

Comments on the briefing, "Engineering and Technical Data Laydown for LTG Link", developed at the Product Data Functional Coordinating Meeting on 20 Jul 99.

General Comments:

- ◆ On charts 3 – 22, remove "Engineering and Technical Data" from heading of each chart. It is redundant and often obscures the real chart heading and purpose. New Chart Titles are required to accurately identify the main points of each chart.
- ◆ Use spell check or entire briefing, to eliminate obvious errors, like "repositoy" on chart 7.
- ◆ When "**Suggestions**" are made for wording of titles or text, these reflect the scribe's sense of the general discussion during the meeting and are not direct comments from the PD FCG members. All other comments reflect direct comments from the PD FCG members.
- ◆ For Charts 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14 the statements under the labels IMPACTS, and PROBLEMS are not consistent with the label. We need better words for the labels, or rewording of the statements or both. Also for these same charts we need to consider a new grouping of statements under another label such as interim solutions. **Suggestions** for new labels are from "IMPACTS" to "Significance of this Function", from "PROBLEMS" to "Needs", add "Interim Solutions".

Chart 5

- ◆ Chart title and structure implies that systems engineering and standardization, as examples, are organizational elements of AMCRDA. Need to remove lines to the key functional areas and clearly label the three main points of the chart. AMCRDA organizational elements responsible for E&T data, key functional areas that make up E&T data, and the key relationships that AMCRDA has with other Army organizations with responsibilities in E&T data. **Suggested** title for chart "AMC organizational relationships and related functional areas".
- ◆ Simulation and Modeling, CAD/CAE/CAM and SBA/SMART should be added to the key functional areas.
- ◆ Add a Legend need to explain color code, and dotted lines.

Chart 6

- ◆ Need more appropriate title/subtitle. Without a good title/subtitle, it is hard to know what the main points of this chart are. Presenting all these numbers will raise questions not germane to the points you want to make, e.g. What are the other standards document types and why are there so many? Need to isolate your main points from the numbers and graphically present rather than using a table of numbers. The point to be made on this chart and graphic is that the trend in the size of E&T data is increasing not decreasing. Acquisition Reform is responsible in part for this increase. We are not managing E&T data adequately now and as E&T data increases we have a need for better management tools. Need to document the Full time Equivalent workyears required to support and manage E&T data.
- ◆ Add "per year" to TDPLs for Spare Parts
- ◆ The CM workload for Commercial item transfer (CIT) items (that is Army items co-managed with DLA) should be included in the total CM workload. CIT CM workload needs visibility and should be quantified as part of the overall CM workload, since AMC is responsible for that CIT CM workload.
- ◆ Eliminate the last four lines since they are repository (JEDMICS) related not CM related, and are repeated on next chart.
- ◆ Eliminate End/Item/spare parts line (you will spend too much time explaining difference and is not germane).

Chart 7

- ◆ Need more appropriate title/subtitle.
- ◆ Change digital repository to JEDMICS – there are other repositories whose numbers are not included. These numbers do not reflect the total inventory of Engineering and Technical Data which is composed of electronic, hardcopy, and other forms. For Example, SBCCOM data, mylars, software, video data, etc.

- ◆ For digital conversions data, don't use the data broken down by levels – pointless to LTG Link. Break out by AMC, Corps of Engineers (COE) and National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC). A graphical depiction rather than tables of numbers is required.
- ◆ Run spell check on entire briefing, e.g. repository on line 2 this chart.

Chart 8

- ◆ This chart should be sequenced after the current chart #5 labeled AMC organization. This chart might be suitable for use with dual screen projection. Display this chart continuously, while the follow-on charts are sequenced.

Chart 9

- ◆ “process needs improvement” is not a problem statement, but is a conclusion.

Chart 10

- ◆ The purpose of this chart should be to depict that the Data Management process is broken. It was broken before Acquisition Reform, and it is broken now.
- ◆ Legend is needed to explain differences in processes more clearly. For Example white block indicates process steps eliminated by acquisition reform.

Chart 12

- ◆ Need more appropriate title/subtitle
- ◆ Need a better label than “Impacts”. Wording offered by members includes: “Enabler or key element of current Business processes”, or “Significance of this function or effort.”
- ◆ Need a better label than “Problem”. Wording offered by members includes Challenges, Issues, or Needs.
- ◆ Substitute “Inadequate for automated CM and too expensive to operate” for “Obsolete”. Or need a definition of Obsolete, other than “no longer in use or no longer useful, or no longer current.”
- ◆ CECOM and SBCCOM (Edgewood) efforts and proponents do not view themselves as problems, and object to being portrayed as problems. Substitute “Issues” label for “Problem” or use new label such as results, potential solutions, interim solutions, or significant actions.
- ◆ Change SBCCOM to SBCCOM (Edgewood site)

Chart 13

- ◆ Need more appropriate title/subtitle
- ◆ Repositories add (JEDMICS only). SBCCOM feels that this chart does not reflect their involvement.
- ◆ Need better labels for impacts and problems categories, as previously stated.
- ◆ The first two sub bullets under JEDMICS are not problem statements
- ◆ Move “No centralized direction/funding before PDM systems statements
- ◆ Relabel PDM systems to “POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS- Product Data Management Systems”. PDM systems are not a problem.
- ◆ Alternative: Add SBCCOM (Edgewood Site) with Workgroup Technologies–CMS as a non-JEDMICS Repository
- ◆ Need better wording for “DoD LIB developing a PDM strategy” The sub-bullet is not politically correct within the Army. Coordination recommended with Ms. Tammy Tuck on better wording. **Suggested** rewording “DoD LIB developing a PDM Strategy Decrease funding for JEDMICS and JCALS efforts with focus on cooperative exploitation of existing and evolving commercial technology, systems, and business practices.”

Chart 14

- ◆ Need more appropriate title/subtitle.
- ◆ Delete “(required for Electronic Commerce/Contracting/Paperless PEO Environment), this is an incorrect statement.
- ◆ Need a better label for IMPACT, Substitute “Significance of this function or effort.” For “IMPACTS”

- ◆ Change spelling out of ADCS acronym to “Automated Document Conversion System (ADCS)”. Also add that ADCS primary focus is only on engineering drawings.

Chart 16

- ◆ Delete “(Automated Configuration Management System (ACMS) – CECOM Nominated CENTRA 2000 as Standard System – Rejected by PD FCG)”

Chart 17

- ◆ Need better and more politically correct wording within Army for PDM strategy. Need input from Mr. A. David Mills (AMCDCG-L), and Mr. Okonsky (LIA). **Suggested** wording “OSD Logistics Information Board (LIB) has initiated a PDM strategy effort which addresses life cycle product data management approach with a broad definition of Product Data and Product Data Management. The LIB PDM strategy is evolving and includes elements of JCALS infrastructure, JCALS applications, JCALS Joint Technical Manual efforts, and other JCALS elements. The PDM strategy will be based on decreased funding for JEDMICS and JCALS efforts with a focus on cooperative exploitation of existing and evolving commercial technology, systems, and business practices.

Chart 19

- ◆ Under PD FCG Change “Identify” to “Identifies”
- ◆ Under PD FCG Change “Develop” to “Develops”

Chart 21

- ◆ Add under funding requirements “Need mechanism to influence external sources of funds, such as effort managed by PEOs and PMs, DSA/DLCM PMs, ASA (ALT), DoD/OSD, and other organizations that directly influence AMC efforts”.

Chart 22

- ◆ Add under Approve General Management and Execution Concept and Funding approval strategy, “Money really has to come from external to AMC sources such as PEOs/PMs and ASA (ALT).”