

FCS-Equipped Unit of Action Complementary and Associate Programs

COL John R. Bartley

FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS
FCS
One Team-The Army/Defense/Industry



Future Combat Systems (FCS) mission accomplishment hinges on the ability to align the cost, schedule and performance of programs outside the control of the Program Manager (PM) FCS. Labeled Complementary and Associate Programs, they are being synchronized and tracked within both the FCS and Army, and touch both the Joint and DOD domains and the multinational arena.

Complementary and Associate Programs

Complementary (CP) and Associate Program (AP) definitions are both programmatic and organizational in nature, and have evolved over time to those contained in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, and Military Deputy (MILDEP) to the Assistant

Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ASAALT), signed Aug. 5 and 27, 2003. The MOA covers the Management Approach for the Unit of Action (UA) and Candidate Unit of Employment (UE) Complementary Systems for FCS Increment I.

The FCS foundation is built around the 19 Core Systems as defined in the above-referenced MOA. These 19 systems are specified in the FCS Operational Requirements Document (ORD) and include current programs that will be integrated directly into the 19 systems. PM FCS is responsible for the systems procurement and integration into FCS platforms. The UA Complementary Systems comprise those systems essential to the family-of-systems (FoS) to work together and/or to support a system-of-systems (SoS). These systems facilitate UA operation. The UE Complementary Systems are needed to operate or support an SoS at the UE. UA APs are those programs that FCS must interoperate with as detailed in the FCS ORD and command, control, communications, computers and intelligent support plan.

Management Within FCS

The PM FCS has partnered with the Lead Systems Integrator (LSI), the Boeing Co. and its partner Science Applications International Corp., to integrate Complementary and Associate programs into the overall FCS program. As such, the LSI has the lead in the integration required to meet SoS specification functionality and performance. In conjunction with the

LSI, the CP Integrated Product Team (IPT) plays a key role in developing the overarching integration and management approach for CPs, and for developing and implementing plans with Army and other service counterparts to identify and manage CPs. The IPT provides the communications path to define the SoS-level interface and interoperability requirements for each FCS complementary and associate system.

In those cases where an existing or development program has applicability to FCS, associate contractor agreements (ACAs) as required will be negotiated with the LSI, or a directed subcontract arrangement will be invoked under the LSI agreement. An ACA is not a purchase order, subcontract, consultant agreement, proprietary information or nondisclosure agreement. The ACA document contains all the same elements as a contract, except that the ACA does not have value, cost, price or payment terms. The value, cost, price and payment terms are addressed in the respective prime contracts.

ACAs are needed because

the LSI is a contractor. An ACA will not always be required and the need may be filled with a government-to-government MOA. PM FCS set the stage for the entire MOA/ACA development process by sending a combined government and LSI team to each of the program executive officers (PEOs) and subordinate program/project managers (PMs) who own a CP and/or AP. Onsite visits were held between June and November 2003.

Draft MOAs and Subordinate MOAs (SMOAs) were developed and are now in the signature review process. These MOAs/SMOAs purpose is to establish the responsibilities and management processes between PEO Ground Combat Systems (GCS) PM FCS and the other PEOs/PMs to procure, develop, test and field an FCS FoS and a UA. The MOAs/SMOAs also provide a basis for cooperative, technical and acquisition efforts between PEO GCS PM FCS and the other PEOs/PMs.

The MOAs/SMOAs are what we are using now to facilitate this significant coordination effort. Current count within only the Army is 19 PEO-to-PEO MOAs and 44 PM-to-PM SMOAs. The Army recognized that if FCS were to be successful, a permanent process in addition to the MOAs, SMOAs and ACAs would be required.

Management Within the Army

Because of the FCS program's complexity and its interdependence on other standalone complementary and associate systems that are essential to meeting UA and UE requirements, the Army G-8 and the ASAALT MILDEP established a management and oversight process. It was documented in an MOA signed between the two in August 2003. Key duties and responsibilities for their offices include:

- Establish a series of action officer level working groups, Council of Colonels (CoC) and 2-Star General Officer Level Equipping Program Evaluation Group (PEG) Synchronization IPT to synchronize the network, survivability, lethality, sustainability and training aspects of FCS.
- Identify programmatic disconnects and funding shortfalls with complementary systems.
- Develop work-arounds to rectify

The FCS foundation is built around the 19 Core Systems as defined in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, and Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, signed Aug. 5 and 27, 2003.

disconnects and for resources and adjustments to the FCS/UA/UE Complementary Systems list.

- Ensure program baselines for the UA and candidate UE Complementary System include FCS key programmatic events as part of their program oversight.
- Manage and track cost, schedule and performance identified in the program baselines for the UA Complementary Systems and candidate UE Complementary Systems.

The MOA also defines the support roles and responsibilities of a Synchronization IPT. The Synchronization IPT is co-chaired by the Equipping PEG co-chairs and has membership from all parts of the Army as well as the Joint and DOD Staffs. The Synchronization IPT exists to resolve issues. If the issue is within the Army's purview, the IPT will convene to map out appropriate resolution to include adjustment of other program funding, scheduling or performance requirements. The IPT then weighs the impacts of proposed alternatives and decides on a course of action (COA) — based on impacts across the Army — and informs the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE) of the preferred COA prior to implementation. If consensus cannot be reached, the issue and alternatives are taken to the AAE for disposition and resolution. When issues with CP and AP fall outside the Army's purview, sometimes a clear COA is not apparent.

Management Outside the Army

If an issue is external to the Army and cannot be solved at the PEO level, the Synchronization IPT will meet and additional members will be brought in to represent their respective services/organizations as the issue warrants. Once alternatives are assessed, the Syn-

chronization IPT will present its recommendation to the AAE in preparation for convening an Overarching IPT (OIPT), or joint OIPT depending on the issue, for a recommended course forward. If the path forward can be effectively resolved at the OIPT level, the Defense Acquisition Executive will be notified of the decision. If consensus cannot be reached, the OIPT will recommend convening a special Defense Acquisition Board to bring the issue to closure. Challenges occur when there is no documented or scheduled process like that defined in the MOA between the Army G-8 and the MILDEP.

In the multinational arena, the intent is to leverage the Multilateral Interoperability Program (MIP). Steps have been taken to contact the MIP Heads of Delegation to notify MIP member nations that Army Battle Command Systems, specifically the Maneuver Control System, will transition to FCS over the next several years. As a current review of the MIP Statement of Intent is ongoing, introduction of FCS is a logical step in the deliberations.

The glue that holds the FCS-equipped UA together is the CPs and APs, a well-recognized fact inside and outside the Army. PM FCS, the LSI's PM office and the CP IPT have put a process and organization in place to align the cost, schedule and performance of programs outside their control. Both the process and organization will continue to evolve as the program moves forward. The PEO and PM

MOAs/SMOAs are starting points for coordination, synchronization and alignment. A follow-on methodology could be a Department of the Army-

level policy such as the one that has been put out on Standardization of Collaborative Environments for Weapon Systems Acquisition Programs.

The Army, in the establishment of the 2-Star General Officer Level Synchronization IPT and the documented supporting structure of action officer level working groups and CoCs, is an excellent beginning. The next step is for the Synchronization IPT to become a cross-functional, empowered and focused PEG versus just an Equipping PEG.

The Synchronization IPT exists to resolve issues. If the issue is within the Army's purview, the IPT will convene to map out appropriate resolution to include adjustment of other program funding, scheduling or performance requirements.

Outside the Army, specifically at DOD level, the process and organization needs to be quantified, similar to what the Army did in its MOA between G-8 and ASAALT. It cannot be an FCS forum, or an Army forum, because the issues go beyond both groups. Just like the Army runs the UA Synchronization IPT, DOD must do something similar.

COL JOHN R. BARTLEY is the Deputy Program Manager of Program Integration for Future Combat Systems. He earned a B.S. degree from the U.S. Military Academy, an M.S. degree in systems management from the Florida Institute of Technology and has completed the Program Manager's Course and the Army War College.