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DBSAE Mission and Vision
Deliver Business Capability to Warfighters

Be recognized as a World Class Acquisition Organization and
Trusted Provider of Transformational Business Capabilities

Develop, operate, and drive successful implementation of
Combat Support Business Enterprise Solutions for the
Warfighter that deliver a solid Foundation for Sovereign
Operations
for the United States of America

Accomplished
through:

- Transformation and
  Innovation
- Transitioning proven systems
to sustainment
- A Trained, Agile and Ready
  Workforce;
  - Skilled
  - Motivated
  - Ethical
  - Diverse

Rapid Acquisition
On Schedule & On Cost

FY10 National Defense
Authorization Act directs a “New
Acquisition Process” based on
DSB... must be designed to include:

- Early and continued user involvement
- Multiple, rapidly executed increments
  or releases of capability
- Early, successive prototyping to
  support evolutionary approaches
- Congressional report in in 270-days
- Modular open-system approach
Problem Statement

“Single Point of Entry for the vendor to access underlying systems for the purposes of receipt, acceptance, and invoicing.”*
High Level Requirements View

- Account Management
- Routing
- Single Sign-on
- Data Visibility

Portal

Vendors

Account Creation
Identity Transfer
Data Visibility

Creation of Transaction
Storage of Data

WAWF
SUS Navy ERP
SUS GFEDS
iSupplier DEAMS
iSupplier DAI
Integrated Feasibility Assessment (IFA) Overview
What Is the IFA

The Integrated Feasibility Assessment (IFA) is an enterprise approach for assessing technology as it applies to mission/business capabilities’ improvements.

IFA is a methodology to:

• Increase the efficiency of solution assessments and reduce redundant pre-acquisition operational activities
• Increase the difficulty in approving non-optimal fielding and enterprise decisions
• Meet compliance with the Title 40 Clinger Cohen, DoD 5000.02 and BCL
IFA Assessment Process

**Project Strategy (PS)** – the problem statement, which is the fundamental requirement of the IFA process, confirms the ability of the solution/technology to satisfy the identified capabilities or gaps while providing a solution deemed “best value”.

**Capability Analysis (CA)** — the CA identifies the requirements and capabilities for the program and further defines the problem statement and scope of the effort. Capabilities are defined at the Program level as a basis of the business case. This analysis ensures that there is sufficient data to understand the viability of technology and sufficient data to develop the Total cost of ownership (TCO) for the materiel solution.

**Capability Prioritization (CP)** – The CP process is used to assess the comparative value of the capabilities to the various activities/roles (use case) of the organization. This process of elimination of low priority business case requirements increase the viability of a solution, reduce time/cost of implementation and decrease the failure risk.

**Capability Determination (CD)** – The Capability Determination process defines “what” capability gaps are to be evaluated, and by “what” technologies. This is a process that creates groupings (tables) of capabilities and technology or solutions that satisfy the capability gaps. This is an important step, which establishes the plan for how the assessment will be conducted.

**Feasibility Assessment (FA)** — Feasibility Assessment is a process for analysis of emerging and innovative technology products regarding the degree to which they will satisfy the capabilities or gaps identified.

**Economic Analysis (EA)** — a minimal decision support process that identifies alternatives and provides business and technical arguments for selection and implementation to achieve stated organizational objectives. The Economic Analysis is a simplified Business Case Analysis, which provides an analytical and uniform foundation upon which sound decisions are made.
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Perform Capability Analysis
Step 1 – Assess Problem Statement
Step 2 – Assess JOPsC, DOTMLPF, CCA Rq’ts
Step 3 – Develop CAR

Perform Capability Determination
Step 1 – Market Survey of Technology
Step 2 – Build Assessment Model(s)

Perform FA Assessment
Step 1 – Setting the Value Criteria
Step 2 – Conducting the Value Assessment
Step 3 – Sensitivity Analysis
Step 4 – Industry Audits: Strength of Evidence
Step 5 – Final Report

Perform AA Assessment
Step 1 – Setting the Value Criteria
Step 2 – Conducting the Value Assessment
Step 3 – Sensitivity Analysis
Step 4 – Industry Audits: Strength of Evidence
Step 5 – Final Report

Translate the Scope to the Financial Model:
Step 1 – Setting Up the Model
Step 2 – Determine the Quantities
Step 3 – Setting up the Sub-Models
Step 4 – Developing the ROI Cost and Returns

Determine the Alternatives
Step 5 – Determining the Alternatives
Step 6 – Determining the Financial Indicators

Collect Data & Benchmark Metrics
Step 7 – Collect the Model’s Data & Assumptions

Conduct the EA Analysis
Step 8 – Conduct the EA Analysis

Update on low value capabilities which have TCO implications

Approve Solution/TCO Plan

Approve Decision
DBSAE
Portfolio Mgr

Econ Analysis
yes
no
no
no
no
yes
no
yes
no
no
no
yes

IFA FLOW DIAGRAM

Sol’n/TCO Plan

End
IFA Speeds Production of Statutory Documents

An Assembly Line Model with clear entry/exist criteria

### JOPsC Rqt’s Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Capability</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Highest Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce time to deploy infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduce infrastructure cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve Reliability, Availability, Survivability (RAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work within current Security Management Posture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Builds On**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Functional/DOTMLPF Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Builds On**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feasibility/Architecture Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Factors</th>
<th>Unmanaged PC</th>
<th>Managed PC</th>
<th>Thin Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce infrastr. cost</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Reliability, Availability, Survivability</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work within current Security Management Posture</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support SBC storage strategy</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Infrastructure Requirements</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Manageability</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Builds On**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unmanaged PC</th>
<th>Managed PC</th>
<th>Thin Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UoM Objective**

- Provide for remote manageability of desktop
- Provide support for all business and mission applications, including bandwidth sensitive applications
- Provide a client computing environment solution that scales over the AF enterprise
- Allow use of a diverse mix of hardware end devices in a heterogeneous environment
- Increase IT service availability to the mobile/pervasive user

### Agility and Accountability
Portal IFA Process

Project Strategy
Capability Analysis
Scoring Guidelines
## Project Strategy

### Objective

Complete CAM process for P2P Portal Option 3 implementation, identifying potential implementation options within 30 business days.

### Stakeholders

- Vendors
- EBPOC
- Target Systems PMOs (ERP, WAWF, etc.)
- BTA

### Schedule and Status

**Completed CAM in 30 Business Days**

- **Kickoff** – 14 JAN
- **Problem Statement** – 22 JAN
- **CAR** – 29 JAN
- **Capability Prioritization** – 5 FEB
- **Snow** – 12 FEB
- **Market Research and Scoring** – 19 FEB
- **AoA Completed** – 26 FEB
- **Presentation of Results** – 5 MAR

### CAM Participants

- **Sponsor** – BTA
- **Lead** – BTA DBSAE
- **Participants** – BTA TP&R; BTA EI
- **Programs** – DoD CIO Storefront, DKO/AKO, WAWF
- **Market Research** – Provided by Gartner, Oracle, CA
# P2P Capabilities
## Level 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cap. No.</th>
<th>Capability Level 1</th>
<th>Description of Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notification to Human Users</td>
<td>Ability for the system to deliver user account information or transactional information to recipients. The system should have the ability to notify users via email or other notification services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Visibility for Reporting</td>
<td>Ability for the system to provide a mechanism for displaying information from all users authorized from each government organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Account management</td>
<td>Ability for system to create a new vendor user account in the Portal. Vendor users will request access to the Portal in order to be routed to the appropriate target system for conducting business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Routing/ Workflow</td>
<td>Ability to provide an automated routing service that will assist users in identifying the correct system to which a user should go and will establish a session on the correct system for the user. The portal must also provide user identity maintenance capabilities to accurately identify users and their access authorizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide Presentation Layer for User</td>
<td>Ability to provide a Presentation Layer, which will be responsible for the delivery and formatting of information to the application layer for further processing or display. Basic Requirements are: NIPRnet Presence, .mil Domain, Firewalls (Security requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single Sign-On to Target System</td>
<td>System shall provide Single Sign-On (SSO) services in support of accessing DoD ERP implementations (primarily Oracle Financials and SAP) and Wide Area Workflow (WAWF) target systems. The system should have the ability to eliminate further credential requests from each of the systems to which they need to connect, thereby enabling users to move among many systems in order to accomplish their various business objectives without signing on to each system individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Data Storage</td>
<td>Ability for the system to store user account information and transactional information and provide easy access to the data, which should be retrievable very quickly and transferable at a high speed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Create Transaction Occurs at the ERP Level and falls outside the scope for this assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cap. No.</th>
<th>Capability Level 1</th>
<th>Description of Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creation of Transaction</td>
<td>Ability for the system to allow the user to complete a &quot;unit of work&quot; which in the business world is known as a &quot;business transaction&quot;. The system must allow the user to view and maintain records within the ERP environment using the standard Create, Read, Update or Delete operations. A transaction may deal with a single occurrence from a single database table or may deal with several occurrences from several database tables. It may only read from the database, or it may perform a number of inserts, updates and deletes within a single operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. No.</td>
<td>Capability Level 1</td>
<td>Capability Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notification to Human Users</td>
<td>Notify User of Account &amp; Transaction Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage Notification Rules and Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Visibility for Reporting</td>
<td>Data Visibility through Reporting Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Search Transaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Account Management</td>
<td>User Provisioning for Web Page (Portlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage User Portlet Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web Page (Portlet) Role Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Routing/ Workflow</td>
<td>Determine Routing for Portlet Account Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Service Interface Handle for Machine to Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide Presentation Layer for User</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticate to the Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authorize Access to Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single Sign-On to Target System</td>
<td>Pass ID Credentials to Target Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive Acknowledgement of Target Systems Receipt of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Data Storage</td>
<td>Store Data Related to Web Page (Portlet, Widget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Store Data in Target Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creation of Transaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation n of Transaction in Target System A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management View
Constraining Descriptions and Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint Letter</th>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Time To Market</td>
<td>Time to market (TTM) is the length of time it takes from a product being conceived until it is available for use - the time it will take for BTA to provide an end to end process fully implemented in the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems.</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Vendor Buy-In</td>
<td>Vendor buy-in is essential to the success of the project and all stakeholders need to know what’s happening, when it’s happening and why it is happening. When all vendors involved understand and support the change initiative, then vendor buy-in has been achieved.</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>DCMO Alignment</td>
<td>DCMO alignment is essential to the success of the project and all stakeholders need to know what’s happening, when it’s happening and why it is happening. When DCMO understand and support the change initiative, then DCMO Alignment has been achieved.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Seamless Stakeholder Participation</td>
<td>Exists if the end-to-end business process enables all stages of the process to work smoothly together ensuring stakeholders (Business Process owners and users) support and comply with the business process operation to enable a successful enterprise. The typical unit of measure for Stakeholder Participation is the number of Desired uses against the number of Successful uses per unit of time.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Usability/Familiarity</td>
<td>Is the ability of business process stakeholders to make effective use of a business process upon demand. Characteristics of the business process are intuitive, uniform, and repeatable, ensuring the establishment of a process “comfort zone” such that all participants and stakeholders have a firm grasp on capabilities, expectations, hand-off requirements and process limitations. The existence of the process “comfort zone” encourages developing process execution proficiency. The typical unit of measure for Usability/Familiarity is the number of Attempted uses opposed to the number of Expected outcomes per unit of time.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Transactional Efficiency</td>
<td>Is the demonstrated reliability and repeatability of a business process. The business process performs as expected, producing consistent results to an expected standard. The typical unit of measure for Transactional Efficiency is the number of Actual process uses against the number of Successful uses per unit of time.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Agility</td>
<td>Is the ability of process stakeholders to use a business process when wanted, with adaptability to change parameters within the process to allow modification as required to manage changing requirements and to assure process fulfillment. The typical unit of measure for Agility is the number of Desired process adjustments against the number of Successful process adjustments per unit of time.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Insight/Controls</td>
<td>Is the ability of enterprise managers and business process stakeholders to easily observe transactions, ensuring that they progress through the business cycle, promoting accuracy and completeness of data and the visibility of evolving requirements that produce reliable/timely information necessary to sustain process success and ensure adherence to policy. The typical unit of measure for Process Insight/Internal Controls is the number of Desired uses against the number of Expected uses per unit of time.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P2P Portal CAM Constraints
| Total             | 1,000                                                                 |

Agility and Accountability
## Scoring Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Value</th>
<th>Scoring Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mature Solution Meet Requirements with limited modification required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mature Solution requires some modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature Solution Requires modification in order to meet requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Immature Solution and may require modification OR Mature Solution requires significant modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Solution was not shown to meet requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portal IFA Process

Portal Analysis of Alternative (AoA) Options
Analysis of Alternative - Option A

CIO StoreFront

CAPABILITIES
1.0 Notification to Human User
   1.1 Notify User of Status
   1.2 Manage Notifications
2.0 Data Visibility for Reporting
   2.1 Data Visibility Report Capabilities
   2.2 Search Transaction
3.0 Account Management
   3.1 User Provisioning for Web page
   3.2 ID Management
   3.3 Manage User Portlet Accounts
   3.4 Web Page Role Management
4.0 Routing/Workflow
   4.1 Routing for Account Creation
   4.2 Service Interface Handler for M2M
5.0 Presentation Layer for User
   5.1 Performance
   5.2 Authenticate to Portal
   5.3 Authorizes Access to Web Page
6.0 SSO on Target System
   6.1 Pass ID credentials to Target System
   6.2 Receive Acknowledgement from Target System
7.0 Data Storage
   7.1 Store Data related o Web Page
8.0 Creation of Transaction
   8.1 Creation of Transaction in Target System

PRO
   Flexibility (Code Centric)
   Cost of Pilot
   Next Generation Pathfinder for “DKO”
   Thin layer Approach

CON
   Storefront schedule may not meet FY10 goal
   New solution not yet scaled
   Heavy programming requirement (Code Centric)
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Analysis of Alternative – Option B2

WAWF Extension

CAPABILITIES

1.0 Notification to Human User
   1.1 Notify User of Status
   1.2 Manage Notifications

2.0 Data Visibility for Reporting
   2.1 Data Visibility Report Capabilities
   2.2 Search Transaction

3.0 Account Management
   3.1 User Provisioning for Web page
   3.2 ID Management
   3.3 Manage User Portlet Accounts
   3.4 Web Page Role Management

4.0 Routing/ Workflow
   4.1 Routing for Account Creation
   4.2 Service Interface Handler for M2M

5.0 Presentation Layer for User
   5.1 Performance
   5.2 Authenticate to Portal
   5.3 Authorizes Access to Web Page

6.0 SSO on Target System
   6.1 Pass ID credentials to Target System
   6.2 Receive Acknowledgement from Target System

7.0 Data Storage
   7.1 Store Data related to Web Page

8.0 Creation of Transaction
   8.1 Creation of Transaction in Target System

Vendors

WAWF Program technologies including IBM Tivoli

P
- Familiarity with Industry and User

R
- Familiarity with target system

O
- Gartner Magic Quadrant tool set for capability 3.0

C
- WAWF team development cycle

O
- New contracting

N
- Continuation of legacy code base with new extensions
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Analysis of Alternative – Option C1

CAPABILITIES

1.0 Notification to Human User
- 1.1 Notify User of Status
- 1.2 Manage Notifications

2.0 Data Visibility for Reporting
- 2.1 Data Visibility Report Capabilities
- 2.2 Search Transaction

3.0 Account Management
- 3.1 User Provisioning for Web page
- 3.2 ID Management
- 3.3 Manage User Portlet Accounts
- 3.4 Web Page Role Management

4.0 Routing/Workflow
- 4.1 Routing for Account Creation
- 4.2 Service Interface Handler for M2M

5.0 Presentation Layer for User
- 5.1 Performance
- 5.2 Authenticate to Portal
- 5.3 Authorizes Access to Web Page

6.0 SSO on Target System
- 6.1 Pass ID credentials to Target System
- 6.2 Receive Acknowledgement from Target System

7.0 Data Storage
- 7.1 Store Data related to Web Page

8.0 Creation of Transaction
- 8.1 Creation of Transaction in Target System

Pros:
- Supported by DKO Team
- Aligns to DCMO Direction
- Mature technology

Cons:
- Technology not acquired/deployed with P2P team
- New contracting

Vendors

Appian, CA ID Manager, CA SiteMinder and other

Gallery Channel, iFrame or WSRP Portlet

DKO

Configure

Portlet

Customization

Account Creation
Identity Transfer
Data Visibility (Crawling)

WAWF SUS Navy ERP SUS GFEBS iSupplier DEAMS iSupplier DAI
Analysis of Alternative – Option D

Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgmt

**CAPABILITIES**

1.0 Notification to Human User
   1.1 Notify User of Status
   1.2 Manage Notifications

2.0 Data Visibility for Reporting
   2.1 Data Visibility Report Capabilities
   2.2 Search Transaction

3.0 Account Management
   3.1 User Provisioning for Web page
   3.2 ID Management
   3.3 Manage User Portlet Accounts
   3.4 Web Page Role Management

4.0 Routing/Workflow
   4.1 Routing for Account Creation
   4.2 Service Interface Handler for M2M

5.0 Presentation Layer for User
   5.1 Performance
   5.2 Authenticate to Portal
   5.3 Authorizes Access to Web Page

6.0 SSO on Target System
   6.1 Pass ID credentials to Target System
   6.2 Receive Acknowledgement from Target System

7.0 Data Storage
   7.1 Store Data related to Web Page

8.0 Creation of Transaction
   8.1 Creation of Transaction in Target System

---

**Support**

- **P**: Supported by DKO Team
- **R**: Aligns to DCMO Direction
- **O**: Vendor Buy-in from WAWF

**Pros**

- Provides for flexibility on P2P side
- Mature technology

**Cons**

- Technology not acquired / deployed with P2P team
- New contracting
- Three or more parties involved (DKO, WAWF, P2P team)
Portal IFA Process

Trends in User Provisioning and Portal Capabilities
Gartner –
• Market has evolved since 2008 to a Commodity Market
• Early Product were not easy to use or configure
• 2010 products available at each layer and some Vendors have full stacks.
• Difficulty of implementation usually drives to a 75% solution
• 10,000 user implementation about $1 MIL ($50/user linear costs per user)
Gartner Market Research
User Provisioning & Web Access Mgmt.

As of September 2009

Agility and Accountability
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Magic Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mature Solution, Limited Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature Solution, Requires Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Solution not shown to meet requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complexity vs. Time to Market

- **Develop**
  - WAWF Portal
  - CIO StoreFront
  - Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgmt
- **Configure**
  - DKO ID Mgmt
  - WAWF Extension

**Before**
- Sept 30

**After**
- Sept 30

- **WAWF Portal**
- **CIO StoreFront**
- **WAWF Extension**
- **DKO ID Mgmt**
- **Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgmt**

Key

- **1** Mature Solution, Limited Modification
- **3** Mature Solution, Requires Modification
- **5** Solution not shown to meet requirements
Results, Implications, & Recommendations
## P2P Portal AoA Results

### IFA: Feasibility Assessment

### Capabilities Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>1.0 Notification to Human Users</th>
<th>2.0 Data Visibility for Reporting</th>
<th>3.0 Account Management</th>
<th>4.0 Routing/Workflow</th>
<th>5.0 Presentation Layer for User</th>
<th>6.0 SSO to Target System</th>
<th>7.0 Data Storage</th>
<th>8.0 Creation of Transaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.9</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.9</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.9</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 – 5.0</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability Weighting (%)</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>23%</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgt</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO ID Mgmt Only</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Extension</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Portal</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO Storefront</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# P2P Portal AoA Results

**IFA: Feasibility Assessment, Management View**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>A. Time To Market</th>
<th>B. Vendor Buy-in</th>
<th>C. DCMO Alignment</th>
<th>D. Seamless Stakeholder Participation</th>
<th>E. Usability/Familiarity</th>
<th>F. Transactional Efficiency</th>
<th>G. Agility</th>
<th>H. Insight/Controls</th>
<th>TOTAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO ID Mgt</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO ID Mgmt Only</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Extension</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Portal</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO Storefront</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

- **1.0 – 1.9** - Red
- **2.0 – 2.9** - Yellow
- **3.0 – 3.9** - Green
- **4.0 – 5.0** - Red
# P2P Portal AoA Results

## IFA: Capabilities and Constraints Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Notification to Human Users</th>
<th>Data Visibility for Reporting</th>
<th>Account Management</th>
<th>Routing/Workflow</th>
<th>Single Sign-On to Target System</th>
<th>Data Storage</th>
<th>Creation of Transaction</th>
<th>Total Capabilities</th>
<th>Time To Market</th>
<th>Vendor Buy-in</th>
<th>DCMO Alignment</th>
<th>Seamless Stakeholder Participation</th>
<th>Usability/Familiarity</th>
<th>Transactional Efficiency</th>
<th>Agility</th>
<th>Insight/Controls</th>
<th>Total Constraints</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgt</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKO ID Mgmt Only</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Extension</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAWF Portal</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO Storefront</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Color Key
- **Blue**: 1.0 – 1.9
- **Green**: 2.0 – 2.9
- **Yellow**: 3.0 – 3.9
- **Red**: 4.0 – 5.0
## AoA Pro’s & Con’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.5    | Hybrid: WAWF + DKO ID Mgmt.  | Supported by DKO Team  
* Aligns to DCMO Direction  
* Vendor Buy-in from WAWF  
* Provides for flexibility on P2P side  
* Mature technology  | Technology not acquired / deployed with P2P team  
* New contracting  
* Three+ parties involved  |
| 1.7    | DKO       | Supported by DKO Team  
* Aligns to DCMO Direction  
* Mature technology  | Technology not acquired / deployed with P2P team  
* New contracting  |
| 2.2    | DKO ID Mgmt. | Supported by DKO Team  
* Aligns to DCMO Direction  
* Provides for flexibility on P2P side  
* Mature technology  | Technology not acquired / deployed with P2P team  
* New contracting  |
| 2.6    | WAWF Extension | Organizationally separate from WAWF  
* Expandable in the future  
* Familiarity with target system  | WAWF team development cycle  
* Technology not acquired / deployed with team before  
* New contracting  |
| 3.8    | WAWF Portal | Familiarity with Industry and User  
* Familiarity with target system  
* Gartner Magic Quadrant tool set for capability 3.0  | WAWF team development cycle  
* New contracting  
* Continuation of legacy code base with new extensions  |
| 4.1    | CIO StoreFront | Flexibility (Code Centric)  
* Cost of Pilot  
* Next Generation Pathfinder for “DKO”  
* Thin layer Approach  | Storefront schedule may not meet FY10 goal  
* New solution not yet scaled  
* Heavy programming requirement (Code Centric)  |
Agility and Accountability

Decision Implications & Recommendations
Assumes Prototypes Aligns with Longer-Term Solution

• Prototype with least Complexity\(^1\) to Build
• Prototype Lowest Risk for Time To Market
• Prototype Alignment with the Market Trend
• Prototype with Highest Flexibility
• Prototype with Highest Stockholder Familiarity
• Prototype Taking Advantage of Open Source

\(^1\) Complexity defined as No. of Capabilities to be customized