

HEADQUARTERS
UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND
UNIT 30400
APO AE 09131-0400

DIRECTIVE
NUMBER 56-2

26 September 2004

PLANS AND POLICY

EUCOM Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System

1. **Summary.** This document outlines policies, procedures, and responsibilities for EUCOM Directorates and Components to interface with the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS). JCIDS focuses on the development, review, validation, and approval of Initial Capabilities Documents (ICDs), Capstone Requirements Documents (CRDs), Capabilities Development Documents (CDDs) and Capabilities Production Documents (CPDs).
2. **Applicability.**
 - a. This directive is a EUCOM publication that establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and directs actions for all Directorates within EUCOM, and components, agencies, and activities supporting or associated with EUCOM. The terms Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System and Joint Capabilities Integration and Development Process are to be considered interchangeably in this document, and refer to any external or internal matters related to the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System / Process.
 - b. This directive also applies, in general, to agencies preparing and submitting requirements in accordance with CJCSI 3170.01, CJCSM 3170.01, DODD 5000.1, and DOD Regulation 5000.2-R. These instructions do not preclude the need to refer to the basic DOD 5000 series documents for guidance and direction on defense acquisition.
3. **Internal Control Systems.** This publication is not subject to requirements of ED 50-8.
4. **Suggested Improvements.** The Director, Plans and Policy (ECJ5/8), is the proponent for this publication. If you have any recommended changes, forward them to ECJ5/8 Capabilities Division (ECJ8-C).
5. **References:**
 - a. Title 10, United States Code, sections 153, 163, 167, 181.
 - b. CJCSM 3170.01 Series, "Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System."
 - c. CJCSI 3170.01 Series, "Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System."

This Directive supersedes ED 56-2, dated 29 Oct 99.

- d. "Transformation Planning Guidance," Secretary of Defense, April 2003.
- e. DOD Directive (DODD) 5000.1, 12 May 2003, "The Defense Acquisition System."
- f. DOD Instruction (DODI) 5000.2, 12 May 2003, "Operation of the Defense Acquisition System."
- g. CJCSI 3010.02 Series, "Joint Vision Implementation Master Plan."
- h. CJCSI 3180.01 Series, "Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) Programmatic Processes for Joint Experimentation and Joint Resource Change Recommendations."
- i. CJCSI 6212.01 Series, "Interoperability and Supportability of National Security Systems and Information Technology Systems."
- j. DODD 4630.5, 11 January 2002, "Interoperability and Supportability of Information Technology (IT) and National Security Systems (NSS)."
- k. DODI 4630.8, 2 May 2002, "Procedures for Interoperability and Supportability of Information Technology (IT) and National Security Systems (NSS)."
- l. CJCSI 5123.01 Series, "Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council."
- m. CJCSI 3137.01 Series, "The Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment Process."
- n. CJCSI 6721.01 Series, "Global Command and Control Management Structure."
- o. "Joint Operating Concepts," Secretary of Defense, November 2003
- p. National Security Space Acquisition Policy 03-01, 6 Oct 2003, Guidance for DoD Space System Acquisition Process

6. **General.**

a. The procedures established in the JCIDS support the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) in identifying, assessing and prioritizing joint military capability needs as specified in reference a. Ensuring the joint force is properly equipped and supported to perform across the range of military operations is the primary focus of the JCIDS process. Therefore, a joint concept-centric capabilities identification process is required to define how new capabilities are identified and developed. JCIDS implements a capabilities-based approach that better leverages the expertise of all government agencies, industry, and academia to identify improvements to existing capabilities and to develop new warfighting capabilities. This approach requires a collaborative process that utilizes joint concepts and integrated architectures to identify prioritized capability gaps and integrated Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel and Facilities (DOTMLPF) solutions (materiel and nonmateriel) to resolve those gaps.

(1) The first step in identifying capability gaps is JCIDS analysis. The JCIDS analysis process documents capability gaps and determines the attributes of a capability or combination of capabilities that would resolve the gaps. Furthermore, this process identifies material and nonmaterial approaches for implementation and roughly assesses the cost and operational effectiveness of the joint force for each of the identified approaches in resolving capabilities gaps. Ultimately, JCIDS analysis will be based upon robust, integrated architectures and joint analytic assets; however, in the interim, JCIDS analysis will utilize existing resources. A detailed explanation of the JCIDS analysis process is provided in reference b.

(2) The Initial Capabilities Documents (ICD) makes the case to establish the need for a materiel approach to resolve a specific capability gap derived from the JCIDS analysis process. The ICD defines the capability gap in terms of the functional area(s) and the relevant range of military operations. Once approved, an ICD is not normally updated. The ICD becomes the baseline document for all subsequent JCIDS documents associated with a specific capability shortfall. The ICD is described in detail in reference b.

(3) Subsequently, the needs expressed in the ICD are then developed into capabilities using JCIDS. The products take the form of Capstone Requirements Documents (CRD) (if required), Capabilities Development Documents (CDD), and/or Capabilities Production Documents (CPD).

(4) CRDs may be approved by the JROC when existing concepts and integrated architectures are not sufficient to support development of capabilities. There may be some instances that require straightforward CRDs which provide clear statements of the military tasks that must be accomplished. Furthermore, these CRDs will continue to induce the development of interoperable capabilities by describing overarching thresholds/goals and standards in functional areas, especially where a Family of Systems (FoS) or System of Systems (SoS) approach is required. The CRD is described in detail in reference b.

(5) CDDs translate the ICD into authoritative, measurable and testable capabilities needed by the warfighters to support the System Development and Demonstration phase of an acquisition program. The CDD captures the necessary information to develop proposed program, normally using an evolutionary acquisition strategy. The CDD outlines affordable increments of capability. Each increment of capability will have its own set of attributes and associated performance values with thresholds and objectives established by the sponsor with input from the user. The CDD supports the Milestone B acquisition decision. The CDD is described in detail in reference b.

(6) The CPD is the sponsor's primary means of providing authoritative, testable capabilities for the Production and Deployment phase of an acquisition program. It captures the information necessary to support production, testing, and deployment of an affordable and supportable increment within an acquisition strategy. The CPD provides the operational performance attributes necessary for the acquisition community to produce a single increment of a specific system. A CPD is finalized after design readiness review and is validated and

approved before the Milestone C acquisition decision. The CPD is described in detail in reference b.

b. Staffing. Once a document enters the formal Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) review process, it will be staffed to all Services, Combatant Commands, Joint Staff, and appropriate DOD agencies for review and comment. This is typically how and when the EUCOM Staff and Components become involved in the process by reviewing the document from the Combatant Command viewpoint. On occasion, however, the EUCOM staff may play an additional role in the staffing process as a member of the Functional Capabilities Board (FCB) during the FCB review.

(1) These documents will be reviewed initially at the O-6 level and then at the flag (GO/FO) level.

(2) O-6 level staffing does not necessarily result in the final Service position.

(3) Flag-level endorsement of O-6 level comments is neither required nor desired.

(4) Detailed staffing procedures are provided in paragraph 8.

c. Functional Capabilities Board. The FCB is responsible for the organization, analysis and prioritization of joint warfighting capability need proposals within assigned functional areas. The FCB is an advisory body to the Joint Capabilities Board (JCB) and JROC for JCIDS initiatives. Each FCB evaluates JCIDS proposals that affect their functional area(s). The FCB will ensure that the supporting analysis adequately leverages the expertise of the Services, Combatant Commands, Agencies, DoD laboratories, science and technology community initiatives, experimentation initiatives, non-DoD agencies and industry to identify promising materiel and nonmateriel approaches.

7. Responsibilities.

a. ECJ5/8 is the office of primary responsibility for coordinating and compiling Component and EUCOM staff reviews/inputs/comments, and developing positions on Joint Capabilities Integration and Development documents and issues as they relate to EUCOM.

(1) Authority to approve all JCIDS “flag-level” reviews/inputs/comments has been delegated to the Director, ECJ5/8, for transmission to the Joint Staff.

(2) Authority to approve all JCIDS “O6-level” reviews/inputs/comments has been delegated by the Director, ECJ5/8 to the Division Chief, ECJ8-C (Capabilities), for transmission to the Joint Staff.

b. Component Commanders, EUCOM Directors and appropriate chiefs of special staff agencies are responsible for:

(1) Designating a point of contact and/or action officer to handle the EUCOM staffing of all requirements documents.

(2) Monitoring programs within their respective functional areas and providing expertise and delegating authority, as required, to develop an official EUCOM position on JCIDS documents and issues.

(3) Designating a representative to Functional Capabilities Board (FCB) which encompasses their respective functional areas, providing expertise and delegating authority, as required, to develop an official EUCOM position on JCIDS documents and issues.

(4) ECJ2 responsibilities. The Joint Staff J2 (JSJ2) and Director Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) are responsible for threat validation and intelligence certification of all JCIDS documents. Therefore, the Joint Staff will typically request ECJ2 support and participation in these certifications. Intelligence related comments may be forwarded to both ECJ8-C and directly to JSJ2 and /or DIA.

(5) ECJ4 responsibilities. The Joint Staff J4 (JSJ4) will certify all CDDs and CPDs for munitions, regardless of ACAT level, contain the requirement to conform to insensitive munitions (unplanned stimuli) criteria. Therefore, the Joint Staff will typically request ECJ4 support and participation in these certifications and /or reviews. Munitions-related comments may be forwarded to both ECJ5-S and directly to the JS J4.

(6) ECJ6 responsibilities. The Joint Staff J6 (JSJ6) will certify CRDs, CDDs and CPDs designated as JROC Interest or Joint Integration for conformance with joint NSS and IT policy and doctrine and compliance with integrated architectures (as available) and interoperability standards. Therefore, the Joint Staff will typically request ECJ6 support and participation in these certifications and /or reviews. NSS and IT-related comments may be forwarded to both ECJ5-S and directly to the JS J6 and /or DISA.

c. ECJ8-C responsibilities include:

(1) Provide a central point of contact for timely receipt, dissemination, staffing, coordination, and processing of JCIDS documents.

(a) All JCIDS documents and issues are received via SIPRNET (Knowledge Management/ Decision Support (KM/DS) website) from the Joint Staff J8 Capabilities and Acquisition Division (J8/CAD) by the ECJ8-C Action Officer (AO).

(b) The ECJ8-C AO disseminates via SIPRNET (or ULAN as appropriate), the JCIDS document or issues to the EUCOM Staff and Components for review. An internal suspense is provided in order to meet the Joint Staff (J8/CAD) suspense.

(c) The EUCOM Staff and Components review the document/issue and prepare their respective input/comments for submission. The ECJ8-C AO coordinates this action.

(d) The ECJ8-C AO collects and compiles all input/comments and prepares the memorandum for the consolidated EUCOM reply to the Joint Staff (J8/CAD).

(2) Continuously coordinate JCIDS issues and actions with the Joint Staff J8/CAD AO to ensure congruency and accuracy.

d. Staff and component AO responsibilities:

(1) Be familiar with and track JCIDS documents and issues affecting their components and staff directorate.

(2) Articulate their respective component's and/or staff Directorate's policy, requirements, and shortfalls in compliance with EUCOM policy and COCOM guidance.

(3) Provide responses, sanctioned by the appropriate Directorate and/or Component Commander on JCIDS documents and issues within established timelines.

(4) Be familiar with the key processes, milestones, and timelines in the JCIDS as they pertain to EUCOM.

8. **Policies and Procedures.**

a. Policies.

(1) DOD Policy.

(a) This instruction is based on the need for a joint concepts-centric capabilities identification process that will allow joint forces to meet the full range of military challenges of the future. Meeting these challenges involves a transformation that requires the ability to project and sustain joint forces and to conduct flexible, distributed and highly networked operations. To achieve substantive improvements in joint warfighting and interoperability in the battlespace of the future, coordination among Department of Defense (DOD) components is essential from the start of the JCIDS process.

(b) To accomplish this transformation, DOD is implementing processes that assess existing and proposed capabilities in light of their contribution to future joint concepts. The process must produce capability proposals that consider the full range of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel and facilities (DOTMLPF) solutions in order to advance joint warfighting.

(2) EUCOM Policy.

(a) EUCOM policies are driven by DOD directives, regulations, CJCSI 3170.01 Series and CJCSM 3170.01 Series.

(b) ECJ8-C responds to the Joint Staff J8 requests for document reviews in a timely and effective manner.

(c) All EUCOM staff directorates and components are expected to comply with the ECJ8-C tasking (Electronic Staffer) to accurately and effectively review JCIDS documents in accordance with established guidelines.

b. Procedures.

(1) Upon electronic receipt from the Joint Staff J8/CAD (via SIPRNET- KM/DS website) tasking the review (O6 or flag-level) of a capabilities document ICD/CRD/CDD/CPD), ECJ8-C will electronically forward a staff package of documents to all applicable EUCOM Staff and Components. Guidelines for the JCIDS document reviews are found in Appendix a. Typically this packet is sent to the Executive Officers for the respective EUCOM staff elements and specifically identified AOs for the components. This staffing packet will include the following electronic files:

(a) An Electronic Staffer outlining the tasking, approved by the ECJ8-C Division Chief (O-6 review) or the DDIR ECJ5/8 (flag review).

(c) A copy of the file containing the document to be reviewed.

(d) A copy of the file that contains previous worldwide staffing comments (if applicable).

(e) A copy of the file that contains the previous HQ EUCOM response/reply to the Joint Staff J8 (if applicable).

(f) A copy of the blank KM/DS comments matrix (used to provide review comments).

(2) An internal suspense will be applied that is 2 working days prior to the Joint Staff suspense. This provides the ECJ8-C AO with sufficient time to compile the responses and prepare the HQ EUCOM reply (memorandum for signature) back to the Joint Staff (J8/CAD). Typical J8/CAD staffing timelines (per reference b) are 25 days for an O-6 level review and 21 days for a flag level review.

(3) The ECJ8-C AO tracks, coordinates, and assimilates any/all responses from the EUCOM Staff and Components. If a staff agency or component concurs with the document as written, a reply with "no comment" or "concur as written" is required.

(4) Electronic (E-mail) responses are highly desired. On a flag-level review, an actual general/flag officer signature (endorsement) is not required. However, the staff agency or Component submitting the response/comment(s) must determine internally if their respective Director (general/flag officer) should endorse/sign the reply.

(5) The ECJ8-C AO synthesizes all responses and comments and incorporates them into the HQ EUCOM reply to the Joint Staff (J8/CAD). This is accomplished in memorandum format, using the three categories for comments (Critical, Substantive, and Administrative). General comments are also accepted.

(6) The ECJ8-C AO will then obtain proper level (O6 or flag) approval and signature for the reply and forward it to the Joint Staff J8/CAD point of contact via SIPRNET (KM/DS website).

FOR THE COMMANDER:

COLBY M. BROADWATER
Lieutenant General, USA
Chief of Staff

OFFICIAL:

WILLIAM L. KISER
Adjutant General

Appendices (excerpts from CJCSI 3170.01 & CJCSM 3170.01):

A - Guide for reviewing JCIDS Document

B - Glossary of JCIDS (Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions)

DISTRIBUTION:

P

Appendix A
Guide for reviewing JCIDS Documents

1. Combatant Commands are required by enclosure C of CJCSM 3170.0, reference b (Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System) to review and comment on all JROC Interest and Joint Impact documents that are validated and approved by the JROC. Combatant Commands also are provided the opportunity to review documents during the FCB review.

2. **Recommended guidelines for reviewing JCIDS Documents (ICD/CRD/CDD/CPD):**

a. Your review should include verification of projected threat, confirmation of the requirements, examination of required capabilities, an assessment of the joint potential, and review for Joint Interoperability concerns. NOTE: ECJ2 is expected to review the threat portion. Others should focus on the functionality, “jointness” and “interoperability” of the document system.

b. Review the document from strictly a EUCOM theater perspective. State why the document, or a specific section of the document, does not support the EUCOM theater or components.

c. Don't spend an inordinate amount of time on typographical and grammatical errors. Select the obvious errors.

d. Use the “Blank Comments Matrix,” Figure A-1, provided in the staffing package to offer comments. This is a Joint Staff requirement, which ensures compatibility with the KM/DS website. The comment matrix will be used by the “authors” to make changes and/or improvements to the document and to provide future feedback regarding all comments upon further reviews. Also, ensure that every field in the matrix is completed. Provide the organization, reviewer's name, email address and phone number. This information expedites contact with the originator to obtain clarification or adjudicate a particular comment.

Org / Reviewer	Page #	Para #	Line #	Class (U,C,S)	Type (A,S,C)	Recommendation	Rationale	Comment

Figure A-1. Blank Comments Matrix

e. Understand the fundamental difference between a “critical,” “substantive,” and “administrative” comment.

(1) A “critical (C)” comment typically means that you (EUCOM) do/do NOT concur with the document and, therefore, the document cannot move to the next step (i.e., go before the JROC) until the comment is resolved. Director, ECJ5/8, reserves the right to downgrade (but not without proper coordination) any “critical” comments to “substantive” when the comment does not meet “critical” criteria or does not have strong enough rationale. NOTE: Often the authors

of the document will attempt to contact comment originators (telephone/email) in order to obtain clarification or adjudication of the comment.

(2) A “substantive (S)” comment is made because a section in the document appears to be or is potentially unnecessary, incorrect, misleading, confusing, or inconsistent with other sections.

(3) An “administrative (A)” comment corrects what appears to be a typographical, format, or grammatical error.

f. One of the key aspects of CRDs, CDDs and CPDs are the Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) and Interoperability Exchange Requirements (IERS). These are the eventual quantitative design criteria that the “manufacturer” of the described system must meet in order for the system to be fielded. Pay particular attention to these. They are stated in both “threshold” (must meet) and “objective” (should meet) criteria, and must be measurable.

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

GLOSSARY

PART I -- ACRONYMS

ACAT	Acquisition Category
AMA	Analysis of Materiel Approaches
AoA	Analysis of Alternatives
APB	Acquisition Program Baseline
ASD(HA)	Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs)
ASD(NII)	Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration
C ⁴	Command, Control, Communications and Computers
C ⁴ I	Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence
C ⁴ ISR	Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance
CAD	Capabilities and Acquisition Division
CDD	Capability Development Document
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CJCS	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
CJCSI	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction
CPD	Capability Production Document
CRD	Capstone Requirements Document
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DOD	Department of Defense
DODD	Department of Defense Directive
DODI	Department of Defense Instruction
DOT&E	Director of Operational Test and Evaluation
DOTMLPF	Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel and Facilities

E3	Electromagnetic Environmental Effects
EA	Electronic Attack
FAA	Functional Area Analysis
FCB	Functional Capabilities Board
FNA	Functional Needs Analysis
FOC	Full Operational Capability
FoS	Family of Systems
FSA	Functional Solution Analysis
HSI	Human Systems Integration
IA	Information Assurance
ICD	Initial Capabilities Document
IER	Information Exchange Requirement
IOC	Initial Operational Capability
IOT&E	Initial Operational Test and Evaluation
JCB	Joint Capabilities Board
JCIDS	Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System
JFC	Joint Functional Concept
JPD	Joint Potential Designator
JROC	Joint Requirements Oversight Council
JROCM	JROC Memorandum
KM/DS	Knowledge Management/Decision Support
KPP	Key Performance Parameter
MCEB	Military Communications Electronics Board
MDA	Milestone Decision Authority
MOE	Measures of Effectiveness

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

MRB	Mission Requirements Board
NBCC	Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Contamination
NGA	National Geospatial Intelligence Agency
NRO	National Reconnaissance Office
NSA	National Security Agency
NSS	National Security Systems
OV	Operational View
PA&E	Program Analysis and Evaluation
CAD	Capabilities and Acquisition Division
SDD	System Development and Demonstration
SOCOM	Special Operations Command
SoS	System of Systems
SV	Systems View
TEMP	Test and Evaluation Master Plan
TV	Technical View
UJTL	Universal Joint Task List
USecAF	Under Secretary of the Air Force
USD(AT&L)	Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics
USD(I)	Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence
WARM	Wartime Reserve Mode

PART II — DEFINITIONS

Acquisition Category (ACAT) - Categories established to facilitate decentralized decision-making and execution, and compliance with statutorily imposed requirements. The categories determine the level of review, decision authority and applicable procedures. Reference b provides the specific definition for each acquisition category.

Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) - Each program's APB is developed and updated by the program manager and will govern the activity in the phase succeeding the milestone for which it was developed.

Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) - The evaluation of the operational effectiveness, operational suitability and estimated costs of alternative systems to meet a mission capability. The analysis assesses the advantages and disadvantages of alternatives being considered to satisfy capabilities, including the sensitivity of each alternative to possible changes in key assumptions or variables.

Analysis of Materiel Approaches (AMA) - The JCIDS analysis to determine the best materiel approach or combination of approaches to provide the desired capability or capabilities. Though the AMA is similar to an AoA, it occurs earlier in the analytical process. Subsequent to approval of an ICD, which may lead to a potential ACAT I/IA program, D, PA&E provides specific guidance to refine this initial AMA into an AoA.

approval - The formal or official sanction of the identified capability described in the capability documentation. Approval also certifies that the documentation has been subject to the uniform process established by the DOD 5000 series.

architecture - The structure of components, their relationships, and the principles and guidelines governing their design and evolution over time.

attribute - A testable or measurable characteristic that describes an aspect of a system or capability.

capability - The ability to execute a specified course of action. It is defined by an operational user and expressed in broad operational terms in the format of an initial capabilities document or a DOTMLPF change recommendation. In the case of material proposals, the definition will progressively evolve to DOTMLPF performance attributes identified in the CDD and the CPD.

Capability Development Document (CDD) - A document that captures the information necessary to develop a proposed program(s), normally using an evolutionary acquisition strategy. The CDD outlines an affordable increment of militarily useful, logistically supportable and technically mature capability.

capability gaps - Those synergistic resources (DOTMLPF) that are unavailable but potentially attainable to the operational user for effective task execution.

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

Capability Production Document (CPD) - A document that addresses the production elements specific to a single increment of an acquisition program.

Capstone Requirements Document (CRD) - A document that contains capabilities-based requirements that facilitates the development of CDDs and CPDs by providing a common framework and operational concept to guide their development.

certification - A statement of adequacy provided by a responsible agency for a specific area of concern in support of the validation process.

comment priorities -

a. Critical - A critical comment indicates nonconcurrency in the document, for both the O-6 and flag review, until the comment is satisfactorily resolved.

b. Substantive - A substantive comment is provided because a section in the document appears to be or is potentially unnecessary, incorrect, misleading, confusing, or inconsistent with other sections.

c. Administrative - An administrative comment corrects what appears to be a typographical, format, or grammatical error.

DOD Component - The DOD Components consist of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the combatant commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense agencies, DOD field activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense.

DOD 5000 Series - DOD 5000 series refers collectively to DODD 5000.1 and DODI 5000.2, references 1 and b, respectively.

Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3) - The impact of the electromagnetic environment upon the operational capability of military forces, equipment, systems and platforms.

embedded instrumentation - Data collection and processing capabilities, integrated into the design of a system for one or more of the following uses: diagnostics, prognostics, testing or training.

environmental quality - The condition of the following elements that make up the environment: flora, fauna, air, water, land and cultural resources.

evolutionary acquisition - DOD's preferred strategy for rapid acquisition of mature technology for the user. An evolutionary approach delivers capability in increments, recognizing up front, the need for future capability improvements.

Family of Systems (FoS) - A set or arrangement of independent systems that can be arranged or interconnected in various ways to provide different

capabilities. The mix of systems can be tailored to provide desired capabilities, dependent on the situation. An example of a FoS would be an anti-submarine warfare FoS consisting of submarines, surface ships, aircraft, static and mobile sensor systems and additional systems. Although these systems can independently provide militarily useful capabilities, in collaboration they can more fully satisfy a more complex and challenging capability: to detect, localize, track and engage submarines.

functional area - A broad scope of related joint warfighting skills and attributes that may span the range of military operations. Specific skill groupings that make up the functional areas are approved by the JROC.

Functional Capabilities Board (FCB) - A permanently established body that is responsible for the organization, analysis and prioritization of joint warfighting capabilities within an assigned functional area.

Human Systems Integration (HIS) - Defined in reference b, includes the integrated and comprehensive analysis, design and assessment of requirements, concepts and resources for system manpower, personnel, training, safety and occupational health, habitability, personnel survivability and human factors engineering.

increment - A militarily useful and supportable operational capability that can be effectively developed, produced or acquired, deployed and sustained. Each increment of capability will have its own set of threshold and objective values set by the user.

Information Assurance (IA) - Information operations that protect and defend information and information systems by ensuring their availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality and non-repudiation. This includes providing for restoration of information systems by incorporating protection, detection and reaction capabilities.

Information Exchange Requirements (IER) - Requirements that define the interoperability KPP threshold and objective values documented in CDDs, CPDs and CRDs. The IERs should reflect both the information needs required by the system under consideration and the needs of other supported systems. The IERs should cover all communication and computing requirements for command, control and intelligence of the proposed system.

Information Technology (IT) - Any equipment, or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission or reception of data or information by the executive agency. This includes equipment used by a Component directly, or used by a contractor under a contract with the Component, which (1) requires the use of such equipment, or (2) requires the use, to a significant extent, of such equipment in the performance of a service or the furnishing of a product. The term "IT" also includes computers, ancillary equipment, software, firmware and

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources. Notwithstanding the above, the term “IT” does not include any equipment that is acquired by a Federal contractor incidental to a Federal contract. The term “IT” includes NSS.

Initial Capabilities Document (ICD) - Documents the need for a materiel approach to a specific capability gap derived from an initial analysis of materiel approaches executed by the operational user and, as required, an independent analysis of materiel alternatives. It defines the capability gap in terms of the functional area, the relevant range of military operations, desired effects and time. The ICD summarizes the results of the DOTMLPF analysis and describes why nonmateriel changes alone have been judged inadequate in fully providing the capability.

insensitive munitions - Munitions that minimize the probability of inadvertent initiation and the severity of subsequent collateral damage as a result of unplanned, external stimuli.

integrated architectures - An architecture consisting of multiple views or perspectives (operational view, systems view, and technical view) that facilitates integration and promotes interoperability across family of systems and systems of systems and compatibility among related architectures.

interoperability - The ability of systems, units or forces to provide data, information, materiel and services to and accept the same from other systems, units or forces and to use the data, information, materiel and services so exchanged to enable them to operate effectively together. NSS and ITS interoperability includes both the technical exchange of information and the end-to-end operational effectiveness of that exchanged information as required for mission accomplishment.

Joint Capabilities Board (JCB) - The JCB functions to assist the JROC in carrying out its duties and responsibilities. The JCB reviews and, if appropriate, endorses all JCIDS and DOTMLPF proposals prior to their submission to the JROC. The JCB is chaired by the Joint Staff, J-8, Director of Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment. It is comprised of Flag/General officer representatives of the Services.

joint experimentation - An iterative process for developing and assessing concept-based hypotheses to identify and recommend the best value-added solutions for changes in DOTMLPF required to achieve significant advances in future joint operational capabilities.

Joint Force - The term “Joint Force” in its broadest sense refers to the Armed Forces of the United States. The term “joint force” (lower case) refers to an element of the Armed Forces that is organized for a particular mission or task.

Because this could refer to a joint task force or a unified command, or some yet unnamed future joint organization, the more generic term “a joint force” will be used, similar in manner to the term “joint force commander” in reference to the commander of any joint force.

Joint Functional Concepts (JFC) - An articulation of how a future joint force commander will integrate a set of related military tasks to attain capabilities required across the range of military operations. Although broadly described within the Joint Operations Concepts, they derive specific context from the joint operating concepts and promote common attributes in sufficient detail to conduct experimentation and measure effectiveness.

Joint Operating Concept (JOC) - An articulation of how a future joint force commander will plan, prepare, deploy, employ and sustain a joint force against potential adversaries' capabilities or crisis situations specified within the range of military operations. JOCs guide the development and integration of JFCs to provide joint capabilities. They articulate the measurable detail needed to conduct experimentation and allow decision makers to compare alternatives.

Joint Operations Concepts (JOpsC) - A concept that describes how the Joint Force intends to operate 15 to 20 years from now. It provides the operational context for the transformation of the Armed Forces of the United States by linking strategic guidance with the integrated application of joint force capabilities.

Joint Potential Designator (JPD) - A designation assigned by the Gatekeeper to specify JCIDS validation, approval and interoperability expectations.

a. “JROC Interest” designation will apply to all ACAT I/IA, ACAT II and below programs where these capabilities have a significant impact on joint warfighting. This designation may also apply to intelligence capabilities that support DOD and national intelligence requirements. These documents will be staffed through the JROC for validation and approval. All CRDs will be designated as JROC Interest. DOTMLPF change proposals will also be designated as JROC Interest in accordance with reference c.

b. “Joint Integration” designation will apply to ACAT II and below programs where the concepts and/or systems associated with the document do not significantly affect the joint force and an expanded review is not required, but NSS and IT interoperability, intelligence or munitions certification is required. Once the required certification(s) are completed, Joint Integration proposals are validated and approved by the sponsoring component.

c. “Independent” designation will apply to ACAT II and below programs where the concepts and/or systems associated with the document do not significantly affect the joint force, an expanded review is not required, and no certifications are required. Once designated, these documents are returned to the sponsoring component for validation and approval.

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum (JROCM) - Official JROC correspondence generally directed to an audience(s) external to the JROC. JROCMs are usually decisional in nature.

Key Performance Parameters (KPP) - Those minimum attributes or characteristics considered most essential for an effective military capability. KPPs are validated by the JROC for JROC Interest documents, by the FCB for Joint Impact documents, and by the DOD Component for Joint Integration or Independent documents. CDD and CPD KPPs are included verbatim in the APB.

lead DOD Component - The Service or agency that has been formally designated as lead for a joint program by the MDA. The lead component is responsible for common documentation, periodic reporting and funding actions.

logistic support - Logistic support encompasses the logistic services, materiel and transportation required to support the continental United States-based and worldwide-deployed forces.

materiel solution - A defense acquisition program (nondevelopmental, modification of existing systems, or new program) that satisfies, or is a primary basis for satisfying identified warfighter capabilities. In the case of FoS and SoS approaches, an individual materiel solution may not fully satisfy a necessary capability gap on its own.

Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) - Metrics used to measure results achieved in the overall mission and execution of assigned tasks. Measures of effectiveness are a prerequisite to the performance of combat measurement.

Milestones - Major decision points that separate the phases of an acquisition program.

Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) - The individual designated, in accordance with criteria established by the USD(AT&L), by the ASD(NII) for automated information system acquisition programs or by the USecAF (as the DOD Space MDA) for space programs to approve entry of an acquisition program into the next phase.

military department - A department headed by a civilian Secretary appointed by the President and includes a Military Service (the Department of the Navy includes two Services).

militarily useful capability - A capability that achieves military objectives through operational effectiveness, suitability and availability, which is interoperable with related systems and processes, transportable and sustainable when and where needed, and at costs known to be affordable over the long term.

Mission Requirements Board (MRB) - The Mission Requirements Board manages the national requirements process that reviews, validates and approves national requirements for future intelligence capabilities and systems. It is the senior validation and approval authority for future intelligence requirements funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), and provides advice and council on future requirements funded outside the NFIP.

National Security Systems (NSS) - Telecommunications and information systems, operated by the DOD -- the functions, operation or use of which involves (1) intelligence activities, (2) cryptologic activities related to national security, (3) the command and control of military forces, (4) equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons systems, or (5) is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions. Subsection (5) in the preceding sentence does not include procurement of automatic data processing equipment or services to be used for routine administrative and business applications (including payroll, finance, logistics and personnel management applications).

nonmateriel solution - Changes in doctrine, organization, training, leadership and education, personnel or facilities to satisfy identified functional capabilities.

objective value - The desired operational goal associated with a performance attribute, beyond which any gain in utility does not warrant additional expenditure. The objective value is an operationally significant increment above the threshold. An objective value may be the same as the threshold when an operationally significant increment above the threshold is not significant or useful.

operational effectiveness - Measure of the overall ability to accomplish a mission when used by representative personnel in the environment planned or expected for operational employment of the system considering organization, doctrine, tactics, supportability, survivability, vulnerability, and threat.

operational suitability - The degree to which a system can be placed and sustained satisfactorily in field use with consideration given to availability, compatibility, transportability, interoperability, reliability, wartime usage rates, maintainability, safety, human factors, habitability, manpower, logistics, supportability, logistics supportability, natural environment effects and impacts, documentation and training requirements.

Operational View (OV) - A view that describes the joint capabilities that the user seeks and how to employ them. The OVs also identify the operational nodes, the critical information needed to support the piece of the process associated with the nodes, and the organizational relationships.

operator - An operational command or agency that employs the acquired system for the benefit of users. Operators may also be users.

Appendix B
Glossary of JCIDS
Abbreviations, Acronyms and Definitions

sponsor - The DOD component responsible for all common documentation, periodic reporting, and funding actions required to support the capabilities development and acquisition process for a specific capability proposal.

sustainability - The ability to maintain the necessary level and duration of operational activity to achieve military objectives. Sustainability is a function of providing for and maintaining those levels of ready forces, materiel and consumables necessary to support military effort.

sustainment - The provision of personnel, logistic, and other support required to maintain and prolong operations or combat until successful accomplishment or revision of the mission or of the national objective.

synchronization - The process of coordinating the timing of the delivery of capabilities, often involving different initiatives, to ensure the evolutionary nature of these deliveries satisfies the capabilities needed at the specified time that they are needed. Synchronization is particularly critical when the method of achieving these capabilities involves a FoS or SoS approach.

System of Systems (SoS) - A set or arrangement of interdependent systems that are related or connected to provide a given capability. The loss of any part of the system will degrade the performance or capabilities of the whole. An example of a SoS could be interdependent information systems. While individual systems within the SoS may be developed to satisfy the peculiar needs of a given user group (like a specific Service or agency), the information they share is so important that the loss of a single system may deprive other systems of the data needed to achieve even minimal capabilities.

Systems View (SV) - A view that identifies the kinds of systems, how to organize them, and the integration needed to achieve the desired operational capability. It will also characterize available technology and systems functionality.

task - A discrete event or action that enables a mission or function to be accomplished by individuals or organizations. Tasks are based upon doctrine, tactics, techniques, and procedures, or an organization's standard operating procedures, and are generated by mission analysis.

Technical View (TV) - A view that describes how to tie the systems together in engineering terms. It consists of standards that define and clarify the individual systems technology and integration requirements.

threshold value - A minimum acceptable operational value below which the utility of the system becomes questionable.

top-level information exchange requirements - For CRDs, top-level IERs are defined as those information exchanges that are between systems that make up the FoS or SoS, as well as those that are external to the FoS or SoS (i.e., with other C/S/A, allied and coalition systems). For CDDs and CPDs, top-level

IERS are defined as those information exchanges that are external to the system (i.e., with other C/S/A, allied and coalition systems).

user - An operational command or agency that receives or will receive benefit from the acquired system. Combatant commanders and their Service Component commands are the users. There may be more than one user for a system. Because the Service Component commands are required to organize, equip and train forces for the combatant commanders, they are seen as users for systems. The Chiefs of the Services and heads of other DOD Components are validation and approval authorities and are not viewed as users.

user representative - A command or agency that has been formally designated by proper authority to represent single or multiple users in the capabilities and acquisition process. The Services and the Service components of the combatant commanders are normally the user representatives. There should only be one user representative for a system.

validation - The review of documentation by an operational authority other than the user to confirm the operational capability. Validation is a precursor to approval.

Validation Authority - The individual within the DOD components charged with overall capability definition and validation. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the role as the Chairman of the JROC, is the Validation Authority for all potential major defense acquisition programs. The Validation Authority for JCIDS issues is dependent upon the JPD of the program or initiative as specified below:

- a. JROC Interest - JROC is Validation Authority.
- b. Joint Integration - The sponsor is the Validation Authority.
- c. Independent - The sponsor is the Validation Authority.