



Acquisition Research Program: Creating Synergy for Informed Change

Determining the Optimal Staffing Level for the Acquisition Workforce: Different Models in Different Services Yield Different Results

Tim Reed, Ph. D.

Visiting Professor, Naval Postgraduate School



Agenda

- Problem Definition
- The Services Approach to Modeling Contracting Workload/Resources
- Model Comparisons
- Going Forward



Research Problem

- Multiple factors drive increased interest in contracting models used in DoD
 - Increasing pace of change
 - Increasing complexity
 - Congressional emphasis on contracting accessions
 - Joint basing and BRAC consolidations
- Factors result in need for consistent
 - Measurement of contracting workload, and
 - Assignment of adequate resources to manage workload with an acceptable level of risk



Research Question

- Identify potential opportunities to enhance existing methodologies using emerging technology
 - e.g. tying models w/ BIS, ERP
- Ensure the work being performed at various stages within the contract process is identified and captured
 - are 2001 models still good?
- Ensure that the differing levels of complexity of the contracting workload are captured in measurement systems



Background

- Acquisition studies and commissions cite personnel management as key factor for success or failure of buying organizations
 - [GAO-10-439](#), April 22, 2010; [GAO-09-342](#), March 25, 2009; Commission on Wartime Contracting; Gansler Commission Report
 - Government Accountability Office (GAO) 2009 High-Risk List continues to highlight:
 - Strategic Human Capital Management
 - DOD Contract Management
 - <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09271.pdf>



Overview of Each Service's Approach



Acquisition Research Program: Creating Synergy for Informed Change

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA

Service Approaches to Modeling in Various Task Environments

- We first sought to identify key elements of various DoD service's and Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) contracting workforce staffing models.
- Then we investigated the rationale and assumptions utilized to develop the models
- Examined process used in each environment
 - Operational (Installation)
 - Major Weapon Systems
 - Contingency



Army

- Workload and Staffing Model History
 - Widely varied approach left to regions and commands
 - FORSCOM/TRADOC (The Grail)
 - ACASR Model
 - USAMAA
 - AMSAA



Army

- Army Contracting Command created 2008
 - Brought organizations from seven centers and two commands together
 - Provides opportunity to formulate “Army” contracting standard model
- First Concept Plan (2008)
 - Developed to stand up ACC
 - No rigorous validation or analysis of workload
 - Glued existing pieces together to enable 30 day standup



Army

- Second Concept Plan (Sep 2009)
 - Enhanced Contract Management Capabilities
 - Addressed contract admin at ECC and MICC
 - Utilized DCMA PLAS data to determine activity time, applied to ACC actions
 - Placed manpower in four buckets
 - Supply/Sys Acq & R&D/Mnx facilities/Services
 - Added 282 spaces in ECC and 187 in MICC



Army

- Third Concept Plan (Summer 2010)
 - Overarching concept plan with 3 main goals
 1. Use AMSAA model & 2009 data to develop top level numbers for each of seven ACC contracting centers
 2. Use AF model on ECC and MICC activity to determine staffing at DOC level
 3. Use individual functional specialty models (e.g. IG, Chaplain, Legal, RM) to determine HQ staff levels



Navy

- Assigns resources based on Position Mgmt Board (NAVFAC)
- Time to Produce Model (COMFISCS)
- Budget driven manpower authorizations



Air Force

- “Scientific management” of resources
- Operational contracting manpower standard 12A0 intended for use down to installation level
- Serves as the model for many other agencies
- AF Material Command has also developed a systems contracting manpower standard – Workload Assessment Model (WAM)



DCMA

- Focused on Post-award environment
- Historically used Resource Utilization Model (RUC) but was abandoned during declining staffing years
- PLAS (Perf Labor Accounting System)
 - Currently in use
 - Offshoot of Activity Based Costing
 - Daily timesheet captures work completed, task type, contract type, etc
 - Flows into DCMA Enterprise Planning



Deployed Environment: Joint Contracting Command I/A

- Joint Command Responsible for Contracting Activity in Iraq and Afghanistan
- No formal workload assessment model
- “Pie-sizing” process was conducted in 2008 to level manning at each contracting center
 - Baseline center was selected on assessment that it was appropriately staffed
 - Other centers were compared to it in dollars, actions and complexity
 - Variability was expected in accordance with those measures
 - Significant departures from expectations were addressed



Comparison of Key Characteristics of Each Service Process



Model Comparisons

- Army Models (examples)
 - FORSCOM/TRADOC - based on dollars obligated, no complexity factor
 - ACASR - used six complexity factors
 - Kind of action, solicitation procedure, IDIQ, Contract Type, Extent Competed, Dollars Obligated
 - Each model phased out



Army Models continued

- AMSAA CMD STD Application Tool – Examined workload at command level, not installation
 - Measured work 1100 series does in PM activities, policy, review, K award, K admin
 - Variables measured include solicitations, actions complete, PWDs assigned, but NOT dollars
 - Complexity addressed by allowing non-competitive actions and PWDs to earn 4.5 x more credit than competitive actions and PWDs



Air Force Operational Contracting Manpower Standard

- Utilized at the installation level contracting office
- Manpower earned via contract actions & dollars
- Excludes modifications, BPAs, and utilities
- Complexity addressed by splitting inputs at 100k level
- Also credits unit for deployment days and fixed support for commander staff, IT, SB, GPC, etc



Air Force Systems Model - WAM

- In use at Aero Systems Center, beta test throughout AF Material Command
- ASC 1102s complete annual workload data call
- Dropdowns allow them to select from variable types of
 - Modifications -16 (SAT supplemental agreements, funding actions, option exercise, etc)
 - Undefinitized Contract Actions - 10 (letter contract, terminations. UCAs, exercise un-priced option, etc)
 - Definitization action -15 (TO, DO, UCA/order definitization, etc
 - Miscellaneous – 8 (ADR, Congressional, GFP, FOIA, etc)
- Credits work complete based on milestones
- Complexity addressed through .1 to .4 indirect rate for each SPO



What Major Variable Considerations Have We Identified?

- Complexity (100k; competitive; SPO tempo)
- Work Load Factor (\$'s; actions; prgms;)
- Process for assigning Time Allowed for Actions (SMEs; Study)
- Work Accomplished Credit (complete; phase)
- Forecast capability of process (can we do better than identifying what our staff should have been LAST year?)



Still to come

- Model Comparisons
- Army sample (MICC?) through AMSAA and AF model
- AF sample (AETC) through AMSAA and AF model
- Compare



Conclusion

- Importance of workload assessment and staffing will continue to gain importance
- Art or Science?
- What's the optimal blend of math and command assessment?
- How do we implement a process that will remain in use when resources are “redistributed” and not just when it earns us “more help”
- What is the ultimate measure of model effectiveness?
(Cycle time, productivity, upheld protests...)





Acquisition Research Program: Creating Synergy for Informed Change

Tim Reed, Ph. D.

Visiting Professor, Naval Postgraduate School

tsreed@nps.edu

703-599-6696

