

DAHB 1000 Automation:

Milestone 1 – Requirement of Capability (ROC)

Description of milestone

Aim:

The aim of the ROC is to establish an operational capability requirement.

Description:

The ROC is basically a summary of the results obtained during the comparison of an existing capability against the approved Capability Master Plan

Procedure:

The ROC is compiled by the User and represents Milestone 1, which is the Priority Decision. This decision refers to the determination of the validity and priority of a requirement within the context of all the SANDF armaments requirements. The following procedure is applicable:

- I. The Service/Division is to appoint a User Specialist to analyse the existing capability against the SANDF's Capability Master Plan, Capability List and approved Force Design and Structure and to compile the ROC.
- II. The User Specialist must obtain input/commentary from the Services/Divisions, as well as ratification from the sponsor Chief of the Service/Division. During the development of the ROC, consideration should be given to the following dimensions:
 - a. military effectiveness,
 - b. strategic independence,
 - c. strategic sovereignty,
 - d. commercial benefits,
 - e. interoperability and
 - f. defence policy compliance.
 - g. Additionally the establishment of a local technology/industrial base to support future acquisition projects should be considered.
- III. After the above-mentioned ratification has been obtained, the ROC is submitted to the OSC for consideration.
- IV. The OSC considers the ROC in the context of the SANDFs capability priorities and verifies that the ROC reflects a valid and integrated requirement stemming from the Military Strategy and the Capability Master Plan. The OSC ensures that duplication of capabilities between Services/Divisions is minimized and that non-matériel solutions to the stated requirements have been investigated and that the correct route² to satisfy the ROC has been selected. In exceptional cases the ROC can be referred to the MCC for approval.
- V. Upon approval by the OSC, the approved ROC is returned to the sponsor Service/Division for configuration control.

VI. The sponsor Service/Division then commences with PreS (Function 1)

Funding:

ROCs are concerned with the statement of a required operational capability and at this stage, the funding of a required capability is not yet considered. Funding is considered for the first time when the ST is initiated.

Timing:

It is of fundamental importance that approved ROCs are available at least two years prior to the year in which finances are allocated on the SCAMP. This will allow the Staff Target to be compiled and approved in good time so that scheduled funds may be released on time for expenditure during the Functional Study.

Next Step in the Approval Process and Timeline Involved:

Presentation to OSC.

Critical Questions

Concept of the ROC.

- Why is this ROC necessary/needed?
- How does it fit into the overall capability of the SANDF?
- Does it address the Force Design and Structure? (Any capability shortfall should be stated as measured against the Capability Master Plan, Capability List and/or the approved Force Design and Structure - define the present situation and the deficiencies in the existing capability).
- Has the ROC been linked to specific Defence Milestones? (as specified in the Defence Review)

Statement of the Requirement.

- Has the Scrutiny Committee pronounced on the capability requirement and management?
- Has the required capability been stated in operational capability terms at Level 8/7 and not in mission, functional or physical terms, (eg what capability is required; not how it should be achieved, as the solution is not yet known, nor is it to be dictated)?
- Has an indication of the capacity and specific/unique competency of the required capacity been stated? (The Capability List should be considered in this regard).
- What constitutes a minimum capability across POSTEDFIT at Level 6 for this ROC? (Less than this minimum will lead to substantial risk of fruitless expenditure. A minimum capability must be deployable in the field). The purpose of this question is to prevent the occurrence of 'Partial Acquisitions' that do not provide a full capability.
- Does this requirement also refer to the required levels of integration, interoperability and standardisation at Levels 8/7? (The proposed capability solution should encapsulate the associated required logistic support capability in the context of the Concept of Operations. The proposed capability solution must be a complete capability and not sub-sets of a capability)

- Have all aspects of POSTEDFIT functions required to deliver the envisaged capability been considered across the capability lifecycle?
- Has the Scrutiny Committee pronounced on the viability of Programme, Technical and Commercial management of the project?
- Indicate the proposed capability solution route to be followed to achieve the capability (eg Capacity Enhancement, Training, Engineering Change Proposal, Doctrine Change, Procurement, Internal Services Project or Acquisition Project).
- Confirm the availability of available 'in-house' project relevant skills and that the project will not be over reliant on industry support.

Integration.

- Please specify other users in the Services/Divisions and elsewhere which might have an interest in making use of the operational capability (this statement will facilitate early Level 8/7 integration and standardisation).
- Indicate with which other operational capabilities this new operational capability will have to be integrated.
- Indicate with which authorities' integrative consultation was done with respect to the required operational capability. (Those authorities' support for the required capability is to be noted).
- Is there alignment between platform, capability and strategic requirement?

Timeline.

- By when must the capability be in service?
- What is the expected life-cycle of the capability?
- Provide an indication of the end of the life-cycle of the existing capability (if it exists or if a capability gap will open up or be filled).
- Confirm the time line for the ROC and that the approved ROC will be in place at least two years before allocated finances appear on the SCAMP. (This will allow for the Staff Target to be compiled and approved in good time so that scheduled funds may be released on time for expenditure during the Functional Study)
- What is the next step in the approval process, when must it take place and what will be the process and financial implications should the time line not be adhered to? (If required discuss a possible extra-ordinary sitting of the approval forum to review the ROC prior to the scheduled next approval level meeting).

Funding and Affordability.

- Has the Scrutiny Committee pronounced on the financial viability and management?
- Indicate affordability at least in terms of the yearly and lifetime cost of ownership of the solution, including the probable upgrade frequencies. (The assumptions that were made about SANDF allocations to the HR, Operating and Acquisition Budgets must be provided overall and for the specific Service/Division that is initiating the ROC).
- Indicate the affordability of the future solution within the planned Service/Division operating budget. (Projected future availability must be indicated for example as flying hours, days at sea or kilometres, and linked to projected future operating funds. This is extremely important and needs to be amended/updated if non-compliant. Potential political and macro-economic influences are to be considered).

- Has the ROC been aligned between platform, capability and strategic requirement across POSTEDFIT, to enhance sound investment decisions and budget allocations to meet the Defence Review key objectives?
- Are different/alternative contracting approaches and proposals made as part of the 'down the line' milestone documentation considering pros, cons and performance trade offs?

Proposed route to satisfy the capability requirement.

- Has the Scrutiny Committee pronounced on the viability of Programme, Technical and Commercial management of the project?
- Indicate the proposed capability solution route to be followed to achieve the capability (eg Capacity Enhancement, Training, Engineering Change Proposal, Doctrine Change, Procurement, Internal Services Project or Acquisition Project).
- Confirm the availability of available 'in-house' project relevant skills and that the project will not be over reliant on industry support.

Security Plan.

Ensure that a detailed security plan for the duration of the project has been developed and will be presented during the ROC milestone presentation for approval. Use DAHB 1000 format.

Media Plan.

Ensure that a detailed media plan for the duration of the project has been developed and will be presented during the ROC milestone presentation for approval. Use DAHB 1000 format.

Risk Management

- Are there any risks that need to be brought to the attention of the forum?
 - ✓ Activities being executed that are not properly mandated or authorised – Uncertainties with regard to Governance, accountabilities and responsibilities.
 - ✓ Inadequate/incomplete definition of requirements.
 - ✓ Requirements exceed available resources (knowledge, capacity, capability, funding, time, etc).
 - ✓ Incomplete interface definition (higher order systems, human constraints, CFE, other projects, other life-cycle phases, etc).
 - ✓ Deviations from the normal acquisition process.
 - ✓ Changes to political/social/economic etc environment.
 - ✓ Changing relationships between stakeholders.
 - ✓ Technological advances that induce obsolescence during the project, or which may cause fruitless expenditure, if the project continues.
 - ✓ Unforeseen changes to the operational environment within which the delivered Product/Products System needs to operate.
 - ✓ Availability of technology at an appropriate readiness level.
 - ✓ Inadequate QA during incoming inspections.
 - ✓ Deficiencies in sub-systems that could have a consequential cascading impact on higher system levels that is difficult to contain and of which the financial impact cannot be apportioned to the subcontractor.

- ✓ Inadequate documentation and/or qualification of a milestone achieved.
- ✓ Human factors that include the availability of suitably qualified and experienced personnel to manage projects.
- ✓ Cost escalation.
- ✓ Time delays.
- Have the required conflicts of interest as well as recusals taken place in accordance with the policy? See DAHB 1000 page 152 pars 83-87.
- Are there any internal proposals for the mitigation of the identified risks?
- Are there any risks that need to be transferred to the following approval level?
- Have all the above been encapsulated in a formal risk management plan at this level?