

Attachment 9
CMIS Issues, Discussions, and Resolutions

1. ISSUE: Multiple Replacement Specs to One SCR: 005, 203, 204

(a) The CMIS System currently allows multiple replacements for a single drawing or specification. These multiples will then appear on a TDPL effectively allowing the contractor to pick which replacement they choose to use. Previous practice has required that if a drawing or specification is replaced by more than one, that drawing or specification is flagged as obsolete and engineering must make a determination (and prepare an ECP) as to the appropriate replacement.

(b) The CMIS System currently only shows one level of drawing or specification replacement. This is incorrect, but the decision to be made is whether we want the reports to reflect all of the replacement levels or only the first and last.

Example: D 30 1 7 replaced by MIL STD 8 replaced by ANSI Y14.5 (1973) replaced by ANSI Y14.5M (1982). Does TDPL show 30 1 7 replaced by ANSI Y14.5M or does it show all of the replacement levels?

Discussion:

(a) The configuration management system must be able to identify replacement specifications and drawings. TD/CMS currently identifies replacements on a one for one basis. The version of CMIS tested during the Phase I IOC test can identify multiple replacements for a single original. This allows the contractor to pick which specification or drawing, rather than the government. Policy changes are leading to permitting the contractor to make the selection unless there is a specific reason for mandating a specific specification or drawing. Government engineers can mandate a particular specification or drawing by including it in the Statement of Work (SOW) rather than via the TDPL.

(b) For rebuilds, overhauls, and repairs, users need to be able to determine the "built-to" configuration prior to doing the work. In these cases, it is necessary that users be able to locate and access original and all subsequent versions of the specifications and drawings. For procurement actions, users only need the latest version of the specifications and drawings.

Resolution:

(a) Accept the CMIS approach for allowing multiple replacements for a single drawing.

(b) Direct CACI to provide the users with the following two (2) options:

- Provide first through last replacement levels of specifications and drawings in the TDPLs and EDLs, and
- Provide only the first and the last specifications and drawings in the TDPLs and EDLs.

2. ISSUE: Support for New Spec Categories Enhancement SCR: 043

The current TD/CMS does not adequately support some new categories of specifications. DINs are just one example. Recommend a new source code with the related note and footnote be created to support DINs and other like specifications.

Footnote should read:

NOT FURNISHED Other agency specifications or standards may be obtained from the source agency. If the source is not known or the document is not available, immediately notify the procuring officer.

Discussion: The source code informs the manufacture as to where the specifications are available. There are nine (9) source codes available, the last being "Z" with no definition or description. The configuration management system must be able to identify specifications that may only be obtained from a source other than the procuring agency. In other words, the specification will not be part of the TDP. As a result, an "Other" category is needed.

Resolution: Change the definition/description of "Z" to "Other" and in the recommended footnote above, change "Other agency" to "Other" and change "source agency" to "source organization." Thus, the footnote would read as follows:

NOT FURNISHED Other specifications or standards may be obtained from the source organization. If the source is not known or the document is not available, immediately notify the procuring officer.

3. ISSUE: New Type Doc Code for DESC Drawings Enhancement SCR: 044

The TD/CMS does not currently provide a capability to annotate a source for DESC drawings. Recommend a new type doc code with the related note and footnote be created for DESC standard drawings.

Footnote should read:

NOT FURNISHED DESC drawings may be obtained from Commander, Defense Electronics Systems Center, ATTN: DESC EL, 1507 Wilmington Pike, Dayton, Ohio 45444.

Full functionality for the new type doc code must be defined. Discussion: The configuration management system needs to be able to direct vendors to DESC for their drawings.

Resolution: Change the footnote associated with the document type code DU to direct vendors to DPSSO (Naval Publications) unless the drawing is from DESC. In which case, the footnote should direct vendors to the following address: Commander, Defense Electronics Systems Center, ATTN: DESC EL, 1507 Wilmington Pike, Dayton, Ohio 45444.

4. ISSUE: EDL and GBL Data Selection SCR 203

A previous FCG agreed that open waivers and deviations should not appear on a TDPL. A determination must be made whether this also applies to EDLs and GBLs.

Discussion: Unapproved waivers and deviations should not appear on EDLs and GBLs.

Resolution: See Discussion.

5. ISSUE: Valid Type Doc Codes SCR 015, 237

The FCG needs to revisit type doc codes. The ones in question are TD, QR, TL, TM, QS VS SQ, LI, DT, PP, D9, 10, LE, TR, and WD. The FCG members need to come prepared to define and/or defend the need for these codes. Additionally the current codes need some further clarification and functional definition (EC).

Discussion:

(a) TD: TDPLs are not treated as documents. There was some question as to whether or not ARDEC used the TD code. They do not.

(b) QR: QR is used by TACOM's Product Assurance group when they have supplemental quality assurance requirements above and beyond QS. QR is used strictly in the spare parts arena. Note: There is a movement towards actually putting the quality requirements directly on the drawings.

(c) TL: In CMIS, TL is not listed as a valid type document code and there is no definition. CBDCOM, MICOM, ARDEC, and others use it locally in TD/CMS.

(d) TM: TM shows as a valid type document code in CMIS, but no definition beyond Technical Manual is provided. CBDCOM used it.

(e) QS vs. SQ: These represent the same entity. QS is the CCSS Operating Instruction (OI) standard. MICOM uses SQ.

(f) LI: ARDEC uses LI in lieu of IL. Paul Behrens (ATCOM) has no objection to IL and LI having the same definition, however, ARDEC is willing to give up LI provided the definition of IL is modified.

(g) DT: DT was used in the original, batch version of TD/CMS to check the relationship with 4T. This explicit linking is no longer required in TD/CMS-E or CMIS where relational databases provide the linkage. TACOM and CECOM still use DT.

(h) PP: ATCOM uses PP.

(i) D9: D9 was deleted by a previous FCG, but reappeared in the CMIS list of type document codes.

(j) 10: No one uses this code. It is believed to be a typo, probably ID.

(k) LE: No one uses LE.

(l) TR: No one uses TR.

(m) WD: WD is shown as an associated list (AL), which in theory accompanies a drawing. Raytheon uses WD in support of MICOM.

(n) AL, PP, and DL: It is necessary to determine where in which sections of the TDPL these document types belong. ATCOM is responsible for this determination.

(o) EC: The section locations for EC in the EDL, TDPL, and TL are incorrect.

(p) GL: GL needs a better definition and verification as to where it belongs in the TDPL.

Resolution: Each member of the FCG must confirm that their organization does not use or will not use in the future (with CMIS) any of the document codes that are being deleted. If they determine that they need one of the document codes up for deletion, they must notify the EDMS FCG Chair and Ms. G. Booker and provide a definition of the document codes to be retained. No response will be taken as concurrence with the FCG's decision to delete.

(a) Delete TD.

(b) Keep QR. TACOM is to complete a Document Code Definition Sheet for QR.

- (c) Keep TL. CBDCOM is to complete a Document Code Definition Sheet for TL.
- (d) Keep TM. CBDCOM is to complete a Document Code Definition Sheet for TM.

- (e) Delete SQ. MICOM will need to convert these codes to QS when they go to the new CMIS system and will need to train their data entry personnel to no longer use SQ. An issue with DSREDS pull file was also mentioned.

- (f) Delete LI. ATCOM to provide a revised definition for IL.

- (g) Delete DT when CMIS is fielded. During the conversion to CMIS, it will be necessary to convert DTs to the appropriate codes.

- (h) Keep PP. ATCOM is to provide a definition.

- (i) Delete D9.

- (j) No resolution necessary given 10 is a typo in the issue statement.

- (k) Delete LE.

- (l) Delete TR.

- (m) Delete WD. MICOM to confirm this is acceptable. If not and WD must be kept, then MICOM is to provide a definition.

- (n) AL, PP, and DL clarification are to be determined (TBD). ATCOM is to determine where in the TDPL the following type documents belong: AL, PP, and DL.

- (o) EC Section Clarification. The section locations for EC in the EDL, TDPL, and TL were changed from 1 to 2 (from Product to Packaging).

- (p) GL clarification is TBD. CBDCOM is to provide a better definition of GL and will verify where it belongs in the TDPL.

6. ISSUE: Validation Table Maintenance

SCR: 145, 256

The CMIS System currently provides a capability for the local DBA to add, modify or delete data from the validation tables. This includes the capability to add type doc codes and change the functionality of existing type doc codes. This ability allows changes to the system that would make it no longer a standard system. Additionally, some of the system capabilities and reports have hard coded data that could cause error conditions if

the validation table was changed but not the hard coded data. Each validation table and its DBA access must be reviewed.

Discussion: The integrity of CMIS as a standard system must be preserved, but there must be sufficient flexibility to accommodate isolated, emergency changes in validation tables. This capability must be centrally controlled to maintain the integrity of the system. It should not be possible to change data in validation tables that are in conflict with hard coded data.

Resolution: The FCG will not allow the continued existence of a general capability for the user or local data base administrator to change data in validation tables. The EDMS FCG Chair and the EDMS PM are to develop a proposal for how to meet this requirement at the lowest practical level without the possibility of introducing errors. Possibilities mentioned included (1) relying on the contractor to make emergency changes within 24 hours and (2) using one-shot passwords that are centrally controlled to allow single, approved changes to the data. The EDMS FCG Chair, the EDMS PM, and the MICOM LAISO representative to the EDMS FCG (Mr. W. Campbell) are to report to the FCG membership by E-mail.

7. ISSUE: Edit Criteria for Distribution Statements Enhancement SCR: 018

The CMIS System provides a capability to track a distribution statement against sheets of a document. The individual sheets track only the distribution statement letter. The basic document tracks the distribution letter, reason, date, and office, but there are no edits on these fields. If you enter a distribution other than A, the system gives you a warning message that the reason, date, and office should not be blank but allows the document entry without correction. The FCG needs to address edit criteria for distribution statements.

Discussion: For distributions other than "A," CMIS should require non-blank entries. No attempt should be made by CMIS to interpret these non-blank entries. The distribution fields must be entered in the future CMIS in accordance with public law.

Resolution: Change the current CMIS to force users to enter non-blank entries for the following: Reason, Date, and Office. CMIS should not attempt to interpret these non-blank entries.

8. ISSUE: Definition of Levels of Security Enhancement SCR: 058, 222

The Functional Description (FD) para 5.6.f. states that the CM System must provide levels of security to include the data element level. These levels of security must be fully defined. Some of the element level security required are:

1. Should not allow changes to the original date of documents and associated documents.
2. Should not allow change to distribution.
3. Should not allow change to security.
4. Should not allow change to limited rights.
5. Should not allow change to hazardous materials.

Additionally the CMIS System does not provide an access level for specific records or groups of records. This requirement must be fully defined. Discussion: The current CMIS gives access control at the table level, not at the record or data field level. CMIS needs to be able to control/restrict access to selected records or selected data fields (i.e., specific sections of the database).

Resolution: The Army needs to define key fields that must have access controls, what kind of controls are required, and who will have the controls. A CM Technical Workgroup will be formed from the MSCs. Each MSC must identify which technical individuals will work with Ms. Booker by July 8, 1994.

9. ISSUE: Need to "configure" Associated Lists Enhancement SCR: 155

The current TD/CMS has a Detail File and a Configuration File. There is no automatic software link between the two. The links are generated through configuration entries. The CMIS System already provides an automatic link of associated lists to their drawing. An enhancement to the system would automatically pick up these associated lists, as appropriate, without the need to additionally "configure" the lists.

Discussion: Because CMIS is based on a relational database, it could be designed so that it is no longer necessary to manually link the Detail File and the Configuration File. CMIS currently requires the user to provide this linkage, because the old, batch version of TD/CMS required it.

Resolution: Keep CMIS as it is. This was perceived to be a non-issue. The MSC's will need to determine appropriate test cases for this capability.

10. ISSUE: Valid Engineering Action Categories SCR: 170, 171

The approval/disapproval categories of engineering actions (ECPs, Waivers, Deviations, Initial Release, etc.) included in CMIS are inadequate and need to be expanded.

Examples of needed categories are:

- Approved as ECP
- Approved as ECP with MODIFICATIONS
- Approved as WAIVER
- Approved as DEVIATION

Disapproved
Canceled
Withdrawn
Approved as PRELIMINARY ECP
Approved as VALUE ECP
ERR(no previous ECP)
Initial Release (ERR)

Discussion: The FCG's consensus was that all of these were needed and possibly more.

Resolution: Keep these categories and Ms. Booker is to contact Bob Beermann to determine if his CMAG work has surfaced additional categories. Ms. Booker is to E-mail the consolidated list out to the FCG membership, who are responsible for reviewing the list to see if any additional categories are needed.

11. ISSUE: Imbedded Spaces

SCR: 160, 234

The requirement for system allowed imbedded spaces requires FCG discussion and approval. Specific areas of concern include: Find numbers, configuration ID, and weapon system codes.

Discussion: Embedded spaces allows the possibility of mismatches between queries and retrieved data. CMIS should not allow embedded spaces in non-text fields. Conversion of data to CMIS should identify embedded spaces in non-text fields and change the data. Text fields can have embedded spaces.

Resolution: Ms. Booker is to review the data fields and identify those that are not likely to have a problem with embedded spaces (e.g., the text fields). She is to inform the FCG membership of her findings and inform the CMIS developer that CMIS should not allow embedded spaces in non- text fields.

12. ISSUE: Conversion MS/AN/NAS,

SCR: Etc.183, 273

Placement of Military Standard drawings (MS, AN, JAN, etc) in breakdown reports and the automated update by IHS (or equivalent) must be discussed and approved by the FCG.

Discussion: There was minimal discussion on this issue. A question was raised as to why the DODISS Part V Index is restricted and whether or not the restriction can be lifted.

Resolution: Military Standard drawings (MS, AN, JAN, etc) will remain drawings in CMIS. They will be included in breakdown reports and automated updates by IHS will be supported.

Mr. Knowles is to find out why the DODISS Part V Index is restricted and whether or not the restriction can be lifted.

13. ISSUE: Supporting Information for Specs and Associated Lists SCR: 200

In the Configuration File, there are several fields of related data for supporting parts/documents. These fields, however, do not apply if the supporting documents are specifications or associated lists. The CMIS System currently allows entry in all of these fields regardless of support doc type. Access and edits must be fully defined.

Discussion: There was minimal discussion on this issue.

Resolution: Apply the same restrictions as are included in TD/CMS.

14. ISSUE: Cost per ECP; Serial Number per Contract Enhancement SCR: 231, 232

The CMIS System only allows one target or actual cost per engineering action. If the costs are broken down under several CLINs, it cannot be recorded. The system also only allows one serial number for each contract. These also cannot be broken out by CLIN. These requirements need FCG discussion and then probably forwarded to the CMAG.

Discussion: CMIS added the ability to track CLINs by contract, but did not give the ability to track costs by CLIN or part serial number.

Resolution: Request that CMIS provide the ability to track cost and serial number by CLIN, which in turn is tied to the contract. The contract total dollars should be the sum of the dollars by CLIN.

15. ISSUE: Quantity Make/From SCR: 235

The CMIS System will not allow a quantity of M/F for Make >From to be used with an Altered Item Drawing. This edit needs FCG discussion.

Discussion: CMIS does not allow the quantity field to be filled with M/F. MICOM uses this capability in TD/CMS.

Resolution: Have CMIS allow the M/F entry in the quantity field.

16. ISSUE: Identification of Standard Form Enhancement SCR: 245

The CMIS System requires an entry that identifies the standard form the data is being entered from (MIL STD 480, MIL STD 973) but then doesn't apply edits that conform to that particular form. An example of this is data identified as MIL STD 973 but shows an Amendment to the action. There is no provision for Amendments in 973.

Discussion: The CMIS system created a form, but did not provide edit checks of the data in accordance with the form's instructions.

Resolution: Change the designation of this issue from "Enhancement" to "Edit" and assign it to the Edit Committee for a recommended resolution.

17. ISSUE: Specification Change Notice (SCN) Approval Enhancement SCR: 248

The CM System functional requirements for Specification Change Notices (SCN) must be fully defined by the FCG.

Discussion: Resolution of this issue depends on whether or not SCNs will still exist in the next version of MIL-STD-973. TD/CMS did not handle SCNs.

Resolution: Contact Mr. Bob Beermann to determine if SCNs will still exist in the next version of MIL-STD-973. If they continue to exist, then CMIS must support transferring data into the Specifications and Standards Change table from approved SCNs. Otherwise, there is no requirement to support SCNs.

18. ISSUE: ECP Information SCR: 250

The CMIS System provides quick access to ECP information from the drawing and document information. The information needed for this quick access needs to be decided by the FCG.

Discussion: A quick reference capability to ECPs helps users decide what they need to look at. Summary information can help this step. It will be necessary to segregate pending and approved ECPs in the quick reference capability.

Resolution: Turn this issue over to the CM Technical Workgroup assigned in Issue 8 for a recommendation on what summary information should be provided with the quick reference capability. Segregate the pending and approved ECPs.

19. ISSUE: Configuration Change Impact Enhancement SCR: 254

The CMIS System provides for automatic update of the Detail and Configuration Files from the ECP data. An enhancement has been proposed that requires these two files to

be updated together and that all functionality and edits of the on line system be applied to these capabilities. This requires FCG discussion.

Discussion: The Detail and Configuration Files currently are updated independently. The FCG determined that the default process should have then updated together, but that the default (synchronized) capability should be suppressible.

Resolution: Ask the CMIS contractor to provide the capability to update the Detail and Configuration Files together as the default capability. Also, request the option to update each file independently.

20. ISSUE: Weapon System Designated Autofill Enhancement SCR: 265

An enhancement to the CMIS System has been suggested to autofill the System Designation Field of an ECP from the associated weapon system nomenclature. This needs FCG discussion.

Discussion: Fields 4a and 4c of DD Form 1692, Engineering Change Proposal, respectively provide the Model/Type and System Designation. It is desired that when the user enters the Model/Type that there be an autofill capability for the System Designation field.

Resolution: Ask the CMIS contractor to change the system so that when the user enters the weapon system Model/type, he or she gets a selection of valid System Designators from which to choose (pick and choose). There also must be a capability to expand the mapping of Model/Type to System Designation.

21. ISSUE: Global CAGE Changes During Initial Loading SCR: 272

The automated IHS load to CMIS currently does not set cage codes correctly. The correct CAGE codes and full functionality must be discussed by the FCG. This must include changes to CAGES and impact, such as specifications configured, specifications as documents affected to an ECP, specifications in baseline freezes, etc.

Discussion: CMIS currently does not set cage codes correctly during IHS loads. There is the potential for mismatches between the Document table and other CMIS tables in the event of a CAGE code change. There are several instances where both Document and CAGE code are required to retrieve the desired data.

Resolution: CMIS must be changed to apply already established rules for assigning CAGE codes to documents during IHS loads. To ensure consistency of CAGE codes throughout all CMIS tables for each document, CMIS must do a global change whenever the CAGE code of a document changes during an IHS load.

22. ISSUE: Entry of Slash Specs

SCR: 274

The IHS automated specification update allows entry of slash specifications (MIL S 123/1) even if the basic specification is not in file. This condition is edited and not allowed in the on line data entry screen. This, and other edits, applying to the IHS update need discussion.

Discussion: Slash specifications are versions or updates of an original specification. The interactive portion of CMIS does not allow entry of a slash specification if the original specification is not already on file. The batch update capability from IHS to CMIS does not apply the editing rules that exist for the interactive session to the batch update. It is not acceptable to allow entry of slash specifications when the basic specification is not in file.

Resolution: CMIS should not allow entry of slash specifications during a batch load from IHS when the basic specification is not in file.

23. ISSUE: Audit of Full Functional Requirements

SCR: 278

The full functional requirements associated with system audit needs FCG discussion. This must include audit functions (add, change, delete, query), audit time frame s, purge capabilities, etc.

Discussion: The specific audit functions (i.e., what transactions must be recorded) must be determined. The query function was definitely dropped by the FCG.

Resolution: The CM Technical Workgroup, assigned earlier with Issue 8, will determine the specific audit functions required.

24. ISSUE: Automated Pullfile Process

SCR: 300

The CMIS System currently has no automated method to move pullfiles to DSREDS. This is done by the SA using a Script File. The functional requirement for moving pullfiles to DSREDS within CMIS must be discussed.

Discussion: Because there are several business processes that involve moving pull files to DSREDS, it would be difficult to establish a single standard method for CMIS to support. It appears that the script file to move pull files to DSREDS will need to be tailored local script files.

Resolution: Retain the approach where System Administrators use locally unique script files to move pullfiles to DSREDS.

25. ISSUE: COTS Software

SCR: 303, 304, 305

The COTS software provided for the CMIS Test to allow executive level reports is a package called Crystal Report Writer. The functionality, training, and access to this package must be discussed by the FCG. The FMSO/JLSC position is that if this package is not acceptable, each MSC can purchase their own preferred package. This issue needs FCG resolution.

Discussion: The Army requires the ability to create Executive level reports and to save the report template for later use.

Resolution: CMIS screens must include an option that sends users to an Executive Report Writer and then returns the user back to CMIS. The contractor must provide the Army with training on Crystal Report Writer (CRW) and support Army testing of CRW, so the Army can conduct a proper evaluation and make an informed decision as to whether or not CRW can be accepted as the standard.