

DoN FYDP Improvement Project

[New...](#)[New Revision](#)**Go**[\[Go Back\]](#)[Meeting Notes](#)[Reports/White Papers](#)[Progress Reports](#)[Presentations](#)[Instructions](#)[Room Index](#)[Room Security](#)**Tools**[news: daily](#) | [weekly](#)
[advanced search](#)[chat](#) | [notify](#) | [print](#) |
[tutorial](#) | [help](#)

Meeting Notes (ASN orgs. April 2001)

Elaine Kujawa, 05/21/2001 - 10:10 AM

Consolidated notes from ASN meetings

*ASN I&E**ASN RD&A**ASN M&RA*

ASN I&E – Roger Normand

- Plays an active role in all phases of PPBS. (Sits in on IWARS, SPP briefs, Budget hearing, writes reclamation, BAM input)
- Close working relationship with N80 and FMB
- WINPAT not used; does use NBTS
- PPBS process creates a culture of stovepipes, discontinuity, confusion. I&E has people responsible for both Programming and Budgeting
- I&E advises SECNAV - takes an independent view. Write reclamation to marks, may or *may not* aggress with claimant position
- Execution tracking is a weakness in the system. Should be able to track to policy and requirements
- Uses NBTS to get execution data (very high level only). For example does not have access to detail project level of detail for MRP
- Performance Improvement Opportunities:
 - o Would like to see how program (appn) fares in the outyears over the course of (and within) multiple cycles. Can't use NBTS to get this
 - o Better data structure might provide better visibility to shape strategy
 - o Execution is weak part of PPBS
 - o Multiple transactions posted to WINPAT and NBTS issues, it is hard to track program. Hard to backtrack through issues to get clear picture of what happened to a program. Hard to reconstruct historical changes
 - o Hard to get agreement between USN and USMC when responding to DON issues (i.e. congressional hearings)

ASN RD&A – Pete Biseda

- RDA's position is not to prioritize requirements, but rather to play in the acquisition of prioritized requirements (OPNAV, USMC based)
- Too much time is spent collecting, tracking down and assimilating data
- Senior Navy management like a lot of options. Options lead to a lot of questions, heartburn, etc. so people don't share information
- RD&A sits in on SPP briefs; do not write reclamation; play more at higher levels – PBCG, major budget issues.
- Performance Improvement Opportunities:
 - o Should make data that is already out there more

- accessible. Goal should be to help the analysts do their job better/ faster
- Tie execution back to Planning, Programming and Budgeting
 - Currently has to go to 4 different sources for execution data
 - Would be beneficial to increase reprogramming thresholds

ASN M&RA – Bonnie Morehouse, Barbara Arreguin

- There is a formal and informal aspect to PPBS process. Personality driven to some extent. Political at the ASN level
- Do not have a lot of insight into what the USMC does with Manpower
- M&RA does disagree with N1 on certain issue. By weighing in on specific issues they are looking out for the best interest of the entire DON
- There is a disconnect at the higher levels. This has impacts at the resource sponsor / claimant level.
- Consistency of data is important
- Have to be able to give the SECNAV a n independent perspective on what the Navy is doing.
- Formal process does not capture all of the activity/decisions that are made in informal process
- Performance Improvement Opportunities:
 - Access to Execution information would be very useful
 - Better coordination with USMC / insight into what USMC is doing with Manpower earlier in the process
 - SECNAV should have a better visibility at an earlier stage in the process
 - Should be a better link from IWARs

[go to top](#)

[previous | folder](#)
[new... | new revision](#)