the Project in FY 96. Based on evolving system sustainment requirements, the Project resubmitted a Program Office Estimate (POE) and is currently awaiting a formal ACP.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? N/A (Talk to your FM)

What percentage is financial N/A, for your component? (In FY 2003)(Determine this with your FM.)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod							
Full Acquisition							
OPA	529.0	97.9	88.6	68.3	46.8	198.6	1029.2
OMNG	97.9						97.9
OMAR	60.8						60.8
RPA	3.0						3.0
Total Dev Mod	690.7	97.9	88.6	68.3	46.8	198.6	1190.9
Maintenance/ Current Services							
OPA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

OMNG	0	9.4	13.6	15.2	19.2	233.4	290.8
OMAR	0	6.7	8.7	8.8	19.4	183.2	226.8
RPA	0	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	5.9	11.4
Total Current Services	0.0	17.4	23.7	25.5	40.0	422.5	529.0
Totals Resources by FY	690.7	115.3	112.3	93.7	86.8	621.1	1719.9

PART II: Justification and Other Information

K. Description/Performance Characteristics:

1. Description.

The RCAS is an automated information management system that will provide the Army the capability to administer, manage, and more effectively mobilize Army National Guard (ARNG) and United States Army Reserve (USAR) forces, as described in the approved Mission Need Statement (MNS), revalidated March 5, 1996.

2. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan).

The RCAS supports agency/DoD mission, long term strategic goals, and objectives through facilitating execution of daily operational, training, and administrative tasks at all Guard and Reserve echelons, and by providing timely and more accurate information with which to plan and support mobilization. Fully deployed, RCAS links approximately 10,500 Guard and Reserve units at approximately 4,000 sites located in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Europe, and the Pacific Rim. Project goals and functional requirements are described in the RCAS Operational Concept Description (OCD), approved in Apr 96 and revised in Jan 02.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The RCAS Project was restructured in FY 1995 to constrain cost growth, establish a realistic requirements baseline, and leverage new information management technology. In January 1996, the RCAS prime contract was modified to incorporate a new technical design, implement a new engineering management approach to software development, and provide a contract with more flexibility and a lower cost.

The RCAS Project exists to correct major deficiencies in the Army's RC functional systems which impact on the Army Mission as reported in General Accounting Office Report titled, "General Management Review of the Reserve Components," May 1988. These deficiencies include:

- Current information systems are unable to provide timely and accurate information to decision makers to support mobilization planning;
- Lack of compatible software and common data elements;
- Little or no data communications between echelons;
- Excessive time needed to complete functions;
- Current systems do not comply with open systems standard architecture;
- Existing functional information procedures do not effectively support operations;
- Many of the data systems that support commanders are outdated; and
- Automated data communications capabilities are limited at unit level, and the capabilities that exist at senior management levels generally are not integrated.

The Army's mission is supported by the functions of mobilization planning and execution, monitoring unit status, implementing mobilization plans, deployment, and demobilization. To this end, the RCAS will:

- Provide an integrated system to support the decision-making needs of all commanders and staff responsible for RC force readiness, mobilization planning, and mobilization execution;

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Provide verification and validation of the information in the system by the peacetime chain of command (including operational control) after data are entered at their source;
- Provide efficient data sharing throughout the system and with external systems to avoid redundant data entry, reduce errors, and improve the capability to handle the wartime surge in operations workload;
- Provide processing and transmission of classified data within the system;
- Provide data processing and office automation down to the unit level to improve the accomplishment of supporting administrative tasks;
- Develop RCAS in harmony with Army automation architecture planning and those systems with which the RCAS must interface;
- Provide for a continuous operational processing capability to the user when located either at or away from home station;
- Provide a system capability that ensures all users are operating on the compatible software version concurrently;
- Provide a continuous assessment and integration of technological advances in the industry; and
- Provide for compliance with and incorporation of emerging DoD and DA standards and policies for automated information systems.

3. Describe the pre-milestone O/Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches.

During project restructure in 1995/1996, all aspects of the program were evaluated on a business basis using the principles of cost as an independent variable (CAIV) and fundamental business process reengineering.

The RCAS Project continues to embrace the expectations and intent of the Clinger-Cohen Act and DoD CIO certification through the use of a comprehensive, integrated management model. This model makes extensive use of (1) a formal oversight and review board structure (e.g., General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC)), and (2) integrated product teams (IPT) to bring together numerous RCAS stakeholders in performing and fulfilling ongoing Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), Economic Analysis (EA), Performance Measurement, and Information Assurance (IA). Specific examples of Project activities in these focus areas are:

1640/Reserve Component Automation System - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- **Business Process Reengineering:** Despite varied demographics, missions, and organizational philosophies, the ARNG and USAR senior leadership continues to aggressively explore IT BPR opportunities. On behalf of the RC GOSC, the Project completed a preliminary, macro-level study identifying organizational, operational, and technical considerations, challenges, impacts, and issues associated with migrating ARNG and USAR to a centralized, RC enterprise IT management solution. The study was an initial BPR step, identifying several enterprise IT management improvement opportunities applicable to RCAS sustainment (life cycle support).
- **Analysis of Alternatives:** RCAS alternatives were examined during the Project's restructure in 1995. During the restructure, benchmarking, modeling, trade-off analyses, and user expectation management techniques were utilized to derive low, medium, and high-risk alternatives. The RCAS Validation Assessment Team (VAT) developed a technical and economic analysis model, based on DoD's Software Reengineering Assessment Handbook, to assess each alternative's coverage of required RCAS functionality. In addition, the VAT determined the viability and costs of each alternative primarily through a study of Government and industry standards. The costs of these alternatives were then proposed by the Prime Contractor, evaluated and negotiated by the RCAS PMO, validated by the Army's Cost and Economic Analysis Center (CEAC), and ultimately used by the Army's senior leadership to decide on a solution representing an acceptable level of risk while effectively balancing user requirements against fiscal realities.
- **Economic Analysis:** The RCAS Project possesses an EA strategy that focuses on: (1) periodic updates to the Project's life cycle cost estimate (LCCE) for each MS review, (2) updating the expected return on investment (ROI) of each increment prior to its MS review (i.e., fielding decision), and (3) periodically estimating the actual ROI of the "total" system. This strategy was developed in coordination with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Program Analysis and Evaluation) (OSD(PA&E)) and CEAC, and includes appropriate, periodic reviews by these organizations. More importantly, this strategy allows the Project to ascertain the (1) quantitative and qualitative benefits of each increment prior to its fielding, and (2) maturing benefits of past increments such that the RCAS community can clearly tie each increment's expectations and benefits to key mission performance measures (e.g., improvements in readiness and mobilization), and gain visibility into the synergy created by all RCAS applications.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Performance Measurement: Results-based (i.e., mission-oriented) RCAS performance objectives and thresholds are identified in the OCD, Acquisition Program Baseline (APB), Critical Operational Issues and Criteria (COIC), Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP), and Prime Contractor's system and sub-system specifications. These performance goals address such considerations as response times, access times, logistics response, security, interoperability, and reliability. Progress against these performance goals is evaluated principally through the RCAS EA Strategy and the Project's Operational Test (OT).
- Information Assurance (IA): RCAS is consistent with the standards in the Joint Technical Architecture-Army (JTA-A), Version 6.0. By following these comprehensive technical standards, required for Army and Joint interoperability, RCAS is positioned to be a secure, interoperable network under the DoD Global Information Grid (GIG) concept. RCAS consists of two separate subsystems, classified and unclassified, that are accredited and certified for operation.

The RCAS acquisition strategy focuses on an incremental and evolutionary approach:

- Increment 1 provided the Project's infrastructure through Wide Area Network (WAN) inter-connectivity, COTS office automation software, and classified-capable and unclassified workstations. Increment 1 is an integrated package of state-of-the-art COTS hardware and software products selected to provide the user community an immediate capability to meet unit administration, mobilization, and communication needs.
- Increment 2 introduced data servers and logistics functionality and was deployed in a series of releases. In the first release (Release 2.0), three GOTS applications (Unit Level Logistics System-Ground (ULLS-G), Unit Level Logistics System-S4 (ULLS-S4), and Standard Property Book System-Redesign (SPBS-R)) were hosted to run on Microsoft Windows 95 as an interim host platform. Migration to the final RCAS architecture (Microsoft Windows NT) will follow when the Global Combat Support System Army/Tactical (GCSS A/T) is fielded. Subsequent releases, 2.1 and 2.1.1 provided COTS upgrades, additional logistics functionality, and Y2K upgrades and hot-fixes. This increment also addressed initial software encryption requirements.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Increment 3 introduced force authorization, training, and human resources (HR) functionality. These functional areas include both new development and hosting GOTS software on the RCAS. Increment 3 also provides for transition to an ORACLE database management system, and an upgrade to the infrastructure via COTS products (e.g., Outlook 98, Internet Explorer 5.0, Project 98, and Jetform 5.1). This increment also addressed the second phase of the software encryption requirements.
- Increment 4/5 added occupational health management, training, force authorization enhancements, and additional HR functionality and approved COTS software upgrades.
- Increment 6 adds safety and additional occupational health management, force authorization, HR functionality, and COTS upgrades.
Future Increments (7-8) will satisfy user requirements in the order of priority established by the ARNG and USAR RCB. The current proposal is:
 - Increment 7 will add safety, occupational health management, mobilization planning, force management, and HR functionality, and COTS upgrades.
 - Increment 8 will add remaining mobilization, force management, safety and occupational health (SOH) management, HR functionality, COTS upgrades, and GOTS hosting. With the completion of Increment 8, the essential mobilization planning data will reside in the RCAS integrated database.

4. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness.

The RCAS supports numerous Government functions. Specifically, RCAS supports the Title 10 functions of manning, equipping, training, and sustaining the Army's RC, and eleven RC functional areas (Logistics, Force Authorization, Training, Mobilization, Aviation, Facilities, Resource Management, Safety, Information Management, Internal Review, and Human Resources). In

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

accordance with the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act, agencies annually identify those activities not considered inherently governmental. The functions that RCAS supports have not been so identified by the Army's FAIR Act inventories.

Beginning in 1989, the Project facilitated user workshops with over 500 Army National Guard (ARNG), U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), and Active Army functional users to ensure all business processes were accurately created (many didn't exist), refined, and documented. The RCAS Functional Description (FD)(July 1995), documents the results of these activities in 25 volumes. During the Project's Restructure, the functional requirements of the FD were consolidated into the OCD. The OCD was utilized to create the RCAS Enterprise Model, which documents the RC's information needs and business processes across 11 functional areas. From the Enterprise Model, Use Cases (11 Volumes documenting pre-automation business processes) were developed for each functional area, which ultimately formed the foundation of the RCAS design requirements. Thus, before RCAS design requirements were translated into an IT investment, the RC functional communities had created, refined, and documented core RC business processes. We will provide to you a hard copy of a representative Use Case that documents a revised RC business process before automation. Today, the RCAS PMO continues to increase functional focus on BPR to increase end user mission effectiveness and maintain fiscal awareness. Specifically, the processes associated with requesting reservations for training areas, ranges, and other facilities; gathering training site information; business processes for the SOH application; and maintaining training site schedules were reengineered/streamlined.

K. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting offices that manages this project; if not, how is this project managed?

The RCAS Project is managed by a Program Executive Officer (PEO) and a Project Manager (PM). The PEO is designated and delegated the full line authority from the Chief, National Guard Bureau (CNGB) and the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE) for the centralized management of the RCAS Project. The PM is delegated the full line authority from the PEO for the centralized and financial management of the RCAS Project. The U.S. Army Communication and Electronics Command (CECOM) Acquisition Center – Washington, located in Alexandria, VA, manages the RCAS prime contract.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

2. Does this project use Integrated Product Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.

The RCAS Project utilizes a joint DOD/DA Overarching Integrated Product Team (OIPT) in accordance with DOD Directive 5000.2 in managing the project. Utilizing this process, the RCAS project received a Milestone III decision with an ADM signed on 2 July 2001.

In addition, the Project utilizes a mature Earned Value Management System (formerly C/SCSC) to manage cost, schedule and technical performance and risks. In addition, the Project has a comprehensive metrics program and a risk management program that are integrated with the earned value reporting into monthly Program Management Reviews (PMR). The RCAS PMO and Prime Contractor have established a robust metrics program. The metrics program focuses on three levels, (1) Project, (2) Process, and (3) Event. Metric data is gathered for specific measures and automated tools are used to facilitate the assessment of progress and performance. The results of this modeling and analysis drive management decision-making.

M. Acquisition Strategy

1. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.

Contract name: Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS)

Prime Contractor: Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

Address: Information Service Sector

Vienna, VA 22183

(Note: Contract initially awarded to Boeing Information Services in September 1991. SAIC acquired Boeing Information Services July 23, 1999.)

2. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Program Management/Design - Cost-Plus Award Fee (CPAF)
Software Development – Initially Time & Material (T&M); migrated to CPAF in FY 01
Hardware/Software - Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ)

The contract, initially awarded in September 1991, was restructured January 31, 1996 with a new base year and six annual options. Core activities (project management, systems analysis, enterprise modeling, functional area planning, etc) are acquired under a cost-plus award fee (CPAF) contract. Task Orders were utilized for software development to allow flexibility and open competition. With maturity in requirements and estimating capabilities, software development is now occurring under the CPAF portion of the contract. This change also decreases government risk inherent in T&M techniques. Hardware is acquired on an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) basis, which maximizes flexibility and responsiveness to changing technology.

3. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.

The RCAS contract was awarded under the provisions of OMB Circular A-109. System performance goals and parameters are specified in the APB and the contractor's system and sub-system specifications address such considerations as response times, access times, support response, security and reliability. Beyond effectively allocating risk between the Government and the Prime Contractor, the RCAS prime contract places a greater degree of emphasis on CPAF than the original prime contract. This emphasis is designed to provide the contractor with incentive to produce reliable, supportable products and to facilitate the stringent monitoring and management of the Prime Contractor's cost and schedule performance, as well as give the Project greater latitude with respect to contract re-competition.

U. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

1. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify.

1640/Reserve Component Automation System - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

An Economic Analysis (EA) was performed for MS II and MS III. In addition, the Project estimates each increment's "expected" ROI prior to its MS fielding decision, and periodically updates the MS III EA with the total system's "realized" and "expected" costs and benefits. The results of these economic analyses are displayed in the table below.

Economic Analyses (PV in \$ M)					
Activity	Date	Scope	Investment	Benefits	R O I
MS IIIa	August 1996	Total System ^E	549.2	3728.6	6.8 : 1
MS IIIb	January 1998	System Infrastructure ^{R/E}	198.3	2418.0	12.2 : 1
MS IIIc	December 1999	Increment 3 ^E	42.3	190.1	4.5 : 1
MS III d	February 2001	Increment 4/5 ^E	8.4	50.0	5.9 : 1
MS III d	February 2001	Total System ^{R/E}	653.7	3236.8	5.0 : 1
MS III e	September 2001	Increment 6 ^E	32.5	186.6	5.7 : 1

E = Expected
 R = Realized
 PV = Present Value

The Total System has an ROI of 5.0:1 and the system infrastructure (Increment 1) has an ROI of 12.2:1. The benefits include productivity improvements enabled by the use of automation, cost savings due to lower transmission and communication costs, and legacy system maintenance cost avoidance. Several intangible benefits were also identified, including elements such as the improved accuracy and timeliness of unit data, the utilization of RCAS by the RC in support of disaster relief activities, and connectivity between state commands and units deployed in Bosnia.

2. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Since its inception in 1987, the RCAS Project has conducted numerous AoAs. In conjunction with MS I (September 89), an AoA (to include EA) was performed to identify and assess the costs and benefits of various technical solutions meeting the functional requirements. The result of this AoA provided a notional RCAS. Between MS I and MS II (November 91), the source selection process included competitive demonstrations of different, actual solutions proposed by the contract offerors. These demonstrations revealed that the state of technology had evolved considerably between the time the notional solution was conceived and award of the prime contract. Specifically, the notional solution utilized a regional data center approach wherein individual personal computers, used as workstations, would dial into a network of mainframe and mini-computers over existing commercial telephone lines. Conversely, the initial solution procured by the RCAS prime contract reflected advances in data processing technology and incorporated client-server architecture. The AoA at this phase revealed the contract solution significantly increased flexibility and improved support, but required a larger investment in hardware and fielding.

Following contract award (Sep 91), the RCAS Project underwent an internal review supported by representatives from the Army Audit Agency (AAA) (cost analysis), Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) (functional analysis), and ODISC4 (benchmark analysis). The purpose of this review was to identify opportunities for cost reduction in the awarded technical solution. The baseline review team analyzed five scenarios varying all aspects of the awarded solution to include component unique costs (including help desk), scheduled technical enhancements, system warranty, software maintenance, system operation, fielding, program support, and testing. No significant opportunities for additional cost reductions were identified as a result of the review.

RCAS alternatives were again examined during the project's restructure in 1995. During the restructure, benchmarking, modeling, trade-off analyses, and user expectation management techniques were utilized to derive low, medium, and high-risk alternatives. The Validation Assessment Team (VAT) developed a technical and economic analysis model, based on DoD's Software Reengineering Assessment Handbook, to assess each alternative's coverage of required RCAS functionality. In addition, the VAT determined the viability and costs of each alternative primarily through a study of Government and industry standards. The costs of these alternatives were then proposed by the Prime Contractor, evaluated and negotiated by the RCAS PMO, validated by the Army's CEAC, and

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

ultimately used by the Army's senior leadership to decide on a solution representing an acceptable level of risk while effectively balancing user requirements against fiscal realities (i.e., design-to-cost (DTC)).

Since MS IIIa, the Project's System Analysis Integration Team (SAIT), Requirements Control Board (RCB), and CFT have led ongoing AoA. These AoA take into account process and technological improvements in both the Project and industry, cost as an independent variable (CAIV) considerations, impacts to the RCAS System Evolution Plan (SEP), and the relevance to the RC's strategic goals.

A specific Increment 4/5 RC/RCAS AoA was conducted to determine the appropriate consolidation of increments for MS IIIc. Additional Increment 3 testing requirements impacted the Project's ability to prepare for an Increment 4 fielding decision. As such, the advantages and disadvantages of three alternatives (status quo, consolidate Increments 3 and 4, and consolidate Increments 4 and 5) were analyzed. The consolidation of Increments 4 and 5 was selected because it allowed the Project to resolve future testing issues, improved the timing of remaining MS reviews, reduced deployment challenges (i.e., deployment of one major release versus two releases over a short period of time), created Project efficiencies (e.g., testing), and maximized the Project's ability to continue focusing on software development and product delivery.

3. Underlying assumptions.

The underlying assumptions associated with RCAS are:

- Will be approved for full-fielding and deployed in a timely manner;
- Will be utilized to the greatest degree possible by all intended users;
- Will have a useful life until 2013;
- Developed functionality is applicable to the entire RC;
- Functionality and number of fielded units at end state will remain constant;

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Productivity improvements (savings of man-hours) will equate to increases in capabilities, not in staff reductions or force structure;
- Overall workload (e.g., number of soldiers, transactions, etc.) associated with the business processes is expected to remain constant; and
- Required RC Infrastructure will be in-place throughout the life-cycle to optimize RCAS functional capabilities.

4. Estimate of risks.

The RCAS continues emphasis on identifying and mitigating risks that have the potential to prevent successful completion of the RCAS Project by March 2003 through its execution of the RCAS Risk Management Program. The Program is a joint RCAS PMO/Prime Contractor activity which evolved out of a best practices assessment performed in collaboration with the Software Engineering Institute (SEI). As a result of the program, the Project Office has identified several areas of risk to include:

- Project Metrics. The PMO continues to work with the Prime Contractor to review, define, apply, and deliver appropriate program metrics. In addition, the PMO provides staff to attend and monitor the Prime Contractor's metric board and to monitor the development, collection, and use of metrics for normal program activities;
- System Problem Reports (SPR). The PMO monitors SPR metrics and the modifications of requirements recorded in Engineering Change Proposals (ECP). SPRs are opened throughout the development, testing, and deployment process. They range in priority from 1 to 5 according to their relative impact on the Project. The PMO team continues to help clarify SPR definitions, proper classification, and corrective action. In addition, the PMO requested detailed trend analysis related to SPRs and ECPs in order to monitor the quality and changes of products throughout the development program; and
- Life Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE). The estimated risks identified in the development of the LCCE were the accuracy of the productivity projections for software development; telecommunications usage; availability and usability of externally provided

data; and the accuracy of hardware cost projections. Sensitivity analysis were performed in each of these areas, and adequate allowance for uncertainty was made in the projection.

V. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

1. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.)

The RCAS architecture remains consistent with current Government wide, DoD, and Agency interoperability requirements by maintaining compliance with the JTA-A. Given the significant cost to migrate RCAS to DII COE Level 5 compliance, and the change in mandate for the use of the COE in the JTA-A, Version 6, the Army CIO directed the Project to expend no further resources to move to a higher level of compliance on the NT platform. During the acquisition life cycle, the RCAS is not funded for migrating from NT to Windows 2000, which has a substantial software licensing and hardware upgrade costs. Prudent DII COE compliance actions will be taken during the system's sustainment. In addition, Defense Messaging System (DMS) compliance is considered as a criterion in all design analyses and product selections. The RCAS has an approved JTA-A migration plan. Part I was approved on June 4, 1996 and part II was approved on December 5, 1997.

2. Infrastructure Strategy:

The RCAS architecture is based on the use of Intel processor equipped workstations running the Windows NT operating system, Microsoft Office/Project/ and JetForm Filler OA software, Microsoft Exchange electronic mail (e-mail), and integrated GOTS/COTS mission support

software. RCAS workstations have access to local databases and printers through a Windows NT compatible Local Area Network (LAN). The database provides the necessary data for use by a brigade, division, USP&FO, and unit-level GOTS/COTS applications. The system includes the database, Web/application, and data exchange servers. Change transactions are entered at the echelon/unit level and executed at the database server. WAN connectivity will vary from one-way dial-up modem access for single-user sites to

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

dedicated WAN access for large sites. Network capabilities will be provided by the Defense Information System Network (DISN), FTS 2001 frame relay service, state provided networks, or in the case of small sites, telephone service. The choice of connectivity for each site will be based on the most cost-effective service available to support system traffic load and connectivity requirements. E-mail will be supported over the network by multiple hierarchical mail hubs. Additional desktop devices can be added to each RCAS LAN without additional network hardware.

Of the approximately 57,000 workstations in the final RCAS solution, 44,500 were supplied through Project funding and 2,500 through reuse of existing assets. The Army National Guard and the Army Reserve provided the remaining 10,000. All other hardware was procured with RCAS project funding. RCAS hardware and software components were procured through the contract and delivered by the contractor under the terms of the contract agreement utilizing "best commercial practices." Data transmission requirements were met through a telecommunications architecture that was initially funded by the RCAS project, with recurring operational costs supported by the using organizations. Existing telecommunications were utilized when technically feasible.

Initial procurement and deployment of all desktop and telecommunications hardware was completed in FY 01. Subsequent hardware refreshment will be completed based on a five-year re-buy cycle, to begin in FY 02.

3. Are H/W requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided? Yes
4. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?

The RCAS teamed with the National Guard Distributive Training Technology Project (DTTP) to migrate Army National Guard State Commands to an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) backbone. The two programs are maximizing the synergistic benefits of this arrangement and realizing economies of scale associated with circuit cost and usage ratios. ATM is a cell-switched technology. The USAR and the ARNG have implemented ATM backbones. These ATM networks are interconnected through the NIPRNET. A 1.544 Mbps (T1 speed) ATM connection was deployed to connect the STARC and RSC sites to ARNG and USAR, respectively.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The RCAS WAN utilizes a frame relay between STARC and RSC locations and their subordinate sites. Frame relay is a packet-switched communications service that provides improved performance through reduced delays, more efficient bandwidth utilization, and the potential for decreased communications usage cost. The bandwidth being deployed is dependent on the size of the site.

Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) is the primary protocol used to connect workstations and servers throughout RCAS. TCP/IP is the standard communication protocol for Army systems. TCP/IP is the core set of protocols required to transfer information across a routed Internet. The TCP portion operates at the transport layer of the Open Systems Interface (OSI) protocol stack. TCP adds a destination port and other information to the outgoing data and puts the resultant group of information in a TCP segment.

5. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?

The RCAS interfaces with numerous existing Army systems, and will interface with future Army systems. A system interface requirement is identified if there is a process documented in the OCD that requires data from an external system, or there is a process documented for an external system that requires data from RCAS. System Interface Agreements (SIA) have been established with required Standard Army Management Information Systems (STAMIS). Data exchange processes using external interfaces will provide RCAS with regular updates of the most current data available.

6. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?

The RCAS supports numerous inherent Government functions. Specifically, the RCAS supports the Title 10 functions of manning, equipping, training and sustaining the Army's RC. To satisfy these requirements, the acquisition strategy stipulates the priority for acquiring software as: 1) GOTS products that fulfill functional requirements; 2) COTS; and 3) new development, only if no GOTS or COTS are available to fulfill requirements. During the Project's restructure, the VAT evaluated the usability of COTS software products and the reusability of 52 GOTS software products in meeting the Project's validated requirements. The Project developed a technical and economic analysis model based on DoD's Software Re-engineering Assessment Handbook to assess the GOTS/COTS

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

products coverage of RCAS functionality. In addition, a number of GOTS/COTS packages were attained and loaded in the Proof of Concept Lab to demonstrate feasibility. As a result of these analyses, the Project identified the remaining requirements as new development. To date, the RCAS solution contains 33 percent GOTS/COTS software and 67 percent custom developed software.

7. Describe the Data Architecture approach.

The RCAS Data Architecture is based on the use of Intel processor equipped workstations running the Windows NT operating system, Microsoft Office/Project/ and OA software, Microsoft Exchange electronic mail (e-mail), and integrated GOTS/COTS mission support software. RCAS workstations have access to local databases and printers through a Windows NT compatible LAN. The database provides the necessary data for use by a brigade, division, USP&FO, and unit-level GOTS/COTS applications. The system includes the database, Web/application, and data exchange servers. Change transactions are entered at the echelon/unit level and executed at the database server.

WAN connectivity will vary from one-way dial-up modem access for single-user sites to dedicated WAN access for large sites. Network capabilities are provided by the Defense Information System Network (DISN), FTS 2001 frame relay service, state provided networks, or in the case of small sites, telephone service. The choice of connectivity for each site is based on the most cost-effective service available to support system traffic load and connectivity requirements. RCAS telecommunications supports mobilization, relocation, and reorganization of units, as well as Continuity of Operations (COOP). E-mail is supported over the network by multiple hierarchical mail hubs. Additional desktop devices can be added to each RCAS LAN without additional network hardware.

In coordination with the users, database servers were consolidated at State Area Command (STARC) and RSC/DRC levels. These database servers require dial-up modem access to the RCAS network for small sites and use previously fielded ARNG and USAR PCs as RCAS workstations, in order to meet CAIV objectives.

8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The RCAS Functional Architecture is designed to be consistent with DoD and DA standards. Based upon the significant cost to migrate RCAS to DII COE Level 5 compliance, and the change in mandate for the use of the COE in the JTA-A, the Army CIO directed the Project to expend no further resources on higher levels of DII COE and remain at the current level (Level III) of compliance until the system migrates from Windows NT to Windows 2000 during system's sustainment phase. In addition, the system is designed to be consistent with:

- DMS;
- DoD Technical Architecture Framework for Information Management (TAFIM);
- JTA-A; and
- GIG.

W. Security and Privacy:

1. Describe the Security approach (Defense in depth).

Security – Windows NT with Service Pack 6A is the current operating system for both servers and workstations. This National Security Agency (NSA) – tested system is compliant with the Government's requirement for C2-level security under conditions approved by the NSA. The required capability includes the isolation of user data on a need-to-know basis. The RCAS Generic Security Accreditation grants the authority to store and process unclassified sensitive information in the unclassified subsystem in systems high security mode of operation. No security clearance is required for users in the unclassified subsystem; however, users may only be assigned access to information using the access control mechanisms in place to ensure they have the proper need-to-know for information based on their duty responsibilities. The Security Accreditation also grants the authority to store and process classified sensitive information up to the Secret level in the classified subsystem in the systems high security mode of operation. Users must possess a minimum Secret Security Clearance for access to the classified subsystem. In addition, the RCAS Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) plan has been updated and briefed to the Director of Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (DISC4) Information Assurance Office. This plan includes new initiatives and security measures

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

that have been implemented since the RCAS Department of Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP) Re-Accreditation in November 1999. The DITSCAP Re-Accreditation, required in November 2002, remains on schedule.

2. Privacy assessments for this initiative.

The FOUO/Privacy Act Analysis was performed by the RCAS PMO on December 14, 2001 IAW Army Regulation (AR) 380-19.

3. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card (CAC)? If no, when will it be?

The functional proponent has not identified requirements for RCAS to implement the CAC. However, the RCAS PMO successfully tested the use of CAC for network access in order to meet the December 2002 compliance date. In addition, RCAS has been issued test cards by the DoD CAC Office and will use Smart Card Readers from the approved list (provided by PM SCT-D) to complete system design and engineering. In addition, all future RCAS hardware replacements will be CAC compliant. The estimated completion date for complete hardware refreshment is FY 05.

X. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

*If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why.

The GPEA (Oct 98) was enacted after the RCAS restructure in FY 96, consequently the RCAS was not included as part of the DoD Strategic GPEA Plan. However, RCAS indirectly supports the Army's GPEA compliance by conducting electronic transactions (when practicable) and maintaining records electronically (when practicable).

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

A. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which PBMS will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life-cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach.

The Project utilizes a fully integrated business management approach that provides for early and accurate determination of the Project's progress. The Project's use of earned value management, coupled with integrated baseline reviews, extensive program metrics and an active risk management program, allows for early detection of variances. These processes, combined with a flexible contract vehicle, provide maximum early response and corrective actions.

T. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

The following table identifies Life-cycle costs as of MS IIIId:

	Dollars in Millions						
	Sunk Costs	FY 00	<i>FY 01</i>	<i>FY 02</i>	<i>FY 03</i>	<i>FY 04-07</i>	Total

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Total Life-Cycle Cost (as of MS IIIId)	718.8	191.0	240.3	225.8	204.4	765.4	2345.7
Rebaseline Total Resources by FY							

The Life Cycle Cost was derived from the OSD Major Automated Information System Review Council (MAISRC) OIPT MS IIIa decision and represents the approved ACP per the ACRB 19 September 1996, as updated for the MS IIIId Review April 2001. Costs incurred in the years prior to the restructured project (FY88-95) in the amount of \$842.9M are not included in the costs shown above. The current APB, as updated for the MS IIIId Review, was approved February 2001.

The RCAS project provides for developing and fielding a total system solution that includes hardware, software, and telecommunications architecture. The RCAS PMO continuously interacts with other Army commands and DOD agencies to eliminate potential duplicative or redundant requirements, and to capitalize on cost saving initiatives where possible.

Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? No

Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget?

The MS IIIe review was conducted in October 01, however a MS IIIe Fielding Decision has been delayed pending approval of the revised RCAS ACP.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

C. Current Baseline Information:

The APB was established and approved in July 1996 and remains valid as updated for MS IIIb, November 1997, MS IIIc, December 1999, and MS IIIId, April 2001. The costs denoted are the total funds necessary to satisfy RCAS Increments 1 through 8 requirements. The incremental, or evolutionary development process of the RCAS, will further amend the baseline to separately address each increment being added to the project.

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005- FY 2007	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	687.9	110.7	113.1	45.0	41.3	173.7	1171.7

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	690.7	115.3	112.3	93.7	86.8	621.1	1719.9
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	2.8	4.6	(0.8)	48.7	45.5	447.4	548.2
Schedule Goals (months)							

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President’s Budget submission? No. However, sustainment funding (FY 03-07) for the Total System has increased due to the redirection of Army resources to correct chronic IT infrastructure shortfalls. RCAS infrastructure refreshment funding is now reflected as part of the Program.
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? N/A
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. N/A
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). N/A
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. N/A
- If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

N. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline: Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent.
Through FY 01, the Project's Budget was \$ 742.8M and actual budget execution was \$ 741.2M. In addition, from FY 96-FY 01, the Prime Contract's cumulative Cost Performance Index (CPI) was 1.1 and the Schedule Performance Index (SPI) is 1.0. The Project's positive CPI and SPI are indicators that the Project continues to be on schedule and within budget.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Listed below are the major events and milestones in the RCAS life cycle. The dates shown represent the target or objective date. Per DoD 5000.2-R, the threshold dates are three months later than the objective date.

Baseline (Milestone) Schedule	FY02 President's Budget (Month Year)		FY03 Budget Estimate (Month Year)
	Approved	Achieved	Approved/Estimated
Milestone 0	4 th Qtr, FY87	Jul 87	
Milestone I	4 th Qtr, FY89	Sep 89	
Milestone II	1 st Qtr, FY91	Nov 91	
Red Team Assessment		Feb 95	
Validation Assessment Team Review		Apr-Jul 95	
Contract Restructure		Jan 96	
Milestone IIIa (Increment 1)		Sep 96	
Milestone IIIb (Increment 2)		Sep 97	
Milestone IIIc (Increment 3)		Oct 99 ^{1,2,3}	
Milestone IIId (Increment 4/5)		4 th Qtr, FY99 ^{3,5,6}	
Milestone IIIe (Increment 6)		4 th Qtr, FY00 ^{3,6}	
Milestone IIIf (Increment 7)		4 th Qtr, FY01 ⁶	
Milestone IIIg (Increment 8)		4 th Qtr, FY02 ⁶	
			2 nd Qtr, FY02 ⁹
			4 th Qtr, FY02
			2 nd Qtr, FY03 ⁸

Foot Notes:

1. During the MS IIIb review in November 1997, the Increment 3 Fielding Decision (MS IIIc) was modified from July 1998 to October 1998. This modification did not extend the milestone date beyond the threshold value.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

2. During the July 1998 IPR (IIPT), the baseline schedule for Increment 3 (MS IIIc) was modified from October 1998 to July 1999. This modification was incorporated to accommodate additional Force Authorization requirements, the transition to an NT database server, the transition from the SyBase to Oracle Relational Database Management System (RDBMS), and the introduction of File Transfer Protocol for data exchange. The IIPT approved this modification to the schedule.
3. In conjunction with the April 1999 IPR (IIPT), the baseline schedule for Increment 3 was modified from July 1999 to October 1999. This modification occurred as a result of DOD direction requiring that the Project address Year 2000 as its principal priority. Additional impacts of this direction included modifications to the baseline schedules for Increment 4 (MS IIIId changed from 4th Quarter, FY99 to 3rd Quarter, FY00) and Increment 5 (MS IIIe was changed from 4th Quarter, FY00 to 1st Quarter, FY01). The IIPT approved this modification to the schedule.
4. During the MS IIIc review in December 1999, the IT OIPT required additional test data analysis on Force Authorization and Commander's Clipboard functional software applications. On 23 March 2000, the results of the additional testing were briefed to the IT OIPT representatives and based on the favorable test results, the IT OIPT approved full fielding of Increment 3.
5. Representatives from the IT OIPT completed a review of the Project's current acquisition strategy, the need to adjust the present milestone schedule, and the RCAS proposed acquisition strategy and increment schedule. In light of the remaining schedule and required functionality, the IIPT approved the consolidation of Increments 4 and 5 and the proposed acquisition strategy and schedule.
6. In conjunction with the June 2000 IIPT, Increments 4 and 5 were consolidated into one increment to reduce schedule conflicts created by Y2K compliance efforts, Increment 3 testing issues, and DoD CIO Certification. In addition, consolidating these increments improved the timing of remaining milestone reviews, reduced deployment challenges (i.e., deployment of one major release versus two releases over a short period of time), created Project efficiencies (e.g., testing), and maximized the continued focus on software development and product delivery. The baseline schedule for the consolidated Increment 4/5 Fielding Decision

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

(MS IIIId) was modified from 3rd Quarter, FY00 to 1st Quarter, FY01. With this consolidation, the remaining increments (6, 7, and 8) become associated with MS IIIe, MS IIIf, and MS IIIg, respectively. The IIPT approved this modification.

7. To accommodate the ATEC's operational test of Increment 4/5, the Increment 4/5 Fielding Decision (MSIIIId) was modified from 1st Quarter, FY01 to 2nd Quarter, FY01. Due to IIPT membership availability and resolution of RC sustainment funding issues, the Increment 4/5 Fielding Decision was delayed to July 2001.
8. In an effort to maximize the delivery of RCAS functionality (based on direction from the RCAS Requirements Control Board (RCB)), Increment 8 will include developed functionality that requires testing and fielding in FY03. To accommodate OT, MS IIIg will move from 4th Qtr, FY02 to 2nd Qtr, FY03.
9. Due to the MS IIIId ADM requirement to address system affordability, the Increment 6 fielding decision continues to be delayed and is now projected to 2nd Quarter FY 02.
10. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assessment will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.

The Project directly supports the mission and goals of the RC, specifically in the areas of mobilization, readiness, training and knowledge management. In support of these goals, the Project will improve administrative tasks, provide timely and accurate mobilization information, and improve organizational decision making by:

- Improving unit readiness reporting through reducing unit status report preparation time;
- Improving soldier readiness assessments through reducing the evaluation time;
- Improving the troop structure compilation process through reducing troop structure report preparation time; and

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Improving unit safety evaluation process through the provision of timely safety data and reducing safety report preparation time.

More specifically at the system level, the RCAS will accomplish the following technical goals:

- Reduce Local Transaction Response Time to ≤ 15 seconds, 95% of the time.
- Reduce Remote Storage Access Time to ≤ 10 minutes, 99% of the time.
- Account for data and information 100% of the time.
- Send and receive data and information with 99% data accuracy.

The Project plans to field the following functionality in FY02-03 to further meet goals:

- Increment 6 will add SOH management, force authorization, HR functionality, and COTS upgrades.
- Increment 7 will add SOH management, mobilization planning, force management, and HR functionality; and COTS upgrades.
- Increment 8 will add remaining mobilization, force management, SOH management, HR functionality, COTS upgrades, and GOTS hosting. With the completion of Increment 8, the essential mobilization planning data will reside in the RCAS integrated database.

To date RCAS has delivered significant functionality to the RC through the fielding of both hardware and software resulting in measurable improvement in mission performance in all goal areas. More specifically, the Project has developed, tested, and fielded the following:

- Increment 1 provided the Project's infrastructure through WAN inter-connectivity, COTS office automation software, and classified-capable and unclassified workstations. Increment 1 is an integrated package of state-of-the-art COTS hardware and
1640/Reserve Component Automation System - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

software products selected to provide the user community an immediate capability to meet unit administration, mobilization, and communication needs;

- Increment 2 introduced data servers and logistics functionality, and was deployed in a series of releases. In the first release (Release 2.0), three GOTS applications (Unit Level Logistics System-Ground (ULLS-G), Unit Level Logistics System-S4 (ULLS-S4), and Standard Property Book System-Redesign (SPBS-R)) were hosted to run on Microsoft Windows 95 as an interim host platform. Migration to the final RCAS architecture (Microsoft Windows NT) will follow when the Global Combat Support System A/T (GCSS A/T) is fielded. Subsequent releases, 2.1 and 2.1.1 provided COTS upgrades, additional logistics functionality, and Y2K upgrades and hot-fixes. This increment also addressed initial software encryption requirements.
- Increment 3 introduced force authorization, training, and human resources functionality. These functional areas include both new development and hosting GOTS software on the RCAS. Increment 3 also provides for transition to an ORACLE database management system, and an upgrade to the infrastructure via COTS products (e.g., Outlook 98, Internet Explorer 5.0, Project 98, and Jetform 5.1). This increment also addressed the second phase of the software encryption requirements.
- Increment 4/5 added occupational health management, training, force authorization enhancements, and additional HR functionality and approved COTS software upgrades.

In turn, the fielding of RCAS Increments 1-4/5 enabled the following examples of mission performance improvements:

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

RCAS Goal	Business Process	MISSION PERFORMANCE
Improve Administrative Tasks	Report Unit Vacancies	Report preparation time reduced by 93 percent
	Maintain Medical Readiness	Patient record update time reduced by 94 percent
	Process Soldier's Orders	Order preparation time reduced by 50 percent
	Publish Organizational Authority	Cost-savings of \$3600 annually
	Request Training	Training request time reduced by 72 percent
	Reconcile Personnel Data	Reconciliation time reduced by 99 percent
Provide Timely and Accurate Mobilization Information	Request Rations	Ration request time reduced by 58 percent
	Determine Unit Status	Report preparation time reduced by 87 percent
	Compile Troop Structure	Report preparation time reduced by 79 percent
	Exchange Information Externally	External interface successful 98 percent of time
	Report Force Size	Report preparation time reduced by 79 percent
	Determine Weapons Qualification	Response time reduced by 98 percent
Improve Organizational Decision Making	Validate Organizational Authority	Report preparation time reduced by 99 percent
	Review Retirement Eligibility	Assessment time reduced by 85 percent
	Determine Soldier Readiness	Evaluation time reduced by 96 percent
	Exchange Information Internally	Internal interface successful 99 percent of time
	Evaluate Unit Safety	Report preparation time reduced by 50 percent
	Secure Organizational Information	Data was securely processed 100 percent of time
	Identify Annual Safety Trends	Report preparation time reduced by 50 percent

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

1. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.

The measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative are:

FY2002

Goal 1: Enable and protect data exchange.

Metric: The percentage of data and information accounted for.

Goal 2: Provide timely and accurate mobilization information.

Metric: Response time for individual orders in support of mobilization.

FY2003

Goal 1: Enable and protect data exchange.

Metric: The percentage of data and information accounted for.

Goal 2: Provide timely and accurate mobilization information.

Metric: Response time for individual orders in support of mobilization.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: N/A

Department of Defense
Standard Installation – Division Personnel System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

As of 5 March 2002 DoD D, CIO continues to assess this capital investment business case requirement.

Department of Defense
Standard Installation – Division Personnel System
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

This National Security System is managed as a Major Defense Weapon System Acquisition. The DoD Deputy CIO recommends use of the SAR, provided to OMB acquisition in lieu of a Capital Investment Report.

Department of Defense
Total Distribution Program
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

As of 5 March 2002 DoD D, CIO continues to assess this capital investment business case requirement.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II (TC-AIMS II)

Budget Initiative Number: 1935

IT Registration System Number (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation): DA00555

Mission Critical Status: No

Information Technology Project or National Security System: IT

Program Activity/Mission Area: Logistics

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: Jan 1997

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; Block I - 3d Qtr, FY02, and of Project: 4th Qtr, FY 09.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

PM submits Monthly Acquisition Program Review (MAPR) reports to the Army Acquisition Executive and quarterly Defense Acquisition Executive Summary (DAES) reports through the Army Acquisition Executive to the Defense Acquisition Executive. In addition, the OSD Chief Information Officer as TC-AIMS II Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) periodically conducts review of the TC-AIMS II acquisition and formally approves major system milestones.

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): 21 Jul 97

1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Project is in combined Phase I & II, Approval Dated: 21 Jul 1997, Requirements Definition & Risk Reduction, Engineering Manufacturing Phase as of the current review.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: At least 1%.

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

CCA Assessment has been submitted to the Army CIO (DISC4) and comments are being worked. The CCA Certification is being reviewed by IIPT members and will be submitted for Army and OSD CIO approvals prior to the planned Milestone III review in 3d Quarter, FY02.

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G?

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes. The Program received additional funding to support validated software development and hardware acquisition/deployment requirements from HQDA.

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level Due to specific Congressional actions? Yes.

How were the resource costs determined?

Software development costs were determined through an IV&V function point count for each development block. The function points were then applied to industry costing standards. The COTS hardware acquisition/deployment requirements were generated by the HQDA functional proponent and costed using current industry standards.

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process? Yes No

Is this project categorized a financial management or Financial Feeder System? Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Project Activity/Mission Area: Logistics

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full Acquisition							
OMA	62.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.9
OPA	29.6	12.3	25.3	11.5	15.1	85.5	179.3
RDTE	0.0	16.8	9.8	10.3	7.3	45.9	90.1
Total Dev Mod	92.5	29.1	35.1	21.8	22.4	131.4	332.3
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	13.3	2.3	7.3	7.6	7.6	36.8	74.9
OMNG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
OMAR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4
MPA	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.1

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

RPA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5
Total Current Services	13.6	2.4	7.4	7.7	7.7	42.4	2
Total Resources by FY	106.1	31.5	42.5	29.5	30.1	173.8	413.5

PART II. Justification and Other Information

L. Description/Performance Characteristics:

TC-AIMS II, a joint management information system, will consolidate management of the unit/installation-level transportation functions of Unit Movement, Load Planning and Installation Transportation Office/Traffic Management Office (ITO/TMO) operations into a single automated capability for use throughout the Department of Defense (DoD).

TC-AIMS II will integrate the functionality of selected, existing Service-unique transportation legacy systems into a single AIS migration system. The objective system will provide software applications designed for easy data retrieval, data exchange and connectivity to relevant external sources. It will also support a common hardware suite of equipment for the Army.

The JTCC assessed the detailed functional, technical and programmatic capabilities of 120 transportation and transportation-related automated information systems. Of those, 62 were identified for elimination. The remaining 58 systems were evaluated to identify migration systems (systems that would continue to be used, with or without modifications) that could eliminate unnecessary duplication among individual Service systems while increasing efficiencies, or that could be developed to provide Joint systems that retained Service-unique system functionalities. Twenty-three were selected as “migration systems”; of these five were evaluated specifically for Unit Move and ITO/TMO functions. The systems selected for continuation/development were to provide cost effective solutions and improve functional processes/capabilities, while simultaneously ensuring the outcome supported the DoD strategic and logistics plans. The long-range focus of the JTCC migration effort was to build toward the future to support the DoD strategic, logistics, and action plans. The methodology, analysis and results of the JTCC study were documented in an Integrated Decision Paper for Unit Movement (1 Feb 1995, revised 14 Apr 1995) prepared by the JTCC and DISA. The selection of a migration system was based on functional, technical and programmatic considerations as outlined in the JTCC Methodology for Development of

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Integrated Decision Papers. An extensive study was accomplished using user and developer questionnaires, and automated tools (such as the Defense Integration Support Tools and Architecture Design Analysis and Planning Tool). The System Evaluation and Estimation of Resources-Software Estimation Model (SEER-SEM) module was used to evaluate the costs to redesign, reuse, integrate and maintain software. The JTCC methodology identified three alternative solutions for satisfying the Unit Move functional baseline. Each alternative would build around a “core” legacy system, while adding the necessary hardware/software components of the others. Each alternative was evaluated for functional, technical, programmatic and cost considerations. Based on their assessment, the IDP recommended that a new system, named TC-AIMS II, be built around the core US Marine Corps TC-AIMS/MDSS II system. This alternative provided the optimum solution considering the factors above, including cost. Significantly, the TC-AIMS II was not intended to be a wholly new developmental program, but rather a cost-effective solution to modify/enhance/improve an existing system, while integrating the “best of breed” functionalities from other legacy systems.

TC-AIMS II resulted from a major business process reengineering effort by the US Transportation Command (US TRANSCOM) in 1994/95. This effort was initiated in response to a 1993 Secretary of Defense Memorandum calling for improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the DTS through application of functional process improvement and central control of transportation-related systems development.

L. Program Management/Management Oversight:

The Headquarters Department of the Army (HQDA) Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (ODCSLOG) executes the designated USA lead Service responsibilities and provides functional proponentcy for USA actions. The Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) J-4 is the Logistics Mobility and Sustainment process owner. TC-AIMS II is managed by PM, TC-AIMS II. PM, TC-AIMS II is assigned to the Program Executive Officer (PEO), Enterprise Information Systems (EIS) who reports directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE), and is PM Level III certified. He assumed the position in Jun 2001. The General Services Administration provides contracting support for this project.

There are seven Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) chartered and chaired by the Project Manager. The IPTs are: Test and Evaluation, Requirements, Technical, Cost, Integrated Logistics Support, Security and Communications. Additionally, a DoD Overarching
1935/Transportation Coordinators’ Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Working-Level IPT (WIPT) periodically reviews the program. Based on the final ORD and independent engineering assessments of the software complexity and sizing, an Acquisition Program Baseline is in development. Earned value measures are used to monitor development cost and schedule.

N. Acquisition Strategy:

Block 2 development contract is in the process of being awarded to DynCorp, Chantilly, Virginia, through the General Services Administration. It includes maintenance of Phase 1.

Block 2 software will be developed under a single Task Order awarded under the GSA Federal Supply Schedule 70, Information Technology. This will be a Time and Materials Task Order using the said GSA Schedule rates. An *Earned Value* like system will be used to track cost and schedule. The *Earned Value* information will be used by the JPMO to manage the development effort.

Rationale for Approach-- To meet 18-month Block capability delivery, the JPMO must shorten the traditional development contract award cycle. The most effective way to do that is to award Task Orders against existing contract vehicles such as those managed by GSA. For Blocks 2-7 this approach works well from a technical perspective as well. Technical risk to both the government and contractor is minimal given that the bulk of the capability is being delivered by integrating COTS/GOTS software rather than through full-scale software development. Further, by awarding new task orders for each Block, the JPMO uses competition among potential offerors to control cost and motivate the contractor to deliver the *Best Value* to the government.

W. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

The primary motivation behind development of the TC-AIMS II system was not purely economic, although tangible economic benefits were identified in the assessment. The main thrust, however, was to develop a robust, efficient and effective transportation support system to meet the stringent worldwide deployment requirements of today's CINCs. While cost analyses played a role in the decision to implement the TC-AIMS II solution, operational necessity for critical wartime missions was a driving factor. Details regarding two analyses and one case study are provided below. Currently, there is not a formal, cost-based return on investment (ROI). The formal cost-based ROI will be completed as part of the EA prior to Milestone III. However, as identified earlier, the benefits of the TC-AIMS II

1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

go far beyond cost savings. This new automated system will provide significant improvement to mission performance and qualitative mission benefits.

- DTS Economic Analysis: The initial cost analysis supporting the decision to migrate to the TC-AIMS II system was established in the Integrated Decision Paper for Unit Moves. Each of the alternative migration system solutions was costed and compared. The TC-AIMS II solution, in addition to being the technical/functional-preferred solution, was also the low cost alternative by \$7M to \$19 M over the competing alternatives.
- Programmatic Life Cycle Cost Analysis: The detailed EA and cost estimates for the TC-AIMS II program are still under development. The Services are finalizing deployment locations, fine-tuning employment doctrines, and defining fielding and training strategies.
- JTCC Business Case Study: A preliminary cost analysis was provided in the Jan 1996 JTCC document: "A Business Case Study for Transportation Systems Migration". While no specific ROI was developed, the JTCC concluded that implementation of the TC AIMS II system, coupled with elimination of legacy systems, would be beneficial to the Department by investing in a single objective system, with increased interoperability with DoD logistics planning and combat support systems. Development of a single system will support improved Joint deployment processes and reengineered Service business processes.

A critical underlying assumption in deciding to implement TC-AIMS II is that business process reengineering will be accomplished, implemented, and accepted by the user community. It also assumes that TC-AIMS II will prove to be dynamic and can maintain pace with commercial best practices as well as changes in the DoD's strategic deployment needs. Additionally, based on the DTS Economic Analysis above, it is assumed that the total ownership costs of a single, integrated transportation system is more economical than maintaining/upgrading multiple disparate Service stovepipe systems.

An assessment of TC-AIMS II program risks revealed three potential technical risks (requirements management, evolving commercial technology, and data standards) as well as one funding and one schedule risk. Like other joint programs, TC-AIMS II must grapple with managing requirements for four Services. Each Service has its own unique requirements and these requirements are often in competition with others. The challenge for requirements management is to set requirement such that capability is delivered to meet the needs of each Service while not negatively impacting the other Services. Aside from competing requirement the program must also deal with the inevitable growth and instability of Service requirements as concepts of operations and associated force and

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

infrastructure evolve. In the area of evolving commercial technology, in that TC-AIMS makes extensive use of commercial technology, the program must likewise evolve to keep pace with industry standards. The final technical risk is data standards. DoD and to a similar extent, component Services use a fair amount of unique business practices that in turn require unique data standards. The advantages of using commercial technology are diminished proportionately to the amount of customization required to accommodate these unique standards. The initial development phase of TC-AIMS II (Unit Move) is almost complete. However, it delivers roughly fifty percent of the objective functional requirements stated in the ORD. The remaining fifty percents will be delivered in Blocks 2 - 7. Adequate funding to achieve development and fielding of the objective system is not currently available. Regarding the schedule risk, each Block of capability required a Milestone III decision review and each of this is predicated on a favorable economic review. The PM expects that coordination/approval of each economic analysis will have significant schedule impacts for each Block subsequent to Phase I. Strategies have been developed to mitigate the affects of these risks and are included in the TC-AIMS II Acquisition Strategy.

X. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

The TC-AIMS II System Architecture incorporates the use of COTS hardware and software. The system is comprised of data servers, workstations, and laptop notebook computers configured in a Client/Server Architecture. It has an added scalability feature of separately operating in a standalone workstation or laptop notebook configuration. This is supported by a technical architecture which implements applicable standards from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) mandated Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) to include the Defense Information Infrastructure/Common Operating Environment (DII/COE), data standards from Department of Defense Data Dictionary System (DDDS) and appropriate evaluated assurance levels of trust for processing information in a Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU) system. Additionally, the system architecture is extendible to a regional architecture to meet Service operational architecture requirements. Interoperability is being achieved through the use of current/existing communications infrastructure and data standardization/data exchange conversions with existing interface systems. OSD has issued a directive that all-new Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) systems and other systems that interface to C4I systems shall be in compliance with the JTA. The JTA in turn mandates use of the DII/COE. Reference is specifically made to C4I Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Architecture Framework, Certified Information System Auditor (CISA)-0000-104-96, Version 1.0, 7 Jun 1996, and the C4ISR Integration Task Force (ITF) Integrated Architectures Panel. This document presents an

1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

innovative definition of levels of interoperability. The DII/COE adopts these levels of interoperability and maps DII compliance to interoperability levels. The COE defines eight progressively deeper levels of integration for the Runtime Environment Category. These levels are directly tied to the degree of interoperability achieved. True integration begins at Level 4. TC-AIMS II is being developed to DII/COE level Six (6) compliance.

- Infrastructure Strategy:
- Only Army hardware requirements are included in the Army total obligation authority (TOA). The other Services have retained the authority to equip their organizations and funds are in the individual Service TOAs.
- Transport: Each Service is responsible for providing the infrastructure. TC-AIMS II is being developed to operate on existing Service infrastructure.
- TC-AIMS II will interface with installation, unit, and depot-level supply systems. TC-AIMS II will support the Joint Operational Planning and Execution Systems (JOPES), as a source data feeder system to Joint Force Requirements Generator II (JFRG II) and service feeder systems; and will be capable of supporting both peacetime and wartime requirements.
- TC-AIMS II software will incorporate the use of COTS software products (operating systems and database management systems (DBMS)).

☒ The TC-AIMS II system's architecture will facilitate the isolation of resources to be protected and subject to access control, auditing requirements, confidentiality and data integrity. The system is developed and fielded under the full provisions for security certification under the DoD IT Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP), DoD 5200.40, 31 Dec 1997. All system specific security documentation is included in the TC-AIMS II System Security Authorization Agreement (SSAA), dated May 2000. TC-AIMS II application will use file access permissions to protect the applications against modification of code or data structures from external interference, which will be set during installation by the install script. TC-AIMS II executables and files will have their permissions set so as to protect them from internal tampering.

☒ The TC-AIMS II program will operate on hardware provided by the Services, based on configuration management guidance provided by the Joint Program Management Office. The TC-AIMS II client/server and standalone platforms run under Microsoft

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

(MS) Windows NT 4.0 Operating System supporting a Sybase relational database. The TC-AIMS II application is designed to function within the security constraints of the Windows NT Operating System and Sybase database and does not circumvent their accepted levels of security controls.

Y. Security and Privacy:

The PEO, EIS has put in place a security management structure capable of reacting to vulnerability alerts, certifying and accrediting development applications, monitoring compliance of these applications to all IA guidance while maintaining readiness, and ensuring a Defense-in-Depth (DiD) approach to assuring availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality, and non-repudiation attributes are embedded in the Army's mission essential and mission support systems including TC-AIMS II. The TC-AIMS II security process is consistent with the provisions of DoD CIO Policy Memo 6-8510, Information Assurance for Systems Under Development as Part of the Global Information Grid (GIG). The result of these efforts is a standard set of security documentation that identifies all activities to accomplish certification, an evaluation of the products and services to ensure compliance to directives, results of security testing with recommendations from the independent evaluator, and the approved generic accreditation by the PEO EIS.

Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) technology is not currently available for use with TC-AIMS II software. Work is ongoing to develop the implementation plan to integrate PKI functionality into TC-AIMS II. Product analysis, identification of certificate authority options, and review of Service policies/requirements is the focus of the current effort. PKI functionality will be included in the Block 2 development effort.

Z. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

Electronic Signature is not applicable to the current TC-AIMS II Phase/Block.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

A. Performance Based Management Systems (PBMS)

1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

TC-AIMS II uses three performance-based systems. They are: (a) Problem/Control Reports (PCR) tracking system for software problems; (b) Risk Management process identifying approximately 10 of the most critical risks associated with completion of the program; and (c) Earned Value Management system to measure cost, schedule and performance deviations.

PCR tracking system will track, by software version, problems associated with priority, closure and other pertinent data. This is a tool used to measure product quality, determine re-work levels and identify development process weaknesses.

Risk Management attempts to control a program's exposure to risks through identification of risk issues, risk assessment to define probability and impacts to prioritize program risks, the preparation and implementation of risk avoidance and risk contingency plans, and the continuous monitoring of those actions to ensure effectiveness. A Risk Management Board has been established to oversee the process. It is composed of management and/or engineering personnel representing all members of the TC-AIMS II development team and covering all program disciplines. A Risk Management database tool, Risk Radar, has been implemented to record and monitor program risks. The Risk Management Board is responsible for ensuring that all potential problem areas are assessed and controlled.

The Earned Value Management System (EVMS) is used by the developer to track metrics for each Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) element.

It is then used by the PMO to evaluate program cost and schedule variances and pinpoint potential problem areas.

M. Original Baseline:

The Total Life Cycle Cost (LCC) for TC-AIMS II spans FY96 - FY18. Based on the revised acquisition strategy and the IV&V function point count the TC-AIMS II APB is in final stages of coordination among the Service Cost Centers. The projected TC-AIMS II objective LCC to attain full operational capability (complete all seven software development blocks, deploy TC-AIMS II to all Services and sustain the fielded system) is \$1,729M.

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? No.
1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president's budget? Yes. It has slipped from late March 02 to early April 02.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005- FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline: PB02							
Cost Goals (\$M)	106.8	27.2	43.1	19.4	27.2	81.6	305.3
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate: PB03							
Cost Goals (\$M)	106.1	31.5	42.5	29.5	30.1	173.8	413.5
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	(0.7)	4.3	(0.6)	10.1	2.9	92.2	108.2
Schedule Goals (months)							

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? Yes
- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives?
 - FY01 change reflects year of execution adjustment
 - FY02 change reflects FY02 Appropriation adjustments
 - FY03-07 changes reflect FY03 BES and POM adjustments

O. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:

The ORD identifies requirements for Initial Operating Capability (IOC) and Full Operational Capability (FOC). The program office is executing an evolutionary acquisition strategy to achieve these capabilities. TC-AIMS II will be developed and fielded in seven Blocks. IOC will be achieved upon the completion of fielding of Phase 1/ Block 1. The subsequent six Blocks will add capability via software upgrades and will culminate in FOC upon completion of fielding of Block 7.

Measurable performance goals:

FY 2001: Continue Phase 1/Block 1 development with a focus on Unit Move

FY 2002: Complete and field Phase 1/Block 1, start development of Block 2 with a focus on web enabled enhancement

FY 2003: Complete and field Block 2, start development of Block 3 with a focus on movements

FY 2004-07: Complete and field Block 3, develop and field Blocks 4-6, start development of Block 7

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: None Required

1935/Transportation Coordinators' Automated Information for Movement System II - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Warfighters' Simulation (WARSIM)

Budget Initiative Number: 5047

IT Registration System Number _____(Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: No

Information Technology Project or National Security System: Information Technology Project

Program Activity/Mission Area: Science and Technology

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: Ongoing

Date Project was Initiated: 1994

Projected Date for Completion of Phase; IOC FY 2005 and of Project FOC FY 2008, with annual software and hardware upgrades throughout its lifecycle.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): 20 June 1994

Project is in EMD PHASE or MILESTONE, Approval Dated 20 June 1994 Phase as of current review

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?
At the direction of the MDA, an independent audit of the WARSIM program was conducted by AMC. The recommendations have been incorporated in the program strategy and execution plans.

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW
Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: 1%

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status? 3-4 December 2001 return visit for review and follow-up scheduled for April 2002.

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No

If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? N/A Yes No

If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G? N/A

Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources? Yes

Were there changes to your resources (manpower/dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? Yes, minor adjustments.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document? General reductions

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions? Congressional

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)? Validated Program Office Estimate

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes No

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
RDTE	129.6	28.1	4.9	4.0	2.2	4.4	173.2
Total Dev Mod	129.6	28.1	4.9	4.0	2.2	4.4	173.2
Full Acquisition							
OPA	0.0	0.0	1.0	20.5	58.0	34.5	114.0
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	1.0	20.5	58.0	34.5	114.0
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	0.0	0.0	4.2	11.9	19.0	76.0	111.1
Total Current Services	0.0	0.0	4.2	11.9	19.0	76.0	111.1
Total Resources by FY	129.6	28.1	10.1	36.4	79.2	114.9	398.3

PART II. Justification and Other Information

N. Description/Performance Characteristics:

5047/Warfighter's Simulation (WARSIM) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

1. Description. WARSIM is a computer-based simulation, with associated hardware, to support the training of unit commanders and their battle staffs, from battalion through theater-level, as well as for the use of command post training events in educational institutions. WARSIM will provide a comprehensive training environment capable of linking its simulation-based constructive entities with virtual (simulator-based) and live (instrumented vehicle) entities. WARSIM will provide a complete synthetic operational environment with scenarios drawn from the entire operational continuum to support Army, joint, and coalition force training, distributed across the globe.
2. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan). Designed and built using modern computer technology, modern software engineering techniques and validated algorithms and databases, WARSIM will allow Army units world-wide to train in their command posts using their organizational equipment. Through the use of modern technology and advanced software constructs WARSIM will minimize the total Army's overhead associated with supporting command post training.
3. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches. The requirement for WARSIM is based upon an Army-wide replacement of legacy command and control simulation systems. It was selected as the Army's primary command and control training tool based upon training effectiveness and cost efficiencies over and above the current legacy command and control simulation systems.
4. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. WARSIM is managed under the auspices of the DOD 5000 series of directives and instructions for weapon system acquisition with an acquisition designation of ACAT II. In concert with this designation, Army outlines the processes and procedures employed for management of the WARSIM acquisition. The WARSIM contracts contain provisions for monthly-earned value reporting.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

M. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed? The Functional Proponent is the National Simulation Center, US Army TRADOC. The Army Acquisition Executive (AAE) is the Milestone Decision Authority; The Program Manager is the PM Warfighter Simulation (WARSIM); U.S. Army Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command is the executing agent; and the Contracting Office is the Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division, Orlando, FL. DSN 970-3662/ PM WARSIM, DSN 970-3650, STRICOM, ATTN: AMSTI-WARSIM, 12350 Research Parkway, Orlando, FL 32826-3276
2. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed. Yes, WARSIM is managed by means of a Partnership arrangement with the contractors and the National Simulation Center, the user proponent of the system. Below this management level, the entire project is decomposed along functional lines with IPT for each concurrent engineering effort. IPTs are staffed with appropriate representation from each member of the partnership and augmented as necessary with members from other key areas of expertise from other agencies and contractors.

O. Acquisition Strategy:

1. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded. The prime contractor for WARSIM is Lockheed Martin Information Systems (LMIS) Group, Orlando, FL. The prime contractor for the WIM segment is Veridian, Fairfax, VA.
2. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen. Best value principles were applied in the contractor selection process. CPAF was chosen in order to incentivize contractor performance and mitigate the risk associated with this highly complex software development. LMIS and Veridian were selected as a result of a free and open competitive selection.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

3. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract. The contracts are performance based with provisions for monthly-earned value reporting.

Y. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

25. No Formal cost benefit analysis or ROI has been performed to date. An assessment of the age and capabilities of the legacy systems to be replaced was done prior to approval of the Operational Requirements Document (ORD).

Z. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

41. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.) The system will be designed to meet emerging High Level Architecture (HLA) standards and protocols to facilitate interoperability with other HLA compliant simulations, simulators, and live training events. WARSIM will be Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE) compliant at the highest level that ensures HLA compliance.
42. Infrastructure Strategy: WARSIM is interdependent on the core architecture to be provided by the Joint Simulation System (JSIMS).
43. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided? Yes, all WARSIM hardware requirements, which are primarily COTS, are included in the funding outlined herein. However, it must be noted that the JSIMS hardware requirements for Army JSIMS-unique sites are not included in the WARSIM (Army) budget.
44. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means? All the equipment is to be from commercial sources and be operated in facilities that conform to standard commercial power and environmental requirements. The system is designed so that the training units can move freely about as they would in live exercises or combat while being 5047/Warfighter's Simulation (WARSIM) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

stimulated by the simulation. The Command Post Interface Module (CPIM) is the interface between the simulation and the organic C4I equipment. The CPIM interfaces with the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) through the tactical communication system. The communication from the CPIM is accomplished through wire or wireless Local Area Network (LAN).

45. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)? The Army's Deputy Chief of Staff Operations (DCSOPS) signed a Joint MOA committing to provide the land warfare functionality for a new Joint Simulation System (JSIMS). WARSIM is interdependent on the core architecture to be provided by the Joint Simulation System (JSIMS).
46. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Mix of COTS and Custom. Provide justification for custom components? Army centric simulation software as specified by TRADOC. WARSIM provides a realistic synthetic environment for commanders and staff from Division through EAC to train a full spectrum of operational scenarios.
7. Describe the Data Architecture approach? Compliant with applicable provisions contained in the Joint Technical Architecture to include Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) Common Operating Environment (COE) compliance.
8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach? Mission

AA. Security and Privacy:

1. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth). Must be able to operate in an unclassified mode as well as to accommodate "multiple levels of security" requirements for training with classified data in classified scenarios. Follows the guidance presented in: Department of Defense, Defense Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency. Joint DoDIIS/Cryptologic SCI Information Systems Security Standards (JDCSISSS), Revision 2, 31 March 2001; DCID 6/3, Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) Directive (DCID) 6/3, Protecting Sensitive Compartmented Information within Information Systems, 6 June 1999; DCID 6/3-Manual, Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) Directive (DCID) 6/3-Manual,

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Protecting Sensitive Compartmented Information within Information Systems-Manual; DoD Intelligence Information Systems (DoDIIS) Security Certification and Accreditation Guide, DS-2610-142-01, April 2001.

2. Privacy assessments for this initiative. N/A
3. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be? N/A

BB. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why. N/A

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

U. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? This is a modeling and simulation project and is managed to ensure that basic R&D goals and scenarios are accomplished

V. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions) and performance benefits or goals for baseline segment or phase of this project. What did you expect to achieve?

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? If so, when and why. The WARSIM Acquisition Plan (AP) was revised to highlight changes in the program's acquisition strategy in 1998. Since the original AP was approved, the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff Operations (DCSOPS) signed a Joint MOA committing to provide the land warfare functionality for a new 5047/Warfighter's Simulation (WARSIM) - IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Joint Simulation System (JSIMS). The JSIMS program has perhaps the most far reaching implications. This initiative calls for participation of all Services and requires extensive coordination of performance requirements, schedules, and costs. In order to account for these impacts, the WARSIM and WARSIM Intelligence Module (WIM) contracts were rebaselined in the areas of cost, schedule, and performance.

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005-FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	184.4	53.3	54.9	55.0	55.0	32.7	435.3
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	129.6	28.1	10.1	36.4	79.2	114.9	398.3
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	(54.8)	(25.2)	(44.8)	(18.6)	24.2	82.2	(37.0)
Schedule Goals (months)							

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President's Budget submission? Yes
 - What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives? Program Expansion
 - Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance. See re-baselining discussion
 - Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means). See re-baselining discussion
 - If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance. Yes, program integration and expansion w/JSIMS (see re-baselining discussion)
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe. N/A
- P. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:** Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —
8. Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.

Performance Goals:

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Performance Goal Summary (Primary Performance Objective Criteria from the Approved APB):

Support Staff & Role Player Automation	66% reduction in support personnel overhead
Synthetic Natural Environment	Virtual environment and interactive targets
Spectrum of Opns & Threats	Operations Other than War
C4I Interface	Full integration with Army C4I equipment
Open Architecture, Object oriented	Fully open and object-oriented
Combat Service Support	Full CSS functionality
JSIMS Land Component	Fully integrated JSIMS component
Intelligence Driver	Portray a full range of threat systems and sensors
HLA Compliant	Interfaces with Army HLA compliant virtual and live simulators
After Action Review	Improvement of IOC Capability based on early user feedback

9. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.

FY 2002: Complete the software development, integration and release of WARSIM Build III, Increments 6; continue software development and integration of WARSIM Build III, Increment 7. Continue Software development and release of WARSIM Intelligence Model (WIM) within JSIMS and WARSIM Version 1.0. Develop and integrate JSMS Common Component Work Station and system Technical Control improvements.

FY 2003: Complete the software development, integration and release of WARSIM Build III, Increments 4 & 5; continue software development and integration of WARSIM Build III, Increment 6. Continue Software development and release of WARSIM Intelligence Model (WIM) within JSIMS and WARSIM Version 1.0. Develop and integrate JSMS Common Component Work Station and system Technical Control improvements.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

FY 2004-07: IOT&E; Production Contract Award; Production and Fielding; Develop, integrate and release Post IOC functionality.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

20. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.

The WARSIM program was designated an ACAT II program in December 1998 from ACAT III. The Acquisition Program Baseline, approved in April 1998, does not include an annual distribution of cost objectives. Because of the ongoing rebaselining, the Acquisition Program Baseline will be revised during FY02. In the current APB, the Development Threshold and the Development Objective is \$402.4M. The Life Cycle Development Threshold is \$527M and Objective Cost is \$479M. The Life Cycle Procurement Threshold is \$231M and Objective Cost is \$210M.

21. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.

- PM JSIMS has been given responsibility for delivery of WARSIM system by the MILDEP to the AAAE.
- The WARSIM cost position is included in the JSIMS Acquisition Program Baseline. CEAC is currently working on validating the cost position.
- Based on guidance from the MILDEP AAE, PM WARSIM has moved out the schedule for all post IOC development.
- WARSIM scheduled completion has been moved to FY04 to better fit within the JSIMS development paradigm.

22. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

- WARSIM contract has experienced cost growth due to the schedule changes in the delivery of JSIMS user interface.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Functionality and current schedule of WARSIM are dependent on timely receipt of JSIMS products; WARSIM and JSIMS schedules have been aligned.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART I. A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Description Information:

Initiative Name and Acronym: Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP)

Budget Initiative Number: 6298

IT Registration System Number ___N/A___ (Section 8121, FY 2000 DoD Appropriation)

Mission Critical Status: N/A

Information Technology Project or National Security System: IT

Program Activity/Mission Area: Logistics Functional Area

PROJECT STATUS:

Project Status: New Ongoing X

Date Project was Initiated: Contract Award December 29, 1999

Projected Date for Completion of Phase: 1st deployment, Jan 03... and of Project: FY 09.

Is this project reviewed by the Procurement Executive for your Component? Yes No X

Explain (this may be as basic as this is not an acquisition project)? The WLMP is not an acquisition program. WLMP is an internal MACOM (AMC) level business execution service funded within the Army Working Capital. The dollars, which were used to fund the same AMC mission before the outsourcing, are now being used for the sustainment of the legacy systems, the modernization effort itself and the long- term (FY09) sustainment and continued improvement of the modernized services. There is no new money for the modernization and sustainment of WLMP core services.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Date of Last Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM): Currently a draft ADM is in the office of ASDATL & C3I for review.

WLMP is not subject to milestone/phase review.

If not in Phase or Milestone, when will it be reviewed or by what other means is the initiative assessed.

Were any weaknesses identified for this initiative in the CIO/program review or during independent evaluations?

On 6-7 December 01, WLMP underwent a comprehensive uninterrupted 2 day review by the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Deputy Chief Information Officer (CIO). There were no weaknesses specifically identified

Assessment, management, oversight and review of the WLMP effort are accomplished continuously by senior level management across DoD from both strategic and operational standpoints. The WLMP is managed by the WLMP Program Office at USACECOM, Ft. Monmouth, NJ. A three level oversight/issue resolution organization based on the IPT concept was put in place to manage the program. At the top of this organizational structure, providing strategic direction, is the Corporate Board of Directors which is headed up by the CG, AMC and the DISC4 and Commander CASCOM; as well as principals from DoD, Army and Joint membership. The membership includes the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Logistics, Director for Logistics J4, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, among others. The CBOD meets at the direction of the chair. In addition, an Operational Board of Directors (OBOD) serves as the CBOD Senior Executive Service oversight and directing body and facilitates requirements for decision-making. The OBOD is chaired by the Principal Deputy to the DCG, AMC and is made up of all AMC Integrated Materiel Management Center (IMMC) Directors, and other key Army leaders. The OBOD meets more frequently than the CBOD and lately has approximated once a month. The WLMP progress is also reported through the GCSS- Army General Officer Working Group (GOWG). The Department of Defense Deputy Chief Information Officer (DCIO) from the office of ASDC3I exercises oversight in the context of the portfolio management of GCSS-Army as part of Tier 2 GCSS-Army. During and after award of the contract an Information Technology Acquisition Paper and a comprehensive CIO Program Assessment were submitted through AMC to DISC4 and ASDC3I.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

CLINGER-COHEN ACT COMPLIANCE/CIO REVIEW

Information Assurance.

Does the security of this project meet the requirements of the Government Information Security Reform requirements?

Yes No If No, Explain in Part 2, Section F. WLMP meets the requirements of DoD security and information assurance; namely, information assurance based on confidentiality, integrity, availability, non -repudiation and authentication. The WLMP modernized services has performance requirements for each of these requirements and Service Description Documents, Implementation Plans, Process Trials and independent testing done by AAA which will validate and verify these requirements prior to deployment.

Percentage of Initiative supporting Information Assurance Activities in FY 2003: Information Assurance, as stated above, is an integral part of the WLMP and is not readily severable as a percentage of total effort.

Has DoD or Component CIO reviewed this project for CCA Compliance? Yes No

If Yes, when, and what is Status?

The WLMP began to formulate the acquisition strategy in the summer of 1997. The oversight requirements of the Information Technology Reform Act of 1996 (Clinger-Cohen), based on prevailing guidance and agreement among AMC, DISC4 and ASDC3I, at the time, indicated that Clinger Cohen certification requirements did not apply, as WLMP was not an investment in new IT, but was the buying of a service funded by existing AMC wholesale mission dollars; i.e. no additional new money is being used for the WLMP core service performance. WLMP was deemed to be neither an acquisition program nor an investment in Information Technology but rather an internal MACOM (AMC) level business execution service funded within the Army Working Capital. Iterative submissions of an agreed to Information Technology Acquisition Paper (ITAP) and detailed CIO Program Assessment Documentation through AMC to DISC4 and ASDC3I, both prior to and subsequent to award, met program oversight requirements The WLMP, however, meets both the spirit and intent of Clinger Cohen. The Clinger-Cohen Act emphasizes achieving program benefits and meeting agency goals through the effective use of information technology. For example, the Act explicitly requires agency heads to analyze the

6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

missions of their organizations, benchmark and assess the performance of their business processes and, based on this analysis, redesign their mission related and administrative processes before making significant investments in information technology to support those missions. In plain terms, agencies should maximize the potential of technology to improve performance, rather than simply automating inefficient processes. (GAO 10.1.15). While WLMP was deemed to be neither an acquisition program nor investment in Information Technology but rather an internal MACOM (AMC) level business execution service funded within existing Army Working Capital funds; it still incorporates all of the above core tenets of the Clinger Cohen legislation.

If No, when will it be reviewed in next 12 months?

Does this initiative implement electronic transactions or recordkeeping? Yes No
If Yes was this initiative included in the GPEA strategic plan? Yes No
If No, discuss in Part 2, Section G? See Part 2 Section G for explanation
Was a privacy impact assessment performed on this project? Yes No
Privacy requirements are part of the performance requirements and will be set forth in Service Description Documents, Implementation Plans, Process Trials and independent testing performed by AAA prior to deployment.

RESOURCE REVIEW:

Is this project in your baseline resources?

Were there changes to your resources (manpower or dollars) during the FY 2002 Amended Budget or during FY 2003 Concurrent Review? If so describe the changes without referencing the Executive Branch Document?

Were they pricing changes or program changes?

Were changes directed at the Component level or the DoD level or due to specific Congressional actions?

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

How were the resource costs determined (CAIG, other costing methods, etc)?

Federal Financial Managers Improvement Act (FFMIA)

Is this project a part of the DoD Financial Management Architectural Improvement Process. Yes X No

Is this project categorized a Financial management or Financial Feeder System. Yes X No

Which FFMIA compliance area does it address? _____ CFO

What percentage is financial _____ 0 _____, for your component?

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

PART I. B. Summary of Spending for Project Stages:

Department of the Army	Dollars in Millions						
	Cumulative Total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005 - FY 2008	Total
Planning							
							0.0
Total Dev Mod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full Acquisition							
DWCF Capital	0.0	38.9	29.1	28.8	28.8	115.0	240.6
Total Dev Mod	0.0	38.9	29.1	28.8	28.8	115.0	240.6
Current Services/Maintenance							
OMA	0.0	6.6	6.7	6.9	10.2	41.8	72.2
DWCF Operations	0.0	0.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	58.8	103.8
Total Current Services	0.0	6.6	21.7	21.9	25.2	100.6	176.0
Total Resources by FY	0.0	45.5	50.8	50.7	54.0	215.6	416.6

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

PART II. Justification and Other Information

O. Description/Performance Characteristics:

1. Description. Contract DAAB07-00-D-E252 was awarded to Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC) of Falls Church, Va, on 29 December 1999, to provide services to sustain, through outsourcing, the U.S. Army wholesale logistics management systems. Concurrent with sustainment of the current systems, CSC is modernizing the US Army wholesale logistics management system; namely the Commodity Command Standard System (CCSS), Standard Depot System (SDS) and associated systems. The goal of the modernization effort is to reengineer the current wholesale logistics business processes, facilitated by the appropriate enabling information technology, to provide integrated, seamless, flexible information management services in support of the Army's wholesale logistics mission. AMC is buying a service not a system. The acquisition will employ a broad based commercial Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) package from SAP, America to integrate business processes across the supply chain and meet the performance requirements for the modernized services. In addition, the Contractor shall furnish, operate and manage the data processing infrastructure necessary to meet the performance requirements for the wholesale logistics modernization services. These services are still provided by DISA in the legacy environment.
2. Statement of how this project helps the agency meet the agency/DoD mission; long term strategic goals and objectives (Mission goals and/or IT strategic plan). The WLMP does support DoD long -term strategic goals and objectives. IAW the DoD Logistics Strategic Plan, the acquisition satisfies many of the Plan's key logistics management imperatives including the reengineering of business processes, the optimization of outsourcing, the reduction of logistics cycle and response times, the minimization of inventory levels, and the maximization of the advantages of acquisition reform. This is being accomplished while ensuring materiel readiness and force sustainment. Likewise, IAW The Army Strategic Plan, the acquisition capitalizes on efficiencies in business practices, increases private sector participation, and provides a logistics service that substitutes logistics velocity for logistics mass. Furthermore, the acquisition maximizes the effective use of scarce resources so that the Army can make the required warfighting modernization investments for the future. In consonance with what the Army Strategic Plan emphasizes for future efforts, this acquisition increases reliance on industry in non-core functions and requires
6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

industry's total integration into logistics planning and execution. Ultimately, this revolution in business affairs (RBA) and resultant revolution in military logistics (RML) will be measured in the readiness of the Army and the combatants' forces ability to operate unencumbered by logistics. The logistics tail will be sufficiently small enough to be transparent to the user but still have the user's total confidence.

3. Describe the pre milestone O/ Planning activities that lead up to this decision. Business Process Reengineering, Migration plan; other approaches. The contract is not subject to Milestones (phases). The contract is consistent withal pre-solicitation and solicitation planning activities. Business process reengineering was central in the planning stage and is core to the performance of the contract. The acquisition employs a broad based commercial Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) package, i.e. SAP America's software suite and integral business processes, that when deployed will meet the performance requirements for the modernized services. Business processes are being reengineered relative to the business supply chain performance spectrum covered by this contract. This allows for the use, initially and continuously, of a robust and dynamic commercial service. The goal is not to just enhance the current business processes, but rather to employ creative "best of breed" commercial solutions that leverage commercial technological advantages; i.e., the modernized services will leverage the advantages of using commercial software with large customer bases. The intent is to achieve a functional architecture capable of meeting immediate business requirements, as well as having the flexibility to accommodate emerging requirements while evolving with the commercial marketplace.

"Migration" Planning - A transition period successfully ran from 29 Dec 99 (contract award) to 30 Jun 00. During this period, the contractor and Government worked hand in hand to mitigate transition and transfer risks and ensure the uninterrupted flow of services. The successful transfer of software sustainment to the contractor occurred on 1 July 00, IAW the contract schedule. On this date and IAW with up front planning and the contractual requirement, displaced Government employees became contractor employees and received a "soft landing" package, i.e. all employees, who elected to, received a position with comparable pay and benefits, guaranteed for at least 3 years, in the same geographical location accompanied by a signing bonus of \$15,000.

In addition, CSC is contractually obligated to perform legacy system sustainment until the modernized services come on line
6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

4. Basis for selecting the project, including demonstration that the investment is required for inherently government function; demonstrate that the work processes have been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness. The WLMP employed an approach based not only on cost considerations, but on the strategic assessment of the marketplace, the current state of (and outlook for) commercially leveraged supply chain business solutions enabled by the appropriate information technology. The acquisition also stressed strategic guidance by outsourcing non-core competencies, integrating the industrial base into our logistics business, and reengineering our business processes. WLMP leverages off of the commercial market through the selection of a broad based commercial solution in evidence in an Enterprise Resource Planning package with the long-term intent to stay abreast of the marketplace and evolve with it. No longer will the Army be the sole bill payer for a unique system with the responsibility and financial burden to own and upgrade business processes and information technology that is distinctly Army.

The Performance Bonus metrics in the contract will measure and report the business benefits of modernization to be achieved.

The results of an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) and cost/benefit analysis, including return on investment (ROI); risks and any intangible mission returns that benefit the organization/mission were thoroughly analyzed by the Business Case, Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program, 12 February 1999, which is available upon request.

N. Program Management/Management Oversight:

1. Identify the process owner (business activity, military mission), executive agent, program manager, and contracting office that manages this project if not, how is this project managed?
 - Functional Proponent: Army Material Command (AMC)
 - Program Manager: The Program Director answers to USACECOM, Deputy to the Commanding General.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Contracting Office: USACECOM, Acquisition Center

The WLMP is managed by the WLMP Program Office at USACECOM, Ft. Monmouth, NJ. A three level oversight/issue resolution organization based on the IPT concept was put in place to manage the program. At the top of this organizational structure, providing strategic direction, is the Corporate Board of Directors which is headed up by the CG, AMC and the DISC4 and Commander CASCOM; as well as principals from DoD, Army and Joint membership. The membership includes the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Logistics, Director for Logistics J4, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller, among others. The CBOD meets at the direction of the chair. In addition, an Operational Board of Directors (OBOD) serves as the CBOD Senior Executive Service oversight and directing body and facilitates requirements for decision-making. The OBOD is chaired by the Principal Deputy to the DCG, AMC and is made up of all AMC Integrated Materiel Management Center (IMMC) Directors, and other key Army leaders. The OBOD meets more frequently than the CBOD and lately has approximated once a month. The WLMP progress is also reported through the GCSS- Army General Officer Working Group (GOWG)

The Department of Defense Deputy Chief Information Officer (DCIO) from the office of ASDC3I exercises oversight in the context of the portfolio management of GCSS-Army as part of Tier 2 GCSS-Army

2. Does this project use Integrated Project Teams approach? If not, how is the project/initiative accomplishments monitored; how are resources reviewed.

The contract makes maximum use of empowered Government-Contractor IPTs. These top level IPTs are supported by numerous “working group” subordinate IPTs. The functioning of IPTs is central to contract performance. Within their areas they define needs, evaluate progress, monitor results, and report to the WLMP Program Director. The IPTs are based on mutual respect, teamwork, cooperation, and good faith performance. Each IPT has a work plan, schedule, defined work products, and performance standards against which performance can be evaluated quantitatively, potential problems and risks can be monitored, and actions taken immediately to keep performance on track. The Government’s primary role in the IPT will be that of a “Smart Customer,” i.e. defining our needs and evaluating results achieved by the Contractor.

P. Acquisition Strategy:

6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

19. Identify major contract names; prime contractor and City, State, if awarded.

Contract: DAAB07-00-E252, Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) Prime Contractor: Computer Science Corporation (CSC), Corporate Office: Falls Church, Va., with offices at Moorestown, NJ

20. Identify the type of contract and why it was chosen.

A task order based, ten-year, Indefinite Delivery type of contract was awarded on 29 December 1999 to Computer Sciences Corporation of Falls Church, VA. The contract contains both a Requirements portion (FAR 16.503) and an Indefinite-Quantity portion (FAR 16.504). The contract provides for the issuance of task orders on both a Firm Fixed Price and Time and Materials basis. This type of contract was chosen because the Army anticipates recurring requirements for these services, but cannot precisely determine the quantity of services that Government activities may need during the ten-year life of the contract. Provisions for earning performance bonuses are also included in the contract. The contract service performance goals are to provide the Army with an integrated end-to-end supply chain solution to improve overall synchronization of information. Significantly improving asset visibility, enhancing data accuracy/ integrity and reporting capabilities, and integrating financial management capabilities while ensuring least risk and disruption shall mainly achieve this. These services meet immediate business requirements and have the flexibility to accommodate emerging requirements for the long-term and optimize supply chain relationships.

21. Identify whether the contract is performance-based and summarize the performance goals in the contract.

The contract is performance based. Modernization solutions will be quantitatively assessed against existing commercial standards, when appropriate, in terms of cost, speed, productivity, and quality of outputs and outcomes. Substantive metrics currently exist in the contract, and will be used as an integral part of the acceptance criteria for the modernized services. Additional metrics will be established to ensure a focus on superior performance, as more becomes known of subsequently approved modernized solutions. Metrics will also be an integral part of continuous process improvement to ensure that the modernized services evolve with the market across all program areas. The Performance Bonus metrics in the contract measure and report the business benefits of modernization against cost savings to be achieved. These metrics/improvements include but are not limited to the optimization of inventory levels, total view of all supply chain information, cycle time reductions, reduced infrastructure requirements as well as

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

other quantifiable improvements in material management, personnel efficiency, customer service levels, optimum readiness postures, and the elimination of data redundancy and data inaccuracy. These metrics must be evident in process trial performance prior to fielding.

Metrics will always be based on industry standards, when appropriate. The Integrated Product Teams (IPT), with the Government as the final decision authority, will approve the use of additional industry standard metrics or the establishment of other metrics, when industry standard metrics are not appropriate. Contract Status Reporting, which will be an agenda item at each IPT meeting, will include reporting of metrics and the contractor's progress toward attaining quantified performance relative to the Contract Master Schedule. As stated above, meeting metric requirements for the modernized services will be incentivized through the use of the Performance Bonus Plan.

Performance Bonus Plan metrics also exist for legacy sustainment.

These metrics will always take into account the Army's effectiveness and efficiency in supporting warfighter needs and the achievement of optimum readiness, when applicable.

AA. Alternative Analysis and Risk Management: Describe AoA.

26. Cost/benefit analysis (including return on investment (ROI), replaced system or process savings, recovery schedule and any intangible (mission) returns that benefit the organization/mission but are difficult to quantify.
27. Analysis of alternative options. (Describe preliminary activities if AOA not yet performed.)
28. Underlying assumptions.
29. Estimate of Risks.

The following addresses all 4 elements above in a comprehensive presentation:

The Business Case for the WLMP Selected Alternative

A. Business Case Alternatives: The WLMP performed an extensive Business Case which is available upon request. The Business Case explored the viability of three alternatives and the status quo to meeting both legacy system sustainment and modernization of the Army's wholesale logistics business. The cost/benefit/investment analysis was Appendix A to the Business Case and is also available upon request. The following is a summary of the Alternatives analyzed and the cost/benefit/investment analyses which appeared in the Business Case.

The following three alternatives plus the status quo were analyzed in the WLMP Business Case

- ☛ *Status quo*. The current systems, supported by the Central Design Activities (CDAs) as currently staffed, organized, trained, and funded, continue essentially as they have been maintained for the last 20 years. Incremental improvements permitted in the confines of the legacy computer code continue to be made with the current business practices. **The status quo is not a viable option.**
- ☛ *Alternative 1* – The CDAs perform legacy sustainment while minimizing changes to existing systems. The Government also performs wholesale logistics modernization. This in-house effort employs the current workforce to implement a modern enterprise project with COTS software. This alternative assumes that the CDAs will be reorganized, provided the skills and trained to perform industry-quality BPR. Additionally, they will acquire the skills to design and implement a system that will achieve the modernization and sustainment goals of the WLMP and GCSS-Army.
- ☛ *Alternative 2* - The Government performs legacy sustainment; the contractor performs wholesale logistics modernization and sustainment of the modernized system. Alternative 2 relies on the private sector for modernization while the Army continues to maintain its legacy system.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- *Alternative 3* - The Contractor performs legacy sustainment services and wholesale logistics modernization services.

Analyses by Alternative: Cost and Operational Benefits of the Alternatives

Full Analyses is in the WLMP Business Case and is available upon request.

Alternative 1:

- Under this alternative the modernized system would be projected to be fully fielded in FY07 which is approximately 3 years later than Alternative 3.
- This alternative has the highest total cost and requires highest Government investment costs.
- Projected reductions in Baseline alternative funding levels did not support the current CDA resource levels required for this alternative. The approximate 30% resource reduction in the projected baseline funding would jeopardize the program and extend completion beyond the ten-year period.
- This alternative required continued use of substantial Army resources in support of a non-core mission.
- The alternative incurs increased risk and costs associated with retraining and use of the workforce in new areas and roles.

In summary, this alternative is the most costly and causes the longest delay to modernization.

Alternative 2:

- This alternative would require a reduction in the CDA staffing and associated costs to provide the funding for modernization under the present CDA budget.
- This alternative did not provide a soft-landing for the CDA workforce.

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- The declining resource requirements over the period would likely cause increased personnel turmoil and associated program risk. The increased coordination requirements due to both the program separation and the above Legacy support turmoil create an even greater operational risk.
- This alternative had the second highest total cost and requires the second highest Government investment costs.
- Under this alternative, the modernized system would be projected to be fully fielded in FY05 which is approximately 1 year later than Alternative 3.

In summary, this alternative is more costly and causes the longer delay to modernization than Alternative 3. In addition, it provided no additional protection or benefits (soft landing) to the displaced Army workforce.

Alternative 3:

- The alternative provides the lowest total cost and government investment cost while delivering the earliest fielding for the modernized system.
- This is the only alternative that provided a soft-landing for all displaced Government employees.

In summary, Alternative 3 provides the most economical and timely strategy for achieving WLMP goals.

BB. Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Standards:

47. Does this system meet current Government wide, DoD and Agency interoperability requirements? Describe current compliance levels, target levels, and date target will be accomplished. (Map to agency's technology vision.) This acquisition mandates an open, extensible solution, based on COTS products, which are compliant with Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) Common Operating Environment (COE) concepts. It requires the use of standardized DoD data elements for data sharing and systems interoperability. Data modeling activities, to include data element standardization, are compliant with Integrated Computer Aided Manufacturing Definition Functional Method (IDEF0)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

and Integrated Computer Aided Manufacturing Definition Functional Method Extended Data Method (IDEF1X). The contract requires that the modernized service complies with Joint Technical Architecture – Army (JTA-Army) mandates, Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE) concepts, the AMC Information Systems Architecture (AMC ISA), and industry accepted best commercial practices for information technology, where appropriate.

48. Infrastructure Strategy:

WLMP is acquiring a service. CSC provides, by contract, provides the necessary infrastructure to generate and maintain all services. The Government's existing infrastructure will be used for all WLMP users who must use that service.

49. Are HW requirements included in this funding? If no, by what means is the hardware provided?

The contract is for services there are no new hardware requirements on contract. The Government will use it's own existing HW.

4. Transport (Communications and Computing) requirements are met by what means?

The contract is compliant with JTA-Army Section 3, Information Transfer Standards. The services' long-haul communication network shall have sufficient connectivity and reach to allow service access from U.S. and NATO military installations and/or activities worldwide. The long-haul communication network shall extend from the data processing service provider's facility to the user site/installation point of presence (PoP). The long-haul communication network shall have sufficient transmission bandwidth and capacity to support the aggregate traffic load presented by the users. The DISN shall be employed to address this long-haul communication network. The existing user locations and their associated long-haul communication connections are presented in Chapter 2 of the Technical Report on AMC Wholesale Logistics Systems Interfaces, TR No. AMSEL-IE-SP 98042. (In the event that the Contractor, in concert with the IPT, determines that the DISN long-haul communication infrastructure is not technically or economically feasible, the Army will seek to obtain a waiver from DISA for an exception to ASD (C3I)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Memorandum, Subject: "Policy Clarification Letter - Long-Haul and Regional Telecommunications Systems and Services for the Department of Defense," which mandates the use of DISN.)

5. What are the interdependencies with other acquisitions (such as base level infrastructure requirements)?
The services shall be based on open commercial standards and industry accepted best commercial practices. The contractor shall use the Joint Technical Architecture— Army (JTA- Army) mandated and emerging commercial standards (i. e., standards likely to become mandates) in designing and developing the modernized services. The WLMP services' data shall fully conform to the Information Modeling, Data Exchange, and Data Definition standards set forth at Section 4 of the JTA-Army to ensure data exchange interoperability. Use of standardized IDEF0 and IDEF1X modeling methods and DOD Data Element Definitions will facilitate interoperability. The contractor shall use the open standards and industry accepted best commercial practices identified in the AMC-ISA to ensure seamless integration of the modernized services within the Army Materiel Command's emerging enterprise- wide information system architectural environment. The contractor shall select COTS applications, which are compliant with the COE software architecture. If necessary, the Contractor shall develop any unique application software required to permit COTS applications to interface with an Application Program Interface (API) that is Defense Information Infrastructure – Common Operating Environment (DII COE) compliant. In addition, the contractor shall provide services to support other relevant logistics programs such as: Single Stock Fund (SSF), Global Combat Support System-Army (GCSS-Army), Defense Property Accountability System (DPAS), Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) systems, National Maintenance Management, Headquarters Application System (HAS), Joined Industrial Operations (JIO), Virtual Integrated Materiel Management Center (VIMMC), Army COMSEC Commodity Logistics Accounting and Information Management System (ACCLAIMS) and Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support (JCALS).
These services may include, but are not limited to: performing studies, analyzing impact, conducting tests, giving demonstrations, witnessing/observing related activities, developing and implementing solutions, preparing reports and performing additional data processing services. Individual task orders will be issued to the Contractor for the performance of these services. The Contractor shall also provide services to support existing and emerging Government programs (other than logistics programs) as such task orders are issued.

6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

6. Is this system based on COTS; mix of COTS and custom, or custom only. Provide justification for custom components?

Yes. The acquisition seeks a broad based commercial Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) package to meet the performance requirements for the modernized services. The chosen software suite and its accompanying reengineered business processes is an SAP, America product. SAP was successfully demonstrated in the Proof of Concept (POC) stage which was completed in June 2001. The goal is not to just enhance the current process, but rather to employ creative solutions that best leverage commercial technological advantages; i.e., the modernized services will leverage the advantages of using commercial software with large customer bases. The intent is to achieve a functional architecture capable of meeting immediate business requirements, as well as having the flexibility to accommodate emerging requirements while evolving with the commercial marketplace. If necessary, the Contractor shall develop any unique application software required to permit COTS applications to interface with an Application Program Interface (API) that is Defense Information Infrastructure – Common Operating Environment (DII COE) compliant. Overall, however, software solutions will be selected and integrated such that absolutely a minimum amount of unique code development is necessary. The modernized services shall be maintainable and upgraded such that they continue to operate at a technology and software release level currently supported by the software developer and used by an existing customer base external to the software developer and outside the Government.

7. Describe the Data Architecture approach?

The Government is not acquiring data as part of this acquisition. The modernization and sustainment of the Army's wholesale logistics business processes were outsourced. The contractor shall provide all services including maintenance, sustainment and upgrading of these commercially based services.

8. Describe the Functional (Mission or Component) Architecture approach?

As stated previously, the modernized services shall be based on open commercial standards and industry accepted best commercial practices. The contractor shall use the Joint Technical Architecture— Army (JTA- Army) mandated and emerging commercial standards (i. e., standards likely to become mandates) in designing and developing the modernized services. The WLMP services' data shall fully conform to the Information Modeling, Data Exchange, and 6298/Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program (WLMP) – IT Capital Investment Exhibit (IT- 300)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Data Definition standards set forth at Section 4 of the JTA-Army to ensure data exchange interoperability. Use of standardized IDEF0 and IDEF1X modeling methods and DOD Data Element Definitions will facilitate interoperability. The contractor shall use the open standards and industry accepted best commercial practices identified in the AMC-ISA to ensure seamless integration of the modernized services within the Army Materiel Command's emerging enterprise-wide information system architectural environment. The contractor shall select COTS applications, which are compliant with the COE software architecture. If necessary, the Contractor shall develop any unique application software required to permit COTS applications to interface with an Application Program Interface (API) that is Defense Information Infrastructure – Common Operating Environment (DII COE) compliant

CC. Security and Privacy:

19. Describe the Security approach (Defense in Depth).

The modernized services when deployed shall protect the logistics information from unauthorized disclosure, destruction, and modification while collected, processed, transmitted, stored or disseminated. Information shall be safeguarded by continuous protection measures. These safeguards consist of: hardware security, software security, procedural security, communications security, personnel security, physical security, and network security. The security certification and accreditation process shall be in accordance with DoD Instruction 5200.40, DoD Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP). The services shall be Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) enabled and consistent with the following: Memorandum, Subject: Department of Defense (DoD) Public Key Infrastructure, dated 6 May 1999, signed John J. Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Public Key Infrastructure Roadmap for the Department of Defense, version 2.0, revision C, dated 12 October 1999; and United States Department of Defense X.509 Certificate Policy, version 2.0, dated March 1999. As a minimum, the PKI enabled services shall interoperate with the DoD PKI. The contractor shall implement authentication, encryption, virus detection and management and access control mechanisms to provide data integrity. The Contractor shall implement firewalls, authentication and access control to protect assets and prevent misdirection that can enable denial of service attacks. The Contractor shall implement security management tools including intrusion detection and auditing tools to identify attacks against the system.

20. Privacy assessments for this initiative. See above.

21. Discuss enabled for use with the DoD Common Access Card? If no, when will it be?

Since WLMP users, as previously stated, will use existing Government IT infrastructure and a contractual requirement is that the service be compatible with existing Government infrastructure; this becomes a de facto requirement for deployment and will be demonstrated prior to deployment and in evidence in Service Description Documents, Implementations Plans and Process Trials, in addition to being independently validated and verified by AAA.

DD. Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA)

If not included in DoD Strategic GPEA Plan, explain why.

During Program inception and the interpretation of Clinger Cohen applicability in that timeframe, as agreed to by DISC4 and ASDC3I, WLMP was not considered an acquisition program or an investment in Information Technology and as such was not subject to GPEA. However, WLMP follows both the spirit and intent of GPEA, P.L.105-277, Title XVII, Oct 21, 1998 and the implementation instructions put out by OMB in Memorandum M-00-10. WLMP will be a web-based service which forwards both the strategic and operational intentions of the prescribed “electronic government”. WLMP will deploy a commercial solution based on the best business practices which are currently used in the marketplace. An Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution utilizing commercially available SAP, version R3 forms the core of the WLMP solution. As such, WLMP stringently endorses the GPEA when it dictates that agencies must stop “systematically treating electronic documents less favorably than their paper counterparts”.

PART III. COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

A. Performance Based Management System (PBMS)

Which Performance based management system will you use to monitor contract or project progress? Management oversight—or the system used to monitor the achievement or deviation from goals during the life cycle of the project. Earned value or alternate approach. (if not earned value what is used?)

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Control of Program Status and Iterative Contractor Assessment; against established metrics

i. WLMP Monthly Status Reports

- Compares how much work has actually been accomplished against the amount of work planned to be accomplished – Earned Value
- Detailed Program Master Schedule developed from bottoms up approach.
- Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) supported by detailed work plans.

ii. Performance Bonus Plan: Evaluated quarterly- Fully 70% of the fixed price contract for core WLMP services is contingent on contractor performance which exceeds acceptable performance

The Performance Bonus Plan outlines specific metrics that are used to measure performance and applies the Performance Bonus for Sustainment, Modernization, and Data Processing Services.

•Sustainment/Recurring Services

Customer Satisfaction
Average Time to Close Service Problem Reports

•Modernized Services

Modernization Performance-User satisfaction surveys
Logistics Business Process Improvement
Continuous Process Improvement

Raising Business Process Improvement Targets

Continuous Improvement Plan
Training Effectiveness

Data Processing (modernized services only)

Availability
Customer Satisfaction

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Disaster Recovery

Substantive metrics currently exist in the contract, and are used as an integral part of the acceptance criteria and the contract's Performance Bonus Plan. Additional metrics will be established to ensure a continued focus on superior performance, as more becomes known of subsequently approved modernized processes and solutions. Metrics will also be an integral part of continuous process improvement to ensure that the modernized services evolve with industry standard metrics across all program areas. The Performance Bonus metrics in the contract will measure and report the business benefits of modernization against cost savings to be achieved. These metrics/improvements include/will include, but will not be limited to, the optimization of inventory levels, total view of all supply chain information, cycle time reductions, reduced infrastructure requirements as well as other quantifiable improvements in material management, personnel efficiency, customer service levels, optimum readiness postures, and the elimination of data redundancy and data inaccuracy. These metrics must be evident in the process trial performance prior to deployment. Metrics will always be based on industry standards, when appropriate. The Integrated Product Teams (IPT), with the Government as the final decision authority, will approve the use of additional industry standard metrics or the establishment of other metrics, when industry standard metrics are not appropriate. Contract Status Reporting, which are agenda items at IPT meetings, include reporting of metrics and the contractor's progress toward attaining quantified performance relative to the Contract Master Schedule. As stated above, meeting and exceeding metric requirements will be incentivized through the use of the Performance Bonus Plan.

These metrics will always be assessed in the light of the Army's effectiveness and efficiency in supporting warfighter needs.

B. Original Baseline:

Provide the Analysis of Full Life-Cycle costs (estimates of total cost of ownership.) (Dollars in Millions)

The cost of performing the legacy sustainment and modernization to a common end state over a 10 year period is \$392.4M in constant FY99 dollars. The analysis that substantiates this amount is from the WLMP Business Case, Appendix A which is available upon request. The \$392.4 M does not include data processing costs for the modernized services since the analysis viewed this as a "wash"; i.e. the Government would either pay DISA or the prospective contractor the same amount (\$30.5M annually) in each of the three scenarios in Appendix A.

Department of Defense
 Capital Investment Exhibit
 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
 Department of the Army

Performance Benefits or Goals for Baseline Segment. What did you expect to achieve? The baseline performance goals are legacy system sustainment until the modernized services come on line, modernization of the Army’s wholesale logistics management systems, and the sustainment of those services until FY09.

- Has this system been rebaselined since initial program establishment? No
- Has this system had milestone slippages since the last president’s budget? No

C. Current Baseline Information:

1. What are the cost and schedule goals?	Cum total FY 2000 and prior	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Cum Total FY 2005- FY 2008	Total
a. Previous Baseline:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	35.5	45.8	51.1	50.7	54.0	181.4	418.5
Schedule Goals (milestones)							
b. Current Estimate:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	0.0	45.5	50.8	50.7	54.0	215.6	416.6
Schedule Goals (months)							
c. Variance from Baseline Goals:							
Cost Goals (\$M)	(35.5)	(0.3)	(0.3)	0.0	0.0	34.2	(1.9)

- Cost Goals of current approved milestone/phase: Have there been changes (10% from last submission) since the last President’s Budget submission? No

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- What was the basis of the dollar change and how did this impact the milestone/phase/increment objectives?
- Variance from last submission (identify which submission): If there has been a 10% change, discuss variance.
- Describe how the CIO/CFO and MDA/IPT will be/has been informed of this variance. (Include when and by what means).
- If there has been a 10% change in the FYDP program, or in any fiscal year, describe and justify the variance.
 - If the cost variance is caused by contract price/quantity changes, describe.

Q. Actual Performance from Approved Baseline:

Summarize what work you planned to accomplish and how much you budgeted to complete the work; What you actually accomplished and how much you actually spent. —

Legacy sustainment of the Army's wholesale logistics business management systems by CSC has been ongoing since July 99. Performance in this area has exceeded acceptable standards as measured by the contract's Performance Bonus Plan. All other significant deliverables, to date, have been made.

The following are critical path deliverables which have been made to date:

- CSC continued successfully sustaining/implementing changes to Legacy System and continued modernization efforts during all of FY01- Ongoing FY01
- Business Process Re-engineering & Analysis and Product Evaluation selection of SAP as ERP backbone - Approved Dec 01
- Proof of Concept – conducted 27 –28 June 01
- Draft of Initial Services Description Document – submitted 29 June 01
- Draft Implementation Plan - submitted 29 June 01

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

The contract for WLMP core services is a ten-year fixed price requirements contract with a performance bonus plan with an annual maximum obligation of \$34.5 M. In addition there is an annual contract amount for \$30.5M which is for the modernized data processing services. DISA continues to provide data processing services in the legacy environment.

Summarize the Performance goals of the acquisition and show how the assess (Sp) will help the agency meet its overall mission, strategic goals, and annual performance plan. Summarize the in house and contract work goals here. Identify accomplishments to date; describe mission and system performance goals against the milestone schedule, or other schedule.

AMC's Corporate Strategic Technology Direction explicitly states, "To achieve the AMC Vision and Strategic Intent for Logistics Power Projection, AMC must update its current suite of logistics systems. As stated in the capabilities assessment (of AMC's Vision and Strategic Intent for Logistics Power Projection) CCSS, SDS, (Commodity Command Standard System Standard Depot System) and other logistics supporting systems do not adequately support the AMC Vision, specifically, and the Strategic Intent".

WLMP addresses these strategic and operational deficiencies. The WLMP modernized services will provide agile, reliable, and responsive services by leveraging best practices and technology that enable the AMC to deliver world-class logistics and readiness to the warfighter, and will advance with the challenges in the Army Vision.

WLMP Goals and Objectives

B. Goal: To modernize the Army's wholesale logistics business practices and supporting information technology to meet current and future military readiness requirements.

C. Objectives:

- Improve Readiness and Weapon System Support

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

- Take Care of People - Both those transitioned to the contractor and those personnel whose jobs will evolve with implementation of the WLMP
- Adopt Best Business Practices - Market Driven
 - Initially
 - Continuously
- Perform Business Process Reengineering while leveraging Information Technologies
- Integrate with Global Combat Support System - Army/Single Stock Fund Milestones
- Provide information, education, and training as needed to help AMC/Army adapt to new ways of doing business with minimal disruption

There are a number of operational capabilities that AMC must achieve within the Revolution of Military Logistics in order to meet DoD's and Army's vision and strategy for the 21st Century Army, Army XXI and Army After Next. The modernized services shall provide the Army with an integrated end-to-end supply chain solution to improve overall synchronization of information. This shall mainly be achieved by significantly improving asset visibility, enhancing data accuracy/ integrity and reporting capabilities, and integrating financial management capabilities while ensuring least risk and disruption.

The Performance Bonus Plan outlines specific metrics that are (legacy sustainment) and will be (modernization and data processing) used to measure performance and applies the Performance Bonus for Sustainment, Modernization, and Data Processing Services. Metrics are essential for achieving the goals and objectives and providing WLMP solutions for AMC's strategic and operational deficiencies identified above. The following shows the areas in the key performance areas which have metrics which are/will be assessed

- Sustainment/Recurring Services
 - Customer Satisfaction
 - Average Time to Close Service Problem Reports
- Modernized Services
 - Modernization Performance-User satisfaction surveys
 - Logistics Business Process Improvement

Department of Defense
Capital Investment Exhibit
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Army

Continuous Process Improvement
Raising Business Process Improvement Targets
Continuous Improvement Plan
Training Effectiveness

•Data Processing

Availability
Customer Satisfaction
Disaster Recovery

10. Describe the measurable performance benefits or goals for this segment or phase of this initiative.

FY 2001: Legacy system sustainment by CSC

FY 2002: Legacy system sustainment by CSC and initial deployment,

FY 2003: Legacy system sustainment by CSC and deployments

FY 2004-07: Legacy system sustainment by CSC and sustainment of the modernized services and continued process improvements.

Cost and Schedule Corrective actions: Variance from performance from last submission (identify which submission): Are the performance goals on track since last president's budget submission/last milestone or phase change? Identify any barriers/risks that must be accommodated. Justify variance. Describe corrective actions. Include barriers or risks to meeting schedule goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.

No variance since last budget

23. Identify and discuss corrective actions that have been or will be taken if the current cost or schedule estimates have a negative variance.

24. Identify the effect the actions will have on cost, schedule and performance.

25. Include barriers or risks to meeting funding/cost goals. Describe methods to reduce risk.