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From The Army Acquisition Executive...

ARMY ACQUISITION WORKFORCE LEADS THE WAY

With this issue devoted to acquisition career management, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Army acquisition workforce for their hard work and dedicated efforts to create efficiency and economy in weapon systems development. We, in America's Army, have led the way in shaping a new acquisition environment. We have had major successes, including:

- Substituting performance specifications in our procurements for detailed, "how-to" military specifications.
- Eliminating boiler plate in the terms and conditions section of our Requests for Proposals and contracts, except for those minimum essential, required clauses.
- Vastly streamlined oversight.
- Adopting a teamwork philosophy using integrated product team management.
- Shifting to real emphasis on best value procurements.

While I applaud your efforts, I also challenge you to do better. I ask you to continually examine how we do business, and how we could do it better. Successful acquisition reform must become a part of the Army culture.

Today's Army is the premier land force in the world. Our soldiers operate with great skill and precision the most sophisticated weaponry on earth. It is a legacy we must protect.

In order to maintain this worldwide land force dominance, I have often stated that today's modernization is tomorrow's readiness. We must become the Army's "futurists" in vision, while keeping our feet solidly on the ground with sound business practices. Despite restructuring of the force and declining Defense dollars, we must ensure that the soldier of tomorrow is as well-equipped as the soldier of today. More than ever before, we will need innovation, leadership, and a willingness to relentlessly push for more implementation of acquisition reform to keep our soldiers equipped with world class weaponry—when tomorrow's readiness becomes a reality.

America's Army is absolutely critical to our national security. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the United States has committed forces in response to crises nearly 40 times. In each deployment, ranging from Operation Desert Storm to Rwanda to Bosnia, the vast majority of military personnel deployed were ground forces. In some cases, ground forces comprised more than 90 percent of the total force. It is clear that in today's world, America's Army is the force of choice.

To successfully acquire materiel and weapon systems to meet military requirements now and in the future, Congress created the Acquisition Corps within the Department of Defense. Additionally, the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) was enacted in FY 91 to improve the overall effectiveness and professionalism of military and civilian personnel charged with management and administration of Defense acquisition programs. In an effort to improve the way the Army is managing its acquisition workforce and to move further towards implementation of the intent of DAWIA, the Army initiated a reengineering effort for the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) this year. As a result of this effort, a strategic vision has been defined for the AAC that will forge the foundation for all policies and initiatives impacting the acquisition workforce.

The AAC vision of a "small, premier professional corps of acquisition leaders willing to serve where needed and committed to developing, integrating, acquiring and fielding systems critical to decisive victory for the 21st century" talks to the goals of developing the Army's top performers and then challenging them with our most demanding jobs. These are the leaders we must develop early on in their careers in order to ensure that they possess the requisite experience and skills to successfully manage the acquisition challenges of the 21st century. Their education, training and career development are of enormous importance to our mission.

The future is full of exciting challenges and opportunities. An individual with fresh ideas and creative solutions can make major contributions to Army acquisition. Innovation, leadership, and determination are important. I urge each of you to live by one of President John F. Kennedy's core beliefs—that one person can make a difference, and everyone should try.

Gilbert F. Decker
This issue focuses on some of the new and ongoing initiatives to enhance the career development of the Army's acquisition professionals. Included are articles on Centralized Management, the Corps Eligible Program, and the new Customer Support Concept.
CAREER DEVELOPMENT AS A MISSION

By Diane M. Schaule, COL Edward A. Cerutti and Karen Walker

THE ARMY ACQUISITION CORPS VISION ...

A Small Premier Professional Corps of Acquisition Leaders Willing to Serve Where Needed and Committed to Developing, Integrating, Acquiring and Fielding Systems Critical to Decisive Victory ... for the 21st Century.

... ONE INTEGRATED CORPS

Figure 1.
CORPS MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

• Serve as a Member of a Premier Corps of Military and Civilian Acquisition Leaders; Certified to Develop, Integrate, Acquire and Field Systems Vital to the 21st Century Army

• Participate in a Comprehensive Career Program; Including Accession, Education, Training, Experience, Assignment, Promotion and Retention.

• Willingly Serve Where Abilities Can Best be Developed and Skills are Most Needed

• Responsible for Possessing Functional, Leadership and Managerial Skills Essential to Achieving the Highest Standards of Excellence and Ethics in Acquisition

Quality achievement factors, which provide a framework for individual preparation for assumption of leadership positions within the Army Acquisition Corps are the foundation upon which to develop the individual development plan.

Quality achievement factors (QAFs), which provide a framework for individual preparation for assumption of leadership positions within the AAC are the foundation upon which to develop the IDP. The QAFs, in conjunction with the functional Army Civilian Training and Education Development System, form a road map which a workforce member can utilize for self-development.

Diane M. Schaule is a program analyst in the Acquisition Education and Training Division of OASARDA. She is currently working toward Level III certification in the program management career field.

COL Edward A. Cerutti is a member of the Officer Personnel Management System XXI Precursor Study Group, Headquarters, Total Army Personnel Command. A licensed professional engineer in Virginia, he holds a B.S. degree from the U.S. Military Academy and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in mechanical engineering from the University of Arizona.

Karen A. Walker is the acting team chief of the AAC Communications Reengineering Team in the Office of the Deputy Director, Acquisition Career Management. She holds a B.S. degree in business administration and is Level III certified in the program management career field.
MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Policy Memorandum No. 96-01, Career Development as a Mission

The Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA), enacted as part of the FY91 Defense Authorization Act, focused heavily on a systematic approach to professionalize the Army Acquisition Workforce (AAW). DAWIA addresses specific requirements for work assignments, experience, education and training. Within the Army, the Director of Acquisition Career Management (DACM) is responsible, by law, for implementation of AAW education, training and career development. The DACM’s implementation strategy includes high quality education, training and other career broadening programs to enhance the AAW’s technical competencies and leadership skills.

Toward that end, a major challenge for today’s Army is to focus on integrating military and civilian AAW employee education, training and career development into the mission of the organization. Organizations will derive great benefit from helping people achieve their potential through these means, particularly as the Army downsizes the force.

Commanders and managers at all levels must possess a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in AAW education, training and career development. These activities for acquisition workforce personnel must become a part of the organization’s stated mission. Organizations are expected to plan for and release AAW personnel for mandatory and other training, education, and developmental opportunities which will enable them to better accomplish the Army’s mission.

Military acquisition career development is covered under DA Pamphlet 600-3, Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Utilization. Military supervisors who manage AAW members will have, as part of their Officer Evaluation Report (OER) Support Form, a major performance objective for members’ career development. Military career development initiatives will be worked in conjunction with the applicable policies established under this memorandum.
For civilians, the vehicle to achieve a systematic approach to career development is the Individual Development Plan (IDP). DoD 5000.52-M, Acquisition Career Development Program, mandates an IDP for each civilian AAW member, as a minimum, through certification at Level III. This memorandum establishes Army policy which requires each civilian AAW member to have a five-year IDP, which must be updated annually. A suggested IDP format and guidance for completing the form will be forthcoming.

Upon publication of the IDP format and guidance, supervisors and managers of civilian AAW members will include IDP development and support to the member in accomplishing planned activities under the overall objective of Organizational Management and Leadership in the Senior System, and Supervision and Leadership Responsibility in the Base System. Their accomplishments in this area will be assessed and the results reflected on their Total Army Performance Evaluation System evaluation report. Likewise, non-supervisory civilian AAW members will be rated on their professional development objectives.

It is vitally important that the Army culture view education, training, and career development as part of the organization’s mission. As the 21st century swiftly approaches, a highly qualified AAW is essential to meet the demands for personnel with highly technical skills and strong leadership abilities. The senior acquisition and personnel leadership in this Headquarters are committed to establishing a partnership to ensure that education, training, and career development as a mission is communicated and practiced throughout the Army for the AAW.

We are dedicated and committed to working within the Army system to ensure that our AAW members possess technical, leadership, and managerial skills, second to none, in the Department of Defense. We look forward to working with you in this team effort. Please give this memorandum widest dissemination to AAW members and their civilian and military supervisors.

Gilbert F. Decker  
Assistant Secretary of the Army  
(Research, Development & Acquisition)

Sara E. Lister  
Assistant Secretary of the Army  
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

DISTRIBUTION:  
PROGRAM EXECUTIVE OFFICERS  
COMMANDERS, MAJOR ARMY COMMANDS  
FUNCTIONAL CHIEF REPRESENTATIVES  
ALL STAFF AND OPERATING CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OFFICES
Why centralized management?

The Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) is aimed at improving the overall effectiveness and professionalism of military and civilian personnel charged with the management and administration of Defense acquisition programs. DAWIA's focus on the acquisition workforce includes recognizing acquisition as a professional career field; improving the education, training and experience levels of acquisition professionals; establishing a career management structure in the Department of Defense; and establishing programs to assist acquisition personnel in their professional development.

The Army Acquisition Corps' (AAC's) strategic vision for a "small, premier professional corps of acquisition leaders willing to serve where needed and committed to developing, integrating, acquiring and fielding systems critical to decisive victory for the 21st century" is designed to achieve the true intent of DAWIA by developing the Army's top performers and then challenging them with its most demanding jobs.

DAWIA further states "The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the policies established under this chapter are designed to provide for the selection of the best qualified individual for a position..." To make this goal a reality, civilian personnel files must be comparable to those of military officers. To that end, the cornerstone of ongoing efforts to reengineer the civilian component of the AAC is the central management of the civilian acquisition workforce—alike to a large extent to what we do today for military acquisition personnel in terms of central acquisition career file development, education and training, and facilitation of career broadening assignments.

What does centralized management really mean for civilian personnel?

The objective of the centralized career management program is to facilitate the career and leadership development of AAC members. Centrally managed career development will consist of an interactive relationship between the Corps member and the functional acquisition specialists (FASs) using clearly established career paths as well as integrated training and education and information from Individual Development Plans (IDPs).

Each member of the AAC remains responsible for his or her own career development; the FASs will simply facilitate acquisition personnel actions and insure all required data is correct.

Will the central management program be based on positions or personnel?

Initially, central management will focus on a subset of AAC members in the program executive office/program management (PEO/PM) organizations. Additionally, a small number of GS-13s, who will be centrally board selected for a Competitive Development Group (see article on page 22 of this
Acquisition Corps Quality Achievement Factors

MINIMUMS TO BE COMPETITIVE:
• OPM Criteria for series and grade
• DAWIA Certification at the lower grade from which considered

QUALITY ACHIEVEMENT FACTORS TO BE USED IN SELECTION PROCESSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO GRADE:</th>
<th>CERTIFICATION LEVEL</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS 14</td>
<td>III in primary Acq. Career Field (ACF) II in second ACF</td>
<td>BA/BS + 18 Graduate Semester hours Army Management Staff College OR Command &amp; General Staff College OR equivalent</td>
<td>Experience in Leadership or Management Operational/field level assignment * 2 MACOM/MSC/OSD/Joint Service assignments** HQDA assignment</td>
<td>Management leadership courses completed, e.g., Organizational Leadership for Executives (OLE), Personnel Management for Executives (PME), etc. Continuing self-development training ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS 15</td>
<td>III in primary ACF II in second ACF</td>
<td>MA/MS/MBA/MPA or equivalent Continuing Education credits</td>
<td>Supervisory, e.g., Division Chief experience Operational/field level assignment * 2 MACOM/MSC/OSD/Joint Service assignments** HQDA assignment</td>
<td>Executive Career Development courses, e.g., Federal Executive Institute, Brookings, Harvard, Personnel Management for Executives II, etc. Continuing self-development training ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>III in primary ACF II in second ACF III in third ACF</td>
<td>MA/MS/MBA/MPA + Continuing Education credits Senior Service College</td>
<td>Supervisory e.g., Director experience 3 MACOM/MSC/Joint Service assignments** HQDA/OSD assignment</td>
<td>Executive Career Development courses, e.g., Federal Executive Institute, Brookings Harvard, etc. Continuing self-development training ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Operational/Field Level assignments include assignment to or in support of PM/PEO Offices, TRADOC System Management Offices, etc.
** Joint Service assignments include acquisition positions in other DoD and Federal agencies, as well as industry. Also included are assignments/details normally lasting 6-12 months to Source Selection Evaluation Boards and MACOM/HQDA Study Teams, “Tiger Teams,” and special projects. Assignments in PEO Offices equate to MACOM assignments.
*** Self-development training includes professional seminars, refresher courses, professional certificate programs, etc.

magazine), will be centrally managed throughout their training. Finally, all individuals selected for Senior Service Colleges or long-term training will be managed during their schooling and through their first post-utilization assignment.

There will be approximately 800 individuals who will be included in this pilot program. As the central management processes and procedures are refined, central management will be extended to a larger number of acquisition organizations and AAC members.

What developmental model will be used for the central management of personnel?

Our goal is to prepare a new generation of acquisition leaders for the Army. Quality Achievement Factors (QAFs) (see accompanying chart), in conjunction with the various Army Civilian Training and Education Development System (ACTEDS) plans, will form a road map for the development (to include education, training and experience, and self-development) required for civilians to prepare themselves to assume leadership positions within the AAC. The QAFs are also the foundation upon which each civilian member of the Army acquisition workforce (AAW) will develop a five-year IDP in conjunction with their supervisor as required by AAC Policy Memorandum 96-01, Career Development as a Mission (see related article on page 2 of this magazine). These QAFs, as well as background experience and manner of performance, will play a role in determining the best qualified AAC members for promotions, developmental assignments, and long-term training opportunities.

How will centrally managed positions be filled?

PEOs and deputy PEOs (General officer/Senior Executive Service-level) will be selected through a central Department of the Army (DA) panel. It is anticipated that PM, and, potentially, deputy PM positions will be made through a DA central board selection process. A central referral process, in which a best qualified list will be provided to local management for selection, will be piloted in the centrally managed PEO structure in FY 97. It is envisioned that the criteria for selection under this system will be based on QAFs, experience, performance and potential evaluations.

The functional acquisition specialists at

The objective of the centralized career management program is to facilitate the career and leadership development of Army Acquisition Corps members.
In this new challenging business environment, the Army Acquisition Corps must possess highly trained individuals who can serve as leaders in a wide variety of circumstances.

The U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) will facilitate the coordination of lateral rotational assignments, job swaps and developmental assignments. Costs for centrally managed personnel accepting opportunities away from home station, such as moving expenses and relocation incentives, will be centrally funded. Reassignments of individuals will open their positions for back fill. This domino effect opens many opportunities for individuals to obtain the experience they desire and require.

Who will be responsible for central management?

The director for acquisition career management's (DACM) goal is to establish a single management structure to oversee, direct and administer the central management of military and civilian members of the AAC. To that end, military and civilian functional acquisition specialists will jointly administer the AAC's central management program at PERSCOM. The Civilian Acquisition Career Management Branch (CAMB) at PERSCOM will be staffed with civilian functional acquisition specialists (FAS) to facilitate the central management of the civilian workforce, much as military assignment officers do at the Military Acquisition Career Management Branch (MAMB) at PERSCOM.

Functional acquisition specialists have been selected from the workforce and represent a variety of acquisition career fields. (See page 9 for a list of recently selected functional acquisition specialists.) They will be the agents who will communicate with the centrally managed members of the AAC and the AAW to facilitate their career development. The FASs at CAMB will maintain complete and accurate data; provide knowledgeable responses to queries regarding career development; operate post-utilization assignment processes; determine the progress of the Competitive Development Group during their three-year program; compare updated files of centrally managed AAC members with approved quality achievement factors; make periodic contacts with all centrally managed AAC members to advise them on available career enhancement opportunities; and schedule centrally managed AAC members for appropriate training, education, and rotational assignments.

Is mobility a prerequisite for centralized management?

No! Mobility is not a prerequisite for centralized management. However, mobility is an essential prerequisite for effective professional development. Mobility is defined as the reassignment of an AAC member for the purpose of advancement or career broadening that may or may not require geographic relocation. Reasonably mobile employees benefit from diverse job experiences and exposure to new and varied challenges. In this new challenging business environment, the AAC must possess highly trained individuals who can serve as leaders in a wide variety of circumstances.

Centrally managed members of the AAC will be provided the opportunity to make their assignment preferences known. FASs, at PERSCOM, will work with those individuals to provide them with new assignment options.

If I am selected for long-term training or other career broadening experiences, will I return to my old job?

Ideally, upon completion of training, developmental opportunity or special assignment (short-term work experience needed by the individual), the employee should be placed in a position in which he or she will utilize their newly acquired knowledge and skills. This may dictate that the individual not return to his or her original position or organization. As part of the selection process for long-term training or special assignments, a post-utilization plan will be required. This plan will outline the types of positions, locations and rationales behind those particular individual and management desires. Working with the FAS, the member will plan for his or her future assignment. (A list of recent long-term training and Senior Service College graduates is shown on page 9 of this magazine.)

When will the central management concept be implemented?

The concept is being implemented now on a limited scale. AAC members selected for central management are being contacted by FASs to correct personnel data and build files. This exercise has included telephone calls and visits to several commands to obtain the required information. The processes and procedures to implement central management are being carefully developed over time with participation from functional and command levels. Each stage of development of the process will be evaluated and refined as necessary. The reengineering team is meeting with representatives from the functional areas (i.e., contracts, engineering, etc.) on a monthly basis to discuss the details of the proposed processes.

The DACM and deputy DACM are actively advocating career management development. They are also attempting to address the concerns of the AAC as the integrated central management process is formulated and initiated. The goal of these efforts is to develop the best possible professional corps of acquisition leaders.

DICK CHILDRESS, an acquisition manager in the Army Digitization Office, is currently serving on special assignment working on central management developmental positions with the Army Acquisition Corps Reengineering Team. He has served as the PM, Combat Identification; PM and Deputy PM, Tactical-Area Weapon Systems; Head of Advanced System Concepts, Army Research Lab (ARL); and Acting Director for Plans and Programs, ARL. A member of the Army Acquisition Corps since 1991, he holds a master's of science degree in electrical engineering from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and a bachelor's of science degree in electronic engineering from the University of Arkansas.

COL EDWARD A. CERUTTI is a member of the Officer Personnel Management System XXI Precursor Study Group, Headquarters, Total Army Personnel Command. A licensed professional engineer in Virginia, he holds a B.S. degree from the U.S. Military Academy and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in mechanical engineering from the University of Arizona.
**FUNCTIONAL ACQUISITION SPECIALISTS**

The functional acquisition specialists recently selected to perform the central management functions described in this article are listed below, along with their phone numbers and the acquisition career field they will manage. They will be contacting each centrally managed careerist to assist in their career development. Each FAS may also manage a number of Category A and S employees, due to the large number of these careerists in the centrally managed population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CAREER FIELD MANAGED</th>
<th>DSN</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marietta Martin</td>
<td>Cat K</td>
<td>221-9690</td>
<td>(703) 325-9690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitha Vos</td>
<td>Cat A, V</td>
<td>221-6137</td>
<td>(703) 325-6137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vuxton</td>
<td>Cat C</td>
<td>221-3215</td>
<td>(703) 325-3215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Long</td>
<td>Cat R, T</td>
<td>221-4267</td>
<td>(703) 325-4267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Longtain</td>
<td>Cat L</td>
<td>221-5092</td>
<td>(703) 325-5093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon McCray</td>
<td>Cat S, H, G</td>
<td>221-3190</td>
<td>(703) 325-3190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Acquisition Senior Service College (SSC)/Long Term Training Graduates**

The FY 96 graduating acquisition students from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, University of Texas SSC Fellowship program, and the Naval Postgraduate School have all been placed in follow-on utilization assignments as part of the AAC Reengineering effort of centralized management. Assignments are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Edgar</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>HQDA(SARDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunnie Greenhouse</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>HQDA(SARDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Guenther</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>HQDA(SAFM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Halloran</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>OSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Howell</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>Medical Research and Materiel Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Inman</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>OSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kroll</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>SOCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Nolan</td>
<td>ICAF</td>
<td>CECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Caudle</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>HQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ciummo</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>OSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Crisp</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>AMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRALIZED SELECTION BOARDS FOR CIVILIANS

By Cathy Johnston

Introduction

The Civilian Acquisition Management Branch (CAMB) has been in existence since April 1990. We are collocated with the Military Acquisition Management Branch in the Army Acquisition Corps Management Office, Functional Area Management Development Directorate of the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM). Our primary mission is to provide civilian personnel management and administration to Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) members, and candidates.

During the last six years, CAMB has conducted 10 accession boards which resulted in a total of 4,120 civilians being granted membership in the AAC. Additionally, four boards have been conducted to centrally select civilians to fill product, program and/or project manager (PM) positions.

Over the years, we have received many questions about the board process. Why are applications boarded? Who are the board officials and how are members selected to serve on a board? Why does it take so long to receive results from a board? This article will answer these questions and also provide a glimpse into the future.

While the military routinely conducts centralized boards for a variety of actions, ranging from promotions to PM selections, civilians are only now becoming accustomed to the idea of centralized boards. One of the primary charters of the Army implementation of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act is that the civilian and military personnel models be as similar as is practical. The military has already developed the framework for a centralized selection system, therefore, it is appropriate for the civilian component to attempt to mirror it without violating civilian personnel laws or regulations.

Types of Boards

The CAMB staff currently conducts two different types of boards. The first is a PERSCOM board convened under the authority of the Commander, PERSCOM, and used primarily for accession purposes. The second is a Department of the Army (DA) Secretariat Board used for selecting centrally managed PM positions. The DA Secretariat Board process is relatively new to the civilian community, but has an unequalled record for integrity, fairness and impartiality. This article will not address the selection process for ACAT I and II PM positions that have been designated by the Army Acquisition Executive for military and civilian fill. That issue was discussed thoroughly in the May-June 1996 issue of Army RD&A magazine, in an article entitled "Using the Best Qualified Selection Method for ACAT I/II PMs."

Rules

Each of these boards conforms to a stringent set of rules that govern the conduct of the board. Membership of a board is made up of senior acquisition officials (GS-15 and above and military O-6 and above). Great faith and trust are placed in board members. They are instructed to maintain a high level of confidentiality about the proceedings of the board and the results of the board.

The director, acquisition career management (DACM) determines the need for a board and develops the policy related to determining the eligibility requirements for the positions as well as the criteria for selection of candidates for the positions. The DACM also works with CAMB to develop appropriate procedures for its application. Finally, CAMB releases the announcement, identifying the type of positions being recruited and details the application procedures.
Late Breaking News

- Larry D. Johnston, Office of the PEO, Aviation, has been selected to fill an ACAT I Program Manager position. Johnston is the first Army civilian to be selected during a board that considered both military and civilian applicants concurrently, selecting the best qualified individual from the combined field.

- The FY 97 Civilian Product and Project Manager’s Board, conducted in March of this year, selected the following individuals to fill ACAT III positions at the locations shown following each name:

  Roxanne C. Braun, Sustaining Base Automation, Fort Belvoir, VA
  Joseph H. Butler, PM ARROW, Huntsville, AL
  Wesley F. McElveen, TEMOD/CALSETS, Warren, MI
  Bela D. Csendes, Light Tactical Vehicles, Warren, MI
  Robert Doto, Joint Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistic Support, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  Kevin J. Flamm, Cooperative Threat Reduction, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
  Robert E Golden, TESAR, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  William S. Hayden, Signals Warfare, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  Peter O. Johnson, ILOGS, Fort Lee, VA
  Richard W. Misiewicz, Chemical Stockpile Disposal, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
  Donna C. Shandle, Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
  Harvey J. Slovin, DCATS, Fort Monmouth, NJ
  Susian E. Vickers, AIT, Fort Belvoir, VA

Methods

PERSCOM uses a wide variety of methods to provide information to the field. The most common method of announcement is the use of messages that travel through command channels. Recently, however, we expanded our sources to include the use of e-mail and the worldwide web. Every effort is made to make information available to every interested civilian employee.

In past years, PERSCOM has used a program called AUTOAPP to capture personal and job history information. CAMB and the DACM Office are working on a number of initiatives that will soon revise the methods used to apply for vacancies and/or membership. Additionally, an Acquisition Civilian Record Brief, a document that mirrors the Officer Record Brief, is under development. Both of these new tools will be used in the board process in the future.

Reviews

Once applications are received in CAMB, staff members review every application to ensure that each application meets minimum qualifications and that all required documents are contained in the application. If an application is not complete, it is not forwarded for boarding. Clearly, it is in the best interest of an applicant to ensure that all required information is provided at the outset.

The board reviews each application based on the instructions established in a memorandum of instruction. Every board member votes each record independently and assigns it a point score. The board members’ scores are then totaled in order to rank the applicants and determine the PM selectees. The results are consolidated and forwarded with the PERSCOM commander’s endorsement through the deputy chief of staff for personnel to the DACM for approval. After the results of the board are approved, the list is released through command channels and successful applicants will be officially notified by mail.

PERSCOM does not approve or disapprove civilian component Army Acquisition Corps board results—that authority resides with the DACM.

As the number of centrally managed positions increases, so will the opportunities to compete for assignment to those positions. It is important for applicants to retain their competitive edge and to document their achievements when applying under an announcement. A successful application is one that has been reviewed to ensure that the application itself is completely filled out and that all required documents are included. If an item is missing or incomplete, an explanation should be given. In some cases, applicants are afforded the opportunity to address a letter to the president of the board. This letter is a tool for the applicant to use to define outstanding skills, talents and education or training that may not have been evident in other parts of the application.

Hopefully, this article has answered some of your questions about the board process. If not, CAMB invites your questions. You can contact us via e-mail using this address: TAPC-OPB-B@Hoffman-EMH1.ARMY.MIL

CATHY JOHNSTON is a personnel management specialist in the Civilian Acquisition Management Branch at the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command. She has an associate’s degree from Northern Virginia Community College.
THE ARMY ACQUISITION CORPS CORPS ELIGIBLE PROGRAM

By Thomas H.E. Drinkwater

Corps eligibles have much to look forward to. This is an exciting time to be in the acquisition workforce and being declared a corps eligible will enhance one's career opportunities.

Introduction

The Army Acquisition Corps Corps Eligible (CE) Program is a direct result of the Acquisition Corps Reengineering Team’s efforts to develop GS-13s within the current resource-constrained environment. The program targets GS-13s Army-wide to determine their eligibility for Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) membership and provides them with various career enhancing opportunities.

While a limited number of Department of the Army GS-13 employees were accessed into the AAC in its infancy, none have been granted membership since that time. It is current policy that, due to constraints, only a few selected GS-13s will be accessed into the AAC (see article in this issue on the Competitive Development Group). The Corps Eligible Program attempts to provide some of the benefits of corps membership within available resources.

The CE Program allows GS-13s in the workforce to take a large step towards corps membership. A streamlined process ensures that all applicants meet the requirements for accession. The fact that our acquisition workforce has become certified in their acquisition career fields in the past 18 months has allowed the simplification of the accession process. Achievement of Level II or Level III certification, in many cases fulfills the experience and training requirements for AAC accession.

Under the current CE process, upon selection to a GS-14 Critical Acquisition Position (CAP), the accession package of a corps eligible goes directly to the Director for Acquisition Career Management for approval, along with the signed Acquisition Corps Mobility Agreement. The individual can then permanently assume their GS-14 position.

It is important to note that corps eligible status is not a prerequisite for selection into a CAP. It simply screens an individual’s file in advance to ensure that he or she meets the corps accession requirements. It allows applicants to avoid a lengthy application process of which the outcome is not completely certain.

As part of the program, those individuals determined to be corps eligible, will be afforded several career enhancing opportunities. The most prestigious of these will be the opportunity to apply for the Competitive Development Group. Corps eligibles will also receive priority for selected acquisition training opportunities. These include attendance at specific Defense Acquisition University courses, management, leadership and ethics seminars, and eligibility to apply for master’s degree programs through the Army Tuition Assistance Program.

Applicants

Since the AAC Corps Eligible Program was first announced in February, the Acquisition Reengineering Team has received more than 2,300 applications. A team of functional experts has been reviewing each application to ensure that the applicants meet Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) and DOD requirements for accession into the Acquisition Corps as outlined in DoD 5000.52M, Acqui...
Career Development Program. The standards consist of three factors: education, experience, and training. These standards, and the requirements in each of the three areas, are shown in Figure 1.

The corps eligible process will provide several direct benefits. First, the Army Civilian Personnel Record System (ACPERs) will be to-Loaded with the data the team collects, thus improving the quality of our database. Additionally, the team has provided career counseling to numerous GS-13s and explained to the applicants how to have their records updated at the local level. Finally, an accurate mailing list of all GS-13 members of the acquisition workforce who have submitted applications for the Corps Eligible Program is being compiled.

Corps eligible applications will continue to be processed until Oct. 1, 1996. After that date, it is envisioned that a more user-friendly, automated application process will be employed. Improvements will include better instructions and an easier to complete application form.

A quick review of the applications reveals several interesting highlights (See Figure 2.) In the area of education, many of our GS-13 employees possess doctoral degrees. A few individuals have two! Master's degrees are in abundance, especially in the engineering career fields. Finally, more than 55 percent of CE applicants have baccalaureate degrees.

The DAWIA requirement to have 24 semester hours in one's career field and 12 semester hours in business subjects was often substituted for by having the allowable 10 years of experience in acquisition positions prior to Oct. 1, 1991. This method of meeting the entrance standards was most commonly used by engineers and contracting personnel.

Most applicants are certified in at least one career acquisition field at Level III, and 16 percent were certified in more than one acquisition career field. The majority of the certifications occurred prior to Jan. 1, 1995, when certification criteria changed for many career fields.

Most of the applicants have between eight and 18 years of experience. Because of the career ladders in different fields, progression varies, and some career fields have more experienced people in them than others. This is especially true of the contracting and business management arenas.

Many GS-13s who are members of the acquisition workforce chose not to apply. Some, who responded, indicated that they were within retirement age, or did not want to face the possibility of changing positions. The Reengineering Team's equal employment opportunity (EEO) member will be

---

### ACQUISITION CORPS ENTRANCE STANDARDS

(See DoD 5000.52-M for authorities to grant waivers to these requirements)

#### EDUCATION

- **Have ONE of:**
  - Baccalaureate degree from an accredited educational institution
  - Acquisition Career Program Board certification of significant potential for advancement
  - Ten years of acquisition experience as of October 1, 1991
  - Less than ten years acquisition experience, but was serving in an acquisition position on October 1, 1991 and meet the requirement for 24 semester credit hours in the business disciplines listed below

- **Have ONE of:**
  - Ten years of acquisition experience as of October 1, 1991
  - 24 semester credit hours among: accounting; business finance; law; contracts; purchasing; economics; industrial management; marketing; quantitative methods; organization and management, or have passed DANTES or CLEP equivalency exams for the above.
  - 24 semester hours in your career field, PLUS 12 semester credit hours from those listed above. DANTES or CLEP equivalency exams, as well as credits given for training courses in these areas, may be used to satisfy the 12-hour requirement.

#### EXPERIENCE:

- Achieved a grade level equivalent to GS-13 (Civilian) or O-4 (Military) or higher, or comparable position outside the DoD

- Four years acquisition experience in a DoD acquisition position, or in a comparable position outside DoD

#### TRAINING:

- Certification at Level 2 or Level 3 in an acquisition career field, or completion of all training requirements for such certification

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7107 Acquisition GS-13’s</th>
<th>1925 Qualified CE’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Range</td>
<td>(27-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Male</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Female</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- None</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bachelors</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Masters</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PhD</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Certifications</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications in Process</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declined CE Status</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Qualified</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Applications Received</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>75%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.**

contacting those who did not want to apply
to determine why they chose not to. The
team will use that data in making future
decisions concerning the management of the
acquisition workforce.

There were several applications received
from individuals who had already been ac­
cessed into the Acquisition Corps as mem­
bers of the Army Reserve. In accordance
with new policy guidance from the Office
of the Deputy Director for Acquisition Ca­
reer Management, these individuals are rec­
ognized as already being members of the
AAC and do not need to reapply. They
should, however, keep abreast of their acqui­
sition training to stay current in their acqui­
sition career fields.

**How to Apply**

Corps eligibles have much to look for­
doing. It is not too late to late to apply.
Please contact: Deputy Director for
Acquisition Career Management, ATTN:
Corp Eligible Program, 9900 Belvoir Rd.,
Suite 101, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5567.

For more information on the Corps Eli­
gible Program, contact Thomas Drinkwater
at DSN 655-5443/5212 or commercial 703-
805-5443/5212.

Following this article is the list of those
applicants who have been designated a
corps eligible at the time of publication of
this article. We congratulate these first mem­
ers of our Corps Eligible Program and look
forward to working with them in the develop­
ment of their careers. As others are design­
gated, their names will be published in fu­
ture issues of Army RD&A magazine.

**THOMAS H.E.DRINKWATER** is
the AAC Civilian Proponency Offi­
cer and a member of the Army Ac­
quition Corps Reengineering
Team. A graduate of St. Bonaven­
ture University, he holds a master's
degree in public administration
from the University of Alaska, An­
chorage. He is also a graduate of
the U.S. Army Command and Gen­
eral Staff College, the Associate Lo­
gistics Executive Development
Course and the Defense Systems
Management College Program
Management Course. A lieutenant
colonel in the Army Reserve, he has
an Individual Mobilization assign­
ment with the Defense Industrial
Supply Center, Philadelphia, and is
the commander of the 8601st IMA
Det, Warrenton, VA.
Corps Eligible Designees

ABBIE GEORGE E
ABELELY NDA D
ABOUL HOSEN ZIAAD R
ABRAMELA H UGENE
ACEVEDO VIDAL
ACKER JIMMIE JU
ACKERSON MARY D
ACOSTA REN
ADAMS DAVE R
ADAMS MARY S
ADKINS GARY G
ADKINS RONALD C
AHMAD ADU H W
AHMED ALTAF
AENSWORTH JAMES S
ALBRECHT GEORGE H
ALCORN FRED L
ALEJO LARRY W
ALESANDRO CYNTHIA A
ALETTA JOSEPH M
ALEXANDER CHRISTINE M
ALEXANDER HENRY T
ALEXANDER MARK S
ALEN CAREY R
ALLEN CHARLES D
ALLEN III WILLIAM A
ALLEN J CRAIG
ALLEN JANET G
ALLEN LONNIE E
ALLEN STEPHANIE J
ALLISON JODY F
ALLOCCA PATRICIA C
ALLTON DAVID J
ALONS ROGER B
ALVARADO CARLOS T
AMBROSIO MARIO
ANDERSON B WAYNE
ANDERSON DEBRA R
ANDERSON JIMMY I
ANDROFI David M
ANTIOLE GEORGE
ANSTINE CURTIS J JR
APFAGS REBECCA H
APODACA RICHARD D
APPLETHEODORE BRUCE
APPLEGATE WILLIAM H
ARGON FILEMON
ARCHBALD JAMES
ARMSTRONG ANDRE L
ARNOLD MARCIA L
ARKER JAMES P
ASH LAWRENCE A
ASHLEY BILLY J
ATCILLY WILLIAM T
ATKINSON RALPH L
AU WALTER YU WING
AUDINO MICHAEL J
AUSTIN LAURIE J
AUSTIN R DORIS
AUSTIN STEVE P
AVALLONE CONNIE J
AWAD MONA M
AYERS JAMES R
BACON WILLIAM M
BADER ALAN M
BAILEY JOHN R
BAJWA JAGDISH S
BAKER ROGER K JR
BAKER SUSAN
BAKER TIMOTHY SCOTT
BAKER TREVEN E
BALBONA JOSEPH A
BALDAUF JOSEPH J
BALDWIN ROBIN A
BALLEW PATRICIA M
BANDERET LOUIS E
BARBER PATRICIA V
BARBIE JOHN H
BARCZAK KENNETH S
BARKER JOSEPHINE F
BARNES KOLOUT
BARNETT KENNETH R
BARONE SALVATORE
BARRETT MARILYN A
BARRY BRIAN M
BARTH STEPHEN G
BARTLING DOROTHY C
BASHAM STEVEN O
BASKIN STEVEN I
BATCHA GEORGE
BATTISTA ANTHONY J
BAUERSFELD DONALD W
BAUGHN MICHAEL K
BAUMAN GEORGE J
BAYER DEBORAH A
BAYE LINDA A
BEAL WESLEY A
BEALE NANCY R
BEAN ROBERT A
BEASLEY JOHN P
BEAVERS BARRY W
BECKGAGE THOMAS NMI
BECKMAN SUSAN L
BELFER JUDITH A
BELK DANIEL D
BELL STEPHEN F
BEMBRY LEONARD A
BENDER JOHN E
BENIS BRIAN K
BENJAMIN ROSS C
BENNITT LEON J
BENSON ROBERT L
BENSON WILLIAM M
BERG GLEN W
BERGIN JOHN F
BERNS PAUL R
BERRY JOHN H
BESTAYD WILLIAM
BEVERLY EDGAR D W
BEZWADA HARIBABU
BIENKOWSKI STANLEY J
BILDERBACK KATE C
BILLUPS ANGELA
BINKFELD JOSEPH B
BINSEEL MARY S
BIRD EDWARD A JR
BIRDSONG CHARLES B
BIRKET TIMOTHY F
BIRGERGAARD WESLEY J
BLACK HEIDI A
BLACKBURN RUBY F
BLACKLOCK PATRI A
BLACKWELL JR WILLIAM F
BLAIR WILLIAM C
BLAKE JUDITH W
BLAKE STEVEN G
BLAUCK KENNETH H
BLANEY HUGH P
BLAZOSKY DAVID M
BLEY ANN D
BLOHM GARY W
BOBBLIT SUSAN C
BODINE JAMES G
BODINE ROBERTA B
BOEHM JAMES A III
BOEHEIME CRAIG S
BOEN JAMES M
Bogner ADAM S
Bogner KATHY PERRY
Bogner MICHAEL JAY
BOLTON ROBERT L
BOMUS MITCHELL J
BONAR DORIS L
BOND MICHAEL H
BONNE SUSAN M
BOOKER HAROLD JR
BOOZER WEYMANN
BORDEN CAROL J
BOSTON MARIANNE M
BOSWELL JACK
BOUCHER ARNOLD C
BOWA YVONNE HICKS
BOVINO LAWRENCE J
BOWEN ROBERTA L
BOWERS JAMES F JR
BOWERS MARY V
BOYD DENNIS S
BOYD DEWAR D JR
BOYER DENNIS A
BOYER EUGENE J
BOYUM ROBERT L
BRADBBS JOHN
BRACKETT MARSHA P
BRADFORD STEPHEN D
BRADY JOSEPH PATRICK
BRADY PAMELA LEE
BRADY RICHARD D
BRADY THOMAS K
BRAMLETT STEPHEN E
BRAND DAVID W
BRANON TONY A
BRAZELTON MARSHA L
BRAZELTON SANDRA S
BREEDWELL MARY M
BRENDLE BRUCE E JR
BRENNAN NANCY J
BRENNEN ROBERT A
BRENNER KEITH
BREWER CARLTON E
BRICK GEORGE
BRIDES DANNY R
BRIERLY JOSEPH E
BRIMSFIELD ALAYA V
BRIONES DARWIN L
BRISKER HENRY C
BROCK ROBERT D
BROCEKER MARK A
BROOKS EVERETT E SR
BROOKS JOSEPH A JR
BROOKS ROBERT E
BROOKS STEVEN M
BROREY DAVID L
BROWN JEFFREY E
BROWN MARK D J
BROWN MICHAEL A
BROWN SHARON R
BROWNELL ELIZABETH P
BROWNING DAVID R
BRUCHMAN NEALE W
BRUCKSCH ROBERT C
BRUNNER ERNEST
BRUNTON LOREN F
BRYSON JANCIE M
BUCHANAN GEORGE M
BUCHANAN JUDY S
BUCHANAN WILLIAM R
BUCHBACH JOHN H
BUCKENOR MICHAEL H
BUDrys SUSAN
BUFFINGTON ROBERT P
BUGNO JOHN E
BURCHER ERNEST E JR
BURDETT SYLVIA A
BURDETTE DOUGLAS E
BURGISANTIO VICTOR M
Bumerester JEAN L
BURNSKISK JOHN B
BURNHAM WILLIAM C
BURNS RICHARD P
BURRAGE MICHAEL P
BURRALL CRAIG
BUSK ALISON K
BUSSE DAVID J
BUTLER DANIEL PATRICK
BUTLER SUSAN J
BUTLER WILLIAM W
BYRD JOANNE
BYERS MARY JO A
CAGLE ROBERT L III
CAGLE WEST MARSHA S
CALABRETA WAYNETHOMAS
CALAPODAS NICHOLAS J
CALDERONE CHARLES J
CALTABLOTA PATRICIA A
CALLAGHABRNE JR JOSEPH P
CAMERON JAMES R
CAMOOSO JAMES C III
CAMPBELL JAMES T III
CAMPBELL KENNETH J
CAMPBELL RICHARD S
CANADAY SUSAN M
CARBONARO ALFRED
CARLSO ANN B
CARLSON HENRY E
CARMODY WILLIAM B
CARNEY PHILIP J
CARNEY SHIRLEY D
CARMEN ROBERTO R
CARONELI DAVID O NMM
CARRON ALLI A
CARPENTER JANET E
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THE COMPETITIVE DEVELOPMENT GROUP

By Clark F. Rehberg II

What's a Competitive Development Group?

The Competitive Development Group (CDG) is a group of high potential GS-13s, competitively board selected, who will be provided expanded training, leadership, and career development opportunities. It is envisioned that these highly qualified individuals will be most competitive to become the future leaders in the Army acquisition community.

An initiative of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) Reengineering Team, the CDG Program is designed to be a critical component of a set of programs being developed to fulfill the AAC vision, "A small premier professional corps of acquisition leaders willing to serve where needed and committed to developing, integrating, acquiring and fielding systems critical to decisive victory ... for the 21st century."

Program Objectives

The objectives of the CDG Program are as follows: select the very best GS-13s from among those eligible to apply; broaden the leadership and management skills of each member; develop future leaders in functional acquisition career fields; and expand each member's knowledge of the acquisition process outside of their own acquisition career field.

Program Highlights

All GS-13s that have applied and been accepted as corps eligibles (CE), as well as all GS-13 members of the Army Acquisition Corps, may apply and compete for the CDG Program. Pages 42-44 of the May-June 1996 issue of Army RD&A magazine provide full details for applying to become corps eligible. Anyone interested in being considered for the FY'97 annual selection for the CDG must submit the CE application to the Director for Acquisition Career Management (DACM) no later than Aug. 15, 1996. Therefore, it is highly recommended for those eligible GS-13s who have not applied for CE status, to do so immediately. More information on the CE Program may be found in a separate article on page 12 of this magazine.

A central selection board, composed of functional and command representatives, will annually select up to 25 individuals for the CDG. Although only the best candidates will be selected for the program, it is envisioned that each acquisition career field will be represented. It is important to note that CE and Army Acquisition Corps members may apply and compete every year, without restriction, for membership in the CDG.

Upon selection to the CDG, individuals will be centrally managed while in the program. Each group of CDG members will be identified throughout the program by their year group. Selectees will have a mentor assigned to assist and provide guidance throughout the training period. CDG members will be assigned to centrally funded developmental positions for up to three years based on their individual experience, education, and training needs. These positions will be located throughout the acquisition community. CDG members will receive priority access to cross functional training and advanced leadership/management courses. Graduation from the program will entail

CDG OBJECTIVES

- SELECT VERY BEST GS-13s
- BROADEN AND SUBSTANTIATE LEADERSHIP SKILLS
- DEVELOP LEADERS FROM ALL ACQUISITION CAREER FIELDS
- EXPAND ACQUISITION EXPERIENCE BY ONE OR MORE CAREER FIELDS
CDG HIGHLIGHTS

- CEs and AAC GS-13s INVITED TO APPLY
- CEs AND AAC GS-13s COMPETE ANNUALLY
- CENTRAL BOARD SELECTION
- SMALL GROUP SELECTED EACH YEAR
- MEMBERS CENTRALLY MANAGED
- 3 YEAR PROGRAM
- PRIORITY ACCESS TO CROSS FUNCTIONAL AND ADVANCED LEADERSHIP COURSES
- UPON COMPLETION, CORPS ACCESSION

successful completion of the requirements identified in the Individual Development Plan within three years or by selection for promotion to a critical acquisition position (CAP). In either case, all CDG graduates who are not in the Acquisition Corps will be accessed.

Application and Selection Process
Certified corps eligibles and GS-13 Army Acquisition Corps members will self-nominate, but supervisor and senior rater participation will be needed to complete the application. The actual submission requirements will be stated in the announcement. The announcement date has not been set, but is expected to be September 1996 with applications due in November 1996.

A PERSCOM-convened selection board will be staffed by senior functional area and command representatives from the acquisition community. The list of selectees will be widely publicized through a variety of information media.

Training Program
All CDG selectees will start their program by attending a unique orientation seminar in the Washington, DC, area. At the orientation, the newly-selected individuals will be welcomed to the program by the DACM. Central to the orientation is the joint development of an Individual Development Plan (IDP), involving the selectee’s mentor, a functional specialist from the individual’s career program, a representative from the Acquisition Education and Training Division of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) (OASARDA), and a PERSCOM propenency specialist. The IDP will be specifically tailored to the individual’s needs based on a careful review of their previous training, educational level attained, and prior job assignments. A combination of education, training, and career development opportunities will be offered to complement their professional and leadership development.

Have I Perked Your Interest?
If you are interested in the CDG Program, first ensure that you have been certified corps eligible (CE) or are a current member of the Army Acquisition Corps. Second, watch for your invitation to apply, which is expected to be out in September.

CLARK F. REHBERG II is an acquisition program management officer responsible for civilian propenency programs with the Army Acquisition Corps Reengineering Team, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition). He is a member of the Army Acquisition Corps with more than 20 years of acquisition experience.
ACQUISITION EDUCATION
AT THE
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Army Acquisition Corps Participation

More than 50 military and civilian members of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) are currently pursuing graduate degrees in a variety of disciplines at the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS). Located approximately 120 miles south of San Francisco on the Monterey Peninsula, NPS offers a variety of master's and doctoral degrees in engineering, business and technology fields. Established in 1909 at the Naval Academy in Annapolis, the Naval Postgraduate School moved to its present location (the former Del Monte Resort Hotel) in 1951.

Over the last several years, NPS and the Army acquisition community have developed close ties. The major concentration of Army officer and civilian students are enrolled in the Systems Acquisition Management (816) curriculum in the Systems Management Department. This 18-month curriculum is sponsored by the Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition), who is currently LTG Ronald V. Hite, and focuses on the program management career field primarily for functional area (FA) 51 officers and program management civilians.

The Acquisition and Contract Management (815) curriculum, which is also 18 months, is geared toward the contracting career field for FA 97s and civilians. Both of these curricula lead to the M.S. degree in management and include, not only Army students, but also Navy and Marine Corps officers and civilians, as well as international students from several allied nations. In addition to the acquisition curriculum, Army officers and civilians also attend various engineering and technology programs, which include acquisition course work. NPS operates on a 12-week quarter system with classes in attendance year round. The management curriculum generally begins in January and July of each year while the engineering and technology curricula have various inputs throughout the four quarters (January, April, July, October) depending upon the program selected.

Acquisition Curricula

Both the Acquisition and Contract Management (815) and the Systems Acquisition Management (816) curricula were recently restructured to meet Army education/training requirements, and consist of six quarters devoted to fundamentals courses (accounting, economics, management, mathematics, statistics) and graduate core courses (strategic management, information systems, policy analysis, operations research, public policy and budgeting). The major thrust of each curriculum, however, is the specialty courses. The 815 program includes contracting and program management courses which are shown in Figure 1. Completion of the 815 curriculum for Army students leads to the M.S. degree in management and also satisfies the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) training requirements through Level II in contracting, systems engineering, software acquisition management, and program management and Level III in test and evaluation.

The 816 curriculum consists of acquisition courses which are shown in Figure 2. Completion of the 816 curriculum for Army students leads to the M.S. degree in management and also satisfies the Department of the Army training requirements through Level I in contracting, Level II in software acquisition management and systems engineering, and Level III in program management (PMT 302) and test and evaluation. This curriculum also satisfies the Acquisition core requirements (ACQ 101 and ACQ 201), as well as the Army's Materiel Acquisition Management (MAM) Course at Fort Lee, VA. Both the 815 and 816 curricula also satisfy one year of the experience requirement in their respective career fields.

Known as the “Hybrid” curricula, various
Contracting and Program Management Courses

Acquisition and Contract Management Curriculum (815)

- Principles of Acquisition and Contracting
- Contract Pricing and Negotiations
- Contract Law
- Contract Administration
- Acquisition Management
- Seminar for Contracting Students
- Principles of Program Management I and II
- Acquisition of Embedded Weapon Systems Software
- Test and Evaluation
- Systems Engineering for Acquisition Managers

Acquisition Courses

Systems Acquisition Management Curriculum (816)

- Systems Acquisition and Program Management
- Financial Management in the Armed Forces
- Logistics Engineering
- Acquisition of Embedded Weapon Systems Software
- Quality Assurance and Reliability Methods
- Test and Evaluation
- Principles of Acquisition and Contracting
- Contract Pricing and Negotiations
- Systems Engineering for Acquisition Managers
- Program Management Policy and Control
- Program Management Exercise
- Seminar for Program Management Students

Acquisition Seminars

An extremely important aspect of the acquisition curriculum is staying in constant touch with the pulse and direction of the acquisition profession, both in terms of relevancy and currency in an ever-changing environment. One method by which this is accomplished is through weekly seminars for contracting and program management students. Meeting every Thursday, these seminars are structured to bring prominent acquisition officials from both government and industry into a dialogue with students on a non-attribution basis to discuss problems and issues faced by the guest speaker and his/her organization. From time to time, an entire day is devoted to visit industry plants and government facilities on a “total immersion” basis, getting to know the organization’s operations and key players. Examples of recent Army acquisition-oriented speakers in both the Contracting Seminar and the Program Management Seminar include:

- David Stone, Vice President Contracts, Hughes Aircraft Co., Tucson;
- BG David Gust, Program Executive Officer, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare;
- Susan Pasterick, PM, Gen II Soldier Systems, Motorola Corp.;
- Bill Montalto, General Counsel, House Small Business Committee;
- Gil Decker, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition);
- Keith Charles, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Plans, Programs and Policy and Deputy Director, Acquisition Career Management;
- Bud Laughlon, Senior Vice President, Loral Vought Systems;
- COL Chet Rees, PM, Utility Helicopters;
- MG William Campbell, Program Executive Officer, Command, Control and Communications Systems;
- George Williams, Program Executive Officer, Tactical Missiles;
- Vicky Armbruster, Deputy PM, Air Ground Missiles Systems;
- COL Wayne Sittler, Commander, Electronic Proving Grounds;
- Mel Brashears, PM, Lockheed Martin;
- COL Tom Sinclair, Commander, Close Combat Armament Center, Picatinny Arsenal;
- CPT Dave Soma, USN, Commander, Defense Contract Management Command, Hughes, Tucson;
- COL Rick Bailer, Commander, Army Test Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD;
- LTG Otto Guenther, Director of Information Systems for Command, Control,
Communications and Computers; and
* MAJ Damon Walsh, PCO;Armament and Chemical Acquisition Logistics Activity, Rock Island.

Recent plant visits have included United Defense Limited Partnership (UDLP) (formerly FMC) San Jose and Hughes/Tuscon.

Student Research

An integral part of each graduate curriculum is independent research in the acquisition field which culminates in the completion of a written thesis. Attacking "real world" problems, this process requires students to formulate a research question, examine the literature and body of knowledge relevant to the issues raised, construct and execute a research design, collect and analyze data, draw appropriate findings and conclusions based on the analysis, and develop significant recommendations. The written thesis is not only a contribution to resolving problems that various acquisition organizations are experiencing but significantly enhances the student's understanding of how to conceptualize a problem, apply critical thinking and problem-solving skills while systematically examining a crucial issue.

At each graduation in June and December, one thesis is selected by the Systems Management faculty for recognition as an exceptional thesis in the systems acquisition management curriculum. The first "Professor Emeritus Melvin B. Kline Award" for outstanding thesis was awarded in December 1995 to MAJ Michael E. Schaller, USA, for his thesis entitled "An Examination of Risk Management Techniques in the Lightweight 155mm Howitzer Program." Schaller's thesis advisor was LTC John Dillard, USA, professor and senior Army representative at NPS. A listing of other theses is shown in Figure 3.

Faculty

The faculty is always a critical part of any educational institution. NPS has a total graduate faculty of approximately 350 professors. The acquisition faculty is located in the Systems Management Department (which includes more than 70 professors in a variety of disciplines) and are responsible for teaching acquisition courses to students across the campus. The current acquisition faculty represents a broad experience base and includes the individuals listed in Figure 4.

Army Acquisition Corps Award

One method of recognition by the Army Acquisition Corps for superior academic accomplishment at NPS is the "Army Acquisition Corps Award for Scholastic Achievement." Awarded at each graduation to that officer or civilian student who has exhibited exceptional academic and leadership traits, both in and outside the classroom, this prestigious honor is the culmination of intensive study and analysis of acquisition issues and problems faced by the workforce. The June 1996 winner of this award was CPT Kenneth P. Rodgers, USA. Previous winners of this award include:

* MAJ Frank Varnado, June 1993 (First Awardee);
* MAJ Perry Delahoussaye, March 1994;
* LTC Brad Naegle, September 1994;
* Edward Doucette, March 1995;
* MAJ Jeffrey Mockensturm, March 1995; and
* MAJ Scott Dolloff, December 1995.

Examples of NPS Theses

- "Parametric Cost Estimation Applied to Composite Helicopter Airframes"--MAJ Joseph J. Klump
- "An Analysis of Weapon System Readiness for Operational Testing"--MAJ James B. Mills
- "The Avenger Air Defense System: An Examination of the Nondevelopmental Item Acquisition Strategy"--MAJ Kenneth M. Stearns
- "Evaluating Foreign-Source Dependencies in U.S. Army Missile System Production"--MAJ Sergio Pena
- "Post-Award Debriefing of Unsuccessful Offerors-Installation Level"--James Cooper
- "A Case Analysis of the Dual Sourcing Strategy as Used in the Acquisition of the Army's Javelin Medium Anti-Armor Weapons Program"--CPT Christopher S. Buck
- "The Role of the Project Manager During the Foreign Military Sales of New Tactical Wheeled Vehicles"--CPT Linda R. Herbert
- "Dual-Use Technology and Sustainment of the Chemical Industrial Base"--CPT Gwendolyn O. Dingle
- "Revolutionizing Army Usage of Modeling and Simulation as an Element of Acquisition Reform"--CPT Craig Carson

Professional Associations

A most important part of any academic community is a close relationship with the profession. This is accomplished in a number of ways, however, one key method is through professional associations. NPS has student-managed chapters of two key professional associations: the Monterey Peninsula Chapter of the National Contract Management Association (NCMA) and the Monterey Chapter of the Program Management Institute (PMI). Both organizations currently have Army civilian students serving as president: Sue Crisp (GM-1102-15) and Jim Caudle (GM-801-14). Both chapters also sponsor monthly luncheon meetings featuring distinguished speakers. This affords the opportunity for student contact and idea exchange with operating managers, policymakers, and educators in the acquisition process.
field, both from industry and government. Students find this interaction most meaningful in terms of providing a broadened perspective and improving their ability to relate formal classroom work to actual application. Both chapters also participate actively in a certificate program: NCMA-Certified Professional Contracts Manager (CPCM); PMI-Project Management Professional (PMP).

Defense Acquisition University

NPS is also a consortium member of the Defense Acquisition University (DAU). Under the umbrella of its Center for Acquisition Education, Training and Research (CAETR), NPS offers the following courses: Test and Evaluation (TST) 202 and 301, Acquisition Logistics (LOG) 304, Systems Engineering (SYS) 201 and Acquisition (ACQ) 201. The first three courses are sponsored by NPS. These courses are taught by NPS faculty both in residence and at on-site locations around the country. Another consortium school, the Naval Center for Acquisition Training (NCAT), is also an NPS organization under CAETR.

Headquartered in Norfolk, VA, with additional locations in Rock Island, IL, and Kaiserslautern, Germany, NCAT sponsors SYS 201 and LOG 204. This school offers a range of DAU courses around the world in several career fields including: contracting (CON 101, 104, 201, 211, 221 231, 241, 335), manufacturing, production, quality assurance (PQM 101 and 201), systems engineering (SYS 201), acquisition logistics (LOG 201, 204, 304), and the acquisition core (ACQ 201).

The NPS Experience

The Naval Postgraduate School programs are rigorous and demanding, but provide extensive preparation and valuable education for future acquisition assignments. The faculty feels very strongly that the approach taken at NPS produces a graduate who has developed and sharpened broad technical and managerial skills, particularly within the acquisition framework, and who has developed the ability to effectively interrelate the complex functional disciplines under the acquisition umbrella. This includes not only analytical and sound business capabilities, but also an ability to think innovatively and creatively and to understand how to significantly influence the acquisition process. The success of these programs would not be possible without strong support from the Army Acquisition Corps leadership, particularly Gilbert Decker, ASA (RDA); LTG Ron Hite, Military Deputy to the ASA (RDA); Keith Charles, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Plans, Programs and Policy); Director for Assessment and Evaluation Dr. Herb Fallin, and the several PEOs, PMs, major acquisition commands and graduates of NPS programs.

More Information

For more information concerning acquisition programs at NPS, contact Dr. David V. Lamm at Code SM/Lt, Naval Postgraduate School, 555 Dyer Road, Monterey, CA 93943-5103, or commercial phone (408)656-2775, DSN 878-2775, or e-mail: dlamm@nps.navymil.

For information regarding a Ph.D. program in acquisition management, please contact Dr. Reuben Harris, Chairman, Systems Management Department, at Code SM, Naval Postgraduate School, 555 Dyer Road, Monterey, CA 93943-5103, or commercial phone (408)656-2161, DSN 878-2161, or e-mail: rharris@nps.navymil.

For information concerning DAU short courses, please contact Dennis Allion, Deputy Director, CAETR, Monterey, CA 93943-5000 or commercial phone (408)656-3613, DSN 878-3613, or e-mail: dallion@nps.navymil. See also the NPS Home Page at http://www.nps.navymil.
A STRATEGY FOR CUSTOMER SUPPORT

By Francis X. Noonan and Clark F. Rehberg II

Introduction
During the summer of 1995, the director for acquisition career management (DACM) appointed a Process Action Team (PAT) to assess the state of the civilian component of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC). The PAT comprised many experienced current and former leaders in the AAC. Their charter was to recommend actions to the director for acquisition career management (DACM) that would prepare the civilian members of the AAC to participate fully with their military counterparts in the AAC of the 21st century. Figure 1 is the AAC Vision Statement.

This vision drove the team’s research which focused on the four issues identified in Figure 2. After making its final recommendations on these four issues, the PAT disbanded in mid-October 1995 and handed off the mission to the AAC Reengineering Team. The checkmark alongside of the first two issues indicates that satisfactory progress to date has been made. It also indicates that there is no significant obstacle to achieving success on that issue. The purpose of this article is to address how the DACM proposes to meet the challenges identified in the last two issues marked by the arrows.

How serious are the issues of communications and quality data?

When you look at all of the DACM’s programs, the product that stands out is the passing, receipt, analysis and processing of information. We communicate information as program guidance and receive feedback on programs. We collect, analyze and publish information as management data on the AAC and on the members of the larger Army acquisition workforce (AAW). Without a commitment from the DACM and others who have a vested interest in the success of the AAC, neither of these two issues will be addressed satisfactorily.

- Communications. We may never achieve 100 percent success in communications. That would mean that we are able to transmit clear, unambiguous and timely information targeted to the appropriate audience. That’s pretty difficult. Even now, with the strong support of the functional chiefs (FC), career program managers (CPM), and the civilian personnel community, we have found that information arrives late, not at all, or is not understood. Just as bad, those on the receiving end of the information frequently do not understand the information and do not know how to obtain clarification.

This situation fosters confusion and results in many people at all levels wasting time and effort. Over time, we expect that improved communications will be a largely self-sustaining function. This will occur as knowledgeable people, our customers, learn where, when, and how to look for information on DACM programs.

- Data. Better data means that we do not have to go out on repeated calls for the...
PROGRESS ON THE NEW APPROACH

- Develop programs to support the AAC vision
- Engage in full partnership with the FCs, M&RA, PERSCOM & the MACOMs
- Improve communications to the FCs and the CPOCs/CPACs
- Improve the availability of high quality data

The Director, Acquisition Career Management has decided to make available those resources at his disposal to make maximum impact on the issues of communications and data quality.

The Plan

The DACM has proposed a bold two-part plan to resolve these serious issues. Part one calls for the appointment of an Acquisition Career Management Advocate (ACMA) for each major command (MACOM), major subordinate command (MSG), program executive office (PEO), and other organizations as needed. This is an additional duty for a senior civilian member of the AAC in the organization. The ACMA serves as an additional source of acquisition career development information for all who require it. He is an advisor to the organization's leadership on emerging DACM issues. This program of establishing the ACMA is well underway.

Part two involves the establishment of Customer/Field Support Elements (C/FSE) at selected sites throughout the country. The DACM proposes to establish a C/FSE with a mission and employment concept as indicated below. This concept is subject to tailoring to meet local needs. It is designed to enhance the current capabilities of the functional CPMs and the civilian personnel support provided by the regional civilian personnel operating centers (CPOC) and the local civilian personnel advisory centers (CPAC). An outline of the basic concept for the C/FSE follows.

**Mission**
- Serve as a resource for MACOM, PEO leadership and MACOM/Activity CPMs (information and surge support);
- Serve as a resource for CPOCs/CPACs (information and surge support);
- Serve as a resource for the U.S. Army Total Army Personnel Command (central management);
- Serve as a resource for the AAC/AAW (information); and
- Shepherd the implementation of the new AAC Vision.

**Employment Concept**
- Initiate a proposed pilot program at three sites— (National Capitol Region (NCR), Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL);
- At full implementation, support 100
percent of the AAC/AAW (see Figure 3):
- Support regionally from the highest density locations;
- NCR C/FSE supports the NCR, low-density locations in the Continental United States (CONUS) and outside of CONUS (OCONUS) locations; and
- NCR C/FSE provides augmentation support for all C/FSE teams;
  • A mix of government and contractor support provides flexibility and surge support;
  • Phase I (pilot) starts ASAP at three locations with a planned initial operational capability (IOC) date of Oct. 1, 1996; and
  • Phase II has an IOC date of Feb. 2, 1997.

**Execution**
- Initially, hire minimum staff for pilot elements;
- Assess the workload at each site before expanding to full strength;
- DACM staff supervises and prepares performance evaluation with letter input from the MACOM, MSC, PEO, and others;
- Government employees will be AAW members or persons who can qualify;
- Central selection will be based on local recruitment using a centrally approved position description;
- Manpower and operations will be financed by DACM;
- Training will be provided by the DACM staff.

**Conclusion**
Both parts of this plan, the ACMA and the C/FSE, represent a conceptual shift of focus for the AAC/CIFSE from an "inside-the-beltway," policy development orientation to the customer-in-the-field, execution orientation. The DACM has decided to make available those resources at his disposal to make maximum impact on the issues of communications and data quality. Over time, the communication issues should recede as all customers become more knowledgeable of the programs and ways to obtain information. With an intense, sustained effort with the CPOCs, data quality should improve to the point that it sustains itself. While the ACMA will continue to be a fixture, success for this plan will be judged on the basis of how quickly the C/FSE makes an impact and works themselves out of a job.

**Figure 3.**
Proposed Customer/Field Support Elements sites and phasing. *Staffing shown is an example only. Actual staffing and the government/contractor mix will be determined after analysis and coordination with the supported activities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IOC</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>C/FSE</th>
<th>C/FSE Staffing (example) (Govt./Contractor)</th>
<th>AAW Personnel Supported by C/FSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OCT 96</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>APG</td>
<td>2 (1/1)</td>
<td>2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Redstone Arsenal</td>
<td>3 (1/2)</td>
<td>3380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>5 (3/2)</td>
<td>8171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (5/5)</td>
<td>14048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FEB 97</td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>3 (1/2)</td>
<td>2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Picatinny</td>
<td>2 (1/1)</td>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>1 (1/0)</td>
<td>1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>St Louis</td>
<td>1 (1/0)</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>2 (1/1)</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>White Sands Msl Range</td>
<td>1 (1/0)</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (11/9)</td>
<td>24461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRANCIS X. NOONAN is a senior systems analyst with Bunyard Enterprises Incorporated, Alexandria, VA. He is currently serving as a member of the AAC Reengineering Team, OASARDA. Having retired from the Army after 22 years of service, Noonan has substantial experience in acquisition program evaluation, financial management, logistics planning, and automation support. He is a graduate of Boston College and the Defense Systems Management College.

CLARK F. REHBERG II is an acquisition program management officer responsible for civilian propensity programs on the AAC Reengineering Team, OASARDA. He is an AAC member with more than 20 years of acquisition experience.
Introduction

Communication among all elements of the Army's personnel community is imperative in order to achieve an effective and manageable personnel system. The personnel proponent or his designated representative(s) is the first link in this complex process. Strictly defined, the personnel proponent is the commander or head of an organization with primary responsibility for providing recommendations on personnel management to the deputy chief of staff for personnel (DCSPER).

The personnel proponent is typically a major general branch chief. The Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) personnel proponent is the director for acquisition career management, currently, LTG Ronald V. Hite. He has a group of officers and civilians, representing all Army acquisition career fields, assisting him. These personnel respond to numerous inquiries regarding assignments, TDAs, board files, and other professional development issues and, as such, are often assumed to work for PERSCOM or the U.S. Army Force Integration Staff Agency (USAFISA). These organizations, however, are separate elements. This suggests a general misunderstanding as to the true role and mission of the AAC's Personnel Proponency Office.

PERSONNEL PROPONENCY: YOUR ADVOCATE

By LTC William M. Gavora

Mission

The mission of all personnel proponents is to provide oversight and recommend policies affecting the eight functions of the personnel life-cycle while organizations such as PERSCOM and USAFISA implement approved policy changes. A useful analogy is to think of personnel proponents as the G-3 plans for the Army Acquisition Corps and the implementors as G-3 Ops. Specifically, these functions are structure, acquisition, individual training and education, distribution, deployment, sustainment, professional development, and separation.

Structure

The first, and perhaps the most important responsibility of personnel proponents is to make recommendations to The Army Authorization Document System (TAADS). TAADS is the means by which the documentations of acquisition positions on TOE/TDAs is evaluated. TAADS also aids in recommending changes or providing feedback to documenting MACOMS. These documents must be properly coded in accordance with AR 611-101 and appropriate civilian regulations: i.e., grade, MOS/job series, additional skill identifier(s), acquisition career fields, language codes, etc. This process includes coordination with ODCSOPS, ODSPER, OPM, and PERSCOM, while USAFISA serves as the implementing agency.

Unlike other branches, the AAC maintains a consolidated list of all military positions, called the Military Acquisition Position List (MAPL). The MAPL essentially serves as the Officer Distribution Plan for the AAC and is maintained by the AAC Proponency Office. This entire process of documenting requirements is the driving force behind all other proponent actions. Disregarding poor or improper coding or grading can adversely affect AAC career fields. A Civilian Acquisition Position List (CAPL) is currently being developed.

Acquisition

After requirements are determined and the structure is developed, the AAC looks across the Army's spectrum to access a sufficient number of personnel to fill the corps. Proponents recommend, and in many cases, determine appropriate accession criteria, which may include, but are not limited to the mental and physical aptitudes and past experience required for an individual to have a reasonable chance of success in a specific career field.

Personnel proponents also recommend accession numbers by year and career field; recommend criteria for selected recall programs in support of mobilization requirements; develop and recommend recruitment strategies, materials, and programs for their respective career fields; and monitor the affirmative action status for assigned career fields.

Training and Education

When a sufficient number of qualified individuals are accessed into the AAC, training...
Proponents recommend, and in many cases, determine appropriate accession criteria, which may include, but are not limited to the mental and physical aptitudes and past experience required for an individual to have a reasonable chance of success in a specific career field.

and education requirements—deemed important for success through the grade of 0-6/SES—are developed. In addition, a job analysis, by grade, for specific career fields is conducted to identify required knowledge, skills and abilities. This analysis involves a systematic collection of data unique to a specific job or group of jobs and provides information useful in determining training needs.

Another responsibility is identifying advanced civil schooling opportunities and developing criteria for PERSCOM to select the best qualified individuals to receive specified education or training. Care is taken to ensure fair and equitable treatment in the selection process. Similarly, proponents validate the Army Educational Requirements System (AERS) positions, including those in the Training With Industry program. This is done annually by career field, grade and academic discipline.

Requirements evolve over time as a result of many intervening factors, including equipment modernization, changes in mission or force structure, training deficiencies, and technological advances. In turn, proponents identify requirements for revised training.

Personnel Distribution

Trained personnel need to be assigned equitably between TOE and TDA organizations. Proponents evaluate career field inventories and recommend adjustments to PERSCOM to support authorizations and force structure changes. Accessing the inventory of personnel against authorizations includes, but is not limited to, operating strength, authorizations, and the Training, Transient, Hospital, and School account. All data is analyzed to identify potential shortcomings.

On a larger scale, personnel proponents may recommend changes to Army policy relating to assignments, details, transfers, and special programs in peacetime and during mobilization. Changes may take many forms, from minor revisions impacting relatively few persons to major revisions affecting the total force.

Sustainment

Another extremely important function of personnel proponents is the sustainment or support of the personnel within their career field. First, proponents must establish and maintain communication with their members. In the AAC, this is accomplished by phone, e-mail, messages, field visits, the AAC Internet Home Page and, of course, via Army RD&A magazine.

Second, proponents must represent the professional interests of their members by analyzing and recommending changes to improve career patterns. Additionally, proponents are responsible for administering requirements at DA- and MACOM-level meetings is helpful in that broad or specific issues and concerns about the profession may be discussed.

Separation

The last major area of responsibility where personnel proponents can have an impact is the process of separating its members. Proponents are responsible for reviewing the separation policies of their respective career fields; and for recommending changes to and analyzing the impact of retirement, retention, force reduction and service obligation policies and proposals. They also determine the impact of "early out" programs on career initiatives.

Summary

While personnel proponents are often confused with PERSCOM and other implementing organizations, they do, in fact, play a very important role in the personnel process. In short, AAC personnel proponents are your advocates at the Department of the Army level—please use them.

Editor's Note: An article on civilian personnel proponents will be published in a future issue of Army RD&A magazine.

LTC WILLIAM M. GAVORRA is the FA 51 proponent officer in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (RDA). He holds a B.S. degree in transportation from Arizona State University, an M.B.A. in management from Golden Gate University and has attended the Materiel Acquisition Management Course, and the Defense Acquisition Contracts Course.
TROPIC TEST SITE ENSURES QUALITY OF SOLDIER EQUIPMENT

By Chuck Wullenjohn

During the dark, early days of the Second World War, American and Filipino troops bitterly fought Japanese invaders on the tropical Bataan Peninsula in the Philippine Islands. Using combat equipment and munitions stockpiled since World War I, a number of problems handicapped their efforts.

For example, the World War I "Stokes" trench mortar, similar in size to today's 81mm mortar, was commonly used to fight the enemy. Unfortunately, due to the length of time and condition of storage, many of the shells fired by the mortar did not explode. Reports stated that unreliable Stokes shells frequently failed to detonate.

Several months later during the Guadalcanal campaign, related problems were reported repeatedly. Due to the harsh tropic environment, equipment that would have been trouble-free in a moderate climate, refused to operate. This included a wide variety of important combat equipment, from electronics in radios to lubricants for anti-aircraft artillery.

As shown by the repeated occurrence of these serious problems, past tropic environment testing had been haphazard, inconsistent and, too often, non-existent. Immediate steps were taken to solve the situation, with increased emphasis on testing to improve equipment reliability. The military Services instigated several "crash" programs, with efforts centered in Panama. Testing continued throughout the war and in the years after.

Many years after World War II, in 1962, these testing programs were consolidated into one agency—the U.S. Army Tropic Test Center, under the authority of the newly created U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command. Numbering well over 300 people during the Vietnam War days of the 1960s, the organization has since been placed under the management of U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, and has been renamed as the Tropic Test Site. The present tropic workforce numbers about 30 people.

Today, Yuma Proving Ground manages environmental testing at three diverse locations: cold weather testing at the Cold Regions Test Activity at Fort Greely, AK, tropic testing at the Tropic Test Site at Fort Clayton, Panama, and desert testing at U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, AZ.

Tropic Test Site manager Roger Williamson is a "true believer" in the value of tropic testing, even during this age of downsizing and with the possibility of the test site relocating due to the imminent implementation of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty.

"While artificially simulating environments in test chambers is valuable, it is crucial that military equipment be tested under natural conditions to prevent the soldier himself from becoming a tester on the battlefield," said Williamson as he looked out over a tropical rain forest. "The cost of discovering and solving problems early in the development process is cheap in comparison to what could happen otherwise."

According to Williamson, who has 11 years Tropic Test Site experience, the major-
ity of test items fail in some way when tested in the tropics. This is due to the many interacting adverse factors presented in tropic environments.

"Effects caused by high temperature, relentless humidity, solar radiation, micro-biologic effects, like fungus, macro-biologic effects, like rodents and insects, and many other individual factors work singularly and in combination to directly affect system and soldier performance," says Williamson.

"The tropic environment is harsh and unforgiving. It is both insidious and relentless," said Williamson. "Testers cannot predict exactly what will happen in advance. Surprises are the norm in this business."

Generally, there are four major natural environments in the world: temperate, desert, cold, and tropic. There are many subsystems of these, but Williamson believes that the tropic testing environment is the toughest on military equipment.

"The synergy of all the negative factors present in the tropic environment combine to surface problems relatively quickly," he said. "It takes problems a great deal longer to develop in more benign environments."

Examples of the effects of the combination of these environmental factors are numerous. One example is the combination of solar radiation and moisture, which join to destroy materials much faster than either single factor would.

"The key point is that these individual factors are combined in the tropic climate," emphasized Williamson. "A moist climate can be duplicated in a test chamber, but these same effects won't result. If you want realism, we've got it right here."

The Tropic Test Site is well suited for simultaneous testing in a variety of humid and wet tropic environments. Inland exposure sites provide mature and secondary tropic forests, savannas and freshwater marshes. Coastal exposure sites include mangrove swamps, mud flats, and rock and sand beaches. The test site's exposure facility on the breakwater at the terminus of the Panama Canal on the Caribbean side of the isthmus is the most highly corrosive test site in the world, due to high salt fall and the tropic conditions.

Nearly 80 percent of the test site's workload deals directly with soldier support systems, including uniforms, boots, weapons and ammunition, tactical vehicles, command and control equipment, food supplies, lubricants, communications equipment, and much more. Troops are provided by U.S. Army South, which actively supports Tropic Test Site activities throughout each year.

The soldiers use developmental equipment on test courses, fire weapons, drive vehicles, and do much more to support a wide variety of testing activities. Over the years, a very effective and 313-285-5003 or commercial 011-507-285-5003. He can also be reached via e-mail at rwillia@emh01.panama.army.mil.

CHUCK WULLENJOHN is chief of the Public Affairs Office at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground. He is a graduate of Humboldt State University in California.

The breakwater on the eastern shore of the Panama Canal provides the most severe salt fall exposure testing in the world.
Introduction

The Army acquisition executive (AAE) and vice chief of staff of the Army (VCSA) approved the Army Technical Architecture (ATA) version 4.0 on Jan. 30, 1996, and mandated its use by anyone involved in the management, development, or acquisition of new or improved Army systems. The ATA provides the foundation for interoperability among all tactical, strategic, and sustaining base systems that produce, use, or exchange information electronically. It serves as the "building code" for the Army's system development which satisfies the operational requirements defined by the Training and Doctrine Command.

In addition to fostering interoperability, the standards and guidelines found within the ATA are intended to reduce life cycle costs and speed the development and fielding times of these Army systems. The ATA V4.0 supersedes the Army C4I Technical Architecture, Version 3.1, dated March 31, 1995.

Background

In the summer of 1994, at the request of the director of information systems for command, control, communications, and computers (DISC4), the Army Science Board (ASB) completed a study which recommended the development of a technical architecture (TA) and the associated technologies required to digitize the battlefield. The ASB Summer Study Panel consisted of experts familiar with TA concepts, Army research, development, and acquisition programs, and specialized technical knowledge of the latest information technologies found in the private sector. The ASB Summer Study Panel recommended that the technical architecture exploit the concepts and technologies from open-system commercial standards, the DOD technical architecture framework for information management, and the DOD data-standardization program, and that the TA be mandated in all Army battle-command system procurements. They also recommended that the responsibility for establishing and overseeing the development and implementation of the TA be given to the AAE. Furthermore, they recommended that an Army systems engineer (ASE) and engineering staff be assigned to support the AAE in executing this responsibility.

Based on the recommendations from this ASB study, the AAE and VCSA signed a memorandum on Sep. 28, 1994, which established the responsibilities for creating, maintaining, and enforcing the Army's technical, system engineering, and operational architectures. The AAE was designated the Army technical architect (i.e. the single TA oversight authority). The Director of the Communications-Electronics Command Research, Development, and Engineering Center was designated the ASE. The ASE was directed to report to the Army technical architect on system engineering and technical architecture matters. The DISC4 was directed to support the Army technical architect by developing and maintaining the technical architecture for both battlefield systems and installations. In executing these responsibilities, the DISC4 would receive matrix support from the ASE.

The Army Systems Engineering Office (ASEO) was established by the ASE to support the Army technical architect and the ASE. The ASEO's responsibilities include: evaluating solicitations, proposals and system designs for compliance; evaluating systems as they are developed to ensure compliance; evaluating conformance to interoperability objectives; interfacing with joint or coalition technical agencies; participating in and influencing commercial standards development and forums; providing expertise in the latest information processing technologies; evaluating hands-on commercial technologies; and providing recommendations for updates to the technical architecture.

On March 31, 1995, the Army technical architect approved the technical architecture entitled "Department of the Army—C4I Technical Architecture, Version 3.1" (now superseded by the ATA V4.0). The Army C4I TA V3.1 focused on tactical, strategic, and sustaining base Army information systems. It consisted of a minimum set of mandates that covered Information Processing, Information Transport, Information Standards, and Human-Computer Interfaces. While it was applicable to all soldier, weapon, and information systems, the Army acknowledged that the standards in the Army C4I TA would have to be augmented to better address the needs of sustaining base and office automation, and embedded C4I systems.

The AAE and VCSA jointly directed each program executive officer (PEO), program and product manager (PM), advanced technology demonstration (ATD) manager, advanced concept and technology demonstration (ACTD) manager, major Army command (MACOM), and milestone decision authority
be responsible for complying with the Army C4I TA.

The Army Digitization Office (ADO) was directed to coordinate and oversee the integration and maintenance of digitization activities and ensure implementation of the TA in all digitization efforts. To permit this coordination and establish that these systems will migrate to the TA standards, PEOs, PMs, ATD managers, ACTD managers, and MACOMs were and are required to submit TA migration plans (which identify program cost, schedule, and performance impacts) to the ADO.

**Army Technical Architecture**

The ATA V4.0 was officially released on Jan. 30, 1996. The ATA, revised under the auspices of the DISC4, expands the scope and applicability of the original Army C4I TA. The ATA applies to all systems that produce, use, or exchange information electronically and must be used by anyone involved in the management, development, or acquisition of new or improved systems. Since information exchanged between weapon systems often travels via automated command, control, and communications systems, the standards found in the former Army C4I TA remain the core and baseline of the expanded ATA. In order to be more discriminating in the applicability of standards, and to extend the ATA without complicating the base document, four appendices have been added for each of four focus areas or "domains"—Sustaining Base and Office Automation, C3I, Weapon Systems, and Modeling and Simulation. These appendices contain exceptions (replace a core standard with a domain standard) or extensions (add a domain standard in addition to a core standard) for each "domain." Ongoing efforts related to the Weapon System appendix are being pursued via the Weapon System Technical Architecture Working Group under the direction of the Army Materiel Command (AMC).

The base ATA document expands on the mandates found in the former Army C4I TA and now includes standards for information security. The Information Processing section covers the common operating environment concept and individual processing standards. The Information Transport section mandates the use of open-systems information transport standards and profiles that are essential to interoperability and seamless communications. The Information Modeling and Data Exchange Standards section has two primary subsections. The first mandates the use of formal information modeling (i.e., integrated definition functional modeling and integrated definition information modeling) to define functional and information requirements. The second requires the interim use of existing standard message formats (e.g., variable message format, U.S. message text format, etc.) until mechanisms for exchanging standard data elements are finalized.

The Human-Computer Interface section provides a common framework for designing and implementing the interface between soldiers and automated systems. The Information Security section prescribes what standards and protocols are used to satisfy the security requirements of a system (while maintaining the interoperability objectives of the ATA) until the Defense goal security architecture is implemented. Similar to the former Army C4I TA, the ATA's Information Transport and Information Modeling and Data Exchange Standards sections are primarily directed towards interoperability, while its Information Processing and Human-Computer Interface sections focus more on standardization. In addition to mandates found in each section, the ATA also lists "emerging standards" that are not yet mandatory (but are likely to be adopted in the near future) to provide a "look-ahead" for designing compatibility into systems and system upgrades.

The ATA reflects the continuing evolution of standards, information technologies, and the commercial marketplace, and includes additional standards which cover areas not addressed in the previous Army C4I TA, such as asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) private network-network interface (PNNI) standards and multimedia standards. The ATA is fully consistent with DOD's policy to minimize the use of military specifications. To the greatest extent practical, the ATA cites commercially-supported open standards. However, the ATA does cite joint military specifications when DOD-generated profiles of commercial standards are required for interoperability among systems, or standardization is critical in an area which lacks acceptable commercial equivalents. All non-commercial standards mandated in the ATA have met the requirements of DOD commercial standards policy and have been waived.

**Implementation**

The ATA's mandated standards are used when a particular service for that standard is required. In other words, the ATA's mandated standards must be implemented by systems that have a "system design" requirement for the corresponding services. If a system does not have a "system design" requirement for the services provided by an ATA standard, then the standard need not be implemented.

As previously stated, all PEOs, PMs, ATD managers, ACTD managers, and MACOMs are required to submit migration plans to the ADO. The AAE and VCSA have extended this requirement to all advanced concept and technology (ACT) II managers and directed that Battle Labs use the ATA to ensure that the fielding of their "good ideas" are not unduly delayed by the cost and time needed for wholesale reengineering to meet interoperability standards. These migration plans should have sufficient detail to:

- confirm that system elements comply with the applicable standards of the ATA;
- substantiate that a given standard is deemed not applicable to the system; and
- fully describe the performance, cost, and schedule impacts associated with migrating non-compliant portions of the system to the applicable ATA mandates.

The ADO and ASEO have developed a migration plan support system software program to simplify and assist the creation of migration plans in accordance with the ATA.

**Future Activities**

The ATA V4.0 serves as the baseline document for a joint technical architecture currently under development by DOD. Representatives from the DISC4 have the lead for the Army in this joint activity. Any future process must ensure that all standards are regularly revisited and kept current so they maintain their value and utility in fostering interoperability and standardization amidst the rapid evolution of information technologies. The bottom line is that the technical architecture is an essential component of the Army's enterprise strategy and supports the ultimate objective of providing the warfighter with a seamless flow of timely, accurate, accessible, and secure information that gives our forces a decisive edge on tomorrow's battlefield.

**PAUL C. MANZ is a senior systems engineer in the Army Systems Engineering Office. He holds a masters of public administration and a B.S. in electrical engineering. Manz was a recipient of the "Ten Outstanding AMC Personnel of the Year" Award in 1994, and is a senior member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and a certified systems planning research, development and engineering level III member of the Army Acquisition Corps.**
Introduction

To many individuals, performance specifications seem like a new idea. This is because their use in the contracting process is a relatively recent requirement. However, requirements that meet the intent of performance specifications have actually existed for years.

The Tri-Service Fuze Engineering Standardization Working Group (FESWG) is the custodian of critical initiation standards, several more than 30 years old, which establish the practices necessary to prevent accidental munition explosive events. These standards do not meet the current format for performance requirements, but are examples of specifications that meet the intent.

Documenting the Intent

The FESWG is using a lesson learned that could be widely applied. The lesson learned is that the intent of a requirement should be communicated. The term intent embodies more than the letter of the requirement. It includes why the requirement is significant, and sometimes a clarification of its meaning. A special guidance appendix was developed for an FESWG standard for this purpose. This form of additional information was endorsed by industry at a recent American Defense Preparedness Association meeting where a draft of the standard was presented.

A well-written performance requirement often communicates intent, but not always. It's difficult to prepare a specification that requires the same thing from a cooperative but ignorant non-developmental item (NDI) producer, and from other developers seeking convoluted interpretations for their convenience. Specification requirements are a balance between a variety of constraints including brevity, contractual or legal language, compromise between individuals (or verbiage that supports more than one interpretation), format, financial constraints and, of course, human limitations.

Further, even when a requirement is clearly stated it can be misinterpreted, perhaps because the reader is anticipating certain wording rather than reading, or because a requirement applies to more than one type of munition. That has happened with FESWG documents and, where it is common, FESWG found it advantageous to provide additional information by elaborating on the requirement, instead of asking later for corrections to unacceptable hardware. For example, for mechanically-implemented safety and arming devices, there is a requirement to directly lock the interrupter mechanically in the safe position by at least two safety features.

A HISTORICAL LESSON LEARNED FROM MILITARY STANDARDS

By Jeffrey A. Lienau

The use of the words direct and lock seem clear enough, but the implications are sometimes missed, even by experienced developers who may use two locks, but with only one directly interfaced to the moving part—or by using detents instead of locks (locks do not release during normal environmental forces but a detent will). The intent of the requirement is to use two direct locks so if one is left out or fails, the critical component is still locked in the safe position, even if the ordnance is handled roughly.

Intent is missing from many of our specifications and standards, even the newest. For example, in the current MIL-STD-962 that established the format for all specifications and standards, one of the most important paragraphs defines standard practice as important. This is because it is one of the two types of standards that can be required in Army contracts without a waiver. A standard practice according to MIL-STD-962 is "A standard that specifies procedures on how to conduct certain non-manufacturing functions. Standard practices are developed for functions that at least some of the time are obtained via contract from private sector firms." There is no other explanation. Procedure and practice are terms that should be explained to better discriminate between a design guide and a standard practice.

Intent

Often, when there are technology changes, it is not the letter, but the intent, of the requirement that must be met. Any requirement is written considering the means currently used to fulfill the requirement. Technology changes, however, often make the wording inaccurate and, over time, even changes in word definitions can change the requirement. Who knows whether the current dissatisfaction with civil and criminal jurors that would exist if the founding fathers had emphasized the intent of what was meant by "a jury of our peers?"

Documented intent is important to help
With downsizing there is a loss of corporate memory that can be compensated for by documenting the intent of requirements in a specification.

an NDI contractor comprehend the requirement, reduce loss of our corporate memory, and ensure the requirement won't inadvertently be changed because someone forgot why it was there. Intent also aids interpreting tomorrow's needs based on a requirement written about today's technologies. Intent is usually not met by the layers of our old standards, the targets of current criticism.

How Should It Be Recorded?

It could be said that including intent in performance specifications is met by merely properly stating the requirement. That is often accomplished. It is easier to do that for requirements that are intended to be met than it is for performance that must be avoided. For example, it's fairly direct to specify we want a vehicle that can carry a payload between two points in less than a specified time. But even the best known and simplest preventative requirement needs some clarification. Arguably, the oldest performance requirements are the Ten Commandments. A simple one is "thou shalt not kill," but, kill what, when, and how? To define the intent of the commandment, we need to turn to the Bible for additional information.

The Bible records the intent by example and historical record. Historical records (or case history) can be very useful when changes are being considered. FESWG has one known test standard that dates back to WWI (a simulation of loose cargo in a caisson). Despite regular review it remains a useful measure. Because of the historical reference, if it becomes necessary to update it, we will understand the intent of the test was to simulate loose cargo.

Often when asked "What does that mean?" we respond by giving an example. Examples are one of the most common methods of describing intent. Examples are also useful to describe solutions to a developer who is not trying to create something new. The use of examples, however, also contains risks. Most examples are application and technology specific, so to show intent it may be necessary to show several examples or add some verbiage that assures the reader does not take the example too literally.

A solution might be to work harder on the requirements, but time and manpower are limited. Another aid might be to obtain constructive comments from a potential user. That's been tried, but comments are rare when standards are circulated through industry.

Where Should It Be Recorded?

Where should the information be documented? Handbooks have been suggested, and NATO standards called STANAGs have similar equivalents to contribute additional information. These are called allied ordnance publications (AOPs). Each AOP can contain additional information related to a specific STANAG. Informal surveys indicate neither the handbooks nor the AOPs are well used. To be useful, the additional information must be part of the specification or standard. FESWG is using additional information appendices to communicate this information in the latest edit of the standards. That accomplishes several goals. If the additional guidance information is part of the standard, it's unlikely to grow improperly to a large volume and, most importantly, it is immediately available to the reader.

We are encouraged to use simple language in all specifications. Simple language may be better for the layman, but it often conflicts with brevity when a technical item is being described. If precise language and brevity are important, the actual requirements probably should use the conventional technical terminology. Any additional information added for guidance purposes could use less technical language.

The requirements and guidance information in the standards will likely be used as a reference document. If so, the user will search for the paragraph he wants and ignore most of the pages that precede it, such as the statement in the scope declaring a section is either mandatory or guidance. To make it easier for the reader, if the information contained in a section or appendix is for guidance only, that could be stated at the top of the page, similar to classification notations. Similarly, it would be useful to place a title on each page of the appendix with the actual title of the appendix, rather than an alphabetic label such as "Appendix A." It's not clear this is acceptable according to current format restrictions, but it would prevent confusion between requirements and guidance.

Learning From Our Mistakes

The changes in our Defense industry place greater importance on properly recording requirements. With downsizing, there is a loss of corporate memory that can be compensated for by documenting the intent of requirements in a specification. We can answer, "What does that mean?" before the question is asked—if we try. Some specifications have included this form of information, some even accompany the additional information with the actual requirement, but it is not a standard practice. Documenting in the specification additional guidance information that reflects the intent of a requirement has extensive potential value to make specifications more useful for both industry and government. Government performance specifications can be improved by applying lessons learned.

JEFFREY A. LIENAU has a B.S. in electrical engineering from the University of Alabama, and more than 30 years government experience. Lienau has been the MICOM representative to the Army Fuze Safety Review Board for several years, and chairs a current ad hoc group that is consolidating and updating several fuzing military standards.
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A NEW APPROACH TO MILITARY STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOFTWARE ACQUISITION

By COL James U. Piersall and Dr. John P. Solomond

Introduction

The Army Materiel Command (AMC) is responsible for acquisition of new software as well as life cycle software engineering support for the U.S. Army. Over the years, more than 31,000 unique military standards and specifications have been written to tell a developer not only what is needed but, in some cases, how to make it. Although these standards and specifications are not applicable to a current contract, they are often applied because they were used under a previous contract. When they are needed, they should often be tailored specifically for the current job.

The number of systems with embedded software is growing since a software driven system can usually be modified more quickly than one which is totally hardware oriented. This growth in software use threatens to drive the cost of new systems beyond the level of affordability. AMC now has an opportunity to realize significant cost savings by adopting a more efficient software process through use of performance specifications rather than design specifications.

Motivation

Performance specifications express requirements in the form of output, function or operation of items or equipment, thus specifying "what" is required. They leave the "how to accomplish" details of design, fabrication, formulation or internal workmanship to the producer. By not specifying the details of design or internal standards, the producer is free to use the most cost effective practices to develop the product. Any time the government requires the producer to deviate, even in the smallest way, from the usual practice, the producer incurs increased cost (see Figure 1, Performance Specification). Performance specifications also tend to be less restrictive, opening competition to producers who can provide a good product but are unwilling or unable to meet the special provisions of a design specification.

MIL-STD-498

MIL-STD-498, "Software Development and Documentation," is a first step in developing a new methodology. It is the result of efforts by a working group to "harmonize" or merge DOD-STD-2167A, "Defense System Software Development" and DOD-STD-7935A, "DOD Automated Information Systems (AIS) Documentation Standards," into a single document. Formed in November 1991, the group produced a standard suitable for both weapon systems and automated information systems. The standard is intended for use by contractor and government personnel who perform software development. Software development, as applied in this standard, encompasses new development, modification, reuse, reengineering, maintenance and all other activities which result in software products. The standard defines "acquirer" as the organization requiring the technical effort, i.e., the entity which will use or benefit from the development effort. The "developer" is the organization performing the technical effort, either contractor or government personnel. MIL-STD-498 supersedes three standards, DOD-STD-2167A, DOD-STD-7935A and DOD-STD-1705(NS) and combines 52 Data Item Descriptions (DIDs) into 22. The standard and DIDs can be tailored for each specific application. Furthermore, this tailoring may be different for each type of software, such as developed vs. database software, or operational vs. engineering test and maintenance software. Tailoring may be specified by the acquirer or sug-
A significant change in MIL-STD-498 is improved compatibility with incremental and evolutionary development, with non-hierarchical design methods and with Computer-Aided Software Engineering (CASE) tools. It offers greater flexibility in documentation preparation, facilitates software reuse, introduces software management indicators, emphasizes supportability and links development to system engineering.

The requirement to "record" or document information is interpreted to mean "set down in a manner that can be retrieved and viewed." Thus, information may be provided as hard copy or electronic "soft copy," computer-aided software engineering (CASE) and project management tools. One thing the MIL-STD-498 does not do is reference other standards. Therefore, there is no layering of requirements which often leads to conflicting and obsolete specifications. This will increase the case of use for most applications.

**Risks With Military Specifications**

Rapid changes in technology make it impossible for AMC to stay current with all standards and specifications for which it is responsible. Today's standards are more complex than they were 10 years ago and their number is increasing. Recently, the DOD and the Services began efforts retiring or canceling standards not identified as essential. Some of these were so dated that they may prevent a developer from using current technology and require two production lines—a current one for commercial products and an older one to meet military specs. An example was the wave soldering equipment specified by MIL-STD-2000A, which was cancelled within the past year.

The cost to DOD to keep all their standards current is unacceptable. We must make greater use of existing or modified commercial standards. Compare Figures 2, Military Specifications, and 3, Commercial Specifications. Figure 2 contains a schematic description of the government's responsibility associated with generating and revising a government specification and then imposing it on a contract with the necessary tailoring. Figure 3, on the other hand, contains a contrasting description of specifications developed commercially. In this case, the industry or industry group assumes responsibility for the development of the specification, while the acquirer or procuring activity is responsible for tailoring the specification and imposing it on the contract.

Recognizing this situation, Dr. William Perry, Secretary of Defense, issued a memorandum, in June 1994, requiring greater reliance on industry standards. MIL-STD-498 was approved in December 1994, but was limited to a two-year trial. Its approval was based, in part, on an agreement between the DOD and industry to develop a commercial replacement for MIL-STD-498.

**Commercialization**

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the Electronics Industry Association (EIA) established a joint working group in October 1994. This group produced a draft of IEEE STD 1498/EIA IS (International Standard) 640, "Standard for Information Technology, Software Life-Cycle Processes, Software Development, Acquirer-Supplier Agreement." The intent of this standard, derived from MIL-STD-498, is to produce a document which keeps the technical content of MIL-STD-498 but removes DOD-specific terms and contractual references while supporting an environment of free and open competition. IEEE Standard 1498 was approved in December 1995 and will be one of the primary U.S. commercial inputs to the ISO/IEC 12207 Standard, "Software Life Cycle Processes," which will be discussed later.
developers, but the acquirer retains control of the specific items tailored.

It is significant that IEEE 1498/EIA IS 640 does not incorporate the DID's of MIL-STD-498. Instead, the contents of the DID's are included as Appendix I, Software Product Descriptions (SPDs). Each SPD eliminates Section 7 of the DID, Application/Interrelationship, but retains Section 3, Description/Purpose and Section 10, Preparation Instructions of the DID.

**ISO/IEC 12207**

Besides superseding three standards, MIL-STD-498 was targeted for potential use as a future national or international standard. During the development of MIL-STD-498, an international standard for software was being developed, ISO/IEC Draft International Standard (DIS) 12207, “Software Life Cycle Processes.” ISO/IEC 12207 is proposed as a framework to reduce the proliferation of standards and provide an international common ground for software development, operation and life cycle development, covering such activities as acquisition, supply, operation, maintenance, quality assurance and others. The standard is a harmonization of DOD-STD-2167 (replaced by MIL-STD-498), and IEEE 1074, “Standard for Developing Software Life Cycle Processes.”

The following summarizes MIL-STD-498 and ISO/IEC 12207 from a top level perspective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIL-STD-498</td>
<td>Top Level</td>
<td>Acquisition Agency</td>
<td>Software Development</td>
<td>Broad Scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary contribution of ISO/IEC 12207 is to combine the fundamental portions of the standard together with the ancillary areas such as resource utilization, metrics and indicators, specialty standards, etc. Ultimately, IEEE-1498 will be replaced by ISO 12207 and harmonized with IEEE 1047 where appropriate (see Figure 4, Standards Relationships).

**Improvements in Software Process Methodology**

By not specifying any particular methodology, both the military and IEEE/EIA standards allow the developer to choose the best technical solution for the task. The developer can consider the task to be accomplished, the experience of the available workforce, customer desires and applicable commercial products. These standards can be used with any development strategy such as, waterfall, incremental, spiral, or continuous and any method such as object oriented or relational. These standards recognize the value of CASE tools as an alternative means of documentmentation, eliminating the need to reformat or create a document to meet a specific DID.

Another step in implementing performance specifications is to reduce the day-to-day government oversight and approval requirements. Reviews should be held only as necessary to provide progress reports. Approval of interim documents should be kept to a minimum. Remember, it is the end products, the functionality and supportability of the software that we want to approve and accept. The acquirer role during development should be to explain the performance specifications whenever there is misinterpretation, not to approve or disapprove how the developer accomplishes the task.

**Acquisition Improvement Implications**

The acquirer should focus on getting a system which meets the stated performance factors and allow the developer to use the most cost effective methods available. The DOD should place increased emphasis on commercial standards, where applicable. Where commercial standards are
not applicable or available, performance specifications should be used. The transition of MIL-STD-498 into IEEE 1498/ElA is 640 will provide a commercial standard where none currently exists. The result is an acquirer-developer relationship in which the software methodology is left open; the acquirer specifies what is needed, while the developer determines which software to use. This conforms with current acquisition reform principles.

Benefits

MIL-STD-498, released in December 1994, addresses the dramatic changes in software development methods and practices of the 1980s and 1990s. We have left the "big bang," "all-or-nothing" approach to software for waterfall, spiral and continuous development methods. Budgets are driving us to incremental approaches where each fiscal year provides a viable deliverable to support early capability in case funding does not materialize for the next fiscal year. With the increased number of reviews and required levels of manpower to develop and maintain a standard, the DOD is ill-suited to continue in this role. We need software which is developed to meet our needs, not just to meet standards.

Conclusions

The Defense acquisition community must make better use of its shrinking resources. Industry is motivated to develop workable performance standards and practices and keep them current with technology in order to stay competitive. The DOD needs to use the best industrial practices, those which respond to the competitive commercial marketplace, to develop cost effective Defense systems. The cooperative joint working group, which developed MIL-STD-498, is a major step in the right direction. Transitioning this standard to commercial practice under the auspices of the IEEE and ElA is the next step. Ensuring that IEEE 1498 is fully implemented in ISO/IEC 12207 is a logical conclusion to this effort. Developing a long-range plan which will transition other military, IEEE, ElA and international standards to industry maintained performance standards is necessary.
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Thomas Michelli
Program Manager
Army Information Systems
Fort Monmouth, NJ

The acquisition mission facing the Army as it prepares to equip its Force XXI offers most challenging opportunities for members of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC). As the institutional Army downsizes to help balance the force, there will clearly be fewer acquisition positions than we have enjoyed in recent years. Nonetheless, each of these positions will create grander challenges for our AAC workforce as we field systems with even greater complexity in a more streamlined manner. In addition, the added focus on horizontal technology integration, conceived to ensure interoperability within and affordability of the digital battlefield, demands that all AAC jobs be far broader in scope than in the past. In short, it is hard to imagine any AAC position that could not challenge the best minds in our business.

As a 28-year member of the Army and DOD acquisition community, I have enjoyed the challenges of numerous project management and systems engineering positions. As a senior level manager, I have served as deputy project manager, program manager and deputy program executive officer fielding C4I systems in the tactical, strategic and sustaining base environments. In each of these positions, I had the good fortune of working with some of the most innovative folks in the acquisition career field. Together we fielded numerous systems in two years or less, through the use of COTS (commercial off-the-shelf) technology and integrated product teams, long before either term was common AAC vernacular.

At this point in my career there are three AAC positions that are of particular interest to me. The first, one might guess, is program executive officer (PEO). A PEO position would clearly be most challenging, particularly given my desire to judiciously guide the Army in the fielding of effective COTS systems.

A specific position of interest is as director of the Communications-Electronics Command Research, Development and Engineering Center. This position offers the challenge of a senior leadership role in the systems engineering and integration of complex command, control, communications, and computers, intelligence and electronic warfare systems. It would give me the opportunity to leverage my experiences in COTS integration and direct the systems engineering of solutions which will help the Army to deploy with its garrison based systems.

Finally, I would look forward to the opportunity to be a deputy to the commander of a major subordinate command. This position would offer one of the best opportunities to implement widespread acquisition streamlining initiatives, focusing primarily on matrix support to the PEOs/PMs. As the Army continues to downsize, we must find newer and more innovative ways to provide quality multidiSciplined support to our PMs. I would welcome the challenge to enhance a major acquisition organization’s effectiveness by building upon team relationships and intensively focusing on customer satisfaction.

Bruce H. Waldschmidt
Director of Acquisition Policy
Office of the Assistant Secretary
Of the Army
(Research, Development and Acquisition)
The Pentagon

There are many days when I believe that I already have the most challenging job assignment in the Army. I suppose we all feel that way. Being in the Army Acquisition Corps is a demanding and, yet, rewarding experience because we acquire and field equipment for the best Army in the world. Rather than name a specific assignment, I have some thoughts on the attributes of the most challenging job assignments. Those assignments:

• Allow us to challenge the status quo and champion new initiatives; allow us to be a catalyst for change and stimulate others.
• Involve us in shaping plans and decisions on the future of the Army’s acquisition programs; we participate in the decisions, we are not just bystanders.
• Allow us to work with OSD and the other Services on joint ventures; we expand our horizons beyond our own organization.
• Allow us the maximum amount of flexibility in accomplishing the mission; we are given the mission; we determine how to get it done.
• Provide new problems that we have never encountered in order to stretch our abilities; we can “plow new ground,” thereby enriching our job experience.

Carolyn S. Thompson
Director, Program Analysis and Integration Directorate
Missile Defense Space and Technology Center
Space and Strategic Defense Command
Huntsville, AL

I believe all job assignments which have been designated as Critical Acquisition Positions are definitely challenging, with perhaps the positions of program managers and deputy program managers being the pinnacle of the MOST challenging. However, I submit there is one other position within the core positions of a PM shop which is extremely critical and definitely challenging. That position is the chief of the Program and Acquisition Management Division (PAMD), i.e. the organizational element within the PM shop which prepares the cost estimates, supports and prepares budget and financial data, monitors costs and schedules, etc. Because of the nature of the responsibilities within the PAMD, the Chief of this Division is involved in and, therefore, must be cognizant of every aspect of the program. I can speak from experience, as I held this position in two different project offices for eight years.

I found that being the chief, Program and Acquisition Management Division of both the Ground Based Radar (GBR) Project Of-
oice, 1985 to 1989, and the Antisatellite (ASAT) Joint Program Office, 1989 to 1993, were the most challenging jobs I have had in my 28 years of federal service. But I can also say these jobs were my most REWARDING assignments! Every day brought a new challenge and it was exciting just to see what that challenge would be. The challenges were also as varied as preparing text for congressional testimony for the PM and PEO on a particular day and perhaps the next day working with environmental specialists on the impact to some endangered species of "beach mice."

Experience has shown in numerous project offices that the chief of the PAMD usually becomes the PM's "right arm." This individual has to be knowledgeable about every aspect of the program and that is a big challenge. This challenge includes being the repository for "corporate knowledge" on everything that has happened on the program to date; also being familiar with current status of cost, schedule, and performance. It is always a "challenge" just to maintain the latest version of the program's acquisition strategy. In the dynamic world of today's acquisition, I have known an acquisition strategy to change three times within one day.

As we all know, program budget issues seem to make their way into our Christmas holiday activities. These exercises are always challenging especially when you, as chief of the PAMD, the PM, and the DPM are huddled around the table on Christmas Eve morning desperately trying to put together a new coherent acquisition strategy because you have just received a call that your program was cut 25 percent. This takes place while everyone else in the command is in conference rooms and hallways singing Christmas carols, etc. and also while you are concerned about two more gifts you still have to buy and 10 family members arriving at 6:00 p.m. for Christmas Eve dinner.

All of the challenges, how great or small, are worth it all, however to know that you have had a part and have made a contribution to the development and acquisition of a weapon system which will benefit our warfighters. Also it is heartwarming to me to know that from my little world, I can contribute to helping preserve the freedom of our great nation, the United States of America!

As a member of the Army Acquisition Corps, the type of job assignment I find most challenging is the program manager, but second to that is the chief of the Program and Acquisition Management Division. It is also a lot of fun!

John J. Goodbody
Chief, Aviation/Space Systems Division
CECOM Acquisition Center
Fort Monmouth, NJ

I have spent most of my career with the government in contracting at CECOM. In the past few years, the way we do business has changed dramatically. We have made acquisition streamlining a number one priority, and have taken steps to reduce cycle time and solicit and award contracts for our customers within newly established cycle time goals. To realize efficiencies (or the reduction of cycle time) we have reengineered many of our processes, used automation to the fullest extent possible and, most importantly, established a teaming concept with all our customers, which has resulted in a highly motivated multi-functional workforce.

A job/developmental assignment that would be challenging and certainly a fruitful learning experience would be an assignment with one of my largest customers or team members, the Program Executive Office (PEO). An Acquisition Corps assignment with this customer would serve to broaden my perspective on the PEO's direction toward the future and more importantly give me an even greater visibility of the Army's push in preparing the doctrine for the Army of the 21st century. Additionally, while on this assignment, I can enhance the PEO's knowledge and understanding of the CECOM Acquisition Center by sharing goals, knowledge and expertise, and becoming familiar with the correlation and commonality of both positions.

One other challenging assignment would be a developmental position with the CECOM Research, Development, and Engineering Center (RDEC), another major customer of the CECOM Acquisition Center. This assignment would also allow me to learn how to better satisfy my customers' needs as well as provide me with a better understanding of the Army/RDEC mission while expanding my acquisition knowledge beyond my primary career field.

The outcome of being temporarily assigned to either of these positions could only be a positive learning experience that would enhance my knowledge and better allow me to satisfy my customers in a more knowledgeable and expedient manner.

COL Edward Cerutti
Member of the Officer Personnel Management System XXI Precursor Study Group, HQ, Total Army Personnel Command, Alexandria, VA

Every member of the Army Acquisition Corps faces significant challenges and opportunities. Acquisition assignments, by their very nature, are exacting. Given the current environment in which we must accomplish our missions within constrained resources, challenging postings may be found throughout the entire acquisition community.

In my view, there are fundamentally three aspects to every position that determine its level of challenge. These are the leadership considerations, the level of technical skills required, and opportunities for innovation.

In the leadership arena, there are many factors to consider. A position that has no supervisory responsibilities may still have significant leadership facets to it. For example, leadership may be exercised as a member of a staff in the process of obtaining consensus on particular policies or courses of action. For positions that do have supervisory responsibilities, the sheer numbers of people are important, but not the only factor in making the task more difficult. The geographic dispersion of personnel and the diversity of tasks and programs can make the leadership aspects of a position more daunting. Finally, the organization's level of visibility has a significant impact on leadership.

The level of technical skills required in a particular position can have a substantial effect on the level of its challenges. Some positions require a high level of competence in a particular field. This may require one to be the expert on a particular topic or topics within an organization. It can be extremely challenging if you must learn a new discipline. Other positions may require broad expertise across a number of fields or disciplines which requires combining a variety of skills in solving a particular problem.

Finally, the ability to innovate can significantly add to the challenges of a specific position. The level of challenge rises significantly if given the freedom to seek alternatives and be creative in the approach to solutions. If only set solutions can be applied to problems, there is little challenge.

After consideration of the leadership and technical aspects of a position as well as the inherent opportunities for innovation, each position must also be considered in light of the environment surrounding it. Rapidly changing statutory, regulatory and budgetary climates can easily raise the challenging aspects of any assignment. That same situation, which is the one we find ourselves in today, makes all our Army Acquisition Corps assignments challenging.
Frequently Asked Questions

The Q&A section is designed to answer questions from the members of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) and workforce regarding acquisition career management initiatives. Questions should be e-mailed to walkerk@sarda.army.mil. Answers will be published in the following edition of the Army RD&A magazine.

Q. Am I in the AAC?
A. If you occupy a critical acquisition position as a G5-14 or above, you should be in the AAC. You should have received a welcome letter from the director, AAC stating that you were accessed into the AAC. A limited number of G5-13s were also accessed into the AAC in its early days. Your servicing Civilian Personnel Office (CPO) should be able to confirm your membership by looking at the data on your certification record brief (CRB).

Q. What do I have to do to become an AAC member?
A. The procedures for becoming a member of the AAC are currently being revised. With the advent of the Corps Eligibles Program for GS-13s, the process has been greatly improved. If you are a GS-13 and are interested in the Corps Eligibles Program, complete a corps eligible status application sheet and send it to the Deputy Director for Acquisition Career Management, 9900 Belvoir Road, Suite 101, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5567. The corps eligible status application is available on the Internet at http://www.sarda.army.mil/rdaisa/aacmo02b.htm. If qualified, you will then be designated a corps eligible. Upon selection to a G5-14 position, you will complete the AAC mobility agreement and then be accessed into the AAC.

If you are already a GS-14 or above, you should contact Kathy Johnston at (703)325-2764 to find out when the next accession board will convene and the procedures for submitting an application.

Q. What do I have to do to get certified?
A. You should obtain a copy of your CRB, update it to reflect the training, education, and experience which qualifies you for certification, and have your supervisor and certifying official sign it. A copy of the signed CRB should then be provided to your servicing CPO for updating the Army Civilian Personnel System, and another copy of the CRB or a certification list is sent to Deputy Director for Acquisition Career Management, 9900 Belvoir Road, Suite 101, ATTN: Janet Jones, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5567, for updating the Acquisition Data Record System.

Q. What courses should I take for certification?
A. The courses that are required for certification in each acquisition career field and at each level are listed in the Defense Acquisition University Catalog.

Q. Can I get grandfathered?
A. "Grandfathering" is the term commonly used to define those individuals who qualify for AAC membership based on their having 10 years of acquisition experience prior to Oct. 1, 1991. If an individual has this experience AND is Level II certified or meets requirements for Level II certification, then the individual can qualify for AAC membership.

Q. Can I get my name or distribution for the Acquisition Update?
A. The Acquisition Update is a periodic e-mail message that contains items of interest to members of the acquisition community. Your name can be placed on the list of addressees by sending an e-mail to walkerk@sarda.army.mil.

Q. How do I get a DAU Catalog?
A. The DAU Catalog is available in local CPO training offices. It can also be accessed on the Internet at: http://www.acq.osd.mil/dau/. The Internet site also has a listing of class schedules and their locations. You should check with your training coordinator to ensure classes are still being held and that you are scheduled.

Q. What is the Internet address for the AAC?
The FY 97 Military Acquisition Position List (MAPL), below, was approved by Director, Army Acquisition Corps LTG Ronald V. Hite on May 2, 1996. Only positions on the approved MAPL are recognized as valid requirements for Army acquisition officers. An electronic copy of the MAPL can be obtained by contacting LTC Bill Gavora, AAC Proponenty Office, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) via e-mail at gavoraw@sarda.army.mil.

The FY 97 Military Acquisition Position List (MAPL), below, was approved by Director, Army Acquisition Corps LTG Ronald V. Hite on May 2, 1996. Only positions on the approved MAPL are recognized as valid requirements for Army acquisition officers. An electronic copy of the MAPL can be obtained by contacting LTC Bill Gavora, AAC Proponenty Office, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) via e-mail at gavoraw@sarda.army.mil.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITSNAME</th>
<th>FORMNUM</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AMM</th>
<th>MNC</th>
<th>MAJ</th>
<th>ACTN</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102086</td>
<td>BOLSTER PERFORMANCE P/D OFF</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A11</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102084</td>
<td>SENSOR MATERIALS NONUPRNT</td>
<td>T LtC</td>
<td>91A00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102085</td>
<td>PA VULNERABILITY ASSESS OFF</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A23</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL PA MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102087</td>
<td>VULNERABILITY ASSESS OFF</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A14</td>
<td>WHITE SANDS NM</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>WHITE SANDS NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102087</td>
<td>SPACE SYSTEMS DEFENSE</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A16</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102087</td>
<td>AEROSPACE ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A16</td>
<td>LANGSTAFF AVA</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>LANGSTAFF AVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102087</td>
<td>SYSTEMS ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A16</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102087</td>
<td>AIRSPACE ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A16</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102082</td>
<td>AIRSPACE ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91A16</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ATLANTA GA</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ATLANTA GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>K102081</td>
<td>SYSTEMS AUTOMATION ENGINEER</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>91C00</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
<td>9/1/96</td>
<td>ABBREUIL MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On March 1, 1996, 26 students graduated from the Materiel Acquisition Management (MAM) Course held at the U.S. Army Logistics Management College, Fort Lee, VA. Research and development, testing, contracting, requirements generation, logistics and production management are examples of the materiel acquisition work assignments being offered to these graduates.

COL Henry W. Meyer Jr., Dean, School of Acquisition Management, ALMC, gave the graduation address and presented diplomas. The Distinguished Graduate award was presented to Robert Sheibn, Program Executive Office—Aviation, St. Louis, MO.

The eight-week MAM Course provides a broad knowledge of the materiel acquisition function. It covers national policies and objectives that shape the acquisition process and the implementation of these policies and objectives by the U.S. Army. Areas of coverage include acquisition concepts and policies; research, development, test, and evaluation; financial and cost management; integrated logistics support; force modernization; production management; and contract management. Emphasis is placed on developing mid-level managers so that they can effectively participate in the management of the acquisition process.
PERSCOM Notes...

FY 96 LTC Promotion Board Results

The FY 96 LTC Promotion Board results were released on March 14, 1996. For the first time, the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) fell below the Army average for promotion to the rank of lieutenant colonel. This has caused some concern from the general population on the perceived promise that the AAC would maintain promotions at least equal to or better than the Army average. The purpose of this article is to explain why the AAC selection rate for promotions was low and to analyze the results of the LTC board.

Promotions at every grade are based on Army requirements. For the AAC, our requirements are generated from the number of centers needed. From this requirement, a model is built determining how many lieutenant colonels, majors, and captains are needed. The model even determines how many captains are accessed per year group. The AAC was initially sized at 250 colonels. In 1994, a joint deputy chief of staff for personnel and director of acquisition career management decision reduced the requirement for AAC colonels to 215. Other grades had to follow. As a result, the AAC was left with many year groups well over the “downsized” inventory requirement. As our larger year groups approach promotion gates, we can no longer expect AAC rates significantly above the Army average. The accompanying chart depicts the current AAC inventory against the requirement to grow 215 AAC colonels.

Overall AAC Results

Board members reviewed the files of 205 AAC officers in the primary zone. From this population, 120 were selected by the board. In addition, one below the zone and two above the zone officers were selected for promotion for a total selection of 123 officers for promotion. The resulting primary zone selection rate of 58.5 percent was below the Army Competitive Category primary zone of 60 percent. AAC officers continue to be competitive with basic branch officers; however, our requirements for lieutenant colonels have been reduced. Acquisition Corps results by functional area are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>Primary Zone Considered</th>
<th>Primary Zone Selected</th>
<th>Primary Zone Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Was the Trend for Those Selected?

After the assignment officers re-reviewed the files of all AAC officers who went before the promotion board the following trend or “formula” emerged:

\[ \text{LTC} = \text{Command and Staff College complete} + \text{Above Center of Mass (ACOM) Command} + \text{ACOM File (usually the last five Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs))} \]

It goes without saying, Command and Staff College (CSC) must be completed (either resident or non-resident) for selection to lieutenant colonel. Although this was not a selection board requirement, all AAC officers selected for promotion had completed CSC. Of the AAC officers selected for promotion, 22 percent were solely non-graduate. Of the officers who completed resident CSC, 93 percent were selected for promotion. We can not emphasize enough the importance of finishing CSC. If selected to attend a resident CSC, go!

Company command was also extremely important. Board members appear to use command reports as the mark of leadership potential. The leadership ability, warfighting skills and potential of all officers are well-documented on those OERs and easily interpreted by the 18 board members (17 of whom are basic branch officers). For this board, ACOM command reports were an important factor in determining success.

The last important discriminator appears to be an ACOM file with the concentration of the last five OERs. Board members want to know how officers performed as majors and, more importantly, what the senior rater thought of those officers’ potential for further success. Senior raters who best articulated the promotion, military school and battalion/LTC command-level potential of successful officers, helped those officers. Officers who maintained steady ACOM performance after command were selected. Officers who received a two block OER just prior to the board were not likely to be selected for promotion. Likewise, officers who had a majority of center of mass OERs after command and who only peaked on the last two OERs prior to the board were also not selected.

These results are consistent with a primary zone selection rate of 58.5 percent. With 41.5 percent of the population not being selected for promotion, a file which can not be rated “above average” is at risk. This was a tough board and we will lose some good officers. The message is clear—take the hard jobs and maintain a high level of performance.

FY 97 LTC PM and Acquisition Command Board Results

The Military Acquisition Management Branch recently completed an analysis of the FY 97 PM/Acquisition Command board results and overall command opportunity for Acquisition Corps officers. The following paragraphs summarize these results and indicate possible trends.

Overall Acquisition Corps Results

Board members reviewed the files of 365 Acquisition Corps officers in year groups 1976 through 1979. From this population, the
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board selected 33. Acquisition Corps results by functional area and year group are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Command Board Procedures

The board selected officers in two categories: Product Manager (PM) and Acquisition Command. The board selected 29 officers to be product managers and four to be acquisition commanders. PERSCOM slated each of these officers to PM/Command positions after considering DA slating guidance, position criteria, experience, training, and personal preferences.

Who Got Selected?

All officers selected have master's degrees, two have Ph.D.s. Only 10 of the selectees have not previously been selected for resident Command and Staff College. Of the 29 officers selected to become PMs, 27 have at least two years of experience in a program office or in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) (OASARDA). All three officers selected to be contracting commanders have at least four years of contracting experience in either the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC), or OASARDA. Two of the three have more than two years of contracting experience in both DLA and AMC.

Analysis

Based on the analysis applied to the above information, it is apparent that officers who complete at least two years in a program office are competitive for PM selection. Officers competing for contracting commands require at least three years of “hands on” contracting experience (preferably in DLA or AMC) to be competitive. The inflation of our current OER system requires “top block” performance in these key developmental positions.

General Observations

The file quality of officers selected for PM/Command continues to improve. Competition is tough for these key positions. Generally, officers are selected for command the first or second time considered. To be competitive for PM/Command, one must seek out and do well in those positions which will branch qualify an officer as a major. For product managers, previous program office experience is most important. However, there is no evidence that consecutive or repetitive program office tours better qualify an officer for PM selection. On the contrary, a successful performance office tour, coupled with successful performance in other qualifying positions (e.g. test, combat development, DA/joint staff) is a common formula for PM selection. Contracting officers require extensive contracting training and experience in pre-award and post-award contracting. Success in other acquisition positions enhances overall file strength toward selection.

Command Opportunity

The Army Acquisition Corps continues to afford officers, in all three functional areas, a healthy opportunity to command. Army Acquisition Corps opportunity to command has compared favorable with the Army average of 16-14 percent for the past three years.

Since each year group is considered four times for command, total opportunity to command for a particular year group cannot be determined until that year group receives its fourth “look.” The following depicts a May 1996 “snap shot” of the cumulative number and percentage of officers in groups 1979-1976 that have been selected to command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA 51</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
<td>27 (32%)</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA 53</td>
<td>2 (5.7%)</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
<td>5 (16.6%)</td>
<td>5 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA 97</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (7.6%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

As future PM/Command boards convene, it is imperative for officers to take the time to personally “scrub” their Officer Record Brief (ORB) and microfiche to ensure accurate information is conveyed to the board members. The Military Acquisition Management Branch will send pre-board scrub packets to officers in the zone of consideration 90 days prior to the convene date. The pre-board scrub packet will consist of an ORB, a fiche, and a checklist. Use this packet to prepare your file for the board. Although not a part of the pre-board scrub packet, the photo is an important part of the board file. It is recommended that if a photo is more than two years old, then it is time for a new one. Prior to taking a new photo, check your awards, branch and U.S. insignia etc. Attention to detail does make a difference.

Finally, as a captain-major, seek career broadening experiences to become competitive for early selection as a PM/Commander. With limited positions in the program offices, PERSCOM will rotate captains and majors at 24 months to ensure a sufficient pool of experienced branch qualified officers for future PM positions. Officers wanting to be competitive for contracting commands should seek warranted contracting officer positions in both pre-award and post-award environments.

FY 97 Army Acquisition Corps
LTC Command/PM List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracting Command</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Career Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>BROWN, Mary K.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>LEONARD, Alvin J.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>QM</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>MILLS, Ainsworth B.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>QM</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>STRICK, Donald E.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Career Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLANCA, Damian P.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITO, Joseph M.</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKINGHAM, Mildred</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKE, John D.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSBY, Thomas E.</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIPPS, David B.</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATTAs, Richard P.</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWLING, Edmund A.</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR, Matthew J.</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAULT, Cloris G.</td>
<td>QM</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GINDER, Lawrence J.</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROITKE, Mark L.</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALLAGAN, Robert E.</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLENBRAND, Edward</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFE, Donald C.</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES, Lauris T. II</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHER, George R.</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July-August 1996
Advanced Civil Schooling Program

A new strategy was approved in January 1996 that governs the policies surrounding the execution of the Army Acquisition Corps' (AAC) Advanced Civil Schooling (ACS) program. This strategy was designed to ensure that officers were afforded the maximum opportunity for ACS, while also providing them the greatest opportunity for continued acquisition field experience. This article describes the AAC ACS program and informs officers on how to apply.

The ACS program consists of approximately 80 full-time, fully funded allocations per fiscal year. ACS also encompasses degree completion (fully funded and funded by the officer). The program is managed by Military Acquisition Management Branch (MAMB), at PERSCOM. The goal of the ACS program is to produce officers with the educational background necessary to become successful program managers and contracting commanders. Therefore, specific curriculums were designed for acquisition officers at the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) and Florida Institute of Technology (FIT)-Fort Lee. These programs include the Systems Acquisition Management and the Acquisition and Contract Management programs at NPS and the Materiel Acquisition Management program at FIT. Approximately one-half of the total allocations for ACS are for slots at those two institutions.

The only other allocations for ACS associated with a specific institution are five annual slots for the IGRAD Program. This is a two-year program that combines ACS and Training With Industry, and culminates with the award of a master's in business administration (M.B.A.) from the University of Texas-Arlington.

The remainder of allocations are divided among various curriculums and officers usually attend the school of their choice. However, universities must be accredited and not have tuitions greater than $13,000 annually. Curriculum choices include computer science, information technology management, engineering and science, operations research and systems analysis, and M.B.A.

To apply for ACS, officers must forward the following information to: Commander, Total Army Personnel Command, ATTN: TAPC-OBP-E (CPT Bob Marion), 200 Stovall Street, Alexandria, VA 22332-0411:

- a completed DA Form 1618-R (located in the back of AR 621-1);
- a copy of their GRE or GMAT results;
- a copy of their undergraduate transcripts; and
- a letter of acceptance from the university they wish to attend.

If an officer is applying to NPS, he or she must include an original undergraduate transcript and the ACS officer at MAMB will request the letter of acceptance.

For FY 97 school allocations, MAMB conducts two boards. The June 1996 board selected officers for school start dates from January-July 1997. The next board will convene during January 1997 to select officers with start dates from August-September 1997. All officers considered by the board will be notified of the results in writing. It is critical that officers desiring to attend ACS send all the appropriate paperwork to the ACS manager at MAMB at least two weeks prior to the board convening. Board dates in subsequent fiscal years will be scheduled to target officers immediately after their accession into the AAC.

For more details regarding the AAC ACS program, contact the AAC ACS Manager, CPT Bob Marion at commercial (703)325-2760, DSN 221-2760, or at the following e-mail address: marion@hoffman-emh1.army.mil.

FY 97 Colonel PM/AAC Command Board Results

Overall Colonel Results

Board members reviewed the files of 61 Acquisition Corps colonels and promotable lieutenant colonels and 16 civilians in the grade of GS-15, or eligible for promotion to GS-15. The board selected 24 officers and one civilian. (Names of selectees were published in the May-June 1996 issue of *Army RDEA* magazine.) Results for military by functional area and year group are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Percentage</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Command Board Procedures

The board membership consisted of six senior military and two senior civilian members. All were members of the Army Acquisition Corps. Officers were selected in two categories: project manager and acquisition command. This was the first DA centralized selection board to select the best qualified individual among senior civilian applicants and eligible colonels for selected positions in the project manager category. Two ACAT I programs were designated by the Acquisition General Officer Steering Committee to be filled by the best qualified candidate, either civilian or military. All other PM and AAC command positions were open to military only. This was also the first year that officers currently serving as, or with previous colonel PM or command experience, were not eligible for consideration.

The board selected one civilian and 10 officers to be project managers and 14 officers to be acquisition commanders. The board slated selectees for the two ACAT I programs designated to be filled by the best qualified candidate. PERSCOM slated all other officers in accordance with slated guidance from the Army chief of staff.

Who Got Selected?

Two officers have baccalaureate degrees, 21 have master's degrees, and one has a Ph.D. Twenty-three have been selected for or have completed Senior Service College (19 or 24 resident). All of the 10 officers selected for project manager previously served as product managers. Of the 14 selected for acquisition command, 12 served as lieutenant colonel commanders or product managers.

Analysis

Of the 61 officers who competed, 56 have been lieutenant colonel commanders or product managers. In general, officers were selected at a higher rate as PMs or R&D commanders if they served on the Army staff and had two tours in a program office, including LTC PM. Officers selected as contracting commanders generally served three or more years in contracting positions with DLA or AMC. Of the seven selected as contracting commanders, five have program office experience. Officers selected as software center commanders all have at least eight years of software acquisition experience.

Command Opportunity

This year's command selection rate (39 percent) is somewhat
higher than last year's rate (33 percent). This is due primarily because, this year, for the first time, officers who had previously commanded at the colonel level were not eligible for consideration. This rate is much higher than the overall Army colonel command selection rate (14 percent).

This year, 75 percent of the officers selected were being considered for the first time. Second time seelectees made up 21 percent of the slate. As the numbers indicate, chances for selection are greatest during the first two years of eligibility. Selection rates as a function of time considered are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Considered</th>
<th>Considered</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
As in all other branches and functional areas, selection for promotion to colonel and colonel command in the Acquisition Corps is highly competitive. Because most officers selected for colonel have successfully served as as lieutenant colonel PM or commander, consistently high performance in a range of career broadening assignments is still the overriding factor in selection for colonel PM or acquisition command.

**Personnel Officer Selectees Announced**

Carol Ashby Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civilian Personnel Policy) and Director of Civilian Personnel, recently announced the selection of personnel officers for civilian personnel operation centers. Congratulations to the seelectees who are listed below with their respective regions:

- Daniel M. Clawson, Southwest Region, Fort Riley, KS;
- Conrad M. Lacy, North Central Region, Rock Island Arsenal, IL;
- Michael L. Vajda, Northeast Region, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, MD; and
- W. Lee Williams, South Central Region, Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL.

Selection of the West Region director will be made after the site selection process is complete.

**New Army Product Manager Established**

Based on recommendations from senior Army leaders and a Department of the Army general officer steering committee, the Product Manager—Soldier Support Office was recently established at the U.S. Army Soldier Systems Command in Natick, MA.

The PM-Soldier Support Office will be responsible for acquisition of soldier support systems and equipment, i.e., "materials and services that directly support the soldier individually or collectively in a tactical, operational or administrative environment." Soldier support items include field feeding equipment, showers, rigid and soft wall shelters, latrines, heaters, field laundry systems and air delivery systems.

By providing centralized executive management of these programs, the soldier/customer will have a "one stop shopping" advantage. PM-Soldier Support will be responsible for trade-off analyses to address cost, schedule and performance parameters. Ever mindful of funding constraints, the office will ensure limited resources are used efficiently, providing the best possible return on investments. Even in light of these business objectives, the PM-Soldier Support Office will always ensure that warfighting requirements are identified and addressed.

It is anticipated that the PM-Soldier Support Office will be fully operational in October 1996 with a board selected product manager identified by the end of the calendar year.

**Thomas Takes Over as A E S A Director**

COL James A. Thomas, former Deputy to the Director for Acquisition Program Integration in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), has assumed new duties as Director of the Army Acquisition Executive Support Agency, Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition).

Backed by more than 26 years of active military service, Thomas served earlier tours as a Program Analyst, Acquisition Resources, Acquisition Program Integration, Office, Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology); Course Director, Defense Systems Management College; and as a program analyst in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (RDA).

He holds an M.S. degree in systems management from the University of Southern California, a B.S. degree in chemical engineering from Purdue University and is a Virginia Polytechnic Institute Ph.D. candidate in public administration. In addition, he has completed the Army War College, the Program Managers Course at the Defense Systems Management College, and the Army Command and General Staff College.

Thomas is a recipient of the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal with one OLC, Meritorious Service Medal with two OLC, Army Commendation Medal with two OLC, Office of the Secretary of Defense Identification Badge, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.
A Strategy of Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management of Change

By David C. Wilson, Routledge, New York, 1992


Change is inevitable. It can be frightening to those who fear it and are reluctant to change; or, challenging to those who embrace it and have become masters at it. However, deciding a strategic plan and understanding the chaos that change brings, as well as preparing for and implementing a process for change, is not only necessary, it is essential in today's organizations, companies, and government.

It would seem reasonable that most individuals responsible for the strategic direction of their organization would have a "strategy of change." David C. Wilson, author of A Strategy of Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management of Change, advises his readers that "Managers should, if they are not already, be 'masters of change.'"

Strategies of change can be applied to individuals, groups, organizations, business sectors, and ultimately to whole economies and nation states. Planned change relies upon a model of organization in which there is uncritical acceptance of the managerial role. Change can occur if managers learn to lead, motivate, negotiate with, and dominate other parts of the organization. Managers lead the way, set the example, and encourage their employees to do the same.

How one views, accepts, struggles against, or promotes organizational change will depend to a great extent on whether one is a woman or a man. Equally, homosexuality and lesbianism are subject to their own set of discriminatory organizational practices, mostly aimed at suppression and encouraging the staff to be heterosexual.

Wilson offers several strategies for managers to use as models in developing their own individual strategy for managing change in their specific organization. Mission statements, encouraging employee empowerment, and working in teams are just a few of the strategies offered by Wilson. Recognizing that each person is an individual is key in aiding a manager in his or her pursuit of developing an organization willing to accept change. Respecting each individual's history, background, and difference will assist the manager in planning a program that will encourage teamwork and cooperation.

The "master manager" is a manager who is a director, producer, coordinator, monitor, mentor, facilitator, innovator, broker and leader.

According to Wilson, directors take initiative, encourage goal setting, and effectively delegate work to their employees. As a producer, he or she encourages personal productivity and motivation, time and stress management, and motivates others. Coordinators plan, organize, and control work flow. A monitor writes effectively, reducing information overload. A mentor understands one's self and others; has effective interpersonal communication; and develops his or her subordinates. Facilitators are good at team building, participative decision-making, and conflict management. Innovators are creative thinkers and live with and manage change. Brokers create and maintain a power base, have effective negotiation and influencing skills, and effective oral presentation. Finally, leadership is a process of social exchange between a leader and his or her follower. It is located in a complex web of organizational and societal contexts.

Just being "competent" is not enough to make a person a good leader or manager. Organizations are no longer run by managers, but by heroes who are insanely great in what they do. They are the empowered individuals who have learned to work together on teams and, although they may be wary of change, still embrace and master it. They are the new employee directed, produced, coordinated, monitored, mentored, facilitated, innovated, and brokered by a master manager who has developed a "strategy for change."

Force XXI-Land Combat in the 21st Century

Published by U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

Foreword by General William W. Hartzog

Reviewed by Joe Sites, Vice President, Director Defense of Systems, Baum Romstedt Technology Research Inc., Fairfax, VA.

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) has just published Force XXI-Land Combat in the 21st Century, the fourth in a series of "black books." This book describes the actions taken to determine requirements for the Army of the 21st century. These actions include development of concepts, experimentation and incorporation of experience gained in recent operations. The document provides reviews of the Advanced Warfighting Experiments (AWE); NTC 94-07, Prairie Warrior 95, Theater Missile Defense (TMD), Focused Dispatch and Warrior Focus.

Based on the work done to date, TRADOC has decided to focus its force developmental work on six military operations: Project the Force; Protect the Force; Gain Information Dominance; Shape the Battlespace; Decisive Operations; and Sustain the Force.

In summary tables, TRADOC has provided the concepts, enablers and technologies which are relevant to each operation. Of particular interest to the RD&A community are the lists of technologies. For example, for Protect the Force, the following technologies have been listed: Enhanced Land Warrior; Air and Ground-Based Sensors; Standoff Mine Detection; Army Battle Command System; and SORATACMS, Comanche, Apache Longbow.

Force XXI-Land Combat in the 21st Century is not just another pamphlet. Although it is an excellent reference source for those interested in recent AWEs, its real importance is that it provides a summary of what is needed by our future Army. This document should be "must" reading for those involved in RD&A activities.
**ACQUISITION REFORM**

**From The Acquisition Reform Office...**

**Procurement Management Reviews**

In order to gain a first-hand look at how acquisition reform is being implemented Army-wide, the Contract Support Agency developed a new format for conducting Procurement Management Reviews (PMRs). The format provides visibility and follow-up on acquisition reform initiatives such as the Purchase Card Program, past performance, the best value and source selection, electronic commerce/electronic data interchange/federal acquisition computer network (EC/EDI/FACNET), acquisition and administrative lead time reductions, performance-based service contracts, commercial practices, integrated process/product teams, and partnering.

**MEDCOM Consolidates Requirements**

In the past, each Medical Treatment Facility (MTF) has either leased or purchased all of the equipment and chemicals required for the conduct of various types of chemistry tests. Recently, the South East Health Service Support Area has changed its way of doing business and awarded a consolidated service contract for use by each of its nine MTFs. As the result, the average cost for each test performed (based on cost per reportable test), has been reduced by 87 percent (from 97 cents to 13 cents). MEDCOM estimates annual savings of $4.3 million over the life cycle of the new contract.

**Multiyear Contracting**

We can no longer afford to individually "re-invent the wheel" each time we have a contracting requirement. With our dwindling budget and subsequent drawdowns, we must employ smart contracting methods and practices. More multiyear or multiple years with options that combine like requirements is one such method. However, the operative word here is "smart." Bundling of requirements that are not alike may well lead to higher costs and/or less efficiency in some requirement areas. Also, we must not forget about other factors such as socio-economic responsibilities. When combining requirements into a multiyear contract leads to diminished opportunities for small and disadvantaged businesses, strong goals for subcontracting to these businesses must be incorporated into any resultant solicitation and contract. In his Memorandum For Acquisition Community, dated March 18, 1996, the deputy assistant secretary of the Army (procurement) clarified the Army policy on contract offloading. Teaming with other Army Commands or other Services within a region or local area to combine like requirements may well be beneficial to all concerned. If one command or Service has a strong area or a successful contract for a requirement that can be shared, contracting work can be divided between the activities. This will take cooperation on the part of all concerned to ensure that each Service's requirement is fully supported. We need to employ economically advantageous methods in contracting that do not take away from quality and that may well improve quality when employing best commercial practices. If you have a good idea for smart contracting, please share it with us.

**TACOM/UDLP Acquisition Task Force**

The U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM), and the Offices of the Program Executive Officer—Field Artillery Systems and Program Executive Officer—Armored Systems Modernization, have joined together and worked with the United Defense Limited Partnership (UDLP) to achieve common quality processes at its facilities in Pennsylvania, Alabama, California, and South Carolina. This partnering effort has expanded from achieving common quality processes to achieving single process initiatives through partnership councils established for each initiative. For example, the Quality Partnership Council—the oldest of the councils—has fostered 13 individual teams, eight of which have final proposals in process with preliminary savings/cost avoidance estimated at a million. Other council achievements include time savings in various areas.

**TRADOC Reviews Requirements**

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) scrubbed all existing contracts and pending solicitations to perform a detailed review of all requirements in order to identify any that overstate minimal needs. Focusing primarily on contracts over $100,000, TRADOC identified requirements which could be reduced or eliminated entirely, resulting in future cost savings and avoidance of $19.3 million. These funds have been shifted to other operational needs.

**Morse Named Contracting FCR**

The assistant secretary of the Army (research, development and acquisition) recently named Estherlene S. Morse the Functional Chief's Representative (FCR) for the Contracting and Acquisition Cadre Field (CP-14). The FCR oversees and develops policy for training, education, and career management. Morse is currently on the staff of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Procurement) and serves as the Deputy for the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, where she represents the Army in promulgating new and revised contracting and acquisition policy for incorporation in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS).

Morse entered government service as an Army intern, completing mandatory training and rotational assignments with distinction. In 1995 she joined the Office of the ASA(RDA), assuming responsibility for developing Army contracting policies for worldwide contracting activities. She authored the Army's implementing guidance to launch the Credit Card Program, which has become one of the Army's great success stories. She also authored the Army's guidance on unsolicited proposals.

A 1990 recipient of the Army's Competition in Contracting Award, Morse is a 1992 graduate of the Program Management Course at the Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) and a 1995 graduate of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF). She holds a B.S degree in business and an M.S. degree in national resource strategy. Morse also completed the Senior Acquisition Course while attending ICAF, conducting research on Singapore's Acquisition Process and served on the Army's first accession board to bring professionals into the Army Acquisition Corps. She has achieved Level III certification in contracting and program management. She has held numerous offices in the National Contract Management Association (NCMA), is currently the Mid-Atlantic Regional Employment Chair and is an NCMA Fellow.

Morse is a "people person," a very desirable asset for the FCR position. Her strategic vision and initiatives for CP-14 will contribute to producing the caliber of dynamic contracting and acquisition leaders and managers to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Please feel free to contact Esther Morse by e-mail at morsee@sarda.army.mil or telephone at DSN 225-5039, commercial (703)695-3039, or fax (703)614-9505.

---
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