

TEMPLATE INSTRUCTIONS – OCTOBER 2004
Defense Information Systems Agency
Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 Compliance Table

1. The Clinger-Cohen Act (CCA) of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) mandates that the Federal government improve the acquisition and management of information technology (IT). The purpose for this template is to assist a Program Managers (PM) of a Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Program (both Acquisition Category (ACAT) 1AC and 1AM) and a PM of a Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAP) in documenting and processing the CCA Compliance Table. The table is a requirement of Department of Defense (DOD) Instruction 5000.2, Enclosure 4, Operation of the Defense Acquisition System, 12 May 2003. The PM prepares and staffs the table with DISA subject matter experts (SMEs) and advisors before DISA CIO certifies to the DOD CIO that a particular system is being developed in accordance with the precepts of the CCA. **NOTE: The organizational designee/advisor will be a SME, who would represent the interest of their respective organization and serve as the official signatory for coordinating CCA documentation.**

2. Essentially, the CCA Compliance Table documents a PM's assessment of a particular MAIS program's compliance with the CCA compliance areas delineated in the first column of the table. It is used by the DISA CIO and the DOD CIO to validate that the IT investment supports core mission functions, is consistent with the Department's architecture, reflects a portfolio management approach, and reduces risk and encourages an incremental, phased acquisition approach. DISA CIO relies upon DISA SMEs' participation and coordination before certifying a program's compliance with all CCA requirements. SMEs represent compliance areas such as those associated with strategic planning, economic analysis, procurement, acquisition policy, performance management, information assurance, traditional security, information technology architecture and standards, interoperability, and legal. DISA internal SMEs will be identified through the Overarching Integrated Product Team (OIPT) process, which is led by DISA's Component Acquisition Executive (CAE).

3. DISA CIO's CCA certification is required prior to each milestone decision. Without CCA certification, a program risks possible withholding of funds, schedule delay, milestone disapproval, and restrictions on contract awards. There are no waivers to the process.

4. The information presented in the table must clearly indicate to key stakeholders that the information technology investment would serve the intended purpose and would prove to be efficient and effective in terms of cost and benefits. The basis for DISA CIO certification is primarily the information presented in the PM's CCA Compliance Table and associated supporting documentation. The information presented in the CCA table should align with the information presented in the Capital Investment Report (also referred to as the IT 300 Exhibit) relative to a particular milestone. Supporting documentation cited in the table will be centrally maintained in program management office files.

- **CCA REQUIREMENT** column: Each CCA requirement must be addressed in accordance with guidance issued through means such as an Acquisition Guidance Memorandum, an Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM), or through members of an Integrating Integrated Product Team (IIPT). All requirements must be addressed for Milestone B and Milestone C. For Milestone A, requirements 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 must be fully addressed and supported; the remaining requirements must indicate status. **NOTE: For weapons systems and command and control systems, CCA requirements 4, 5, and 6 apply to the extent practicable. CCA requirements 1, 2, and 3 are presumed to be satisfied for weapon systems with embedded information technology and for command and control systems that are not themselves information technology systems.**

- **SUMMARY RESPONSE** column: Prepare a brief description for each CCA requirement. The description must be traceable to the supporting documentation cited. The description should address, at minimum, the responses to the sample questions provided in the template. Simple yes and no responses are not acceptable – please elaborate. **NOTE: The questions themselves are not to be included in the table.**
- **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** column: List the documentation pertinent to the program milestone and block or phase to which the program is preparing to enter. Supporting documentation required under policy, decision memorandum, or IPT must be cited as appropriate. Documents shown in the template are examples – applicability is based on case-by-case basis. List documents in chronological order beginning with the earliest date. A supporting document in final draft status is acceptable for valid reasons such as a document awaiting milestone decision authority approval and signature (e.g., Acquisition Program Baseline) or in the case of a document requiring fine-tuning on an insignificant area (e.g., Economic Analysis). **NOTE: The system documents/information cited are examples of the most likely but not the only references for the required information. If other references are more appropriate, they may be used in addition to or instead of those cited.**

5. A typical process timeline (at a high-level view and more detailed view) is depicted in the flow charts provided at Enclosure 3. *NOTE: Any variation will be considered and tailored, if necessary, on a case-by-case basis and upon agreement between DOD CIO, PM, and DISA CIO IPT members.*

6. DISA CIO, along with the concurrence from the appropriate DISA staff elements, issues a formal CCA confirmation or certification memorandum. To comply with DOD Instruction 5000.2 of 12 May 2003, notification of CCA “confirmation” will be provided to the milestone decision authority (e.g., DISA’s CAE; whereas CCA “certification” will be submitted to the DOD CIO (in most cases the ASD(NII), who also serves as the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA)). When the milestone decision authority is at the Component level (e.g., the CAE or a designee), the document requirements and the process are essentially the same as when the milestone decision authority is at the Department level. The primary difference is that DISA CIO confirms CCA compliance in a memorandum to the Component MDA (i.e., DISA’s CAE or designee) and certifies CCA compliance in a memorandum to the DOD CIO, who in most cases is also the MDA. DISA CIO CCA Certification and the DOD CIO’s acknowledgement of DISA CIO CCA certification is typically part of the ADM, which is issued after milestone decision approval is made at each milestone and block or phase. DISA CIO CCA confirmation of an ACAT IAC program (i.e., a program with Component-level MDA) is typically documented in the ADM as well.

GENERAL NOTES:

- Ensure early contact with DISA CIO and functional stakeholders.
- *Use e-mail to the maximum extent practicable to expedite process activities such as those involving the review, coordination, and transmittal of the table.*
- Provide “Section/Page Number” for each “Supporting Document” to support the “Summary Response”. Include “Day Month Year” each document was validated/signed/approved and by whom/organization, and indicate the “Day Month Year” of each Final Draft document such as the Acquisition Program Baseline, which is not approved/signed until the MDA approves a milestone.
- Spell out acronyms and abbreviations at initial usage.
- Use of “to be determined” and “not applicable” are not acceptable without an explanation.
- Provide pertinent and clear information that would not lead to unanswered questions or follow-on inquiries.
- Ensure DISA CIO is notified soon after MDA milestone approval of approval/signature dates of each Final Draft document (e.g., the Acquisition Program Baseline) cited in the certified CCA Compliance Table.

TEMPLATE – OCTOBER 2004
Defense Information Systems Agency

Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 Compliance Table
Defense Information Systems Agency
PROGRAM NAME
Acquisition Category XXX – Milestone X, Block <or Phase> X
DAY MONTH YEAR

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
<p>1. Make a determination that the acquisition supports core, priority functions of the Department.</p>	<p>Does the program support Department of Defense (DOD) Core/Primary mission functions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the program support DOD core/primary functions as documented in the Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) or Strategic Plan? • Is there an approved Mission Needs Statement (MNS) or Initial Capabilities Document (ICD)? Date, Title? Approval Authority? Does the MNS or ICD reference appropriate Principal Staff Assistant (PSA) Functional Strategic Plan goals, objectives, and measures of performance? • Is this program covered by a Capstone Requirements Document (CRD)/Capability Development Document (CDD)/Capability Production Document (CPD)? Date? Title? Approval Authority? Does the CRD, CDD, or CPD reference or use appropriate PSA Functional Strategic Plan goals, objectives, and measures of performance? If yes, is there an approved and validated CRD, CDD, or CPD? Date, Title? Approval Authority? Are there pending changes to the CRD, CDD, or CPD, that will/should impact the upcoming milestone decision? If yes, explain. • Is there an approved Operational Requirements Document (ORD)? Date, Title? Approval Authority? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is it consistent with the CRD, CDD, or CPD (if applicable)? ○ Are program outcome-oriented performance objectives and associated thresholds 	<p><u>Mission Needs Statement or Initial Capabilities Document</u></p> <p><u>Capstone Requirements Document, Capabilities Development Document, or Capabilities Production Document</u></p> <p><u>Operational Requirements Document</u></p> <p><u>Information Support Strategy (formerly the Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) Support Plan)</u></p> <p><u>Functional Requirements Specification</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
	<p>for improving effectiveness and efficiency of the mission identified in the ORD?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is program affordability addressed in the ORD? ○ Has the JROC approved the ORD? Date? ○ Are there pending changes to the ORD, that will/should impact the upcoming milestone decision? If yes, explain. <p>Note: A validated and approved ORD, developed under a previous version of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3170.01D, dated 12 March 2004, may be used to support a Milestone B or C decision in lieu of a CDD or CPD until 24 June 2005.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If changes to threshold and objective performance requirements have been (are being) made for the upcoming milestone decision, describe the changes, why they have been (are being) made, and provide detail on how mission effectiveness and efficiency would be improved/maintained by the change(s). • Mention any other documents (e.g., agenda, roadmap, plan, directive) to support the program's link to core, priority functions. 	
<p>2. Establish outcome-based performance measures linked to strategic goals.</p>	<p>Are work processes, information flows, and technology integrated to achieve DOD strategic goals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the program compliant with the DOD Information Management Strategic Plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In support of the DOD mission, have the mission-related and administrative processes supported been analyzed and information flows determined as part of making IT investment decisions? ○ Briefly describe revisions made, or to be made, to the mission-related and/or administrative processes. • Have work processes been assessed for potential insertion of information system technology advances that could result in process simplification and/or more effective and efficient mission accomplishment? Examples? • What goals have been established for improving the contribution of information systems to program and mission productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness? Have measures been identified that will allow measuring progress towards achieving these goals and have responsibilities been assigned for performing measurement and evaluating progress? 	<p><u>Capstone Requirements Document/ Capabilities Development Document/Capabilities Production Document</u></p> <p><u>Operational Requirements Document</u></p> <p><u>Acquisition Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Acquisition Program Baseline</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
<p>3. Redesign the processes that the system supports to reduce costs, improve effectiveness and maximize the use of commercial technology.</p>	<p>Have work processes been redesigned to reduce costs and improve effectiveness (including Benchmarking against comparable processes in other public or private organizations)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the mission-related and/or administrative processes thoroughly analyzed (including use of benchmarking) to determine if any processes should be considered for performance improvements prior to Milestone A and during Concept Exploration? • Describe how the processes were reengineered and how process performance improvements will be measured in terms of increased mission performance, cost reduction/avoidance, reduced cycle time, productivity, and quality of output and outcomes. • Does the program maximize use of COTS technology? • Is there a plan for PMO and/or contractor identification, evaluation and incorporation of reusable COTS or government off-the-shelf (GOTS) hardware and software products (e.g., requirements, domain models, architectures, designs, software development plans, data element descriptions, test plans, test data, etc.) in developing the system? If yes, is the plan consistent with maximizing the use of COTS technology? • Does the program require the reuse of specific COTS or GOTS common software products (e.g., Common Operating Environment) in the system? If yes, has a plan been developed to integrate updates, revisions, or replacements to the COTS or GOTS? • Are plans for consideration/implementation of COTS/GOTS hardware and software products consistent with the approved Acquisition Strategy? 	<p><u>Mission Needs Statement or Initial Capabilities Document</u></p> <p><u>Capstone Requirements Document/Capabilities Development Document (CDD)/Capabilities Production Document (CPD)</u></p> <p><u>Information Support Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Analysis of Alternatives</u></p> <p><u>Concept of Operations</u></p>
<p>4. No private sector or government source can better support the function.</p>	<p>Is it an inherently government function?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed investment in IT support core mission or inherently governmental functions that need to be or must be performed by the government? If yes, explain. If no, provide rationale for why the functions should not be eliminated or outsourced in part or entirely. • Can the functions be accomplished more efficiently (reduced cost and/or improved effectiveness) by another Federal organization. If no, provide rationale. If yes, explain. 	<p><u>Mission Needs Statement or Initial Capabilities Document</u></p> <p><u>Technology Development Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Acquisition Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Analysis of Alternatives</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed investment in IT fall under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76, Performance of Commercial Activities (also referred to as outsourcing)? If not, why. 	
<p>5. An analysis of alternatives has been conducted.</p>	<p>Is there an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA)? Date? Approval Authority? Has it been updated for the upcoming milestone decision? If yes, date? If no, provide status of any in-process AoA. Does it support the selected alternative?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a description of each alternative reviewed. Identify and discuss the alternatives analyzed to justify the preferred alternative to be initiated to satisfy valid mission need(s). • To prove the investment is in the best interest of the – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the investment in a major capital asset support core/priority mission functions that need to be performed by the Federal government? ○ Does the investment need to be undertaken by the requesting agency because no alternative private sector or governmental source can better support the functions? ○ Does the investment support work processes that have been simplified or otherwise redesigned to reduce costs, improve effectiveness, and make maximum use of commercial, off-the-shelf technology? ○ Describe the methods of evaluation; i.e., the method and criteria used to assess the alternatives – DOD/DISA mission requirements, key performance parameters (KPPs)/measures, DOD/DISA technical requirements including information assurance, DOD/DISA architecture requirements including information assurance, GAO’s criteria for comparing and ranking projects (risk – performance, schedule, cost, organizational impact, contribution to mission effectiveness, and cost benefit contribution. ○ Provide brief comparison for viable alternatives, including status quo and use of COTS/GOTS – describe process, benefits, and shortfalls. ○ Summarize how well the viable alternatives met the evaluation criteria. Provide AoA recommended alternative and justification. 	<p><u>Operational Requirements Document</u></p> <p><u>Technology Development Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Analysis of Alternatives</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
<p>6. An economic analysis has been conducted that includes a calculation of the return on investment (ROI); or for non-automated information system programs, a life-cycle cost estimate (LCCE) has been conducted.</p>	<p>Does the projected ROI support the recommended alternative? [ROI includes: improvements to mission performance, resource savings, or qualitative mission benefits]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a Cost Analysis Requirements Description (CARD) been prepared and approved? Date? Has/will it been/be updated for the upcoming milestone decision? Date? Describe any changes that impact the upcoming milestone decision. • Has an Economic Analysis (EA) (IT programs) or a Program Office Estimate (POE) (NSS programs) been prepared? Was a Business Case Analysis performed? Date? Has it been completed? Date? • Is the EA consistent with the AoA (if applicable)? Does it need to be updated for the upcoming milestone decision? If yes, status? • Has the return on investment (ROI) (e.g., improvements to mission performance, resource savings, qualitative mission benefits, etc.) for the selected alternative been shown to be better than that for existing/alternative ways of accomplishing the mission? Has the ROI been adjusted for risk factors such as technical complexity, likelihood of cost overruns, consequences of under- or non-performance, etc.? Explain. (NOTE: While the documentation must satisfy the intent of the CCA, a particular MAIS program may benefit by focusing on metrics that measure mission performance.) • Are the benefits shown in the EA based on documented, program requirement KPPs? • Is there an agreed to cost position by an appropriate cost organization? ACAT IAM: Component Cost Analysis approved. Date? ACAT IAC: Component Cost Position approved. Date? • For a MAIS Program with a Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAP) designation – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has an Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) been prepared by the Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG)? Date? ○ If the program requires an IT Acquisition Board (ITAB) or Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) review, has it been performed and has OSD deemed the program affordable? 	<p><u>Program LCCE or Program Economic Analysis for MAIS</u></p> <p><u>Analysis of Alternatives</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
<p>7. There are clearly established measures and accountability for program/project progress.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there clearly established measures and accountability for program progress? Are these measures linked to strategic goals? [Acquisition Program Baseline (APB), Cost as an Independent Variable (CAIV) objectives, Milestone Exit Criteria, or Software Measures] • Has the APB been developed or updated for the upcoming milestone decision and is it consistent with the current ORD? Has the APB been reviewed and deemed ready for submission to the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA)? • Has the revised APB been approved by the MDA? Date? • Has accountability been established for program progress toward meeting APB parameters? • Have all exit criteria for the current phase been satisfied? If no, which ones haven't been satisfied and how will they be satisfied before the milestone decision? • Have entrance and exit criteria been developed for the next phase? Is there at least one for tracking progress on each of technical, schedule, and management risk areas? If no, why not? Have the exit criteria been included in the proposed ADM? Has the ADM been reviewed and deemed ready to submit to the MDA? 	<p><u>Acquisition Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Acquisition Program Baseline</u></p> <p><u>Risk Management Plan</u></p>
<p>8. The acquisition is consistent with Global Information Grid (GIG) policies and architecture to include relevant standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed investment reflect the DOD technology vision? [Global Information Grid (GIG)] • Is there a Net-Ready Key Performance Parameter (KPP)? If so, describe. If not, why? • Are the approved IT standards and standards profiles in the DOD IT Standards Registry (DISR) (formerly the Joint Technical Architecture (JTA)) being used in developing and fielding interoperable and net-centric enabled systems and products? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has the appropriate language been included in the Request for Proposal Statement of Work, Performance Work Statement, and/or system specification to require development of the system compliant with the GIG? ○ Have all aspects of interoperability, including joint and allied interoperability, been included in the operational architecture, design approach, and selection of technical standards? • Are standards incorporated that enable information exchange and resource sharing while retaining flexibility? [Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating 	<p><u>Acquisition Program Baseline (Interoperability Key Performance Parameter)</u></p> <p><u>GIG Capstone Requirements Document</u></p> <p><u>Information Support Plan</u></p> <p><u>Information Assurance Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Test and Evaluation Master Plan</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
	<p>Environment (DII COE), Automated Information Collection/Continuous Acquisition and Life-Cycle Support (CALs), Software engineering (software reuse, software language, DOD standard data), or Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3) and Spectrum Management].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there a documented plan for the system software to use the DII COE as a system foundation? To what level of compliance will the program implement the DII COE? If not planned, has a waiver been submitted/ approved? Date? • Does the program require on-line access to, or delivery of, programmatic and technical data in digital form (required on all new contracts beginning FY97)? If not, why not? • Has an architecture been developed according to GIG policy that identifies and describes the required external system interfaces and associated characteristics? Where is this documented? • Does the program need to obtain frequency spectrum use approval? If no, why not? If yes, has the appropriate frequency spectrum request (DD1494/J12) been approved? Date? • Has frequency spectrum dependent equipment been certified? Date? 	
<p>9. The program/ project has an information assurance strategy that is consistent with relevant policies, standards, and architectures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If security is an issue, has a security strategy been developed and described in a security model of the architecture that is traceable through requirements, design, implementation, and operating procedure documents? • Are the IA features consistent with the architecture described in the program's Information Support Plan (ISP)? • Is the security strategy consistent with DOD security policy? • Is there an approach that addresses how specific security features will be tested and certified (e.g., level of access, number of allowable passwords, response of system to an incorrect password)? • Is Information Security integrated into a Command and Control protect program with OPSEC, Electronic Protection, Intelligence, Counter PSYOPS, and Deception and Physical Security? 	<p><u>Security Classification Guide</u></p> <p><u>Information Assurance Strategy</u></p> <p><u>Program Protection Plan</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the program have an approved Systems Security Authorization Agreement (SSAA) and Approval to Operate (ATO) or Interim ATO? Date(s)? 	
<p>10. To the maximum extent practicable, (1) modular contracting has been used, and (2) the program/project is being implemented in phased, successive blocks, each of which meets part of the mission need and delivers measurable benefit, independent of future blocks.</p>	<p>Will the program be implemented in a phased strategy? [incremental, evolutionary, block or phase]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Acquisition Strategy current for the upcoming milestone decision? If so, has the Acquisition Strategy been approved? Date? If no, what is the plan for revising the Acquisition Strategy? • Does the Acquisition Strategy call for block/increment development and fielding? If no, why not? If yes, have the increments been defined such that each is not dependent upon any subsequent increment for performance of its principal functions? • Does the Acquisition Strategy identify what contract vehicle(s) are to be used to execute the program and how these contract vehicles will address potential risk areas? • Does the Acquisition Strategy consider risk sharing by government and contractors and how to apply incentives to reduce/avoid contractor cost? • What is being done to provide the contractor incentive to accept or share the risk and produce reliable, supportable products? • Does the program effectively use competition? Does the Acquisition Strategy call for competition in all increments and life cycle phases? If no, why not? • For incremental development, does the Acquisition Strategy identify if and why full and open competition would not be appropriate for a subsequent increment(s)? Explain. Does it call for an approach supportive of component breakout that allows consideration of a broad set of suppliers for components with open system interfaces? 	<p><u>Acquisition Strategy</u></p>
<p>11. The system being acquired is registered.</p>	<p>Is the system registered in DOD's registry? Is it registered as a mission-critical (MC) or mission essential (ME) system? Date registered? Number assigned?</p>	<p><u>DOD Information Technology Registration Database</u></p>

<i>CCA Requirement</i>	<i>Summary Response</i>	<i>Supporting Documents</i>
<p>12. Funding baseline and milestone schedule are established and being maintained.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the program or current increment fully funded (POM'd or firm commitment from funding organization that it will be POM'd next cycle) and supported by the users/sponsors? • Is the program or current increment consistent with DOD funding priorities as reflected in the DOD's Strategic Planning Guidance (SPG) or other budget guidance? • Are contract payments tied to accomplishments? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe the government and contractor jointly developed contract work breakdown structure and organizational elements that constitute cost, schedule, or technical risk on the contract? Is there a procedure in place to periodically review risk areas; to require the contractor to provide explanations of variances in these risk areas if they exceed pre-established thresholds? Are there thresholds identified as conditions for re-evaluating program schedules and/or funding? ○ Are earned value or equivalent metrics used to determine program progress and schedule status? How often are these metrics reviewed against the program baseline? ○ Describe the basis on which costs are reimbursed and/or progress payments are made? • Does the APB serve as the program's measurement baseline in terms of funding, schedule, and performance? If so, explain. • Is a software tool being used in developing a master schedule in managing overall program's significant events, including funded resources and milestones? If so, describe. 	<p><u>Acquisition Program Baseline</u></p> <p><u>Risk Management Plan</u></p>

Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 Compliance Table
Defense Information Systems Agency
PROGRAM NAME
Acquisition Category XXX – Milestone X, Block <or Phase> X
Coordination/Approval

Typed Name & Signature:

Date:

PREPARED BY:

Program Manager or Deputy Program Manager

COORDINATED BY:

Component Acquisition Executive or Designee

Chief Financial Executive or Designee

Director, Procurement & Logistic, or Designee

Chief, Defense Information Technology Contracting
 Organization, or Designee

Chief Information Assurance Executive or Designee

Chief, Strategic Business Unit, Strategic
 Planning and Information Directorate, or Designee

Chief, Information Assurance Division, Office of
 the Chief Information Officer, or Designee

Chief, Information Technology Division, Office of
 the Chief Information Officer, or Designee

General Counsel or Designee

CERTIFIED BY:

Chief Information Officer (CIO) or Deputy CIO
