



DCMA Manual 4502-01

Corporate Governance Structure and Procedures

Office of Primary Responsibility

Corporate Governance Capability

Effective:

July 22, 2019

Releasability:

Cleared for public release

Implements:

DCMA Instruction 4502, "Corporate Governance," January 14, 2019

Incorporates and Cancels:

DCMA Instruction 592, "Agency Suggestion Program," May 29, 2014

Internal Control:

Process flow and key controls are located on the Resource Page

Labor Codes:

Located on the Resource Page

Resource Page Link:

<https://360.dcm.mil/sites/policy/CG/SitePages/4502-01r.aspx>

Approved by:

David H. Lewis, VADM, USN, Director

Purpose: In accordance with the authority in DoD Directive 5105.64, "Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA)," this issuance implements DCMA Instruction 4502, "Corporate Governance," and establishes corporate governance structure and procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: GENERAL ISSUANCE INFORMATION	4
1.1. Applicability.....	4
1.2. Policy.....	4
SECTION 2: RESPONSIBILITIES	6
2.1. Director, DCMA.....	6
2.2. Deputy Director, DCMA.....	6
2.3. Senior Leadership Team.....	6
2.4. Director, Corporate Operations	7
2.5. Capability Manager, Corporate Governance Capability Board	7
2.6. Capability Managers.....	8
2.7. Commanders and Director, East, Central, West Regions, International and Special Programs Commands.....	9
2.8. Component Heads and Operational Unit Commanders/Directors.....	9
2.9. Headquarters Functional Component Heads	9
2.10. Employees	9
SECTION 3: REQUIREMENTS DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION	10
3.1. Overview	10
3.2. Requirements Sources and Types.....	10
3.3. Capability Gap Assessments	12
3.4. Capability Requirement Development and Refinement	12
3.5. Capability Requirement Documentation	15
3.6. Document Staffing	18
3.7. Validation.....	18
SECTION 4: CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT	19
4.1. Overview	19
4.2. The Capability Requirement Portfolio	19
4.3. Managing the Capability Requirement Portfolio.....	19
SECTION 5: THE SENIOR GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE	22
5.1. Overview	22
5.2. Functional Components.....	22
5.3. Operational Units	22
5.4. Business Capability Framework.....	22
5.5. Enterprise Architecture Review	25
5.6. Mission-Level Committees	26
5.7. DCMA Requirements Oversight Council.....	27
5.8. Senior Leadership Team.....	27
SECTION 6: THE CORPORATE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS	29
6.1. Overview	29
6.2. Requirement Submission Elements.....	29
6.3. Requirements Intake Process.....	31
6.4. Capability Board Review Process	32
6.5. Mission-Level Committees Review Process	35

6.6. DCMA Requirements Oversight Council Review Process36

6.7. Senior Leadership Team Review Process37

6.8. Agency Director Review37

6.9. Implementation.....38

6.10. Urgent Operational Need Process.....38

6.11. Recordkeeping.....40

GLOSSARY.....41

 G.1. Definitions.....41

 G.2. Acronyms43

REFERENCES.....44

SECTION 1: GENERAL ISSUANCE INFORMATION

1.1. APPLICABILITY. This issuance applies to all DCMA activities unless higher-level regulations, policy, guidance, or agreements take precedence.

1.2. POLICY. DCMA is committed to good governance principles to ensure that its resources and activities are aligned to accomplish the Agency's strategic goals and priorities. Good governance is characterized by fact-based and transparent decision-making in order to achieve expected outcomes for our stakeholders, customers, and workforce. It is DCMA policy to:

a. Establish, deliver, and maintain a robust corporate governance (CG) capability to fulfill the Agency's mission and fully comply with laws, regulations, and DoD issuances.

b. Perform corporate decision-making in a multi-functional, integrated, flexible, and coordinated manner.

c. Apply these governing principles for decision-making:

(1) Utilize the DCMA governance structure (including the Business Capabilities Framework (BCF) and associated processes), as the principal method to validate and prioritize resource allocations, as well as oversee the appropriate policy, tools and training development to support the Agency's mission.

(2) Align decisions with the Agency's Strategic Plan, priorities, and associated measurements to ensure progress and results, in accordance with (IAW) DCMA Instruction (DCMA-INST) 4503, "Planning and Resourcing."

(3) Align authority with responsibility to drive accountability.

(4) Ensure that activities, studies and decision-making processes are fact-based, consistent, timely, responsible, transparent, collaborative, and they are communicated to promote appropriate action and unified effort to achieve results.

(5) Introduce proposed requirements into the governance and decision-making process using the authorized system of record (herein called "intake system") for Agency requirements intake, collection and review. This system will serve as the entry point for collecting, processing and prioritizing all new and recurring Agency requirements.

(6) Establish (and disestablish) governance bodies as required to ensure operational necessity, economy, efficiency, and execution within resource constraints.

(7) Develop and consider options using the lenses of Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy (DOTmLPP-P).

(8) Use the validated capability requirements and other decision-making process outputs to:

(a) Inform the Agency Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPB&E) processes IAW DCMA-INST 4503 series and the DCMA-INST 4301, “Stewardship” series.

(b) Drive Agency acquisition decisions as described in the DCMA-INST 4301 series and the DCMA-INST 4401, “Information Technology Management” series.

(c) Execute Agency manpower strategies as described in the DCMA-INST 4201, “Civilian Personnel” series and the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

(d) Effectively address urgent operational needs (UONs) in a timely manner.

d. Allow Agency entities to retain savings and other resourcing benefits generated by implementing beneficial employee-generated suggestions and other improvement initiatives submitted through the intake system, unless explicitly directed to meet efficiency targets IAW Agency guidance.

e. Execute this Manual in a safe, efficient, effective, and ethical manner.

SECTION 2: RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. DIRECTOR, DCMA. The DCMA Director or delegatee will:

- a. Implement DCMA Governance Structure to ensure that its resources and activities are aligned to accomplish the Agency's mission, strategic goals and priorities.
- b. Assign membership to Agency governance bodies who will serve as the principals to implement methods to prioritize and make decisions on resource allocations within the Agency.
- c. Implement the programs described herein by staffing and equipping the proper organizational components to manage them.
- d. Appoint, in writing, the appropriate leadership to Capability Boards (CAP BDs) and other governance bodies as outlined in this Manual, in order to assign authorities for their respective programs. An appointment letter template may be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.
- e. Serve as the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA), IAW DoD Instruction (DoDI) 5000.02, "Operation of the Defense Acquisition System," DoDI 5000.74, "Defense Acquisition Services," and DoDI 5000.75, "Business Systems Requirements and Acquisition." In this role, the Director, DCMA:
 - (1) Approves critical acquisition decisions for Authority To Proceed (ATP) decision points and Milestones (MS) or concurs in contractual commitments.
 - (2) Oversees business system delivery within cost, schedule and performance parameters.
 - (3) Establishes oversight controls for programs, including procedures to report cost, schedule and performance variances and to address reported variances. The acquisition chain of command supports the MDA by leading the program manager (PM) and program execution.

2.2. DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DCMA. The DCMA Deputy Director will:

- a. Serve as the Agency lead over the BCF, keeping the Director informed and escalating issues when necessary.
- b. Request studies and supporting documentation, initiate project charters, and approve expenditures to ensure proper requirements review and resource allocation decisions for the Agency.

2.3. SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM. The Senior Leadership Team (SLT) is defined in paragraph 5.8. The SLT will:

- a. Assist the Director by providing capability requirements validation and recommending prioritization within and across the capabilities requirement portfolios.

b. Ensure cross-functional integration of the BCF and identify potential trade-offs between CAP BDs.

2.4. DIRECTOR, CORPORATE OPERATIONS. The Director, Corporate Operations (DC), or delegatee will:

a. Perform administrative oversight functions for select governance bodies as directed by the DCMA Director and Deputy Director.

b. Serve as Chair of the DCMA Requirements Oversight Council (DROC).

2.5. CAPABILITY MANAGER, CORPORATE GOVERNANCE CAPABILITY BOARD. The CG CAP BD Capability Manager (CM) will:

a. Develop, establish, and implement Agency-wide policy for governance management, IAW DCMA Director and Deputy Director guidance and decisions,.

b. Provide guidance for the efficient DCMA governance management and revise Agency instructions and related documents as appropriate.

c. Annually review DCMA governance bodies to ensure effective and efficient use, and recommend changes to senior leadership, as appropriate. This process addresses establishing, continuing, and terminating all internal governance bodies within DCMA.

d. Perform administrative oversight functions for select governance bodies as directed by the DCMA Director and Deputy Director.

e. Post signed charters for approved governance bodies in DCMA's central repository for official publications.

f. Post CAP BD meeting minutes and decisions in DCMA's central repository for CAP BD documents.

g. Establish and oversee intake system implementation and provide support to CAP BDs, Operational Units, Functional Components and other Agency entities (herein called "Agency entities") as they receive and review submitted requirements.

h. Develop and implement guidance, procedures, and performance metrics for the Agency governance, capability development, and Agency intake processes.

i. Conduct periodic workshops to give Agency entities the training they need to succeed in navigating the Agency governance and intake processes.

j. Ensure programs are properly staffed and resourced.

k. Annually complete a Management Controls Checklist for the processes associated with Agency governance.

l. Conduct periodic reviews to evaluate program efficiency and effectiveness.

2.6. CAPABILITY MANAGERS. The CMs will:

a. Be the proponent with advocacy for all Agency efforts under a given Capability. The CM is responsible to deliver the defined capability including the policy (Instructions and Manuals), tools, and training associated with the activities that fall under the Capability's purview.

b. Serve as the senior leader with capability responsibility seeking to improve mission performance. When gaps are identified, the CM will present the Agency with a business problem or opportunity that may be addressed via business system acquisition, business process reengineering, or related business changes.

c. Create clear traceability between the approved capability requirements and emerging functional requirements, and ensure that functional requirements are developed in detail to facilitate verification and validation as the capability matures.

d. Oversee requirements reviews and evaluations that fall within their purview as submitted via the intake system, and ensure that the formal acknowledgments are made and appropriate findings are uploaded in the required timeframes.

e. Ensure that the Component Head programs and budgets for full business spectrum solution lifecycle costs.

f. Engage stakeholders to keep them involved in shaping the complete future solution.

g. Confirm the need for improved business operations and represent the user community interests throughout the Business Capability Acquisition Cycle (BCAC) as described in DoDI 5000.75. The CM will serve as the "Functional Sponsor" of their requirements as described in DoDI 5000.75.

h. Work with the Component Heads who will provide resources for each phase of requirements development, validation, implementation and/or acquisition.

i. Confirm that deployed solutions meet business requirements, deliver expected benefits, and provide return on investment.

j. Ensure the Capabilities do not duplicate existing or proposed solutions.

k. Jointly with the PM, create clear traceability between the approved capability requirements and the emerging functional requirements, and ensure that the functional requirements are developed in detail to facilitate verification and validation as the capability matures.

2.7. COMMANDERS AND DIRECTOR, EAST, CENTRAL, WEST REGIONS, INTERNATIONAL AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS COMMANDS.

- a. Serve as the Deputy Manager to the Primary Capabilities. A link to the BCF alignment chart can be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.
- b. Manage decisions at their level within the specified thresholds IAW the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

2.8. COMPONENT HEADS AND OPERATIONAL UNIT COMMANDERS/DIRECTORS. As the Director's Principal Advisors, the Executive Directors, Directors, and Operational Unit Commanders/Directors will:

- a. Serve as the senior leader with business function responsibility seeking to improve mission performance. When gaps are identified, the Component Head will use the intake system to present the appropriate CAP BD with a business problem or opportunity that may be addressed via business system acquisition, business process reengineering, or related business changes.
- b. Program and budget for full business spectrum solution lifecycle costs IAW the DCMA-INST 4301 series.
- c. Support and execute the work of the CAP BDs with functionally-trained individuals, and make resources available for each phase of requirements development, acquisition and implementation (including market research). This includes designating a Functional Lead who will assist the CM and collaborate with the designated PMs for acquisition-related activities.
- d. Team with the CM to engage stakeholders to keep them actively involved in shaping the complete future solution.

2.9. HEADQUARTERS FUNCTIONAL COMPONENT HEADS. Headquarters Functional Component Heads serve as the functional proponent with advocacy for all Agency efforts under a given function. Headquarters Functional Component Heads are responsible to deliver the functionally-aligned subject matter expertise to support policy (Instructions and Manuals), tools, and training development associated with the activities that fall under a Capability's purview. They will also ensure that the associated Capabilities are executed with functionally-trained individuals.

2.10. EMPLOYEES. Prior to formally submitting an idea or beneficial suggestion for consideration as a potential new Agency-wide policy, tools or training (capability) requirement, employees will submit their recommendations to their local chain of command. Once vetted locally, endorsed recommendations will be input into the intake system, which serves as DCMA's central repository and database for coordinating, completing, knowledge sharing, and archiving all endorsed employee improvement suggestions and proposals. See the Resource Page for the Intake Endorsement Form required with submissions.

SECTION 3: REQUIREMENTS DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION

3.1. OVERVIEW.

a. The fundamental goal of deliberative requirements development and validation is for a CM to derive and refine capability requirements and associated capability gaps – for which a capability solution must be provided either organically or leveraged through acquisition of additional resources – to accomplish assigned functions, roles, missions, and operations. This Section identifies and defines the elements of the requirements development, review and validation process.

b. Capability requirements must be traceable to the organization's roles and missions, and, to the greatest extent possible, be described as tasks, standards, and conditions. The requirements development process provides the baseline for capability requirements documentation, review, and validation across the Agency.

c. The requirements development process operates through the organizational structures defined in Section 5, with participation and advice from all other organizations that have equity in capability requirements review and validation. Validated and prioritized requirements, along with information about the materiel and non-materiel solutions in work or already fielded to satisfy validated capability requirements, provide the basis for the Agency's requirements-related responsibilities.

d. The CM confirms the need for improved business operations and represents the user community interests throughout the process. The problem or opportunity may be addressed via business system acquisition, business process reengineering, or related business changes.

e. The functional and acquisition communities share responsibility for requirements validation. Both communities are accountable for successful business capability delivery, from business process design through business system deployment and operations. The CAP BD confirms the need for improved business operations and represents the user community interests throughout the process. The problem or opportunity may be addressed via the business system acquisition, business process reengineering, or related business changes.

f. Requirements development and validation process outputs are used to facilitate business changes through DOTmLPF-P to drive performance improvements, efficiencies and effectiveness. The outputs also provide validated capability requirements to drive and inform the PPB&E processes as described in DCMA-INST 4503 and the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

3.2. REQUIREMENTS SOURCES AND TYPES.

a. Sources of Requirements. Requirements (capability gaps) can be identified at all levels of the Agency and, as such, may represent varying opportunities to increase value to the mission, decrease risk, improve compliance with regulations or statute, etc. The two predominant sources are:

(1) Strategically-identified requirements. These are requirements identified through Capability Gap Assessments (CGAs) conducted by Agency entities. (CGAs are described in paragraph 3.3.) These gaps can be identified through external and/or internal customer feedback, changes in legislation or regulation, performance measurements, risk assessments, or other mission drivers.

(2) Employee-generated suggestions.

(a) These are requirements identified by employees from throughout the Agency. They are based on real-life experiences, and, when given appropriate consideration, may indicate systemic issues that need to be addressed and resolved. As such, they will be carefully considered as part of the requirements review and validation process.

(b) To formally submit an idea or beneficial suggestion for consideration as a potential new Agency-wide policy, tools or training (capability) requirement, employees will submit their recommendations to their local chain of command. Once vetted locally, endorsed recommendations will be submitted into the intake system, which serves as DCMA's central repository and database for coordinating, completing, knowledge sharing, and archiving all endorsed employee improvement suggestions and proposals. See the Resource Page for the Intake Endorsement Form required with submissions.

(c) Recognizing beneficial suggestion contributors is essential for encouraging an improvement-oriented culture in the Agency. Agency entities that benefit from implementing beneficial suggestions submitted into the intake system will use the Agency's established recognition and reward program to inspire new ideas, encourage innovation and engagement among the workforce, and to demonstrate leadership commitment towards improving Agency stewardship. Awards will be managed IAW the DCMA-INST 4201 series.

b. Requirement Types.

(1) Enduring Capability Requirement. This type of requirement forms the baseline of the year-to-year mission. These requirements are so universal that they tend to be overlooked in the requirements (capability gap) identification process; however, they will not be approved for future resources without periodic review and revalidation. Given advances in technology and changes in the mission, some long-standing requirements may be judged to need fewer resources, be accomplished in an entirely more efficient manner, and/or may require different solutions when the requirement is reviewed through the lenses of DOTmLPPF-P.

(2) New Capability Requirement (New Business Need). This type of requirement may be the result of an operational shortcoming, a perceived future need, changes in legislation, or an operational concept proposed by a particular community within the capability. All will be presented in solution-agnostic terms to the maximum extent possible.

(3) Urgent Operational Need. The basic definition of a Urgent Operational Need (UON), and the process for decision-making regarding them, is outlined in paragraph 6.10. For more detailed guidance and thresholds, refer to the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

3.3. CAPABILITY GAP ASSESSMENTS.

a. Prior to entering the Agency process for new or updated capability requirements validation, Agency entities will conduct CGAs or other studies to assess capability requirements and associated capability gaps and risks and develop the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP).

(1) CGAs are informed by high-level strategy and guidance in documents such as, but not limited to, the National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy (NMS), Defense Planning Guidance (DPG), and the Agency Strategic Plan.

(2) CMs may pursue a variety of approaches to determine their organizational capability requirements, depending upon the timeliness of the assessment and the scope of the activities being reviewed.

(a) Use lessons learned, customer surveys, corrective action plans, audits, and other studies to identify capability requirements and associated capability gaps.

(b) Identify and build upon any previous CGAs, studies, and other analytical products applicable to the area of interest. Avoid any unnecessary repetition of prior efforts, and provide continuity between analyses for reviewers and decision makers. This does not preclude the CM from applying different context or different assumptions, as appropriate, for the approach being pursued.

(c) Compare each identified capability requirement (gap) to current and programmed future capability solutions, if any, to determine level of risk and whether it warrants further solution development to mitigate or eliminate the issue. Gaps that pose an unacceptable risk need to be developed and refined in preparation for formal assessment and possible resourcing strategy.

(d) Identify and submit what are considered high value requirements even if there are no known solutions, as these may be considered good candidates for possible Lean Six Sigma or Business Process Reengineering efforts, as defined in DCMA Manual (DCMA-MAN) 4502-05, "Continuous Process Improvement."

(3) For urgent or emergent operational needs, the assessment scope may be reduced to an appropriate level to determine the capability requirements in a timely manner. See paragraph 6.10.

b. Results of CGAs and other studies, as well as operational gaps assessments and other documents intended to justify generating capability requirement intake submissions, will be provided to the CG CAP BD for reference purposes.

3.4. CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT DEVELOPMENT AND REFINEMENT.

a. Precedence of recommended approaches. When conducting analyses and drafting capability requirement documents, CMs will consider both non-materiel and materiel solutions,

and to the maximum extent possible, recommend approaches in the preferred order listed in this paragraph, starting with non-material approaches. If applicable, CMs will explain in the document summary why less preferred approaches were recommended.

- (1) Implementing DOTmLPF-P changes which do not require development and procurement of a new materiel capability solution.
- (2) Procuring or modifying commercially-available products, services, and technologies, from domestic or international sources, or the development of dual-use technologies.
- (3) The additional production or modification of previously developed U.S. and/or allied/partner-nation/other U.S. government agency/department systems or equipment.
- (4) Developing a new, joint, DoD Component or other U.S. government agency/department program.
- (5) Developing a new Agency-unique program.

b. Solution Agnostic Proposals. The requirements development and refinement process must not presuppose a specific capability solution or end item, but provide data related to a potential form, fit, and function-based solution. The final recommendations will include a focused and concise justification for the proposed action.

c. Elements of DOTmLPF-P Analysis. IAW the DoDI 5000 series, in order to ensure that a full array of solutions are considered, and that less costly and complicated solutions are favored over others, all requirements require a DOTmLPF-P analysis. This analysis is included in the standard Business Case (BC) template for capability requirements (see paragraph 3.5.). The basic elements of DOTmLPF-P analysis are outlined here:

(1) Doctrine. The DOTmLPF-P doctrine impact is derived by examining the existing doctrine to see if there is a better way to solve a capability gap.

(a) Key questions include: Is there existing doctrine that addresses or relates to the business need? Are there operating procedures in place that are NOT being followed which contribute to the identified need?

(b) Recommendations for revising, amending or realigning doctrine will be coordinated through the authority responsible for the doctrine. Proposed changes to agency-level doctrine are in the CG CAP BD's purview.

(2) Organization. The DOTmLPF-P organization impact is derived by examining how the agency organizes to complete the organizational mission. It looks to see if there is a better organizational structure or capability that can be developed to solve a capability gap.

(a) Key questions include: What organizations is the problem occurring in? Is the organization properly staffed and funded to deal with the issue?

(b) Recommendations for revising, amending or realigning organizational structures will be coordinated through the authority responsible for the organizational structure, IAW DCMA-MAN 4501-03, “Organization Structure, Mission and Functions Program,” and the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

(3) Training. The DOTmLPPF-P training impact is derived by assessing how the organization prepares their personnel, to see if improvement can be made to offset capability gaps.

(a) Key questions include: Is the issue caused, at least in part, by a complete lack of or inadequate training? Does training exist which addresses the issue?

(b) Recommendations for revising, amending or creating training solutions will be coordinated through the authority responsible for the training program, IAW the DCMA-INST 4201 series.

(4) Materiel. The DOTmLPPF-P materiel impact is derived by assessing all necessary equipment and systems that are needed by the organization to operate effectively to determine if new equipment or systems are needed to fill a capability gap.

(a) Key questions include: Is the issue caused by inadequate systems or equipment?

(b) Recommendations for revising, amending or creating materiel solutions will be developed IAW in the DCMA-INST 4401 series.

(5) Leadership and Education. The DOTmLPPF-P leadership and education impact is derived by analyzing how the organization prepares their leaders to complete the mission.

(a) Key questions are: Does leadership understand the problem scope? Does leadership have resources at its disposal to correct the issue?

(b) Recommendations for addressing leadership issues will be coordinated through local leadership. Proposed strategies to improve Agency-level leadership are in the CG CAP BD’s purview.

(6) Personnel. The DOTmLPPF-P personnel impact is derived by assessing the availability of qualified people to support a capability gap by restructuring.

(a) Key questions include: Is the issue caused by an inability or decreased ability to place qualified and trained personnel in the correct occupational specialties? Are the right personnel in the right positions (skillset match)?

(b) Recommendations for restructuring the workforce will be coordinated through the authority responsible for the workforce structure, IAW the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

(7) Facilities. The DOTmLPP-P facilities impact is derived by assessing military property, installations, and industrial facilities that support the organization to determine if they can be used to satisfy a capability gap.

(a) Key questions include: Is there a lack of operations and maintenance? Is the problem caused, at least in part, by inadequate infrastructure?

(b) Recommendations for changes to agency-occupied facilities will be endorsed by CMO and Region leadership and coordinated through the DCMA authority responsible for the facility, IAW the DCMA-INST 4101, “Facilities Management” series.

(8) Policy. The DOTmLPP-P policy impact is derived by assessing DoD, interagency, or international policy issues that may prevent effective implementation of changes in the other seven DOTMLPP-P categories.

(a) Key questions include: Is there inadequate policy or a lack of policy?

(b) Recommendations for changes to Agency policies and procedures will be coordinated through the CAP BD responsible for the policies and procedures.

3.5. CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT DOCUMENTATION.

a. Overview. Identifying capability requirements typically leads to the formal documentation and review process. Based on an assessment of the proposed requirement, the CAP BD must determine the analytic rigor needed. It will be based on the mission complexity and the consequences of failure. In all cases, the level of documentation required will be appropriate to the level of investment and risk anticipated, and be clear enough to explain and justify the decisions made on the proposal to someone previously unfamiliar with the issue at hand.

b. The Intake System.

(1) The intake system is the authoritative system for processing, coordinating, and archiving unclassified capability requirement documents, validation memorandums, and related action items. Consistently using this system will ensure reliable handling, processing, transparency, cross-functional review and management of all proposed and validated requirements.

(2) For the purposes of this Manual, the person who inputs a requirement into the intake system is called the “submitter.”

(3) The Intake Endorsement Form (see Resource Page), which demonstrates chain of command endorsement, will accompany requirements entered into the intake system.

(4) The intake system functions as the central suggestion program collection point for all enterprise-wide policy, tools and training suggestions identified by employees, once vetted and endorsed by the employee's chain of command (see paragraph 3.5.b.(2)).

(5) A link to the intake system, as well as the user guide, may be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.

c. Capability Requirement Documentation. There are four basic types of capability requirement documents that are required, as a minimum, for intake and requirements validation. Each document aligns with the level of detail known at the current phase of requirement research and solution development. The identified place to collect and manage these documents is the intake system. The types of capability requirement documents required by the formal governance process are:

(1) Initial Problem Statement. An Initial Problem Statement (IPS) specifies one or more capability requirements and associated capability gaps which represent unacceptable operational risk if left unmitigated. The intake system provides the template for the IPS. A link to the intake system may be found on the Resource Page of this Manual. The IPS is developed and input by the requirement submitter.

(2) Business Case. The BC provides the minimum requirements for decision-makers to make sound investment decisions as well as subsequent planning, resourcing, and acquisition decisions. A BC provides the rationale for investing in a requirement by describing a problem that needs to be solved and capturing the impact that solving the problem will have on the Agency's mission effectiveness. It demonstrates traceability between strategic guidance, operational mission, and concept of operations (CONOPS). The tailored BC is updated continuously throughout the lifecycle as program management plans and approaches evolve and react to changes in the business and mission environment. A link to the required template that conforms to CG CAP BD minimum requirements is provided on the Resource Page of this Manual. The BC is directed by the CAP BD leadership and is typically developed by CAP BD-designated subject matter experts (SMEs), and/or the requirement submitter, as appropriate.

(a) BC (Sections 1 - 4). This portion of the complete BC template outlines in moderate detail the capability gap(s), the articulated requirement, the rough order of magnitude, the risk if the gap is not addressed, and an analysis of alternatives. The BC (Sections 1 - 4) is required whether or not the envisioned solution will align partially or wholly with a non-materiel solution, a materiel solution, or some combination of the two. Ideally, developing the BC (Sections 1 - 4) will result in identifying recommended changes to one or more of the eight DOTmLPPF-P areas. The BC is tailorable; a link to the required template is provided on the Resource Page of this Manual.

(b) BC (Section 5). If a materiel solution (either in whole or in part) is anticipated to satisfy the identified capability requirement (gap), then a Section 5 of the BC must also be developed pursuant to DoDI 5000.75. A link to the DCMA BC (Section 5) template that conforms to DoDI 5000.75 minimum requirements is provided on the Resource Page of this Manual.

(3) DROC Presentation Package. This standard set of presentation slides (prepared jointly by the CAP BD and key proponent) serves as an executive summary for the decision-makers, and captures the final senior-level deliberation results. A link to the Decision Brief Template and Decision Summary Chart that conform to DROC/SLT minimum requirements is provided on the Resource Page of this Manual. The DROC Presentation Package is typically developed by CAP BD-designated SMEs, and may also include the requirement submitter's input, as appropriate.

(4) Integrated Priority List Scoresheet. The standard set of Integrated Priority List (IPL) presentation slides captures CAP BD, Mission-Level (M-Level) and DROC deliberation results. A link to the IPL Scoresheet Template that conforms to DROC/SLT minimum requirements is provided on the Resource Page of this Manual.

(a) As the name implies, the IPL is the Agency's single, integrated and capability gaps list, prioritized in order of risk and value to the Agency towards meeting our assigned roles, missions and functions. It is the output of a methodology employed to rank order all capability gaps associated with validated or proposed capability requirements.

(b) The IPL is developed annually and applied to budgetary decisions for routine mission, as well as to decisions surrounding emerging Agency requirements. The IPL includes, but is not limited to, high priority capability needs prioritized across operational and functional lines, risk areas, and long-term strategic planning issues. The IPL articulates the consolidated Agency recommendations for programming funds in the PPB&E process.

(c) The IPL is used to appropriately align limited resources to ensure that the Agency's highest needs, highest risk areas, and strategic goals are met. It defines shortfalls in key programs that may adversely affect the mission.

(d) The IPL is a tailorable scoring system output, which assigns higher values to highest needs and highest risk areas. Although tailorable, the same scoring system is used consistently across all requirements, to ensure that the most critical Agency needs are met in a consistent, objective, and strategically-aligned manner.

(e) The IPL methodology is to be reviewed and validated annually by the CG CAP BD, and updated as Agency assigned roles, missions, functions, and strategic goals are updated to meeting changing defense postures. A link to the IPL methodology and IPL Scoresheet Template can be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.

(5) Additional documentation.

(a) At its own discretion and based on the proposal's complexity, the reviewing CAP BD or other reviewing authority may require additional documentation be developed by the key proponent for the requirement (as described in paragraph 6.4.g.(1)) and/or SMEs, as appropriate.

(b) Once a requirement is validated and approved for implementation by the Agency, project and program specific documentation will be developed IAW the applicable DoDI 5000 acquisition series.

3.6. DOCUMENT STAFFING. The staffing process is described in Section 6, The Corporate Decision-Making Process.

3.7. VALIDATION. The capability, functional, acquisition and technical communities share responsibility for capability requirements validation. These communities are accountable for successful business capability delivery, from business process design through business system deployment and operation.

a. Agency entities will exercise independent validation authority EXCEPT under these circumstances and conditions:

(1) The Agency Director and SLT reserve validation authority for capability requirements and DOTmLPPF-P change recommendations formally designated as an “SLT Item of Interest.”

(2) The Agency Director and SLT reserve validation authority for capability requirements and DOTmLPPF-P change recommendations over the thresholds and other authorities, IAW the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

b. When Agency entities are granted independent validation authority for requirements, they may tailor their review process to validate their specific capability requirements.

c. Validated capability requirement documents are archived in the intake system.

SECTION 4: CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

4.1. OVERVIEW. The most critical aspect of the requirements review process is to allow the senior leadership to manage and prioritize capability requirements.

a. Senior leaders will optimize capability investments and minimize risk IAW DoD Directive (DoDD) 7045.20, “Capability Portfolio Management.”

b. The existing BCF structure will serve as the Agency’s common framework and lexicon for capability portfolio organization. A link to the BCF organization chart and additional information can be accessed on the Resource Page of this Manual.

c. Capability requirement portfolios will be managed by the CM and Capability Team Leads. A link to the current list of CMs and Team Leads can be accessed on the Resource Page of this Manual.

4.2. THE CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT PORTFOLIO. Capability requirement portfolios include capability requirements that are both endorsed by the CAP BD and validated by the appropriate validation authority. They are grouped into one of three categories as follows:

a. Under Development. Validated capability requirements being addressed (resourced) by an acquisition program or DOTmLPF-P change implementation.

b. Programmed. Validated capability requirements not (yet) being addressed (resourced) by an acquisition program or DOTmLPF-P change implementation, but are aligned with programmed future initiatives identified in the Program Objective Memorandum (POM).

c. Unprogrammed. Validated capability requirements not (yet) being addressed (resourced) by an acquisition program or DOTmLPF-P change implementation, and are not currently identified for funding.

4.3. MANAGING THE CAPABILITY REQUIREMENT PORTFOLIO.

a. CM Oversight.

(1) CMs serve as the senior Agency proponent charged with integrating, synchronizing, and coordinating portfolio content for their CAP BD, to ensure alignment to strategic priorities and capability demand.

(2) Fundamentally, CMs must be advocates for changes to the capability requirement portfolio which are in the Agency’s best interest, and not exclusively advocate for every capability requirement proposed by their CAP BD.

(3) CMs provide cross-Component alternatives and recommendations on current and future capability needs, investments, and prioritization; however, must not infringe on any

existing statutory or regulatory authorities, and must work within established coordination processes. That being said, to be most effective, they must have access to pertinent information and processes required to appropriately advise the M-Level Committees, DROC, and SLT. To this end, CMs are afforded open access to these and other established Agency forums to raise portfolio-related issues.

(4) CMs must ensure that Enterprise Architecture (EA) products are updated to reflect how new or modified capability requirements, and associated solutions, impact their capability requirement portfolios without introducing unnecessary redundancy in capability or capacity.

b. Capability Portfolio Activities. To facilitate capability requirement portfolio management, a number of periodic and event-driven activities may be applicable to each capability requirement portfolio. The CM will publish the status of these activities in a central DCMA repository.

(1) Capability Portfolio Strategic Plan. CMs will establish and maintain a Capability Portfolio Strategic Plan to support the Agency Strategic Plan. The Capability Portfolio Strategic Plan specifically addresses how the CAP BD can strategically support Agency goals. Together, the Agency and Capability Portfolio Strategic Plans articulate the specific capability performance goals, define a high level direction to meet the goal, identify related capability areas and synchronization, as well as indicate recommended prioritization.

(2) Capability Gap Assessment. The CGA is an annual assessment, conducted by all CAP BDs (as assisted by the CG CAP BD), which examines strategically-aligned priorities, along with other issues and perspectives from our external customers and higher headquarters. CGAs are further discussed in paragraph 3.3.

(3) Other Capability Requirement Portfolio Assessments. CMs also have responsibility for monitoring ongoing activities impacting their capability requirement portfolios.

(4) Program and Budget Review (PBR). Validated capability requirements are the driver for a large portion of the Agency POM, including both new fielded capability solutions and enduring requirements.

(a) Validated capability requirements will inform budgetary decisions.

(b) CMs will submit their proposed upcoming POM cycle requirements (gaps) into the intake system by 1 August each year. If submitted timely, CMs can reasonably expect to have their requirements considered for validation, prioritization and incorporation into the proposed upcoming POM cycle. (For example, a proposed requirement submitted into the intake system by August 2019 can reasonably be expected to be reviewed and considered for inclusion into the FY22 – 26 POM cycle.)

(c) Previously unidentified requirements that arise after the August timeframe will be entered into Intake immediately upon discovery, for review and validation as appropriate.

(5) Implementation Progress Monitoring. Funded DOTmLPF-P change recommendations are the means to implement non-materiel capability solutions – either independently or in conjunction with materiel capability solutions – therefore, the CAP BD must monitor implementation progress and associated impact to their capability requirement portfolio.

(a) In cases where there are changes, the CAP BD must assess operational risk, impact on EA and related capability solutions.

(b) CMs are responsible for coordinating assigned tasks with the key proponent for the requirement (as described in paragraph 6.4.g.(1)) and for providing periodic updates on implementation progress to senior leaders as requested.

(c) CMs will provide periodic progress reports to the CG CAP BD. Refer to the Resource Page of this Manual for a link to the template(s) and reporting schedule.

c. DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation Implementation.

(1) Implementation plan refinement. The sponsoring CAP BD and the key proponent for the requirement (as described in paragraph 6.4.g.(1)), are responsible for:

(a) Refining implementation plan(s) and assigning associated point of contacts to address the tasks identified in the validated DOTmLPF-P change recommendation.

(b) Ensuring that each task is completed IAW the timeline, and providing status of, and visibility into, the process to senior leaders.

(c) Making recommendations to the validation authority for modifications to timelines, as needed, based upon task synchronization.

(2) Documenting DOTmLPF-P change recommendation completion. Upon completion, the lead CM will document completion in a memorandum to be posted with the original requirement and validation memorandum in the intake system.

(3) Additional Information. Refer to the DCMA-INST 4401 series for additional specific guidance on materiel solution implementation and completion.

SECTION 5: THE SENIOR GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

5.1. OVERVIEW. This section describes the senior-most decision-making bodies in the Agency.

a. The DCMA senior governance structure is the official Agency venue for requirements review, initiatives, processes, programs, and policies that have Agency-wide impact. The senior governance structure provides a tiered mechanism for intra-agency performance review and integrating Agency-level policies, programs and initiatives. The senior governance structure facilitates coordination, advocacy, issue resolution, and priorities balancing among organizations, and provides proactive review and integration into the Agency Strategic Plan.

b. Agency activities management and oversight must be conducted in a transparent and collaborative manner to promote unified effort; provide effective support to the Agency entities.

5.2 FUNCTIONAL COMPONENTS. IAW DCMA-MAN 4501-03, the Agency Headquarters is comprised of several essential, Functional Components that are generally aligned by discipline (i.e., separate directorates for contracting, technical, human capital management, or financial business operations). Understanding the Functional Components' roles and purpose is essential to appreciating their role in the overall decision-making process. Functional Components will conduct function-specific needs assessments and generate requirements for submission to the appropriate CAP BD for consideration.

5.3. OPERATIONAL UNITS. Is articulated in DCMA-MAN 4501-03.

5.4. BUSINESS CAPABILITY FRAMEWORK. The BCF overlays the functional alignment of the Agency's core structure, and ensures cross-functional, integrated, and collaborative decision-making. The BCF is a set of high-level management functions that underpin the Agency's strategic plan and capture the results of the daily, multi-functional activities of our personnel, in order to provide actionable insight to the Defense Acquisition Enterprise.

a. CAP BD Purpose and Focus. The BCF harnesses a broad spectrum of disciplines, and integrates them into a framework of eleven cross-functional CAP BDs that provide the major services required by our customers, both internal and external. Each CAP BD is responsible for policy (Instructions and Manuals), tools and training for their specific portion of the DCMA mission. Although each CAP BD has a specific mission capability as its focus and concern, it is comprised of technical experts and representatives from each of the other ten CAP BDS, in order to foster cross-functional collaboration and transparency. A link to the BCF diagram may be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.

(1) Primary Capabilities: The Primary CAP BDs are all focused on the essential Agency core mission of administering contracts for the DoD and authorized customers.

(a) Contract Maintenance. This CAP BD focuses on internal day-to-day efforts to maintain the contract management database and contract files, utilizing the Agency systems of record, so that contracts close appropriately. Activities include: Contract receipt and review,

deficiency reporting, novation actions, modifications, terminations, plant clearance, cancelling funds, and contract close out.

(b) Contractor Effectiveness. This CAP BD assesses the contractor's ability to maintain effective and reliable control over internal operations and subcontractor performance. Activities include: Business system evaluations, quality management system audits, and process reviews.

(c) Indirect Cost Control. This CAP BD focuses on efforts to ensure that a contractor's proposed or claimed costs used to negotiate contract pricing or to settle final contract costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable. Activities include: Negotiating forward pricing rate agreements and final indirect cost rates, ensuring compliance with Cost Accounting Standards, obtaining technical support to indirect cost analysis, settling disallowed costs, and other associated activities.

(d) Product Acceptance and Proper Payment. This CAP BD ensures that products and services received meet the terms of the contract and that payments made are correct. Activities include: Material Review Board (MRB) actions, schedule monitoring, product exams, packaging, payment processing, demands, and consideration determinations.

(e) Negotiation Intelligence. This CAP BD provides information to buyers so they can manage risk and reduce future acquisitions costs. Activities include: Technical support to negotiations, pre-award surveys, proposal analysis, commercial item determinations, and "should cost" reports.

(2) Integrating Capability: This CAP BD focuses on taking the information gleaned from the Primary Capabilities and repackaging it to support other external stakeholder needs. It is considered a CAP BD, in and of itself. However, due to the variety of external customer needs for integrated information, this CAP BD is comprised of four Working Groups (WGs) that address discrete customer support missions:

(a) Program Support. This WG works with, and on behalf of, the program office to ensure success of a given program. Tasks include: OSD/Service Assessments, program assessment reports, and customer engagements.

(b) Corporate Assessment. This WG examines the health and viability of the top Defense Contractors. Tasks include: Corporate management council interactions, process analysis, workforce analysis, financial analysis, investment decision analysis, and management analysis.

(c) Agency Mission Assurance. This WG ensures that essential Agency work will continue in all circumstances. Tasks include: Critical asset analysis, hazard impact and surge analysis and mission essential function identification.

(d) Defense Industrial Base (DIB) Mission Assurance. This WG assesses the ability of the DIB to meet the nation's defense needs in all circumstances. Tasks include: Critical asset

analysis of the DIB, hazard impact and surge analysis, economic viability assessments, and supply chain network analysis.

(3) Enabling Capabilities: The DCMA enabling capabilities are essential to run the Agency's business. Enabling Capabilities may serve as solution-providers to meet the requirements.

(a) Stewardship. This CAP BD ensures the proper and efficient use of Agency resources. Activities include: Budget formulation and execution, Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) program efforts, Managers' Internal Control Program (MICP) mission reviews, and manpower management.

(b) Talent Management. This CAP BD provides the oversight and guidance for recruiting, employing, training, and supporting employees until retirement or departure. Activities include: Employee data, training programs, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity, union interactions, health and wellness programs, personnel safety, performance, and awards.

(c) Facilities Management. Provides the brick and mortar solutions to house personnel through various means.

(d) Information Technology Management. This CAP BD provides and maintains the equipment and services to meet our business needs. Activities include: Hardware requirements, maintenance, and management; software requirements and management; cybersecurity; software development; and business solution implementation.

(e) Corporate Governance. The CG CAP BD aligns program requirements to the Agency's long-range strategic plan. Activities include: CG structure management, POM submissions, program change requests, strategic plan development and monitoring, organizational performance assessments, Agency administrative processes, BCF oversight and intake system management.

b. Administration. Each CAP BD is chaired by an Agency senior leader. The chair is referred to as the CM. Each primary has a designated Deputy from one of the three Regions and the Special Programs and International Commands. The CM is assisted in day-to-day operation of the CAP BDs duties by two or more Team Leads and Program Analysis, as they may duly designate. The template for appointment letters is located on the Resource Page of this Manual.

c. Battle Rhythm. Each CAP BD will meet at least quarterly, and must have multi-functional membership, encompassing representatives from all other CAP BDs, Operational Unit representation, as well as an ad hoc representative from General Counsel, as appropriate. This requirement ensures transparency and synchronization and will result in better recommendations for decision-making. Members of the CAP BDs will represent their Functional Component's interests, are expected to express their views openly in an environment of non-attribution, and are responsible for keeping their Functional Component informed of CAP BD activities.

d. Charter. Each CAP BD has a charter, signed by the Director and managed by the CG CAP BD, that delineates the board's membership, goals and responsibilities. See paragraph 2.5.e. of this Manual.

e. Documentation. To encourage transparency and collaboration, each CAP BD is responsible for developing and maintaining their membership roster, battle rhythm, and other operational documents on the CAP BD resource site hosted within the Agency system of record for collaboration.

f. Additional Duties. Each CAP BD is responsible for its own capability strategic planning, performance measurement, gap analysis, requirements generation, capability portfolio management (see Section 4), documentation review, validated requirement endorsement to higher-level elements, conducting studies, modeling and simulations (as appropriate), and other tasks as assigned or deemed necessary to meet the mission. Meetings and endorsement decisions will be documented and posted for transparency, as appropriate.

5.5. ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE REVIEW. The Enterprise Architecture Review (EAR) is an enterprise review body that will analyze and evaluate business processes, automated capabilities, and policy changes to DCMA's existing and proposed operational and business environment to ensure alignment to the DoD and DCMA strategic goals and mission statement. The EAR directly assists Agency entities by reviewing proposed capability requirements and advising on solutions within and across the EA. The EAR facilitates change initiatives through the managing and using an authoritative collection of business, data and technology catalogs and analytical/ advisory services. The EAR plays a vital role in managing risk and fostering transparency through reviews of and support for DCMA change and acquisition initiatives. By so doing, the EAR reinforces BCF cross-functional integration and identifies potential trade-offs between CAP BDs.

a. Administration. The EAR is chaired by the DCMA Chief Enterprise Architect. The chair is assisted in day-to-day operation of the committee duties by two or more Team Leads and scribes, as they may duly designate.

b. Battle Rhythm. The EAR will meet at least quarterly, and must have multi-functional membership, encompassing representatives from all Agency entities, as well as an ad hoc representative from General Counsel, as appropriate. This requirement ensures transparency and synchronization, and will result in better recommendations for decision-making. EAR members will represent their organizational entity's interests, are expected to express their views openly in an environment of non-attribution, and are responsible for keeping their organizational entity informed of EAR activities.

c. Charter. The EAR charter, signed by the Director and managed by the CG CAP BD, delineates the membership, goals and responsibilities. See paragraph 2.5.e. of this Manual.

d. Documentation. To support the CG decision-making process, the EAR is responsible to review capability requirements from the CAP BDs, conduct applicable impacts analysis and provide recommendations to CAP BDs, M-Level Committees, the DROC, SLT, and Agency

Director on solution sets. The EAR actively monitors the Agency Intake system for situational awareness in order to provide assistance to CAP BDs as they assess the merits of various Intake items. EAR meetings and decisions will be documented and posted for transparency, as appropriate.

5.6. MISSION-LEVEL COMMITTEES. The M-Level Committees are a set of high-level teams chartered to ensure that all requirements developed and endorsed by the CAP BDs reflect Agency strategic and near-term needs. M-Level Committees provide recommendations to the DROC, SLT, and Agency Director on proposed requirements.

a. Purpose and Focus.

(1) Mission Operations Committee. The Mission Operations (MO) Committee is comprised of the major Operational Units (East, West, Central, International, Special Programs, Cost and Pricing, and Business Operations). Their role is to assess CAP BD-endorsed requirements through the unique perspective of the operational user in the field.

(2) Mission Function Committee. The Mission Function (MF) Committee is comprised of the Functional Components (Contracts, Technical, Portfolio Management and Aircraft Operations Directorates). The membership, together and separately, will assess CAP BD-endorsed requirements through the unique perspective of their functional disciplines. Their viewpoint will focus on the needs and requirements of the functional workforce and discipline they represent.

(3) Mission Enabling Committee. The Mission Enabling (ME) Committee is comprised of the supporting Components of DCMA Headquarters (Human Capital, Finance and Business, Information Technology, and Corporate Operations Directorates). The membership, together and separately, will assess CAP BD-endorsed requirements through the unique perspective of their supporting expertise. Their viewpoint will focus on their ability to support and enable the requirements presented by the CAP BDs.

b. Administration. Each M-Level Committee is chaired by a designated senior leader (not a member of the SLT), who is elected from the committee membership, endorsed by the Director, and serves for a 1-year term. The M-Level Manager (MM) is assisted in day-to-day operation of the committee duties by two or more Team Leads and/or scribes, as they may duly designate. The template for appointment letters is located on the Resource Page of this Manual.

c. Battle Rhythm. Each M-Level Committee will meet at least quarterly, and focus on its own role, as described in paragraphs 5.6. and 6.5. This ensures unique functional perspective and assessment is taken into account, and will result in better recommendations for decision-making. M-Level Committee members will represent the interests of their Functional Component or Operational Unit (as applicable), are expected to express their views openly in an environment of non-attribution, and are responsible for keeping their Functional Component or Operational Unit informed of M-Level Committee activities.

d. Charter. Each M-Level Committee charter, signed by the Director and managed by the CG CAP BD, delineates the committee's membership, goals and responsibilities. See paragraph 2.5.e. of this Manual.

e. Documentation. To support the CG decision-making process, each M-Level Committee is responsible for documentation review and endorsement of validated requirements to higher-level elements as assigned or deemed necessary to meet the mission. Meetings and endorsement decisions will be documented and posted for transparency, as appropriate.

5.7. DCMA REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT COUNCIL. The DROC is the forum for senior-level, enterprise-wide coordination and deliberation on both external and internal Agency issues impacting strategic planning, programming, policy, and program development. It oversees all integrated capabilities process activities.

a. Administration. The DROC is chaired by the Corporate Operations Director. The chair is assisted in day-to-day operation of the committee duties by two or more Team Leads and scribes, as they may duly designate. The template for appointment letters is located on the Resource Page of this Manual.

b. Battle Rhythm. The DROC will meet at least quarterly. DROC membership consists of the principals of the M-Level Committees. See paragraph 5.6. Members will represent the interests of their Functional Component or Operational Unit, are expected to express their views openly in an environment of non-attribution, and are responsible for keeping their Functional Component or Operational Unit informed of DROC activities.

c. Charter. The DROC charter, signed by the Director and managed by the CG CAP BD, delineates the membership, goals and responsibilities. See paragraph 2.5.e. of this Manual.

d. Documentation. To support the CG decision-making process, the DROC is responsible for receipt and review of capability requirements from the M-Level Committees, and for forwarding said requirements to the SLT. Meetings and decisions will be documented and posted for transparency.

5.8. SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM. The SLT is the highest forum for collaborative deliberation on Agency-level issues, including Agency budget and finance decisions, strategic planning, resource allocation, policy and program development, performance management, setting prioritization within and across capabilities and final adjudication of any other Agency-level issues. The SLT assists the Director by providing capability requirements validation and recommending prioritization within and across the capabilities requirement portfolios. By so doing, the SLT ensures BCF cross-functional integration and identifies potential trade-offs between CAP BDs. This authority in no way usurps the authority of the Agency Director to override or change a decision made by the SLT.

a. Administration. The SLT is chaired by the Deputy Director. The chair is assisted in day-to-day operation of the committee duties by the Corporate Operations Director. A

Secretariat may be designated by the Corporate Operations Director. The template for appointment letters is located on the Resource Page of this Manual.

b. Battle Rhythm. The SLT will meet at least monthly. SLT membership includes all members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) assigned to the Agency.

c. Charter. The SLT charter, signed by the Director and managed by the CG CAP BD, delineates the membership, goals and responsibilities. See paragraph 2.5.e. of this Manual.

d. Documentation. To support the CG decision-making process, the SLT is responsible for review and validated requirements prioritization as submitted by the M-Level Committees and the DROC. Meetings and endorsement decisions will be documented and posted for transparency, as appropriate.

e. Additional Duties. The SLT serves as the Senior Assessment Team (SAT) for the Agency's Managers' Internal Control Program (MICP), consistent with the Agency's mission. The Managers' Internal Control Plan process is found in DCMA-MAN 4301-11-V1, "Management Controls: Managers' Internal Control Program."

SECTION 6: THE CORPORATE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

6.1. OVERVIEW. The most visible aspect of the corporate decision-making process is the review and validation of deliberate and urgent/emergent capability requirements, including staffing, review, and validation, enabling tradeoffs and prioritization within or between capability requirement portfolios. This section focuses on capability need identification, which begins with Intake. Once assigned to a Capability, the CM must establish a clear understanding of needed business capabilities to decide to invest time and resources into investigating business solutions.

a. Close collaboration between requirements setting and needs fulfillment communities is essential to ensure that knowledge gained early in the acquisition process is leveraged to set achievable risk-informed capability requirements, and make effective cost, performance, schedule, and quantity trade-offs.

(1) Validated capability requirements drive the early part of the DOTmLPF-P process, which then inform updates to related acquisition documents relevant to specific materiel capability solutions and those related to non-materiel capability solutions to be pursued.

(2) The subsequent validated capability requirement documents then drive the development, procurement, and fielding materiel and non-materiel solutions that satisfy the validated capability requirements and close or mitigate associated capability gaps.

b. For capability requirement documents validation, DCMA operates in an iterative manner as shown in the flowchart found on the Resource Page of this Manual and described in Section 6. The corporate decision-making process is also tailorable in many ways to facilitate timely capability solutions fielding to meet validated capability requirements. (See the process for validating UONs, paragraph 6.10.)

6.2. REQUIREMENT SUBMISSION ELEMENTS.

a. Oversight. Requirements submission process oversight and management will be maintained by the CG CAP BD.

b. Document Submission Guidance.

(1) In order to maintain visibility and receive direct responses from the intake system, submitters need to submit their own IPS. The CG CAP BD review team will not upload requirements into the system for any other entity.

(2) Agency entities, in their role as endorsers, are responsible for ensuring that the supporting requirement documents they submit to a CAP BD for staffing are IAW this Manual.

(3) Once a CAP BD endorses a requirement to a higher level authority, it then assumes responsibility for requirement package adequacy and content. (See paragraph 6.4.g.) The CAP BD is responsible for all subsequent required documentation, and while they may receive input

(and in cases, extensive assistance) from a solution provider (e.g. Information Technology, Human Capital, or Corporate Operations), the owning CAP BD is responsible for all capability documentation.

(4) Minimum required documents for capability requirement validation and approval are outlined in paragraph 3.5. They may be submitted at any step of the process; however, implementation will not take place without the appropriate level of documentation having been completed and uploaded into the intake system.

(5) All key decision documents and physical signature pages will be uploaded into the intake system in pdf format as attachments.

(6) IAW the guidance herein, as well as that in the DCMA-INST 4301 series, the submitter for a UON requirement will input the complete validated package to the intake system for visibility and archiving within three business days after validation, if not before.

c. Standard requirement review responses. These responses can be applied at any appropriate step in the requirements review process. Although most standard responses are outlined here, this is not an all-inclusive list:

(1) Item Returned for Additional Information. This response will be provided to the person (submitter) or organization (e.g., CAP BD) who last forwarded the requirement package as soon as possible but no later than 30 days of receipt within the intake system.

(2) Closed without Action. This indicates that the submitted requirement was resolved by providing information or status to the submitter about a solution that is already available or is in development. This status will not be used for deferrals or disapprovals.

(3) Reassigned. This indicates that the reviewing CAP BD has determined that they are not the office of primary responsibility for the subject matter of the assigned IPS, and the item is being reassigned to the CG CAP BD review team accordingly. This must be accomplished as early in the initial 30-calendar-day window as possible so that the newly assigned CAP BD for the requirement has ample time to adjudicate it. In cases where determining primary responsibility is difficult or disputed, the CG CAP BD review team will present the IPS for formal determination and assignment at the CG CAP BD's next regularly scheduled meeting.

(4) Deferred. This indicates that the requirement solution has been reviewed and appears to have merit, but is being deferred to a later time. Submitters will be provided with current information about the proposed way forward.

(5) Disapproved. This indicates that the requirement solution has been reviewed and does not appear to have merit. Submitters will be provided with a status update at this point in the process.

(6) Accepted for Business Case Development. This indicates that the requirement has been reviewed by the CAP BD and appears to have merit, but requires additional research,

analysis and documentation. The requirement may or may not require higher level authority to execute. Submitters will be provided with current information about the proposed way forward.

(7) Partially Approved. This response indicates that the reviewing entity has the authority to approve a portion of this requirement solution and that it is being addressed through actions taken as a result of the submission. The remainder of the solution set is considered to be closed without action unless otherwise noted.

(8) Approved. This response indicates that the reviewing entity has the authority to approve this requirement solution and that it is being addressed through actions taken as a result of the submission.

(9) Implemented. This requirement solution has been completed.

(10) Endorsed/Not Endorsed. This indicates that the requirement solution has had a BC developed, has been reviewed, and is being forwarded for consideration by a higher authority. The decision to “Endorse” indicates that the requirement has merit, and clearly, the decision to “Not Endorse” means the opposite.

6.3. REQUIREMENTS INTAKE PROCESS.

a. The intake system is the single point of entry for externally identified requirements review and validation process. This system serves as the transparent vehicle for the requirements process; related information will be captured in the notes and if applicable, associated documentation will be managed IAW DCMA-MAN 4501-04 “Records Management.”

b. Logging a clear and concise submission is the best first step in moving a proposed requirement and/or endorsed beneficial suggestion from thought to action. Submitters will thoroughly explain the problem, the envisioned end state and the anticipated intrinsic/extrinsic benefit(s) that will result.

c. Once an IPS is received in the intake system, it is assessed by the CG CAP BD review team and, within three business days, is assigned to the appropriate CAP BD for in-depth review and adjudication.

d. As outlined in paragraph 3.2, requirements submitted to the intake system can originate from various sources. Even if the submitter is a representative of the actual CAP BD to which the requirement would be assigned for formal review and adjudication, it is essential that the CAP BD upload their own requirement into the system. This act ensures consistent handling, processing, transparency, cross-functional review and management of all requirements.

e. Although the CG CAP BD review team typically assigns an IPS to the appropriate CAP BD, in cases where determining primary responsibility is difficult or disputed, the CG CAP BD review team will present the IPS for formal determination and assignment at the CG CAP BD’s next regularly scheduled meeting.

f. In some situations, the CAP BD review team may elect to adjudicate the submission with any of the following actions (as described in paragraph 6.2.c.):

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Closed without Action.

g. The submitter is to be provided with a status update at this step in the process.

6.4. CAP BD REVIEW PROCESS.

a. Overview. The CAP BDs provide the first level of corporate deliberation in the corporate decision-making process. Once a submitted requirement is received by the CAP BD, it must be reviewed and adjudicated in a thorough, but timely, manner.

b. Timely Response to Submitters. An initial response to the submitter is required within 30 calendar days of receipt. Unless the IPS can be reviewed and decided quite rapidly, the 30-day response is intended to be a status update only, indicating the CAP BD's intended path forward for review and adjudication.

c. CAP BD Review Authorities. Due to the vast array of capability requirements, endorsed beneficial suggestions, and other items submitted to the intake system, this Manual provides minimum review specifications only, and is not intended to dictate to the CAP BD how to fully review and adjudicate their assigned IPSs. The CAP BDs are hereby required to develop their own methodology for review and adjudication.

d. CAP BD Initial Review.

(1) Once an IPS is received, the CAP BD staff will immediately determine whether the requirement has been correctly assigned to their office for review, or if it will be reassigned. (Refer to the definition of "Reassigned" in paragraph 6.2.c.)

(2) If accepted at this step, the CAP BD will conduct a thorough review of the entire content of the IPS, and will contact the submitter, as a minimum, to verify intent and to obtain any additional information or clarification.

(3) Once the IPS is fully understood by the CAP BD staff, it may elect to adjudicate the submission with any of the following actions (as described in paragraph 6.2.c.), as they are within the CAP BD's authority to execute:

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Closed without Action.
- Reassigned.
- Deferred.
- Disapproved.
- Accepted for Business Case Development.
- Partially Approved.

- Approved.
- Implemented.

(4) An IPS cannot be “Endorsed/Not Endorsed” by the CAP BD at this step in the process. Endorsement indicates that a BC has been developed and the item is being elevated to the next higher authority.

(5) Accepted for BC Development. If the IPS is notionally deemed to have merit by the CAP BD, but the CAP BD cannot make a decision based on the contents of the IPS alone, then additional research is needed for a determination. At this point, the CAP BD assigns a team of SMEs and engages the EAR to further explore and articulate the requirement. At a minimum, this documentation will take the form of a BC (Sections 1 - 4), as described in paragraph 3.5. If endorsement to the DROC and SLT is envisioned, a DROC Presentation Package will also be prepared.

(a) Functional SME Review.

1. A team of SMEs will be provided by the appropriate Component Heads to fully support the research designated by the CAP BDs.

2. SMEs will engage and work together with the EAR to research the requirement, identify alternatives using DOTmLPF-P methodology, and document their findings and recommendations IAW this Manual.

(b) Enterprise Architecture Review.

1. The EAR and the SMEs are expected to jointly conduct an appropriate level of research into potential materiel solutions and present their findings IAW the guidance outlined in this Manual.

2. Working closely with the CMs, Team Leads and SMEs, the EAR leads the As-Is Problem Statement (PS) review and facilitates the formal Business Process Impact Analysis. The elements of this effort include:

a. Evaluating the requirement to ensure that the proposed capability aligns to DCMA goals and standards;

b. Assessing whether the requirement could be addressed with an existing policy, business process, automated capability, DoD shared service or DCMA service or platform capability;

c. Assisting CAP BD SMEs in conducting EA reviews to identify and recommend actions to eliminate gaps, duplications, or incompatibilities among business functions, programs, and or technologies;

d. Validating whether the proposed policy, business process, automated capability, translates to an improved efficiency;

e. Ensuring the proposed asset acquisition(s) aligns to Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) guidelines; and

f. Ensuring the CAP BD documents the findings and recommendations in the BC (Section 1- 4) and draft DROC Presentation Package.

(6) The submitter will be provided with a status update whenever a CAP BD action is taken.

e. CAP BD Secondary Review (Review of the BC (Sections 1 - 4)).

(1) Once a CAP BD completes the BC (Sections 1 - 4), it may elect to adjudicate the submission with any of the following actions (as described in paragraph 6.2.c.), as they are within the CAP BD's authority to execute:

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Closed without Action.
- Deferred.
- Disapproved.
- Partially Approved.
- Approved.
- Implemented.
- Endorsed.
- Not Endorsed.

(2) Non-Materiel Solutions. If the BC (Sections 1 - 4) and draft DROC Presentation Package have been assessed by the EAR, and are deemed to have merit and are fully supported by the CAP BD, but the proposed solution requires higher level authority to implement, the package is then formally endorsed, and it is uploaded and noted accordingly in the intake system for subsequent review by the M-Level Committees and DROC. See next steps as outlined in paragraph 6.5.

(3) Materiel Solutions. Once a requirement resulting in a materiel solution is DROC endorsed and SLT approved the following will occur.

(a) The designated Functional SME assisting the CAP BD will work with the relevant solution provider and SMEs to complete BC (Section 5). See related DoDI 5000 series for acquisition documentation requirements.

(b) The MDA and SLT will be updated via Project/Program Management Reviews, at a minimum, prior to each ATP decision point and MS.

(4) The submitter will be provided with a status update whenever a CAP BD action is taken.

f. CAP BD as Requirement Sponsor. Throughout the process, the CAP BD remains the formal sponsor and is responsible for the veracity and completeness of the requirement package going forward.

(1) If the key proponent for the requirement is an Agency entity, they will remain engaged in the process, working through the CAP BD to provide subject matter expertise and to ensure that their needs are met, as appropriate.

(2) A CAP BD representative and/or key proponent for the requirement (as described in paragraph 6.4.f.(1)) will be available to present the packages at the DROC and/or SLT forums upon request.

(3) As the Requirement Sponsor, the CAP BD is responsible for collecting all decision documents for the validated capability requirement and uploading them into the intake system. This includes those requirements validated by the CAP BD (within the threshold limits set forth in the DCMA-INST 4301 series) and/or SLT, as well as updates to previously validated capability requirement documents.

6.5. M-LEVEL COMMITTEE REVIEW PROCESS.

a. Overview. The M-Level Committees provide specific, functionally- and operationally-aligned review, in order to augment the corporate decision-making process. Once a submitted requirement is received by the three M-Level Committees, it must be reviewed and adjudicated in a thorough, but timely, manner.

b. M-Level Review Authorities. The M-Level Committee cannot “Approve,” “Close Without Action,” “Defer,” “Disapprove” any capability requirement package at this step in the process. The M-Level committees have only two actions that are within their authority to execute (as described in paragraph 6.2.c.):

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Endorsed/Not Endorsed.

c. M-Level IPL Scoring. Unless the requirement is returned for additional information, each M-Level Committee is required to separately review and generate an IPL score for the proposed requirement using the IPL methodology, then decide to either endorse or not endorse the requirement as it is forwarded to the DROC and SLT. A link to the IPL methodology and IPL Scoresheet Template can be found on the Resource Page of this Manual.

d. The IPL Score and Scoresheet.

(1) The IPL score and endorsement (or non-endorsement) from each of the three M-Level Committees are to be documented in the intake system and forwarded within the system to the DROC.

(2) Due to the differences in perspective, it is expected that not all M-Level Committees will adjudicate or IPL score the capability requirements identically. Whether or not an M-Level committee endorses the requirement, their IPL score and independent assessment are always forwarded to the DROC and SLT for consideration. These three committee assessments provide valuable insight during the next steps in the decision-making process.

6.6. DCMA REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT COUNCIL REVIEW PROCESS.

a. Overview. The DROC is a forum specifically designed to create and encourage collaboration and discussion among the functionally- and operationally-aligned M-Level Committee membership. Once a capabilities requirement package (including BC, IPL scores, and M-Level endorsements) is received by the DROC, it must be reviewed and adjudicated in a thorough, but timely, manner.

b. Timely Response to Submitters. A status update to the submitter is required within 30 calendar days of receipt. The 30-day response is intended to be a status update only, indicating the DROC's path forward for review and endorsement.

c. DROC Review Authorities. Due to the vast array of capability requirement packages submitted to the DROC, this Manual is not intended to dictate to the DROC how to review and adjudicate their assigned capability requirements. The DROC is hereby required to develop their own methodology for review and adjudication.

(1) Once an endorsed BC and the three M-Level IPL scores and endorsements (or non-endorsements) are received by the DROC, the requirement is to be reviewed and discussed by the joint session, prior to forwarding the requirement package to the SLT.

(2) The DROC may elect to adjudicate the submission with any of the following results (described in paragraph 6.2.c.), as they are within the DROC's authority to execute:

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Endorsed/Not Endorsed.

(3) This step in the process is designed to encourage collaboration and discussion among and between the functionally- and operationally-aligned perspectives of a given, CAP BD-endorsed requirement, in order to better inform the SLT. A capability requirement cannot be "Approved," "Closed Without Action," "Deferred," or "Disapproved" by the DROC at this step in the process.

(4) When the DROC collectively makes a final determination to endorse a requirement, it is officially designated as a "validated capability requirement" going forward. It is to be documented in the intake system as such, and forwarded within the system to the SLT.

(5) The submitter will be provided with a status update at this point in the process.

6.7. SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM REVIEW PROCESS.

a. Overview. The SLT is the senior-most forum for Agency decision-making. This step in the process is designed to encourage collaboration and discussion among and between the senior-most leaders, regarding every CAP BD-endorsed requirement. Once a capabilities requirement package (including BC, IPL scores, and M-Level and DROC endorsements) is received by the SLT, it must be reviewed and adjudicated in a thorough, but timely, manner.

b. Timely Response to Submitters. A status update to the submitter is required within 30 calendar days of receipt by the SLT. The 30-day response is intended to be a status update only, indicating the SLT's path forward for review and endorsement.

c. SLT Review Authorities. Due to the vast array of capability requirement packages submitted to the SLT, this Manual is not intended to dictate to the SLT how to review and adjudicate their assigned capability requirements. The SLT is hereby required to develop their own methodology for review and adjudication.

(1) Once a CAP BD-endorsed BC, the three M-Level IPL scores and endorsements (or non-endorsements) and DROC endorsement (or non-endorsement) are received by the SLT, the SLT may elect to adjudicate the submission with any of the following results (as described in paragraph 6.2.c.), as they are within the SLT's authority to execute:

- Item Returned for Additional Information.
- Closed without Action.
- Deferred.
- Disapproved.
- Partially Approved.
- Approved.
- Implemented.
- Endorsed.
- Not Endorsed.

(2) The SLT has authority to "Approve," "Disapprove" and "Implement" at this step in the process, as delegated by the Director.

(3) Requirement packages that do not receive SLT endorsement will be recorded in the intake system accordingly, and will not be forwarded to the Director for consideration.

(4) The submitter will be provided with a status update at this point in the process.

6.8. AGENCY DIRECTOR REVIEW.

a. The Director, DCMA, has final decision-making authority. Once a capabilities requirement package (including BC, IPL scores, and M-Level/DROC/SLT endorsements) is received by the Director, it will be reviewed and adjudicated in a thorough, but timely, manner.

b. The submitter will be provided with a status update at this point in the process.

6.9. IMPLEMENTATION.

a. As described in Section 4, approved requirement solution implementation and execution is part of the capability requirement portfolio process. No matter the level of approval authority obtained, the CAP BD must provide management and oversight for the approved requirement solution. This includes performance measurement tracking and oversight IAW DCMA-MAN 4503-03, "Executive Review, Assessment and Performance Evaluation."

b. Agency entities that benefit from implementing employee-generated suggestions as endorsed and submitted into the intake system will establish a recognition and reward program to inspire new ideas, encourage innovation and engagement among the workforce, and to demonstrate leadership commitment towards improving Agency stewardship. Awards will be managed IAW the DCMA-INST 4201 series.

6.10. URGENT OPERATIONAL NEED PROCESS.

a. Overview. When an identified operational need is both urgent and too costly or complex to address using available cost thresholds and approval authorities, it is designated as a UON. By their very nature, urgent requirements demand focused, dedicated attention to address effectively, and naturally pull labor and attention away from the routine, deliberative governance and decision-making processes. As such, while UON processing may appear to be more expedient and efficient, the decision management process is both riskier and highly laborious, and therefore, these events will be the exception, not the rule.

b. UON Examples. UONs may arise from any Agency entity. Although not an all-inclusive list, capability gaps that become UONs typically have one or more of the following attributes, if left unmet could:

- Result in loss of life.
- Lead to serious injury and/or seriously endanger employee health.
- Result in mission failure for a Buying Command or Program Office within 60 days.
- Result in mission failure for an Agency entity within 60 days.
- Result in significant loss of Agency investment in labor or dollars.

c. The UON Process. A UON will be processed as follows:

(1) First, the requirement is identified by the sponsoring Agency entity, as being both urgent and necessary, IAW the guidance in this Manual.

(2) Second, a valid solution is identified and documented. It is highly recommended that the UON proponent prepare a rudimentary BC and a DROC Presentation Package, IAW the guidance in Section 5 of this Manual, in order to capture basic information about alternative solutions considered and rejected, and provide necessary answers for subsequent reviewers, thereby streamlining the rapid review process.

(3) Third, the UON proponent endorses the package and uploads it into the intake system. By this endorsement, the UON proponent confirms that their own higher echelon entity within DCMA supports this claim for urgent handling. Source of funds or labor, if required, must be identified with this submission.

(4) The UON package will be reviewed for completeness by the CG CAP BD and forwarded as an out-of-cycle request to the SLT members for approval, bypassing the formal CAP BD, M-Level, and DROC reviews.

(5) The CG CAP BD will collect and forward the results of the SLT review to the UON proponent.

(6) The UON proponent will follow specific guidance found in the DCMA-INST 4301 series and prepare an Action Memorandum (attaching the consolidated SLT responses and other documents) for the Director's signature, as appropriate. If funds are involved, a copy will also be provided directly to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for expedited processing IAW the DCMA-INST 4301 series.

(7) Once approved, the CAP BD responsible for the requirement will oversee and monitor solution implementation, IAW Section 4 of this Manual.

d. Exceptions to the Strict Definition of UON. There are certain occasions when other unexpected funding issues—ones that do not strictly meet the UON definition—may need to be rapidly addressed and decided (e.g., whether or not to reprogram funds to meet higher-than-expected bid proposals on an approved project). While not strictly falling under the UON definition, these procedures may be used on a case-by-case basis, at the Deputy Director's discretion.

e. Restriction Against Using the UON Process for Materiel Solutions. Requirements for materiel development will not be handled using the UON process.

f. Restriction Against Using the UON Process for Out-Year Requirements. A UON will not be addressed using the rapid process in subsequent years. If the UON, once addressed, becomes an enduring requirement, it will be managed in future years IAW the deliberative decision-making processes outlined in this Manual. UONs will be the exception, not the rule.

g. Documentation and Tracking. If not accomplished beforehand, the CAP BD responsible for the requirement will upload all pertinent documents into the intake system within three business days of approval for tracking and transparency purposes.

6.11. RECORDKEEPING. As the Requirement Sponsor, the CAP BD is responsible for uploading all validated capability requirement documents into the intake system. This includes those validated by the CAP BD and/or SLT, as well as updates to previously validated capability requirement documents. Records of decisions will be maintained IAW DCMA-MAN 4501-04.

GLOSSARY

G.1. DEFINITIONS.

Agency entities. Agency entities are CAP BDs, Operational Units, Functional Components and other Agency elements that receive and review submitted requirements.

Capability Gap. The inability to meet or exceed a capability requirement, resulting in an associated operational risk until closed or mitigated. The gap may be the result of no fielded capability, lack of proficiency or sufficiency in a fielded capability solution, or the need to replace a fielded capability solution to prevent a future gap.

CGA. A deliberate assessment of the FYDP that reviews the Agency IPL and other issues and perspectives from the Services and other DoD components, relative to fielded materiel and non-materiel capability solutions, and development efforts, which may already be underway to address capability gaps.

Capability Requirements. A capability required to meet an organization's roles, functions, and missions in current or future operations. To the greatest extent possible, capability requirements are described in relation to tasks, standards. If a capability requirement is not satisfied by a capability solution, then there is also an associated capability gap. A requirement is considered to be 'draft' or 'proposed' until validated by the appropriate authority.

Capability Requirements Document(s). Any document(s) used to articulate deliberate or urgent/emergent capability requirements and associated information pertinent to review and validation.

Capability Solution. A materiel solution and/or non-materiel solution to satisfy one or more capability requirements and reduce or eliminate one or more capability gaps.

DOTmLPP-P analysis. DOTmLPP-P analysis is the first step in the analysis of an identified capability gap. It determines/recommends if a non-material approach or a materiel approach is required to meet the need. The "m" of DOTmLPP-P is lower case to remind the user that the materiel solution is not the most important option available. Other options will be examined first, to see if a (typically less costly) change in doctrine, organization, etc., could meet the need.

DROC. This is the forum for senior-level, enterprise-wide coordination and deliberation on both external and internal Agency issues impacting strategic planning, programming, policy, and program development. It oversees all integrated capabilities process activities

Endorsed Suggestion. An employee-generated suggestion that has been routed, as appropriate, through the employee's chain of command, and has been vetted and endorsed by an Agency entity for input into the intake system.

Functional Lead. The CAP BD-designated SME that serves as the proponent for a requirement that leads business process reengineering, develops business process changes and leads definition of functional requirements, training and deployment for business systems.

IPL. A list of a DCMA's highest priority requirements, prioritized across Capability and functional lines, defining shortfalls in key programs that, in the judgment of the DCMA, may adversely affect DCMA's ability to accomplish its assigned mission.

Materiel. All items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, etc., and related spares, repair parts, support equipment and information technology solutions, but excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support DCMA activities without distinction as to its application for administrative purposes.

Need. See "Capability Requirements."

Non-materiel (Capability Solution). Changes to doctrine, organization, training, (fielded) materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, and/or policy, implemented to satisfy one or more capability requirements (or needs) and reduce or eliminate one or more capability gaps, without the need to develop or purchase new materiel capability solutions.

Requirement. See "Capability requirements."

Solution Provider. The component that provides materiel and non-materiel solution sets for a given requirement.

Submitter. Submitters input requirements into the intake system.

Validation. The review and approval of capability requirements documents by a designated validation authority. The Agency Director and SLT are the ultimate validation authority for capability requirements unless otherwise delegated to a subordinate board or to a designated validation authority.

GLOSSARY

G.2. ACRONYMS.

ATP	authority to proceed
BC	business case
BCF	business capability framework
CAP BD	capability board
CG	corporate governance
CGA	capability gap assessment
CM	capability manager
DCMA-INST	DCMA Instruction
DCMA-MAN	DCMA Manual
DIB	defense industrial base
DoDI	DoD Instruction
DOTmLPF-P	doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, and policy
DROC	DCMA Requirements Oversight Council
EA	enterprise architecture
EAR	Enterprise Architecture Review
IAW	in accordance with
IPL	integrated priority list
IPS	initial problem statement
MDA	milestone decision authority
MICP	Managers' Internal Control Program
M-Level	mission level
MS	milestones
PM	program manager
POM	program objective memorandum
PPB&E	planning, programming, budgeting, and execution
SLT	Senior Leadership Team
SME	subject matter expert
UON	urgent operational need
WG	working group

REFERENCES

- DCMA Instruction 4101, "Facilities Management," August 7, 2018
DCMA Instruction 4201, "Civilian Personnel," July 20, 2018
DCMA Instruction 4301, "Stewardship," July 18, 2018
DCMA Instruction 4401, "Information Technology Management," TBD
DCMA Instruction 4502, "Corporate Governance," January 14, 2019
DCMA Instruction 4503, "Planning and Resourcing," April 3, 2019
DCMA Manual 4501-03, "Organization Structure, Mission and Functions Program," April 3, 2019
DCMA Manual 4501-04, "Records Management," TBD
DCMA Manual 4502-05, "Continuous Process Improvement," TBD
DCMA Manual 4503-03, "Executive Review, Assessment and Performance Evaluation," TBD.
DCMA Manual 5301-11-V1, "Management Controls: Managers' Internal Control Program," June 24, 2019
DoD Directive 5105.64, "Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA)," January 10, 2013
DoD Directive 7045.20, "Capability Portfolio Management," May 25, 2017
DoD Instruction 5000.02, "Operation of the Defense Acquisition System," August 10, 2017
DoD Instruction 5000.74, "Defense Acquisition Services," October 5, 2017
DoD Instruction 5000.75, "Business Systems Requirements and Acquisition," February 2, 2017