

**UNCLASSIFIED**

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY



**Problem Statement &  
General Program  
Requirements for:**

***< Specify the IT Proposal Here >***

---

<Submittal Date >

< Version >

< Organization >

<POC >

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**[IT Proposal]**  
**Problem Statement & General Program Requirements**  
**Approval and Change Summary**

<b>Ver. No.</b>	<b>Version Date</b>	<b>Change Purpose</b>	<b>Change Authority</b>	<b>Disposition</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<b>PSGPR X.XX.XX</b>	DD-MMM-YY	[Initial approval; certification in the amount of XX; annual review; close-out review; decision authority directed change; governance board directed change; minor update; administrative change; new major version; other]	[Decision authority; governance board; integrated product team; project lead; other]  <<Provide name and title>>	[Approved; approved with conditions; disapproved; cancel; other]	[MDA decision memorandum; IRB or DBSMC memorandum or meeting minutes; integrated product team or project lead or program manager email/memorandum]  <<Provide link to document or document location.>>

## FOREWORD

---

A Department of the Navy (DON) Problem Statement and General Program Requirements overview (PS+GPR) is recommended for on-going, previously certified information technology business systems investments valued at over \$1 million when the existing business case is out of date and does not accurately represent the current direction.

This template is based on the DON standard business case analysis (BCA) template, but because the course of direction has already been selected and is being executed, it excludes the analysis of alternatives. A PS+GPR requires all of the information required in a standard PS, i.e.: 1) a particular business or mission-related need, gap, inefficiency or problem to be solved; 2) the benefits of correcting it; 3) root causes; 4) context; 5) boundaries and constraints; 6) potential impacts within doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel and facilities; 7) process improvements; and 8) a general approach to addressing the problem. Additionally, a PS+GPR requires detail concerning process reengineering results, milestones and measures, and requirements. If the existing business case contains relevant material, it may be referenced instead of repeating that content in the document.

A PS+GPR provides governance bodies with an up-to-date overview of the program, including milestones and measures information that show whether the program is on track.

# CONTENTS

---

**Program Executive Summary .....iv**

**1. Program Overview & Problem Statement .....1**

1.1 Purpose .....1

1.2 Problem Statement .....1

1.3 Background and Context .....1

1.4 Program Description and Requirement(s) .....1

1.5 Benefits and Performance Measures.....1

1.6 Scope .....2

1.7 Key Risks, Assumptions/Constraints and Impacts .....2

1.8 Program Cost, Economic Viability, and Funding Requirements.....2

1.9 Points of Contact.....3

**2. Requirements .....3**

2.1 Strategic Objectives and Compliance Requirements .....3

2.2 Program Functional Requirements .....3

2.3 Materiel, Technical and Interface/Data Exchange Requirements .....3

2.4 Non-Materiel Requirements .....4

2.5 Business Process Reengineering Requirements .....4

**Appendix A: Glossary.....5**

**Appendix B: Milestones and Measures.....8**

**Appendix C: Requirements Detail (Optional).....9**

## PROGRAM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

<<Present an executive-level overview **NOT TO EXCEED 1-2 pages** that describes: the program; where it is in its lifecycle; the current decision being made and by what authority; why this new program or modernization is necessary; costs and benefits of this particular investment; and general requirements.>>

**IMPORTANT: for modernizations to existing systems, clearly differentiate between what already exists and what is new or being added.**

- **Summarize the request.** Include: the program's name; who owns it (e.g., Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, etc.); where it is in its lifecycle (e.g., *pre-milestone B*); when delivery is expected; and what decision is being requested from what decision body (e.g., *certification from the Financial Management Investment Review Board and approval by the Defense Business Systems Management Committee to obligate funds in the amount of \$xx*). For certifications, include amount of funding being certified.
- **Describe the valid requirement/need/problem and provide compelling evidence that it is not being met.** Explain the magnitude/scope of problem, mission/functional areas affected, why the need is valid (provide evidence from studies or data such as high level baseline measures of cost/and or performance for the "as is" situation) and the cost and mission impacts if the problem is not addressed. Substantiate with statute, regulations, policy, strategic priorities, mission requirements, etc.
- **Explain how the proposed project/initiative addresses this problem and the specific benefits it will deliver.** Identify savings. Explain what mission outcomes, key objectives, measureable goals, process improvements and other benefits it is expected to achieve -- preferably in quantifiable terms. Explain the overall implementation timeline. If other systems are being replaced, identify them and when they will be replaced/sunsetted.
- **Summarize the program or modernization's scope and requirements** based on the DOTMLPF<sup>1</sup> analysis, Business Process Reengineering efforts and other analyses performed. Explain how the program will address the root causes of the problem(s). Clearly define what is in scope and what is not for this particular request. (If the project will be executed in phases/spirals, identify how this request fits into a larger plan.)
- **Summarize the alternatives considered and portfolio impacts of this solution.** Explain what alternatives were considered – particularly enterprise or other Component systems – and rationale for final selection. Explain the benefits this system brings to a specific portfolio (e.g., addresses a capability gap, improves data interoperability, results in sunseting of legacy systems, etc.).

As appropriate, include a summary level chart/graph/table that captures the essence of the project.

*The executive summary should be updated and tailored to the review requirement.*

---

<sup>1</sup> CJCSI 3170.01G Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System of 7 Mar 2011 requires, military planners to perform an analysis of needs associated with doctrine, organizational changes, training, materiel requirements, leadership and education, personnel and/or facilities – referred to as a DOTMLPF analysis -- before authorizing a new course of action. The DOTMLPF analysis results are reflected in this business case in various sections including: the scope, requirements, operational impacts, risks, key enablers, project plan, deliverables and costs.

# 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW & PROBLEM STATEMENT

---

## 1.1 Purpose

<<Explain the purpose of this document (who will use this information and why) and the source of the information (e.g., based on/extracted from the original business case analysis). Explain the valid mission need that the program supports. Identify the program's lifecycle phase and whether it is a program of record. Also include any specific decisions/actions required of leadership.>> For example:

*This document includes a problem statement (PS) and program overview for [program full name] based on the program's original business case analysis. It is being submitted to the [Investment Review Board (IRB) name] for [state decision type, e.g., certification decision for \$xx and approval [state other request]]. [Program acronym] supports a valid mission requirement to provide the [Department of the Navy (DON), Navy, Marine Corps, or other organization name] the capability to [describe high level capability and why is required]. [Program acronym] is/is not a program of record; it is currently at/in [state lifecycle phase].*

Terms used in this document are defined in the glossary at **Appendix A**.

## 1.2 Problem Statement

<<Summarize the circumstances that led to the need for this program. Identify root causes and contributors to the observed problem(s) and explain the mission/business impacts. Provide the magnitude of the gap/problem(s) in measurable terms and explain which mission/functional areas, people, organizations, processes, etc. are affected. Explain why correcting this problem is a priority (e.g., alignment to strategic/mission area or functional priorities). Describe the general characteristics of the solution needed to address the problem(s) without going into specifics.>>

*NOTE: this problem description should be succinct and the wording the same or consistent with problem statement wording in other data sources (e.g., DITPR-DON<sup>2</sup> or IRB dashboards).*

## 1.3 Background and Context

<<Provide additional context (e.g., policy, process, environmental factors, etc.) that helps explain what created or sustains the current problem and provides insight into how to address it. Include relevant research and information on industry or market conditions as appropriate. Keep the focus strategic.>>

## 1.4 Program Description and Requirement(s)

<<Provide a short, high level description of the program: what it is, what it is intended to accomplish, whether it will be achieved in increments and a high level timeline (start and end dates). Generally summarize what mission needs, mandates, policies, compliance requirements, etc. it must satisfy and what non-materiel requirements and process reengineering improvements it includes. Additional detail is provided in Chapter 2.>>

## 1.5 Benefits and Performance Measures

<<Describe the expected savings,<sup>3</sup> outcomes, benefits, and efficiencies of implementing this program in measureable terms, if possible. A bulletized format is recommended. Generally explain what types of measures will be collected to evaluate whether the benefits and process improvements identified in this

---

<sup>2</sup> DITPR is the Department of Defense IT Portfolio and Repository. A DON variant of this system is called DITPR-DON

<sup>3</sup> Actual savings are much preferred to cost avoidances. If potential savings are expected to benefit another organization, the savings and benefiting organizations should be identified in this document to give DON leadership insight into how funds could be realigned to actually recoup savings.

section are actually realized after the program or increment of capability is delivered. **Appendix B** contains more detailed information on performance measures. >>

### 1.6 Scope

<<Define the project/initiative's boundaries (e.g., technology, organizations, users, processes, functions, etc.). Clarify what materiel and non-materiel requirements/deliverables are included and/or excluded.>>

### 1.7 Key Risks, Assumptions/Constraints and Impacts

<<Briefly explain key assumptions and constraints used in developing this problem statement. Identify major risks that could affect project/program success (e.g. dependencies on other programs, availability of funding and other resources, cost drivers, etc. If any risks have been realized or original assumptions were erroneous or new constraints have been identified that are impacting program costs, schedule or performance, they should be explained.>>

### 1.8 Program Cost, Economic Viability, and Funding Requirements

<<Provide the program's Budget Identification Number (BIN), AIS extension per NITE-STAR<sup>4</sup> and total budget amounts. (NOTE: If the program's actual budget differs from the authoritative budget data sources or the budget includes other costs, explain the differences and what actions are being taken to address discrepancies.)

If the program is not fully funded and reprogramming actions are underway, explain those. NOTE: Programs can only request certification and obligation approval of funds that have designated for that program; they cannot include unfunded amounts in their requests.>>

[Program Name, (BIN no. and AIS extension)] Budget							
Funding Available (Millions)		FYXX	FYXX	FYXX	FYXX	FYXX	Total
Budget available	Invest. <sup>1</sup>						
	O&S						
Reprogramming plans [state source(s)]	Invest.						
	O&S						
Total required	Invest.						
	O&S						

NOTE: Investment (Invest.)" reflects all one-time/non-recurring costs, regardless of appropriation expected to be incurred to implement the preferred alternative. It includes: Other Procurement Navy; Research Develop Testing and Evaluation, Navy; Navy Working Capital Fund; capital budget authority). Operations and Support (O&S) reflects costs of operating and maintaining the preferred solution after implementation.

Provide the program's economic viability measures for Net Present Value, Benefit Cost Ratio, and Break-Even using the Department of Defense's (DoD's) Economic Viability (EV) Tool.<sup>5</sup> (NOTE: summary amounts entered into the tool should be substantiated with a more detailed cost break-down that is available to decision authorities upon request.)>>

<sup>4</sup> The Naval Information Technology Exhibits/Standard Reporting (NITE/STAR) is used within the DON to capture, report and distribute IT budget and program objective memorandum resource information.

<sup>5</sup> The EV Tool is a Department of Defense tool developed by Teracore, Inc. The Business Mission Area has mandated use of the EV Tool since 2005 for business systems requiring Investment Review Board certification per 10 United States Code (U.S.C.),section 2222. While its original purpose was to value business system investments, it can also be used to value other types of projects and investments. ROI measures generated by the EV Tool may be included in the BCA, but should not be used for go/no-go decisions due to an ongoing debate over the EV tool's ROI formula. BCR is considered a much better indicator.

Economic Viability of [Program Name]			
Net Present Value (NPV) =		Break Even (Discounted) =	
		Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) =	

### 1.9 Points of Contact

<<Include contact information for: the person(s) and organization(s) leading the effort; the milestone decision authority and program manager (if designated); the program’s resource sponsor and functional and technical experts; the financial person/organization who/that validated the financial measures; and others involved in writing this document.>>

## 2. REQUIREMENTS

<<Describe the analyses performed, information sources and benchmarks used, etc., to determine the requirements for this program. Additional detail, if required, may be provided in **Appendix C**.>> For example:

*The requirements for [program acronym] were developed from many sources. The material and non-material requirements were developed based on: strategic objectives; statutory, regulatory and other compliance requirements; input from various analyses including a DOTMLPF<sup>6</sup> analysis; process reengineering efforts; and stakeholder working groups comprised of [identify areas of expertise and/or organizations that participated] that met from [dates]. Information from lean six sigma projects conducted by [state who and when] was used to identify current process root cause issues. Materiel and technical requirements were gathered from [sources]. General requirements are summarized below and additional details are provided in **Appendices B and C**.*

### 2.1 Strategic Objectives and Compliance Requirements

<<Identify the primary strategic objectives and their sources (e.g. Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Navy (DON), Business Mission Area, Functional Core Business Missions, etc.) and statutory, regulatory, and/or compliance requirements this program satisfies. Include Enterprise Architecture (e.g. end-to-end process alignment) and Information Assurance requirements as applicable.>>

### 2.2 Program Functional Requirements

<<Summarize program’s functional requirements. As appropriate, identify the performance measures that will be used during the acquisition process to ensure this functionality is delivered.>>

### 2.3 Materiel, Technical and Interface/Data Exchange Requirements

<<Summarize general materiel requirements (e.g., equipment, hardware, software, apparatus, and supplies of the program), related technical requirements and interface/data exchange requirements. If data storage is required, address what storage sources will be utilized and whether they are authorized

---

<sup>6</sup>CJCSI 3170.01G Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System of 7 Mar 2011 requires, military planners to perform an analysis of needs associated with doctrine, organizational changes, training, materiel requirements, leadership and education, personnel and/or facilities – referred to as a DOTMLPF analysis -- before authorizing a new course of action. The DOTMLPF analysis results are reflected in this business case in various sections including: the scope, requirements, operational impacts, risks, key enablers, project plan, deliverables and costs.

per DON CIO policies.<sup>7</sup> As appropriate, identify the performance measures that will be used during the acquisition process to ensure materiel, technical and/or interface requirements are delivered.>>

## 2.4 Non-Materiel Requirements

<<Summarize non-materiel requirements included in this project resulting from the DOTMLPF analysis (e.g., doctrine/policy/guidance, organizational changes, training, new governance or leadership activities, new/matrixed personnel and skills, and facilities) and state when they will be accomplished. Scheduled deliverables may be included with the program milestones identified in **Appendix B**.>>

## 2.5 Business Process Reengineering Requirements

<<Explain what business process reengineering (BPR)<sup>8</sup> efforts were performed and what efficiencies will be incorporated into the new solution. Highlight any interfaces and/or unique requirements associated with Reports, Interfaces, Conversions, Extensions (RICE) objects in Commercial-Off-the-Shelf (COTS)/Government-Off-the-Shelf (GOTS) that were eliminated. As appropriate, include the performance measures in **Appendix B** that will be instituted after this capability is delivered to assess whether the process is, in fact, more efficient.>>

---

<sup>7</sup> DON CIO memorandum of 20 July 2011, Subj: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (DON) DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION (DCC) POLICY GUIDANCE, establishes the DON's Data Center Consolidation (DCC) guidance and places a moratorium on DON investment (to include individual program of record resources) in increased data storage capacity without first determining that existing DON data center capacity is insufficient to meet the storage requirements, and secondly determining it is not more cost effective to expand capacity in an existing DON owned Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWARSSYSCOM), Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCi), or Marine Corps enterprise or regional data center. Approval to make investments in data storage must be obtained from the DON Chief Information Officer (CIO) for Secretary of the Navy (SECNA V) organizations and DON enterprise programs; DON Deputy CIO (DDCIO) Navy for Navy organizations and programs; or DON Deputy CIO (DDCIO) Marine Corps for Marine Corps organizations and programs.

<sup>8</sup> Section 1072 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2010 stipulated that defense business system modernizations may not be certified to obligate funds in excess of \$1 million without a determination having been made whether or not appropriate Business Process Reengineering (BPR) had been completed to ensure that the business process to be supported by the modernization will be as streamlined and efficient as practicable; and the need to tailor commercial-off-the-shelf systems to meet unique requirements or incorporate unique interfaces has been eliminated or reduced to the maximum extent practicable. This requirement was integrated into the Department's Investment Review Board (IRB) and Defense Business System Management Committee (DBSMC) governance framework. BPR determinations are made by the Department of Defense (DoD) Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) or one of the Military Department Chief Management Officers (CMO) depending on which Component's business processes the defense business system modernization supports.

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

<<These definitions may augmented/changed as needed to support a particular Problem Statement and Program Overview.>>

Term	Description
<b>Analysis of Alternatives</b>	Evaluation of different choices available for achieving an objective, usually requiring a cost benefit analysis, life cycle costing and sensitivity analysis.
<b>Assumption</b>	An informed position about what is believed to be true for a situation where explicit factual knowledge is unobtainable.
<b>Baseline</b>	A description of the beginning condition in measureable terms and a start date from which progress can be measured.
<b>Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR)</b>	BCR is the index resulting from dividing discounted benefits (savings/cost avoidances) by discounted investment costs (Economic Viability (EV) Tool Users Guide). Therefore, an initiative must have a BCR > 1.0 to be considered financially viable.
<b>Break Even (B-E)</b>	The fiscal year in which the initiative “breaks-even” based on discounted cash flows, i.e., the point at which the Net Present Value (NPV) becomes positive (Economic Viability (EV) Tool Users Guide).
<b>Business Capability Lifecycle (BCL)</b>	Per DTM-11-009, June 23, 2011, signed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, BCL is the overarching framework for the planning, design, acquisition, deployment, operations, maintenance, and modernization of Defense Business Systems (DBS), in accordance with section 2222(f) of title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.). This policy takes precedence over DoD Instruction 5000.02, “Operation of the Defense Acquisition System,” dated December 8, 2008. BCL shall apply to each DBS modernization with a total cost over \$1,000,000.
<b>Business Enterprise Architecture (BEA)</b>	The BEA was established in 2005 and mandated by statute (Title 10, Section 2222) to cover all the functions and activities supported by defense business systems and was required to be sufficiently defined to effectively guide, constrain, and permit implementation of interoperable defense business system solutions and consistent with the policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.
<b>Business Process Reengineering (BPR)</b>	Section 1072 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2010 stipulated that defense business system modernizations may not be certified to obligate funds in excess of \$1 million without a determination having been made whether or not appropriate Business Process Reengineering (BPR) had been completed to ensure that the business process to be supported by the modernization will be as streamlined and efficient as practicable; and the need to tailor commercial-off-the-shelf systems to meet unique requirements or incorporate unique interfaces has been eliminated or reduced to the maximum extent practicable. This requirement was integrated into the Department’s Investment Review Board (IRB) and Defense Business System Management Committee (DBSMC) governance framework. BPR determinations are made by the Department of Defense (DoD) Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) or one of the Military Department Chief Management Officers (CMO) depending on which Component’s business processes the defense business system modernization supports.
<b>Business Case Analysis (BCA)</b>	A fact-based argument advocating a course of action to improve business performance results. Most are prepared to support project or acquisition investment go/no-go decisions. The project business case is not a one-time

Term	Description
	document. It provides critical information for decision making throughout the project life span.
<b>Constraint</b>	Factors known or discovered that are expected to limit the analysis, possible solutions and/or expected outcomes.
<b>Cost Savings</b>	A reduction in costs below the projected (i.e., budgeted) level as a result of a specific initiative. Because cost savings are a reduction in the level of budgeted costs, savings are available to be recouped from the budget.
<b>Defense Business Systems (DBS)</b>	Title 10, Section 2222, defines a DBS as an information system, other than a national security system, operated by, for, or on behalf of the Department of Defense, including financial systems, mixed systems, financial data feeder systems, and information technology and information assurance infrastructure, used to support business activities, such as acquisition, financial management, logistics, strategic planning and budgeting, installations and environment, and human resource management.
<b>Defense Business Systems Management Committee (DBSMC)</b>	The DBSMC was established in 2005 by 10 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 186. The DBSMC is the senior governance body and that together with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) established IRBs and Military Department DCMOs constitute a governance and oversight framework for business system investment decision-making. The DBSMC is chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, with direct participation from senior leaders from the Joint Staff, OSD Offices and the Department of Defense (DoD) Components. The DBSMC approves DBS modernizations in excess of \$1 million that have been certified by the appropriate approval authority (initially it was the IRB; later it became the DCMO) as compliant to the DoD BEA and a determination made whether or not appropriate business process reengineering efforts had been undertaken.
<b>Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO)</b>	Title 10, section 2222, establishes DCMO positions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Military Departments. It requires them to certify to the DBSMC whether or not their defense business system modernizations are in compliance with the enterprise architecture and appropriate business process re-engineering efforts have been performed.
<b>DOTMLPF</b>	The DOTMLPF acronym is defined by the CJCSI 3170.01G -Joint Capabilities Development System (JCIDS) as: doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel and facilities. JCIDS requires all DOTMLPF aspects (materiel and non-materiel) be considered when developing a solution/recommendation. Per DoD BCL and BPR policies, DOTMLPF analyses are also required for all DBS requiring IRB/DCMO review and DBSMC approval.
<b>Enterprise Transition Plan (ETP)</b>	Title 10, section 2222, requires the DoD to develop a transition plan (referred to as the ETP) to implement the BEA. It is required to include specific time-phased milestones, performance metrics, and a statement of the financial and nonfinancial resource needs. Additionally, it is required to include: (A) The acquisition strategy for new systems that are expected to be needed to complete the defense business enterprise architecture. (B) A listing of the defense business systems as of December 2, 2002 (known as "legacy systems"), that will not be part of the objective defense business enterprise architecture, together with the schedule for terminating those legacy systems that provides for reducing the use of those legacy systems in phases. (C) A listing of the legacy systems that will be a part of the objective defense business system, together with a strategy for making the modifications to those systems that will be needed to ensure that such systems comply with the defense business enterprise architecture.
<b>Goal</b>	A description of the desired/expected end-state condition.

Term	Description
<b>Investment funds</b>	Funding used for non-recurring costs to upgrade, refresh, or modernize existing systems/processes, or new developments (Economic Viability (EV) Tool Users Guide).
<b>Investment Review Board (IRB)</b>	The IRBs were established by section 2222 of title 10, United States Code. They are chaired by designees appointed by the following offices: Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition Technology and Logistics; Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller); Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration; and the Deputy Secretary of Defense or other Under Secretary of Defense as designated by the Secretary of Defense. The IRBs are required to review the planning, design, acquisition, development, deployment, operation, maintenance, modernization, and project cost benefits and risks of all defense business systems for which they are responsible and before funds may be obligated. They are also responsible for performing periodic reviews at least annually.
<b>Net Present Value (NPV)</b>	NPV is the difference between discounted benefits and discounted costs (i.e., discounted savings/cost avoidances less discounted costs). An initiative must have an NPV > 0.0 to be considered financially viable. (Economic Viability (EV) Tool Users Guide).
<b>Operations &amp; Support (O&amp;S)</b>	All costs to sustain the system/project after it has been released to production (i.e., after deployment or upon achievement of Full Operational Capability (FOC) (Economic Viability (EV) Tool Users Guide).
<b>Problem Statement (PS)</b>	A perceived business problem, capability gap, or opportunity, also referred to as "business need," is documented in a Problem Statement. This information is used to inform the IRB Chair and Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) when making investment or acquisition decisions.
<b>Target</b>	Expected/planned progress in quantifiable terms towards a specific end-state.

## APPENDIX B: MILESTONES AND MEASURES

<<This section identifies the key milestones and measures reported in the DoD Enterprise Transition Plan (ETP) or Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) and explains any deviations and implications for program success.>> For example:

*The following key milestones were reported in the DoD Enterprise Transition Plan (ETP).*

Milestones & Decisions	Original APB/ETP Due Date	Revised APB/ETP Due Date	Actual Complete Date or Status	Comments
PS approved				
BCA approved				
MS A				
MS B				
MS C				
FDD				
FD				
Increment 1				

<<Identify the performance measures that will be / are being captured during the post delivery phase. These measures are to be reported even if the program has not yet reached the delivery phase and should be consistent with those reported in the ETP. Any changes, additions and deletions should be explained.>> For example:

*The following measures will be tracked during the program’s delivery phase. They will be used to validate the original business case assumptions and expected benefits identified in Section 1.5 of this document.*

[Program Acronym] Post Delivery Measures					
Measure type	Baseline measure	Target measure and Date	Goal measure and Date	Actual measure and Date	Measure Frequency
Savings					
Efficiency <sup>1</sup>					
Mission					
Compliance					
Customer value					
Other					

1. Should relate to BPR activities and other efficiencies identified under program benefits.

<<Provide additional detail explaining why targets and goals were established and whether there are dependencies between the measures. For example, goals for “speed” may have negative impacts on “quality.” Likewise, goals for “cost savings” may negatively affect “customer service.” Goals and targets should be set to achieve the optimum overall outcome, which may sub-optimize individual measure outcomes.>> *NOTE: Measures to track progress during project execution will be different than measures used to assess project success after delivery.*

## **APPENDIX C: REQUIREMENTS DETAIL (OPTIONAL)**

<<This appendix provides additional detail regarding requirements, including those resulting from the DOTMLPF analysis, lean six sigma and BPR efforts, and change management planning.>>

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**Instructions regarding BCA Classification Marking:**

**UNCLASSIFIED:** If the final BCA does not contain sensitive or classified information, mark the front and back covers "UNCLASSIFIED" (as shown on this BCA template).

**FOUO:** A "For Official Use Only" (FOUO) designation applies to unclassified information sensitive in nature and exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act. If the BCA contains such information, "FOUO" must appear on the front and back covers (where UNCLASSIFIED now appears) and on the page(s) on which the sensitive information exists.

**CLASSIFIED:** BCAs containing any CLASSIFIED information are to be handled through separate channels, in accordance with the submitting organization's CLASSIFIED handling process and all applicable security policy procedures.



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS**

**UNCLASSIFIED**