2018 OSD CAPE CADE
TECHNICAL FOCUS GROUP

Meeting Date: Thursday, June 28, 2018

Topic: Technical, eCARD, Software Resource, Maintenance & Repair (M/R),
and Bill of Materials (BoM) Data Reporting

Location: Lockheed Martin Global Vision Center
2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, VA 22202

Audio Connection: (703) 647-2275
Access Code: 999 256 720

Purpose: To promote discussion amongst key individuals within the community in order to gain insight into their views and experiences related to the OSD CAPE Initiatives. CAPE wanted to draw upon participants' attitudes, feelings, beliefs, experiences and reactions in a way that would not be feasible using other methods.

Presentation Style: Since Technical Focus Group provided informational briefs, refer to detailed initiative briefs for full content

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:	TOTAL ATTENDEES: Industry • 45 Government • 77 Dial – In • 14

Topic:	*eCARD, Tech Data* **Greg Hogan, AFCAA**
Informational Brief:	• Technical data has always been a requirement, but not always implemented effectively. • 1921-T is a misnomer because 1921 implies it is a cost report when it is not. It's really a technical data report. • Current data collections are ad hoc, ineffective, and random, within the DoD • Tech data vocabulary – ensures consistence across programs and engineering community; link between CARD, -T, and other engineering documents • Implementation plan – CWIPT involvement and industry coordination is essential

	• Core parameter introduction
	    ○ Common parameters for every hardware WBS element
	    ○ Unique parameters for every hardware WBS element
	    ○ Unique parameters by end item
	    ○ Core list of parameters to select from; although there are hundreds of parameters, expect 10-20 per program.
	• Industry Collaboration will inform practical implementation
	• Tech Data Schedule
	    ○ Breakout meeting with CAPE and/or members or Tech Data Working Group
	    ○ Discuss immediate concerns
	    ○ Initial discussion of alternative CDRLs
	    ○ Initial discussion of processes to satisfy requirements
	• Accept action to deep dive on core parameter list and provide feedback
	• July 2018 plan of action:
	    ○ Scrub parameter list with subject matter experts
	    ○ Return list by July 31
	• Goal is to minimize duplication to the greatest extent possible
	• Dave Lyons noted that it is more important to get all the data in a consolidated place than to have a data model.

Action Items	• N/A

Topic:	*SRDR* **Ranae Woods, AFCAA**

Informational Brief:	• 2016 DID changes
	    ○ Updated Dev section
	    ○ Added MX section
	• 2017 DID changes
	    ○ Updated Dev section
	    ○ Updated Mx section
	    ○ Added ERP w/ Agile tables
	• SURF Lead – Marc Russo; team is 2 years old
	• SRDR collects technical data with some cost and effort data
	• SURF V&V Guide published in Feb 2018
	• At some point in the future, it would be good to have something similar to cPET for SRDRs.
	• There are a couple Agile reports that are on contract but none that have been submitted yet

Action Items	• N/A

Topic:	*Maintenance & Repair Parts* **Lisa Mably, AFCAA**
Informational Brief:	- There was a discussion on whether or not there will be an implementation memo; government stated this may not be necessary since there is an approved DID. - A 1921-1 M/R needs to be requested when a significant portion of a contract cost is tied up in parts related maintenance activities such as supply chain, heavy maintenance, recurring spares, or repairs - M/R also needs to be requested when Flex File reporting eliminates insights into what is driving maintenance activities - M/R is not commonly associated with space programs - Approximately 12% of sustainment contracts will have M/Rs
Action Items	Request industry and government stakeholders provide feedback on the current Bill of Materials (BoM) DID.

Topic:	*Bill of Materials (BoM)* **Nicholas Cesare, DASA-CE**
Informational Brief:	- The main challenge for this initiative is that there is no standardized format for DIDs - BoM data already exists in industry data systems, but no effort previously made by government cost estimating community to centralize collection and investigate some level of standardization in format - BoM data mapped to WB - BoM DID Path Forward: - Current draft DID assumes standardized data model for all contract with 40 fields for each part - Assumption is that contractor format BoMs already have come percentage of this information, but existing vs. non-existing fields and efforts associated with standardized format have not fully been explored. - Before approving any new DID, the government need sto understand status quo BoM submissions and cost of requiring data submission in standardized format (with potential additional of data fields that don't already exist) - The priority will be determining policy for new approved DIDs (e.g. FlexFile) and understanding status quo BoM submissions prior to requesting comments on new iterations of draft BoM DID. - BoMs help government do much better estimates. 30% off on estimate without BoM data 4% off on estimate with BoM data - Industry feedback: - Initial knee-jerk reaction to draft DID was that there are 50 data points and industry doesn't have all of that data. - It's difficult to sign up for a pilot unless the format is defined.

Action Items	• N/A

Topic:	*Government Panel Discussion*	**Ranae Woods, AFCAA** **Duncan Thomas, NCCA** **Shevonne Stanley, NAVAIR** **Don Allen, NAVAIR** **Dave Henningsen, ODASA-CE** **Nick Cesare, ODASA-CE** **Bruce Thompson, SMC** **Greg Hogan, AFCAA** **Crickett Petty, MDA** **Charlotte Tarr, Moderator** **Fred Janicki, Facilitator**

Discussion:	• There are many years of special studies and AoAs that occur at SCCs before a contract is awarded. Most of the estimating is analogy or parametric instead of engineering buildups.
	• Technical data is important in order to set accurate budgets.
	• Government would rather have technical data pushed to the government rather than having to go out and retrieve it. It would reduce government work to have data come in to a centralized location and for these requirements to be put on contract.
	• Sometimes analogies are performed with programs that aren't necessarily the best match but have the most data.
	• It takes a very long time to construct a ship (5 – 10 years). The shipbuilding community does not do a good job of software data collection.
	• Cost estimating spans finance, engineering, and contracting. Cost estimators often have better technical baselines than engineers.
	• Space Fence - Program Office predicted $650M.
	    ○ Underestimated power needs
	    ○ Turned out to be $2 – 3 billion
	• The engineering community does not align data based on WBS.
	• It is very difficult to get unit cost reporting. Sometimes 1980s data is used because nothing more recent is available.	

Action Items	• N/A	