FMP Policy Implementation Conference
PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES
January 28-30, 2003
Naval Amphibious Base
Coronado, California

Tuesday, 28 January 2003

Planning Subcommittee: Chair: Puget Sound Naval Shipyard
Co-Chair: Norfolk Naval Shipyard

Subcommittee Chairman opened the subcommittee session with a review of the agenda, goals, and assigned action items.

- Schedule:
  - 1300 to 1600 Tues
  - 0800 to 0900 Weds (Joint Session)
  - 0900 to 1600 Weds
  - 0800 to 1130 Thurs
    - 0830 Brief to ESC
  - Break into Working Groups by 0900 on Wed

- Assigned Strategic Goals
  - CONOPS: Assure Fleet Modernization Program investments address the fleet's most significant concerns while maintaining clear lines of responsibility for the modernization plan and its resourceing.
  - COMMON PROCESS: Develop a single common business process that supports modernization, Battle Force interoperability, and the FMP CONOPS/ CFCC requirements.
- Other Goals Assigned by ESC
  - Fleet Strategic Goal (Assigned at last (Jan 02) FMP Conference): Look at TMA/TMI, develop solutions, develop priorities (with Fleet assist), and then engage resource sponsor in getting funding for those solutions.

Chair and Co-Chair reviewed the Planning Subcommittee's assigned strategic goals and provided an overview of the results from the SPM Working Group. The overview presentation is available on the FMP Web Site. The following summarizes the status of each action item being worked by the Planning Subcommittee, including agreements reached during the working group sessions:

On Wednesday, 29 January, 2003, the Planning Subcommittee broke into two working groups:
SPM Working Group: Working Group Leaders
AIT Working Group: Working Group Leaders

Strategic Goal #1, CONOPS:

- Approach:
- Short term: Develop a process to ensure fleet concerns are adequately addressed
  - Address Fleet Strategic Goal pursuant to TMA/TMI
- Working with CAPT C.W. Chesterman (NAVSEA 05N) to ensure "FMP/SPM" integration into TMA/TMI process

•TMA Panel includes Fleets, SPMs, and OPNAV
•*Key link to FMP is SPM participation in TMA Panel*
-Planning Subcommittee main action is to facilitate communications between CAPT Chesterman and the SPMs
•TMA panel screens problems, approves solutions, and reviews implementation
•No formal turnover process or "TMA Shipalts"…a solution may be a Shipalt
•TMA/TMI flags have been added to the JCF/SAR
•The working group approved a proposed addition to the FMP Manual, Chapter 4, which defines the TMA/TMI interface to the FMP Manual
•Next Action: Implement SHIPMAIN CFT4 Results as directed.

JCF/SAR Technical Specifications (9090-210A/500C):

•The working group reached agreement on a new JCF Form
–It was recognized that PEO(CV) is developing a unique JCF Form. This form was designed to replace the current JCF Form, used to approve Engineering Change Proposals as part of the new construction/RCOH process, and eliminate the need to develop most SARs. Since a PEO(CV) representative was not present, only the existence of this unique process could be noted.
–The working group agreed to remove some fields from the JCF that are not currently in NDE. The goal was to make the transition to an electronic JCF as simple as possible.
–Added one field not currently in NDE (Other Systems Impacted). This "catch all" field was designed to replace the specific flags such as stowage, aviation, calibration, etc. removed from the JCF. It was suggested by the ESC that a drop down menu be programmed in NDE.
•There was agreement that Shipalt Briefs (Titles) should not be changed. It was also agreed that the submitter/PARM was responsible to ensure Brief/Title commonality among the various applicable ship classes.
–A formal process/form was reviewed in approved (part of FMP Manual Chapter 4) to change briefs. This process requires a formal request by the submitter to the SPM once the JCF has been submitted and for the SPM to request approval for Title/Brief change.
–It was agreed that a new capability needs to be a new alt (i.e., it's not OK to simply change the brief/intent of an Shipalt)
–Back-fit needs to be separate alt
•Agreement was reached on an enhanced definition for service estimates contained in the JCF/SAR tech specs.
•Minor changes to the SAR technical spec were also review and approved.

Proposed Alterations:

•Proposed alterations have been a part of legacy FMPMIS and the capability to enter Proposed Alts also exists in NDE.
–There has been limited use of the capability (SURFLANT, PEO(EXW), SPAWAR)
•SPAWAR programs Advance Alterations (Type "AA")
–Converted to Proposed Alts when databases are synchronized (planned)
•Proposed alteration process was added to the FMPMIS Manual
–Sections 4-4.4.1 and 4-4.4.2
•The working group agreed the Proposed Alteration capability should be retained/used
•It was also agreed that NDE should be modified to accommodate electronic JCFs (Electronic JCF = Proposed Alt)
–Only one JCF element is not currently in NDE based on early work by the working group on the JCF form.
–NDE Proposed Alteration Modifications will be sent to the AIS Subcommittee for implementation
•Add one field to NDE (Other Systems Impacted)
•Include NDE fields in Proposed Alt input screen that are included on the JCF
•Develop a JCF report including option to export to MS Word. This feature was desired (by PEO(SUB)) so that electronic JCFs could be attached to e-mails and routed for review and approval within the Command.
•The working group also agreed that the Proposed Alt process should be used for all Shipalts and AERs. Currently the FMP Manual only requires use for Type Commander Shipalts and AERs.
•There was not unanimous agreement on the Proposed Alt process. PEO(CV) had reservations due to the use of a unique JCF Form. PEO(SUB) withheld support for the new process.

Temp Alts:

•The FMP Manual currently requires Temp Alts to be submitted to the SPM via JCF
•The working group agreed that the use of Temp Alt packages should be retained (vs. JCF). In other words, the FMP Manual requirement to use a JCF was a mistake.
•It was agreed that the Temp Alt sponsor may request advance approval prior to package development (to minimize financial risk)
–Approval request will be via Electronic JCF / Proposed Alt
•Even if a JCF is submitted, a Temp Alt package is still required.
•NDE needs to be modified to include type "Temp Alt" and electronically update the official NDE database once approved by the SPM

FMP Policy Implementation Conference
PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES
January 28-30, 2003
Naval Amphibious Base
Coronado, California

Authorization Letters:

•The working group agreed that Authorization Letters should be retained. It was noted that the letter contains more than just simply a list of alterations authorized for accomplishment.
–The working group reviewed a proposed template developed by Steve Murray and agreement was reached on standard template (with a few comments)
•The need to keep FMPMIS/NDE kept up-to-date was discussed. Some SPMs were not updating FMPMIS and using authorization letters to communicate programming changes. It was recognized that NDE is the single, authoritative, database.
•Agreement was reached on an electronic revision/update process (once NDE was fully functional)
–Notification shall be via e-mail from the SPM
–Working on a NDE Generated notification process
•There was discussion on the list of alterations that needed to be included on the authorization letter. Enclosure (3) was added to the template to include proposed alterations not approved for installation. There was no consensus regarding the need to include Type Commander Shipalts and AERs on the letter. Currently the FMP Manual requires that the Type Commander authorize his Shipalts separately and the working group agreed to keep this policy in effect.

Software:

•**Charter:** Develop a software alteration process.

Status:

• Working group will be divided into three subgroups:
-Executive Level
-2 Working Levels
• Initial Executive Level meeting is expected to be held on the 18 February, 2003.
• Initial Working Level meeting is expected to be held on 25 February, 2003.

Issues:

•Integrate with existing Combat/C4I Software Certification Process
•Integrate with ILS Software Reporting
•Level of reporting and management
•Management process/software alterations
•List of planned Software Installations of Authorization Letters
•Address equipment and software dependencies

Metrics: - The template developed by the Metrics subcommittee pursuant to SID Quality was determined to be satisfactory to the Planning Subcommittee. Rather than developing a qualitative measure such as counting and weighting LARs, it was agreed that actual cost return data associated with Planning Yard drawing errors should be used.

The complete Metrics package has been approved by the FMP ESC Committee and is available for review on the FMP Web site. Direction to begin collection of data is expected shortly.

AIT ISSUES: - Christ Christensen, FTSCLANT:
•Agreed that reference to Standard Items needed to be included in tech spec
•Agreed that TYCOM should track exceptions
•Reviewed NAVSEA 04X comments to 9090-310D
  –No issues with proposed comments
•Awaiting NAVSEA 08 review comments
  –Plan to adjudicate comments through working group
•Discussed RMMCO differences and standardization
  –Adjudicating difference between 9090-310 check in/out forms and RMMCO Web site(s)
•Herb Armstrong & Pam Schools agreed to become co-working group leaders
•Pat Haney stated at the closing session that once the NAVSEA 08 comments to 310D were incorporated that the spec would be issued rather than waiting to include additional changes and resend for chop.

FMP Milestones: It was raised to the attention of the Planning Subcommittee that a new COMNAVSURFOR message established new availability planning milestones. The major change was requiring a contract award and A-90 days, which in turn drives the WPIC to A-180 days. The current FMP Milestones are based on a WPIC at A-120 days and delivering drawings at A-180 days does not support the WPIC and contract development, solicitation and award. The ESC provided direction to postpone modifying milestones until results of SHIPMAIN are promulgated.

New Action Items: Although the subcommittee discussed desired FMP Process improvements and potential new action items, the FMP ESC recommended that the Planning Subcommittee hold off implementing new process improvements until the results of the SHIPMAIN (CFT #4) are promulgated. The SHIPMAIN efforts will more than likely modify the current FMP process and the methodology to be used to implement has not been decided.

The Planning Subcommittee adjourned at 1100 on Thursday, 30 January, 2003.