



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
RESEARCH LABORATORY**

**Information Gathering for the Initial
Tools Study for the Integrated
Requirements Support System (IRSS)**

Roger Moulder

**Battelle Memorial Institute
5100 Springfield Pike, Suite 219
Dayton, Ohio 45431**

April 1998

Final Report for the Period June 1995 to June 1997

19990208 028

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**Human Effectiveness Directorate
Crew Survivability and Logistics Division
Sustainment Logistics Branch
2610 Seventh Street
Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7901**

NOTICES

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner, licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Please do not request copies of this report from the Air Force Research Laboratory. Additional copies may be purchased from:

National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield VA 22161

Federal Government agencies and their contractors registered with Defense Technical Information Center should direct requests for copies of this report to:

Defense Technical Information Center
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944
Ft Belvoir VA 22060-6218

DISCLAIMER

This Technical Report is published as received and has not been edited by the Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate.

TECHNICAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

AFRL-HE-WP-TR-1998-0061

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Public Affairs (PA) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS, it will be available to the general public, including foreign nations.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

FOR THE COMMANDER

THOMAS J. MOORE Lt COL, DEPUTY
FOR
THOMAS J. MOORE, Chief
Crew Survivability and Logistics Division
Air Force Research Laboratory

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | | Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188 | |
|--|---|---|--|----------------|
| Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503. | | | | |
| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank) | 2. REPORT DATE April 1998 | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final - June 1995 - June 1997 | | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Information Gathering for the Initial Tools Study for the Integrated Requirements Support System (IRSS) | | | 5. FUNDING NUMBERS C - F33657-92-D-2055 PE - 62202F PR - 1710 TA - D0 WU - 05 | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) Roger Moulder | | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Battelle 5100 Springfield Pike, Suite 219 Dayton, Ohio 45431 | | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate Crew Survivability and Logistics Division Air Force Materiel Command Sustainment Logistics Branch Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-7604 | | | 10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER AFRL-HE-WP-TR-1998-0061 | |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | | |
| 12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited | | | 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE | |
| 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) We describe a group of related approaches to quantitative evaluations and prioritization of system requirements and proposals. In formulating requirements for new systems, analysts face difficult tasks of selecting between alternative requirement decompositions, identifying questionable or low-priority requirements, eliminating requirements that add unnecessary costs, projecting cost impact of the requirements and then evaluating alternative system design proposals against the stated requirements. We seek approaches that require modest investments of time and can be applied even at the early stages of the requirements formulation process. We show that the Analytical Hierarchy Process can be applied to provide such evaluation mechanisms and illustrate our approach with a detailed example. | | | | |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS RAPID; Requirements; requirements specification; functionality; functional contracts, design constraints; design constraints data; communication protocols; project management information; system objective; cost impact | | | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES 56 | 16. PRICE CODE |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED | 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED | 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL | |

PREFACE

This report documents the results of a comprehensive study to provide support in the creation of a core operational requirements generation and processing testbed as part of a logistics research and development program title Integrated Requirements Support System (IRSS) (Contract Number F33657-92-D-2055) managed by the Air Force Research Laboratory, Logistics Sustainment Branch (AFRL/HESS), at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. The primary goal of the information gathering effort of this study was to provide a comprehensive review of all current ongoing efforts in the area of requirements documentation and coordination, including current methods and any automated systems under development. The results provide support in the creation of a core operational requirements generation and processing testbed, henceforth called the Core Testbed, to become a stable foundation for research and development leading to an Integrated Requirements Support System (IRSS).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 | BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| 1.2 | PURPOSE..... | 1 |
| 1.3 | SUMMARY..... | 2 |
| 1.4 | CONCLUSIONS..... | 2 |
| 2 | DETAILED ANALYSIS..... | 4 |
| 2.1 | DATA..... | 4 |
| 2.2 | SOFTWARE..... | 5 |
| 2.3 | COMPUTERS BEING USED..... | 6 |
| 2.4 | DOCUMENTATION..... | 7 |
| 2.4.1 | <i>Current Organizational Procedures.....</i> | <i>8</i> |
| 2.4.2 | <i>Future/Anticipated Requirements Needs.....</i> | <i>11</i> |
| 3 | SUMMARY AND REFERENCES..... | 14 |
| 3.1 | SUMMARY..... | 14 |
| 3.2 | REFERENCES..... | 14 |
| 4 | APPENDIXES..... | 15 |
| 4.1 | APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES..... | 15 |
| 4.2 | APPENDIX B: STATEMENT OF SCOPE FOR THE INITIAL TOOLS STUDY FOR A REQUIREMENTS TESTBED..... | 20 |
| 4.3 | APPENDIX C: DATA TABLES..... | 22 |

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Initial Tools Study for the Integrated Requirements Support System (IRSS) subtask of SIDAC Special Project Task Number 123 is a comprehensive study to provide support in the creation of a core operational requirements generation and processing testbed, henceforth called the Core Testbed. The Core Testbed will become a stable foundation for research and development leading to an Integrated Requirements Support System (IRSS). This study will define the common functions, data, and information being used by the organizations specified in the Statement of Scope for this task, in particular, the systems currently under development by Headquarters Air Combat Command (HQ ACC), Headquarters Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC), Headquarters Air Education and Training Command (AETC), Headquarters Space Command (AFSPC), and the Air Force Armstrong Laboratory (AL). This study will produce information and models that support the design, planning, and development of the Core Testbed. This will serve as an effective example for implementation of integrated requirements support concepts by the Air Force. The information produced will include recommendations for software development tools, graphical user interface methods, data storage, and hardware and communications components. The study will also include a detailed implementation plan and schedule. Information Gathering is one of ten subtasks of this study.

1.2 PURPOSE

The primary goal of the information gathering effort of this study was to provide a comprehensive review of all current ongoing efforts in the area of requirements documentation and coordination, including current methods and any automated systems under development.

The information gathering activities were accomplished utilizing several methods. These activities commenced immediately following the kickoff meeting and continued through 19 June 1996. The information to be gathered was defined as the current or "as-is" state of requirements documentation development and processing and planned improvements in that area. This information included hardware and software utilized; other tools used to create, manage, communicate and coordinate operational requirements; and the methods and procedures followed by action officers performing requirements processing. The methods and procedures that were identified by the Tools Study participants as required information to be captured for the IRSS are outlined in the data call, Appendix A.

1.3 SUMMARY

The first method of information gathering was to visit requirements organizations in order to interview and gain an understanding of the procedures used by requirements action officers in their daily routines. Battelle and ARINC conducted on-site visits with most of the requirements organizations referenced in the Statement of Scope, Appendix B. Table 1, Survey Participants, shows which contractors visited which organizations. It should be noted that the IRSS Integrated Product Team (IPT) has identified other organizations that should be included in the survey exercise. Since the Information Gathering Task is completed for this phase of the study effort, these newly identified organizations will be contacted in the next phase of the study beginning 9 Aug 96.

The second method involved gathering information via electronic mail, the telephone, or again, in person. Standardized questionnaires, or data calls, were developed to ensure that accurate information is gathered in all cases. The data calls were used at the on-site visits and distributed to those organizations who were not visited by Battelle or ARINC. Table 1, Survey Participants, shows.

The third method for information gathering was groupware sessions involving organizations from the requirements community using group discussion activities in a non-attribution environment. There were three different sessions scheduled on or about the following dates: Tuesday, 7 May; Tuesday, 14 May; and Wednesday, 22 May 1996. However, it was decided by the Tools Study participants that these sessions would be a repeat of the on-site visits. Therefore, the groupware sessions were canceled until the IRSS IPT could investigate how a groupware session could be productive. The decision was made to hold a groupware session at the Tools Forum on 19 June. The session will be used to help obtain inputs for the core testbed description and to develop, in more detail, the priorities of the core functions. Results of the session added as an appendix to report.

1.4 CONCLUSIONS

The information gathered during this task shows many of similarities between the hardware and software configurations of the requirements processing organizations. These similarities can be seen in the data models and core processes of organizations that have automated procedures, in particular those that have databases. A baseline data model and set of core processes have already been initiated as part of the Three-Schema Architecture Teaming/Development Model subtask.

Table 1. Survey Participants

| Organization | Survey | Notes | Location | Surveyed by |
|---------------|--------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|
| HQ AFSOC/DOXR | X | | Hurlburt Field, FL | ARINC |
| AFOTEC | X | | Albuquerque | ARINC |
| HQ AFSPC | X | | Colorado Springs | ARINC |
| AIA | X | | San Antonio | ARINC |
| HQ AMC/XPQP | X | | St. Louis | ARINC |
| HQ ACC/DR | X | | Langley AFB, VA | Battelle/Arlington |
| AFMC/DRX | X | | Dayton | Battelle/Arlington |
| AFMC/STR | | X | Dayton | Battelle/Arlington |
| HQ AFFSA/XRR | X | | Andrews AFB | Battelle/Arlington |
| SAF/AQSM | | X | Pentagon | Battelle/Arlington |
| AF/XORD | X | | Pentagon | Battelle/Arlington |
| AF/LGMM | | X | Pentagon | Battelle/Arlington |

2 DETAILED ANALYSIS

A survey was created and distributed to the various requirements processing organizations to determine the "as-is" state of the requirements processing for those organizations. A blank copy of the survey is included in Appendix A. The organizations that participated in the data gathering process are listed in Table 1.

The data that was gathered from these organizations was in one of two forms: answers to the survey questions, or notes that were gathered during a less formally structured interviewing process. The raw data gathered from the site visits and surveys are included in Appendix C.

The survey was organized into four main sections:

1. Data
2. Software
3. Computers being used
4. Documentation, Including: Current Organizational Procedures and Future/Anticipated Requirements Needs.

The remainder of this section is an analysis of the data contained in each of the sections outlined above. The summarized data will show averages and similarities among organizations. Identification of common procedures will provide for the design of the core processes and functions of the IRSS. Similarly, identification of average software and hardware currently available and in use by the organizations will provide the baseline infrastructure for the IRSS.

2.1 DATA

The intent of the survey questions in the data section was to collect information on databases being used and user's queries of those databases. This information would help to determine the current requirements of the data needed to support requirements gathering as it stands today. Table 2 summarizes the data received from this section in the survey.

The majority of the organizations had some type of database. Of those that did have a database, all were relational, although the relational databases were used in many different ways. One was essentially flat -- with no relationships. Another used the database only to track where documents were located within their organization and maintained by one person.

The database sizes ranged from 114K to 15 MB,. The same is true for the number of tables per database with a range from 1 to 36, with no clear trend. The number of

records per table did not exceed 1724, with most under 500. When flat files were used, the typical file size was in the 10K - 1M range.

Table 2. Summary of Data Section Survey Results

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| DATA | |
| Database | 0 Object Oriented |
| | 8 Relational |
| | 4 None |
| Size | Ranging from 144 K to 15 Mb, with no clear trend |
| Requests/Day | MNS/ORDS 3-5/Month |
| | APL 10-15/Month |
| | MODS 5-10/Month |
| | 1/Week |
| | 100/Day |
| | 5/Day |
| # of Users | Ranging from 1 to 300, with no clear trend |
| UnClassified | 10 |
| Classified | 6 |
| Handling of Classified | 1 by mail, 1 by stand-alone network |
| Current User Privileges | 4 Read/Write (Admin only); Read (Users) |
| | 3 Read/Write (all) |

Currently, the typical number of users ranges from 1 to 300, with no clear trend. Several of the organizations, with the number of users in the lower range of 1 to 25, do not currently have user names and passwords for restricting privileges. In one case, the organization does not anticipate needing user privileges and passwords in the future, but in the others, the organization does anticipate needing these features.

Of the five organizations that responded to the question regarding the number of data requests, the typical number of data requests ranged from 1 a week to 100 a day. Once again, there were no clear trends. One organization anticipated that monthly data requests would exceed 2000 when their system was fully implemented.

All but one organization handles a combination of unclassified and classified data. The one exception, AIA, handles classified data exclusively. The methods of handling classified data ranged from a stand-alone network, to exclusively hardcopy documents.

2.2 SOFTWARE

The intent of the survey questions in the software section was to capture information regarding the types of software packages currently owned by the organizations, as well as identifying plans for anticipated upgrades to those packages. Table 3 summarizes the data that came from this section in the survey.

Of those organizations that responded to this question, all have Word 6.0 or newer as their primary word processing software. The same is true for Excel, with the versions ranging from 4.0 to 7.0.

Table 3. Summary of Survey Results for the Software Section

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Word Processor | 9 Word 6.0, 1 Word 7.0 |
| Spreadsheet | 1 Excel 4.0, 7 Excel 5.0, 1 Excel 7.0 |
| Data Base | 4 currently have or are transitioning to Access; 2 Paradox; 2 FoxPro; 1 Superbase 4 |
| Multi-User Access | 6 Yes |
| | 1 No |
| E-mail Connection to Internet | 5 MS Mail; 1 Banyan; 1 Groupware; 1 Beyond Mail; 1 CCMail |
| WWW connection | 8 Yes; 1 No |
| Browser Software | 6 Netscape; 3 Mosaic; 1 GNN |

With database software, there is no clear trend. Currently, six different database packages are being used. More organizations have Microsoft Access than any other, with 3 out of 10 currently using it, with another considering switching to it in the near term. Two organizations use Paradox and FoxPro. Superbase 4 and SQL Server each had one organization using them.

Other tools that were used to create, manage, communicate and coordinate operational requirements included Powerpoint (5), some form of a mail software package (3), the Internet and World Wide Web (WWW) (3), and one each of All Clear, Metrics Management, Sarah Lite, Perform Pro, and Windows for Workgroups.

Of the 7 responses to the question regarding multi-user access, all but one currently have multi-user access capabilities. The typical workstation software suite was overwhelmingly Microsoft Office.

Most of the organizations had e-mail, with Microsoft Mail being the preferred choice by 2 to 1. Most had e-mail connections to the Internet and a WWW connection. Netscape and Mosaic were the most popular WWW browsers.

With regards to future software upgrades, 5 of the 7 organizations that responded to this question said that they were considering moving to Windows NT or Windows 95 in the near term.

2.3 COMPUTERS BEING USED

The intent of the questions in the Computers Being Used section to the survey was to capture information regarding the types of hardware currently being used by the organizations, as well as identifying plans for anticipated upgrades. Table 4 summarizes the data from this section

Table 4. Summary of Survey Results for the Computers Being Used Section

| | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Computer | PC Compatible |
| Processor | Median: 486 |
| Speed | Median: 66MHz |
| Ram | Median: 8M |
| Hard Disk | Median: 240 Mb |
| OS | Median: Windows 3.1 |

The majority of the organizations have PC-compatible computers. The median computer across all organizations is the 486. At least half of the organizations have Pentiums and one organization still has 386s.

Of the 6 organizations that responded to the question regarding hard disk capacity, the answers range from 40 Mb to 1.2 GB, with no clear trend. The median RAM for each organization is 8 Mb.

The median operating system that runs on the PCs is Windows 3.1 or Windows 3.11 (Windows for Workgroups). Only one organization has Windows 95. However, referring back to the question in the Software Section regarding future software upgrades, half of the organizations will be going to Windows 95 or Windows NT in the near term.

Novell is the typical network operating system for 3 of the 5 organizations that responded to this question. Windows NT and Windows 95 are used by the other two. Everyone has a LAN/WAN connection, several have LANs specifically for classified data.

Most of the organizations have multiple buildings in the physical organization layout, with only one having a single building. Most have firewalls(physical vs. Computer) within their organization.

Plans for future hardware upgrades range from the organization of an unclassified LAN, to upgrading to all Pentiums, to increasing RAM and hard disk space on existing machines, and upgrading the backbone to a 100 Mb per sec FDDI.

2.4 DOCUMENTATION

The intent of the questions in the Documentation section was to collect information on the types of documentation that exist in the organizations. The information could be used as a reference from which more detailed functional specifications could be drawn. Table 5 summarizes the data that came from this section in the survey.

Table 5. Summary of Survey Results for the Documentation Section

| | |
|---|---|
| Are any of your requirements processing procedures documented in a MAJCOM instruction/organization Operating Instruction (OI)? | (2) HOI 10-1; (3) 10-601; (2) YES; (1) NO |
| Other documentation? (Of processes, database structure, maintenance procedures, user access procedures for requirements database,...) | Of those that responded, all said NO except for one that replied PENDING. |

In response to the question about whether any of the organization's requirements processing procedures are documented in a MAJCOM instruction/organization Operating Instruction (OI), 2 responded "No" and 7 responded "Yes". Of those that said "Yes", their documentation sources ranged from the governing directives and the office continuity book to the organization-specific AFI 10-601 and the HOI 10-1. When asked if any processes were documented in any other way, one organization responded that they had their own internal procedures.

No organizations had a database administrator's manual or any documentation on the structure and operations of the database. Similarly, none of the organizations had any formal documented maintenance procedures that were unique to the specific software application.

Only two organizations responded to the question regarding the existence of operator's/user's manuals or documentation of user access procedures and other features of the requirements database. One had documentation pending and the other had on-the-job training and some training in Microsoft Access.

2.4.1 Current Organizational Procedures

The intent of the questions in the Current Organizational Procedures section was to collect information regarding the processes used in document requirements tracking. This information was intended to be used as a reference from which more detailed functional specifications could be drawn. Table 6 summarizes the data that came from this section in the survey.

Table 6. Organizational Procedures Survey Results Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Analyze, process, and track requirements. | (1) Receive, categorize, file and track via electronic database; (2) Database; (1) Word Processing, telephone, email, fax |
| Requirements Identification. | (1) MAA; (1) HOI Instructions; (1) MAP/USSPACE Integrated Priority List; (2) Hard Copy and Electronic |

| | Docs |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Requirements Documentation. | (3) MNS/ORDs; (2) hard and electronic copies; (1) AF Form 1067; (1) CRSD |
| Coordination of Requirements with AF | (1) IAW AFI 10-601; Unclassified: (2) Mail; (3) email; (3) fax; (4) hard copy |
| | Classified: (1) Mail |
| Requirements Prioritization. | RRB; RRG; Prioritized by developers of the requirements; AFFSA lead command for ATCALS; coordinate priorities with MAJCOM POC |
| Manage/Track Supporting Docs. | (1) Ad Hoc; (1) Excel; (2) DB/email/manual rcds; (1) Word; (1) Funding Profiles recorded and managed separately from DB |

Four organizations responded to the question asking about the methods used to analyze, process, and track requirements. The responses that were received were too high level to be of much use. The responses included the following:

1. They are received, categorized, filed and tracked via an electronic database
2. They are controlled by HQ. This is accomplished via database, word processing, telephone, e-mail, fax, and manual processing of hard copy documents;
3. This is accomplished via a Database
4. This is accomplished via word processing, e-mail, and manual processing of hard copy. (use periods instead of semicolons)

In response to how their organization accomplishes requirements identification, the following answers were given:

1. Through the MAA
2. Through a MAP/USSPACE Integrated Priority List
3. Through HOI Instructions
4. Through Hard copy and electronic documents; and
5. Through word processing and manual files.

In response to how their organizations accomplish requirements documentation, most of those organizations responded that they are using formal documents such as MNS/ORDS, CSRDs, and AF Form 1067. Others didn't specify particular documents but rather said that they were using hard copy and electronic copies.

When asked how their organizations accomplish coordination of requirements with the Air Force, the organizations interpreted the question in various ways. Some responded by saying they are using hard copy and electronic versions; others are using mail, e-mail, telephone, and fax, and other specified specific documents such as the 10-601.

In response to how their organizations accomplish requirements prioritization, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Done during the quarterly Requirements Review Board (RRB) and reviewed by AFSOC Council
2. RRB and RRG
3. Prioritized by developers of the requirement
4. AFFSA lead command for ATCALs; coordinate priorities with MAJCOM POC.

When asked to how their organizations manage and track supporting documents, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Funding profiles are recorded on the fact sheets but are managed by my office. The rest of the information is managed in the database by the AO
2. Excel
3. DR Database, also in-house DB and Requirements Documents
4. Ad Hoc; No set process
5. Database, e-mail, and manual records
6. Stored as Word Document on PC

When asked to how their organization's general capabilities are, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Done in the MAA/MAP
2. Air Mobility Master Plan.

When asked to how what their organization's general deficiencies are, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. No formal data to track deficiencies;
2. Air Mobility Master Plan;
3. Lack of up-to-date computer hardware, inadequate data storage capability and lack of up-to-date communications tools;
4. Data sharing between offices and lack of fields like MAJCOM; and
5. Need a way to more rapidly sort documents coming to them for review. An ability to scan documents looking for key words. The ability to score the keywords, based on the number of times the word appears in a document. Concerned with how to deal with organizations which work off a classified LAN, in terms of interfacing them with outside agencies dealing with unclassified documents.

When asked what queries and reports are currently available to them, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Documentation reviews;
2. Program info is available in DR Database;
3. Total documents processed during a given time period; and
4. ATCALs Database published in October.

Three of the organizations responded that they were aware of AF-wide requirements processing automation initiatives. When asked if their procedures were compatible, all answered that they did not know because they were unaware of the anticipated capabilities of the automation initiatives.

When asked to who the organization's customers are, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. AFSOC-gained units;
2. The entire AF community and joint programs;
3. AF AFSPC/OU, Wings;
4. Other HQ AMC directories, various action officers and reserve forces;
5. All MAJCOMS, Product Centers, Air Logistics Centers and HQ AFMC offices; and
6. Pilots, Air Traffic Controllers, FAA personnel, and Acquisition personnel as ESC/TG.

When asked to what products the organization's have to deliver, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. MNS, ORD, C-MNS and supporting staff documentation;
2. Comments;
3. MNS/ORDS;
4. APL and MOD summaries
5. Document review, comments, and coordination. Document distribution. Procedural and Policy guidance; and
6. MNS, ORD, MAA, AOA, COEAs, Site surveys, and ATC faculty distance.

When asked to the how the organizations distribute appropriate requirements data to customers, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Handled by AO, preferably via electronic means (computer);
2. Hard copy; some electronic;
3. Respond to Ad Hoc requests; and
4. Mail and e-mail.

2.4.2 Future/Anticipated Requirements Needs

When asked about the present challenges to producing/distributing the organization's deliverables, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Manpower restrictions that limit our capability to take a document from concept to completion organically;
2. All are major factors in developing deficiencies in solutions. Management of resources to meet an extended time line is key factor;
3. All current challenges due to lack of communications between action officers and inadequate data linkage to cost, scheduling, and performance actions;
4. All current challenges due to a lack of up-to-date hardware/software and communications tools, as well as a lack of manpower;

5. The ability to see deficiencies without technologies, identify deficiencies that are in trouble if technology is pulled and what happens if a concept is killed; and
6. Many of the challenges are due to the lack of understanding concerning the requirements by various review offices that are involved in the MNS/ORD process.

When asked to what experience the people performing the requirements processing tasks need, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. A minimal amount of hands- on time using the database and a working knowledge of AF staff procedures;
2. Test Manager experience;
3. AFSPC provides a training program to include S4/S111, command management seminar, etc. to give basic information;
4. We have experience levels ranging from virtually none to extensive, obviously the more the better;
5. A knowledge of current processes, existing requirements guidance, and understanding of organizational functions and interrelationships as well as a familiarity with computer hardware/software tools and a good set of communications tools.

When asked to what are the estimated resources required to complete these tasks (in terms of processing a single "average" requirement) the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. A flexible database and the computers to host it, and the time and patience to use it
2. End-to-end process involving multiple 2 layer organization.

When asked to the question regarding whether their organizations have any plans in the near future to change their current requirements management processes or the products they deliver, the organizations responded with the following answers:

1. Some acquisition reform measures have the potential for reducing our workload within the AF system, the SOF system has no reform on the horizon;
2. No (2);
3. Totally flow chart processes to show input, output, supplier, customer, and internal process actions; automate as best we can;
4. The systems requirement division is reorganizing to address new and maturing acquisitions, as well as deficiencies in training and quality processes;
5. Any major changes within HQ AFMC will be driven by HQ USAF/XORD initiatives.

It is more difficult to analyze and compare responses to free form questions, such as the ones in the Organization Procedures Section of the survey. Since the intent of this section was to identify functionality of a future software application that could do requirements tracking, the responses could be used to capture what is currently being done and what

they would like to see done. The following list contains a set of system requirements as a result of the comments from this survey section. This list needs to be prioritized and classified according to urgency of need.

1. Receive, categorize, file, and track requirements via a database;
2. Coordinate data sharing with other AF organizations (email, fax, mail,etc.);
3. Add MAJCOM fields;
4. Prioritize Requirements;
5. Have funding management;
6. Rapidly sort documents for review;
7. Scan documents looking for keywords and "score" the keywords, based on the number of times the word appears in a document;
8. Create deliverables (MNS, ORD, C-MNS, APL, MOD summaries) in hard and electronic copy;
9. Have the ability to manage documents;
10. Add/improve data linkages to cost, scheduling, and performance actions;
11. Have the ability to see deficiencies without technologies (i.e. identify deficiencies that are in trouble if technology is pulled).

3 SUMMARY AND REFERENCES

3.1 SUMMARY

Battelle and ARINC conducted on-site visits with most of the requirements organizations referenced in the Statement of Scope, Appendix B. Standardized survey questionnaires, or data calls, were developed to ensure that accurate information was gathered in all cases and also distributed to organizations that were not visited. A groupware session was held at the Tools Study Forum on 19 June. This session was used to help obtain inputs for the core testbed description and to develop, in more detail, the priorities of the core functions. Since this report was due on 19 June, the results of the groupware session added to this report in the form of an appendix.

Common procedures of the requirements processing organizations will provide for the design of the core processes and functions of the IRSS. Average software and hardware currently available and in use by the organizations will provide the baseline infrastructure for the IRSS.

The information gathered during this task shows many similarities among the requirements processing organizations. A baseline data model and set of core processes have already been initiated as part of the Three-Schema Architecture Teaming/Development Model subtask.

3.2 REFERENCES

Ms. Janet Peasant
AL/HRGA
2698 G Street, Building 190
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433
Phone: (513) 255-8502
FAX: (513) 255-6555
E-mail: jpeasant@alhrg.wpafb.af.mil

Mr. Roger Moulder
Battelle Dayton Operations
5100 Springfield Pike, Suite 219
Dayton, Ohio 45431
Phone: (513) 258-6777 *6811
FAX: (513) 254-8583
E-mail: rmoulder@alhrg.wpafb.af.mil

Mr. James Walters
Battelle Dayton Operations
5100 Springfield Pike, Suite 219
Dayton, Ohio 45431
Phone: (513) 258-6777 *6800
FAX: (513) 254-8583
E-mail: jwalters@alhrg.wpafb.af.mil

Ms. Mary Johnson
Battelle Dayton Operations
5100 Springfield Pike, Suite 219
Dayton, Ohio 45431
Phone: (513) 258-6777 *6823
FAX: (513) 254-8583
E-mail: mjohnson@alhrg.wpafb.af.mil

4 APPENDIXES

4.1 APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES

"As-Is" State of Requirements Processing Data Call

Organization:

Location:

Point of Contact:

E-mail address:

Phone number:

Fax number:

Date:

1. Data

- Are you using a database?
- If yes, what type (relational, object-oriented, etc.)?
- If you do not use a database, how do you store the data for tracking requirements etc.?
- Amount of data
 - If using a database, what is the size of the database in bytes?
 - How many tables are there?
 - How many records in each table?
 - If not using a database, what is the size of files in bytes?
- How many requests for information from the requirements data are there per day?
- How many users of the data?
- How many requests from users to include additional information in the data per month?
- Types of data and data relationships (perhaps a table layout or diagram). Please attach.
- Classified and/or unclassified data?
- What type of user privileges are you currently using (user names, passwords, levels for creating, reading, editing, deleting)?
- What type of user privileges do you need?

2. Software

- If you use a word processor for any of the requirements processes, which one (Word, WordPerfect, etc.)? What version/release?
- If you use a spreadsheet, which one (Excel, Lotus, etc.)? What version/release?
- If you use database management software, which one (Access, FoxPro, SQL Server, etc.)? What version/release?
- What other software tools do you use to create, manage, communicate and coordinate operational requirements?
- Does your software allow for multi-user or single-user access?
- What is your **typical** computer workstation **software** suite?
- What e-mail system do you use? Does it connect to the Internet?
- Can you connect to the World Wide Web? What Internet browser do you use (version/release)?
- Do you plan any software upgrades in the next 6, 12, 18 months? What are they?

3. Computers being used:

- IBM-compatible PCs, Macintosh, Suns?

- Hardware specifications (processor, speed, RAM, disk space, etc.) for your “high-end”, “low-end”, and “**typical**” PC/workstation?
- Operating system - Windows 3.1, Windows NT, Windows 95, Unix (version?)?
- Are you connected to a LAN/WAN?
- Server type and capacity
- Communications
- What is the physical layout of your organization? (e.g. Is your organization spread out over two buildings?)
- Do you have firewalls?
- Do you plan any hardware upgrades in the next 6, 12, 18 months? What are they?

4. Documentation

- Are any of your requirements processing procedures documented in a MAJCOM instruction/organization Operating Instruction (OI)?
- Are any processes documented in another manner?
- If you are using a database, is there a database administrator’s manual or any documentation on the structure and operations of the database?
- Are there maintenance procedures that are unique to the specific software application? Are these procedures documented in any way?
- Is there an operator’s/user’s manual or any documentation of user access procedures and other features of the requirements database? (e.g., queries or searches for information, entering new data, modifying data)

5. Other: (Including Current Organizational Procedures and Future/Anticipated Requirements Needs)

Briefly describe how your organization accomplishes the following processes:

- Analyze, process, and track requirements
- Requirements identification
- Requirements documentation
- Coordination of requirements (classified and unclassified) with the Air Force
- Requirements prioritization
- Manage/track supporting documents (e.g., Mission Need Statements or Operational Requirements Documents), funding profiles, point of contact information, and background information.
- Define general capabilities and deficiencies
- Associate rationales with requirements
- What queries and/or reports are currently generated by/available to your organization?
- Are you aware of any Air Force-wide requirements processing automation initiatives?
- If yes, are your procedures compatible with emerging Air Force automation initiatives for the management and analysis of the requirements processes?

- Who are your customers?
- What are the products you have to deliver?
- How do you distribute appropriate requirements data to customers?

- What are your present challenges to producing/distributing your deliverables in terms of:
 - product completion
 - time schedule
 - quality expectations
 - budget
- What experience do the people performing requirements processing tasks need?
- What are the estimated resources required to complete these tasks (in terms of processing a single “average” requirement)?
 - cost
 - material, equipment, postage, etc.
 - hours
- Does your organization have any plans in the near future (to include any MAJCOM initiative which would effect your organization) to change your current requirements management processes or the products you deliver? If yes, please provide a synopsis of the key points (e.g., contracting out, upgrading equipment, upgrading software, etc.)

4.2 APPENDIX B: STATEMENT OF SCOPE FOR THE INITIAL TOOLS STUDY FOR A REQUIREMENTS TESTBED

1. PURPOSE

This Statement of Scope, when approved by AL/HRGA, will serve as a limit on the organizations and products that will be included in this study. Once this Statement of Scope is approved, no further changes to the organizations and/or products will be accepted without extending the period of performance and delivery dates of all deliverables that have not been submitted.

2. SCOPE

2.1 Core Organizations

The following organizations will comprise the core of the Tools Study. These organizations will be included in all aspects of the study, including the data call, groupware sessions, and information gathering visits.

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| HQ ACC/DRM | Langley AFB, VA |
| HQ AETC/XORP | Randolph AFB, TX |
| HQ AFFSA | Andrews AFB, MD |
| HQ AFMC/DR | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |
| HQ AFOTEC/XR | Kirtland AFB, NM |
| HQ AFSOC/DO | Hurlburt Field, FL |
| HQ AFSPC/DRR | Peterson AFB, CO |
| HQ AIA | Kelly AFB, TX |
| HQ AMC/XP | Scott AFB, IL |
| HQ OSAF/AQ | Washington, DC |
| HQ USAF/C4A | Scott AFB, IL |
| HQ USAF/SPO | Washington, DC |

Information only:

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| HQ USAF/XORD | Washington, DC |
| OL AL HSC/HRG | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH |

2.2 Satellite Organizations

The following organizations will be satellite organizations of the Tools Study. These organizations will be included in selected aspects of the study, including some, but not necessarily all, of the data call, groupware sessions, and information gathering visits.

HQ USAF/CEP
HQ USAF/INX
HQ USAF/LGMY
HQ USAF/PER
HQ USAF/PES
HQ USAF/REO
HQ USAF/SCXP
HQ USAF/XOW
HQ ANG/AQ

2.3 Core Products

The following products currently under development or completed by USAF organizations and/or contractors, and commercial-off-the-shelf products will be included in the Tools Study.

| | |
|----------|--|
| I-MPP | ACC/DRM (Battelle Arlington) AFSOC/DO & AETC/XO (ARINC) |
| RAPID-WS | AL/HRG (Sumaria Systems) |

2.4 Satellite Products

The following products will be included in the Tools Study as time and resources permit.

Vitech Corporation's CORE
Zycad Corporation's DOORS
Ascent Logic Corporation's RDD-100
Marconi Systems Technology, Inc.'s RTM
TD Technologies' SLATE
Other products that become available

4.3 APPENDIX C: DATA TABLES

DATA SUMMARY

| | Database Type | Database Size | Number of tables | Records per Table | Flat File Size | Types of Data Relationships |
|---------------------|---|---------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Relational | 1.5 MB | 9 | 200 | X | X |
| AFOTEC | NONE | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10K - 1M | X |
| AFSPC | Relational | 1.8 MB | X | X | X | X |
| AIA | Relational | 15 MB | 5 | 460 | 10K -1M | X |
| AMC | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | 150 - 311 Kb | X |
| HQ ACC/DR | Relational | 4 Mb | 36 | 0 - 1000+ | N/A | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Relational | 114 K | 1 | 240 | N/A | Received |
| AFMC/STR | Relational | X | 3 | X | N/A | X |
| HQ AFFSA/XRR | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes: X | X |
| SAF/AQSM | None | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes: X | |
| AF/XOR | Relational (Flat) | 9 Mb | 2 | Main: 1724 PMD: 487 | N/A | |
| AF/LGMM | Yes: Only to track where documents are within LGM; kept by LGM exec | X | X | X | N/A | X |

X denotes information not provided

DATA SUMMARY

| | Number of Users | User Privileges |
|--------------|---|---|
| AFSOC/DOXR | 25 | <i>Current:</i> Passwords |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> X |
| AFOTEC | X | <i>Current:</i> None |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Passwords |
| AFSPC | 125 | <i>Current:</i> User Names, Passwords, All with Read/Write |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Administrator - all privileges, Others - Read Only |
| AIA | 2 | <i>Current:</i> Editing for two users |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Passwords |
| AMC | Regular: 60 Ad Hoc: 20 - 30 | <i>Current:</i> LAN Action Officers: Administrative LAN Users: Read Only |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Read, Write, Create, Delete, and Edit |
| HQ ACC/DR | 300 | <i>Current:</i> User Names and Passwords Application manager: varying levels of access for read, write, view, and edit Requirements Part of Database: Action Officer can edit their own documents and browse all DB Administrator can edit all Heads of organizations can edit all within their organization and browse all |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Same as above |
| AFMC/DRX | 1 | <i>Current:</i> One user |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Same |
| AFMC/STR | X | <i>Current:</i> X |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> X |
| HQ AFFSA/XRR | X | <i>Current:</i> X |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> X |
| SAF/AQSM | X | <i>Current:</i> X |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> X |
| AF/XOR | Continuous: 2 Periodically: 3 Multiple Walk-ins | <i>Current:</i> Multilevel users: Read Only and Read/Write |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> Same as above |
| AF/LGMM | X | <i>Current:</i> X |
| | | <i>Anticipated:</i> X |

X denotes information not provided

DATA SUMMARY

| | Unclassified Data | Classified Data |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Yes | No |
| AFOTEC | Yes | Yes |
| AFSPC | Yes | No |
| AIA | No | Yes |
| AMC | Yes | No |
| HQ ACC/DR | Yes | Yes - Handled by Stand Alone network |
| AFMC/DRX | Yes | Yes - Handled by Hardcopy |
| AFMC/STR | X | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Yes | No |
| SAF/AQSM | 80% | 20% |
| AF/XOR | Yes | No |
| AF/LGMM | 95% | 5% |

X denotes information not provided

DATA SUMMARY

| | Data Requests | Requests for Additional Information |
|----------------------|---|---|
| AFSOC/DOXR | <i>Daily:</i> X | |
| | <i>Weekly:</i> X | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AFOTEC | <i>Daily:</i> X | |
| | <i>Weekly:</i> 1 | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AFSPC | <i>Daily:</i> Unavailable On-line | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AIA | <i>Daily:</i> X | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AMC | <i>Daily:</i> APL: 5 at Peak | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> APL: 10 -15 MODs: 5 -10, MNS-ORDs: 3 - 5 | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| HQ ACC/DR | <i>Daily:</i> 5 (under final testing) 100 when fully implemented | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> | <i>Monthly:</i> : Anticipate over 2000 when fully implemented |
| AFMC/DRX | <i>Daily:</i> 2 | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> 1 | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AFMC/STR | <i>Daily:</i> X | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | <i>Daily:</i> X | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| SAF/AQSM | <i>Daily:</i> X | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> X | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AF/XOR | <i>Daily:</i> 100 | <i>Daily:</i> Not Sure |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> | <i>Monthly:</i> X |
| AF/LGMM | <i>Daily:</i> | <i>Daily:</i> X |
| | <i>Monthly:</i> | <i>Monthly:</i> X |

X denotes information not provided

SOFTWARE DATA

| | Word Processor | Spreadsheet | Database |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Word 6.0 | Excel 4.0 | FileMaker Pro 2.1 Transitioning to Access |
| AFOTEC | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | Access |
| AFSPC | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | Access 2.0 |
| AIA | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | Paradox |
| AMC | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | None |
| HQ ACC/DR | Word 6.0 Word 7.0 | Excel 5.0 Excel 7.0 | FoxPro MS Access SQL Server |
| AFMC/DRX | Word 6.0 | N/A | Superbase 4 v1.21 |
| AFMC/STR | X | X | FoxPro 2.6 |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X | X |
| AF/XOR | Word 6.0 | Excel 5.0 | Paradox 1.0 |
| AF/LGMM | X | X | X |

X denotes information not provided

SOFTWARE DATA

| | Other software tools used to create, manage, communicate and coordinate operational requirements |
|--------------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Powerpoint CC:Mail Internet |
| AFOTEC | MS Mail 3.5 NCSA Mosaic |
| AFSPC | All Clear Metrics Management Sarah Lite Perform Pro Windows for Workgroups |
| AIA | WWW software |
| AMC | Powerpoint |
| HQ ACC/DR | E-mail |
| AFMC/DRX | Powerpoint 4.0 Beyond Mail v2.0 |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | Powerpoint 4.0a |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

SOFTWARE DATA

| | MultiUser Access | Typical Workstation Software Suite | Plans for Operating System Upgrade |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Yes | MS Office LAN applications | X |
| AFOTEC | | DOS 5.0 Powerpoint Word Excel Formflow Windows 3.11 Mosaic | X |
| AFSPC | Yes | Windows for Workgroups 3.11 | X |
| AIA | No | MS Office | X |
| AMC | Yes | MS Office | X |
| HQ ACC/DR | Yes | Windows 95 | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Yes | Word 6.0 Powerpoint 4.0 Excel 5.0 Beyond Mail 2.0 Paradox 4.5 Superbase 4 1.21 Netscape 2.0 | X |
| AFMC/STR | X | FoxPro 2.6 | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X | DeskTop IV GTSI | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X | No |
| AF/XOR | Yes | MS Office 4.2 | X |
| AF/LGMM | X | X | X |

X denotes information not provided

EMAIL SUMMARY

| | Software | Email Connection to Internet | WWW Connection |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| AFCSOC/DOXR | CC:Mail | Yes | Yes |
| AFOTEC | MS Mail 3.5 | Yes | Yes |
| AFSPC | MS Mail | Yes | Yes |
| AIA | Banyan | Yes | No |
| AMC | Novell Groupwise 4.1 | Yes | Yes |
| HQ ACC/DR | Microsoft Exchange | Yes | Yes |
| AFMC/DRX | Beyond Mail 2.0 | Yes | Yes |
| AFMC/STR | X | X | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Windows 3.1 | Yes | Yes |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X | X |
| AF/XOR | MS Mail | Yes | Yes |
| AF/LGMM | MS Mail | Yes | Yes |

X denotes information not provided

INTERNET SUMMARY

| | Browser Software | Future Software Upgrades |
|----------------------|------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Netscape | Yes. TBD |
| AFOTEC | Mosaic 2.0 | 6 mos: MS Exchange 12 mos: Windows NT |
| AFSPC | GNN (beta) | E-mail: Looking at MS Exchange Evaluating Windows NT (but will not be supported base wide) |
| AIA | X | X |
| AMC | Netscape 1.1 | Windows 95 (9 months out) |
| HQ ACC/DR | Mosaic 2.0 | In the process of implementing I-MPP, moving to MS Web server browser, and windows 95 office suite of applications |
| AFMC/DRX | Netscape 2.0 | X |
| AFMC/STR | X | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | NCSA Mosaic | Dependent on Base Program |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X |
| AF/XOR | Netscape | Unclassified LAN installation with NT O/S and Windows 95 |
| AF/LGMM | Netscape | X |
| | Mosaic | |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | COMPUTER | PROCESSOR | MHz |
|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| AFSOC/DOXR | IBM compatible PCs | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> 166 |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 386 | <i>Low:</i> 25 |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 50 |
| AFOTEC | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 33 |
| AFSPC | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> 133 |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 486 | <i>Low:</i> 66 |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 66 |
| AIA | Zenith | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 33 |
| AMC | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> Pentium 486DX | <i>Typical:</i> 66 |
| HQ ACC/DR | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 486 | <i>Low:</i> 33 |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 66 |
| AFMC/DRX | Wang | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 25 |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | COMPUTER | PROCESSOR | MHz |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| AFMC/STR | IBM Compatible PC MACs | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> 120 |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 486 | <i>Low:</i> 33 |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 33 |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 33 |
| SAF/AQSM | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 486 | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> X |
| AF/XOR | IBM Compatible PC | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> Pentium | <i>High:</i> 100 |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 486 | <i>Low:</i> 33 |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 33-100 |
| AF/LGMM | X | | |
| | | <i>High:</i> | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 486 | <i>Typical:</i> 66 |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | Hard Disk Capacity | RAM |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| AFSOC/DOXR | 200-500 MB; 1 GB | |
| | | <i>High:</i> 16 - 32 MB |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 4 - 8 MB |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8 - 16 MB |
| AFOTEC | 240 Mb | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8 M |
| AFSPC | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> 8 Mb |
| | | <i>Low:</i> 4 Mb |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8-12 Mb |
| AIA | 400 Mb | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8 Mb |
| AMC | 1.2 Gb and 420 Mb | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 16 Mb |
| HQ ACC/DR | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8 Mb |
| AFMC/DRX | 40 Mb | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical:</i> 8 Mb |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | Hard Disk Capacity | RAM |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| AFMC/STR | 40 Mb | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical: 8 Mb</i> |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical: 8 Mb</i> |
| SAF/AQSM | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical: X</i> |
| AF/XOR | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical: X</i> |
| AF/LGMM | X | |
| | | <i>High:</i> |
| | | <i>Low:</i> |
| | | <i>Typical</i> |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | Operating System (Desk Top) | Operating System (Network) | LAN/WAN Connection | Server |
|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DOXR | Windows (95%); Windows 95 (4%); Macintosh (1%) | Novell 4.1 | Yes | Current: Compaq Proliant 4500 Server Planned: X |
| AFOTEC | Windows 3.1 | X | Yes | Current: Pentium Planned: X |
| AFSPC | Windows for Workgroups 3.11 | Windows NT | Yes | Current: Compaq and Dell Planned: X |
| AIA | Window 3.1 | X | Yes | Current: Pentium Planned: X |
| AMC | MS Dos 6.22 Windows 3.1 | Novell 4.1 | Yes | Current: Pentium 166 with 640 Mb RAM utilizing Novell 3.2 Planned: Upgrade to Novell 4.1 OS |
| HQ ACC/DR | Windows 95 | NT Novell | Yes | Current: NT Novell servers (11 Gb) Planned: X |
| AFMC/DRX | Windows 3.1 | X | Yes | Current: 486- 6 Planned: Pentium |
| AFMC/STR | X | Novel | Yes | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Windows NT | X | Yes | Current: Same as 89th Air Lift Wing Planned: X |
| SAF/AQSM | Windows for Workgroups | X | Closed Classified 3 Stand Alone | Current: X Planned: X |
| AF/XOR | Classified Windows 3.11 in Novell 4.1 | Unclassified: within 6 mos. Windows 95 and NT | Yes Classified | Current: Single workstation on Internet with Endora mail Planned: X |
| AF/LGMM | Windows 3.1 | X | X | X |

X denotes information not provided

HARDWARE SUMMARY

| | Physical Organization Layout | Firewalls | Hardware Upgrade Planned |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | One primary building. About 4 small organizations dial-in to LAN or have TI connections | We have various security measures | Upgrade backbone to 100Mbit per sec FDDI |
| AFOTEC | Multiple buildings | Yes | 6 mos 16 Mb RAM 12 mos Larger hard drives 18 mos Pentium upgrade |
| AFSPC | Multiple local buildings, also a remote site -- all connected to LAN | Yes | Upgrades evaluated as migration plan |
| AIA | X | X | X |
| AMC | Multiple buildings | Yes | No |
| HQ ACC/DR | Multiple buildings 4 on-base and off-base site | Yes | No |
| AFMC/DRX | Multiple buildings | Yes | LAN and Server |
| AFMC/STR | X | X | All Pentiums/120 |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Single building | X | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X | X |
| AF/XOR | Pentagon with swing sites | Unknown | Installation of Unclassified LAN |
| AF/LGMM | X | X | X |

X denotes information not provided

DOCUMENTATION SUMMARY

| | Are any of your requirements processing procedures documented in a MAJCOM instruction/organization Operating Instruction (OI)? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Yes in the governing directives ant the office continuity book |
| AFOTEC | No. |
| AFSPC | AFSAC HOI 10-1 |
| AIA | Yes |
| AMC | Yes. HOI |
| HQ ACC/DR | Yes, ACCI 10-601 |
| AFMC/DRX | No. Too long to develop |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Yes, AFFOI |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | Yes. AFI 10-601 |
| AF/LGMM | AFI 10-601 |

X denotes information not provided

| | Are any processes documented in another way? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | X |
| AFOTEC | No |
| AFSPC | No |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | No |
| HQ ACC/DR | No |
| AFMC/DRX | Internal DRX procedures |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | AFI 10-601 |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

DOCUMENTATION SUMMARY

| | If using a database, is there a database administrator's manual or any documentation on the structure and operations of the database? |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | X |
| AFOTEC | No |
| AFSPC | No |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | No |
| HQ ACC/DR | Pending |
| AFMC/DRX | No |
| AFMC/STR | No |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | N/A |
| SAF/AQSM | No |
| AF/XOR | No |
| AF/LGMM | No |

X denotes information not provided

| | Are there maintenance procedures that are unique to the specific software application? Are these procedures documented in any way? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | X |
| AFOTEC | No |
| AFSPC | No |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | N/A |
| HQ ACC/DR | No |
| AFMC/DRX | Yes, but not documented |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | No |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | No |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

DOCUMENTATION SUMMARY

| | Is there an operator's/user's manual or any documentation of user access procedures and other features of the requirements database? (e.g., queries or searches for information, entering new data, modifying data) |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | X |
| AFOTEC | No |
| AFSPC | Basic OJT and training in Access 2.0; Some written doc. |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | X |
| HQ ACC/DR | Pending |
| AFMC/DRX | Due to Access User friendliness little or no documentation |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | No |
| AF/LGMM | No |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Analyze, process, and track requirement |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | They are received, categorized, filed and tracked via an electronic database |
| AFOTEC | N/A |
| AFSPC | DR Database |
| AIA | N/A |
| AMC | HOI Instructions |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Controlled by HQ AFMC/DRX. Accomplished via database, word processing, telephone, e-mail, fax, and manual processing of hard copy documents |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Done via word processing and manual files (paper); email with XORD |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

| | Requirements Identification |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | Identified primarily in the MAA |
| AFOTEC | N/A |
| AFSPC | MAP/ USSPACE Integrated Priority List |
| AIA | N/A |
| AMC | Draft needs statement |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Hard copy and electronic documents |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Done via word processing and manual files (paper); email with XORD |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Requirements Documentation |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Mission Needs Statement (MNS), AF Form 1067, Operational Requirements Document (ORD), ORD Addendum, and CSRDs |
| AFOTEC | N/A |
| AFSPC | MNS/ORD's (in MS Word) |
| AIA | N/A |
| AMC | MNS and ORDS |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Hard copy and electronic copies. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Accomplished via word processing and manual files (paper); email with XORD |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

| | Coordination of Requirements with Air Force |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | IAW AFI 10-601 |
| AFOTEC | Classified : Mail, and Unclassified: E-mail, snail mail, and fax |
| AFSPC | Paper Copy (some electronic) |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Regular Mail, occasional e-mail, and hard copies |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | E-mail, telephone, fax, and hard copy. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | IAW AFI 10-601 |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Requirements Prioritization |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | Done during the quarterly Requirements Review Board (RRB), reviewed by AFSOC Council |
| AFOTEC | N/A |
| AFSPC | X |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | RRB and RRG |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Prioritized by developers of the requirement |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | AFFSA lead command for ATCALs; coordinate priorities with MAJCOM P.O.C |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

| | Managing Supporting Document |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | Funding profiles are recorded on the fact sheets but are managed by my office. The rest of the information is managed in the database by the AO. |
| AFOTEC | Excel to track documents |
| AFSPC | DR Database, also in-house DB and Req. Docs. |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Ad Hoc: No Set process |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Database, email, and manual records |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Stored as Word Document on PC (486) |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Defining General Capabilities |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Done in the MAA/MAP |
| AFOTEC | X |
| AFSPC | No formal data to track deficiencies |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Air Mobility Master Plan |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Ability to process data electronically and manually |
| AFMC/STR | Data sharing between offices and lack of fields like MAJCOM |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Defining General Deficiencies |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Done in the MAA/MAP |
| AFOTEC | X |
| AFSPC | MAP |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Air Mobility Master Plan |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Lack of up-to-date computer hardware, inadequate data storage capability and lack of up-to-date communications tools. |
| AFMC/STR | Data sharing between offices and lack of fields like MAJCOM |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | X |
| SAF/AQSM | They need a way to more rapidly sort documents coming to them for review. An ability to scan documents looking for key words would be a major aid for them, particularly if they could "score" the keywords, based on the number of times the word appears in a document. Concerned with how to deal with organizations which work off a classified LAN, in terms of interfacing them with outside agencies dealing with unclassified documents. |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Current Queries & Reports available to your organization |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | X |
| AFOTEC | Documentation reviews |
| AFSPC | Program info is available in DR Database |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Acquisition priority list, MOD summaries, P3 funding data provided by AF/LGSY |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | 1) Total documents processed during a given time period. 2) Documents completed 3) Documents by category, year, MAJCOM, title, and number |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | ATCAL Database Published in October |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Awareness of any AF-wide rqmts processing automation initiatives? | If yes, are your procedures compatible? |
|----------------------|---|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Unknown | Unknown |
| AFOTEC | No | |
| AFSPC | lots out there; none appear formalized | Unknown |
| AIA | X | X |
| AMC | Yes | Uncertain |
| HQ ACC/DR | X | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Requirements tools initiatives being headed by HQ USAF/XORD | Unknown, HQ USAF initiative still being defined. |
| AFMC/STR | X | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | No | Unknown |
| SAF/AQSM | X | X |
| AF/XOR | X | X |
| AF/LGMM | X | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Customers |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | AFSOC - gained units |
| AFOTEC | The entire AF community and Joint programs. |
| AFSPC | AF AFSPC/OU, Wings |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Other HQ AMC directories, various Action officers and Reserve forces |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | All MAJCOMS, Product Centers, Air Logistics Centers and HQ AFMC offices. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Pilots, Air traffic controllers, FAA personnel, and Acquisition personnel as ESC/TG. |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Products Delivered |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | MNS, ORD, C-MNS and supporting staff documentation |
| AFOTEC | Comments |
| AFSPC | MNS/ORDS/ |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | APL and MOD Summaries |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Document review, comments, and coordination. Document distribution. Procedural and Policy guidance. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | MNS, ORD, MAA, AOA, COIAS, Site surveys, and ATC faculty distance |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | How do you distribute appropriate requirements data to customers? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Handled by AO, preferably via electronic means (computer) |
| AFOTEC | N/A |
| AFSPC | Paper copy/ some electronic |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Respond to Ad Hoc requests |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Electronically and manually via hard copy |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Regular mail and some E-mail |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | What are your present challenges to producing/distributing your deliverables in terms of: |
|----------------------|--|
| AFSOC/DORX | Manpower restrictions that limit our capability to take a document from concept to completion organically |
| AFOTEC | None |
| AFSPC | All are major factors in developing deficiencies into solutions. Management of resources to meet an extended time line is key factor. |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | All Current challenges due to lack of communications between action officers and inadequate data linkage to cost, scheduling, and performance actions |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | All current challenges due to a lack of up-to-date hardware/software and communications tools, as well as a lack of manpower. |
| AFMC/STR | The ability to see deficiencies without technologies, identify deficiencies that are in trouble if technology is pulled and what happens if a concept is killed. |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Many of the challenges are due to the lack of understanding concerning the requirements by various review offices that are involved in the MNS/ORD process |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | What experience do the people performing the requirements processing tasks need? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | A minimal amount of hands on time using the database and a working knowledge of AF staff procedures |
| AFOTEC | Test Manager experience |
| AFSPC | AFSPC provides a training program to include S4/S111, command management seminar, etc. to give basic information |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | We have experience levels ranging form virtually none to extensive, obviously the more the better. |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | A knowledge of current processes, existing requirements guidance, and understanding of organizational functions and interrelationships as well as a familiarity with computer hardware/software tools and a good set of communications tools. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | Field experience in mission area, some acquisition training (ACQ 101) - MNS/ORD (Sys 111) |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | What are the estimated resources required to complete these tasks (in terms of processing a single "average" requirement)? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | A flexible database and the computers to host it, and the time and patience to use it. |
| AFOTEC | 8 M |
| AFSPC | Not tracked; End-to-end process involving multiple 2 LTR organization (???) |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | Unknown |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | No data. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | unknown |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided

ORGANIZATION PROCEDURE SUMMARY

| | Does your organization have any plans in the near future to change your current requirements mgmt processes or the products you deliver? |
|----------------------|---|
| AFSOC/DORX | Some acquisition reform measures have the potential for reducing our workload within AF system, the SOF system has no reform on the horizon. |
| AFOTEC | No |
| AFSPC | 1) totally flow chart process to show input, output, supplier, customer, and internal process actions 2) Automate as best we can do |
| AIA | X |
| AMC | The systems requirement division is reorganizing to address new and maturing acquisitions, as well as deficiencies in training and quality processes. |
| HQ ACC/DR | X |
| AFMC/DRX | Any major changes within HQ AFMC will be driven by HQ USAF/XORD initiatives. |
| AFMC/STR | X |
| HQ AFFSA/ XRR | No |
| SAF/AQSM | X |
| AF/XOR | X |
| AF/LGMM | X |

X denotes information not provided