Shaping the Way Ahead

Army Biometrics WIPT Kickoff

Nicole Daniel ■ Kevin Trissell ■ Richard Hansen

A Terrorist Threat Approaches

Somewhere on the border of Iraq, a driver is stopped and asked to exit his vehicle. He is asked to enter the nearby building to have his passport and identity papers examined. Meanwhile, soldiers check his vehicle for contraband. Everything seems to be in order. The Iraqi passport appears to be valid and belongs to the driver. Before the man leaves, a U.S. official captures images of his fingerprints. Suddenly, the official's computer screen flashes that the man is wanted for questioning. The official confers with the Iraqis, and the driver is told he will have to wait. In a few minutes, U.S. and Iraqi police arrive and take the man away for interrogation.

How was this person identified when his identity papers seemed to be in order? Nothing unusual was observed in his vehicle. There was no notice to detain a man with this name. Yet he was a highly sought-after terrorist. Upon

Daniel *is the communications manager for the project manager at DoD Biometrics. She was previously a communications and public relations consultant for the federal contracting community.* **Trissell**, *a retired U.S. Air Force lieutenant colonel, has served as a senior strategy consultant to the program manager for DoD Biometrics since 2007. He has helped craft the strategies to guide the biometric successful efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan into programs of record to preserve biometrics as enduring capabilities for tomorrow's Army.* **Hansen** *is a professor of program management and executive coach with the Defense Systems Management College at DAU. He spent 26 years in the Army, in both the warfighting and acquisition fields.*

a more careful examination, it was later discovered that his passport had been expertly altered to conceal his actual name. Yet he was still caught, because he could not change his fingerprints. By employing biometric markers (fingerprints, iris images, etc.), the U.S. military is stripping the veil of anonymity from terrorists worldwide, making it increasingly harder for them to pass unnoticed.

Integrated Product Team Workshop

In August 2010, the Army Project Office for Department of Defense Biometrics held a conference with more than 140 attendees, to ensure that the deployed Service members and those in the next war have the biometrics capabilities that have proven so successful in Iraq and Afghanistan. This conference marks a milestone in the process to transition the initial biometrics quick reaction capabilities to an enduring program of record and ensure the optimal biometric capabilities are developed and fielded to soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines.

The Quick Reaction Capability and its Proliferation

In 1999, at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., the Army began to develop tactical tools intelligence gathering by soldiers. One such tool was the Biometrics Automated Toolset (BAT), field tested in Kosovo and then sent to Iraq with a Marine Corps unit in 2003. The BAT captures fingerprints, iris patterns, and facial images and compares them to an internal watch list. The Marines lauded the BAT and passed it to the Army unit replacing them. Use of the BAT in Iraq grew rapidly. To date, several thousand have been sent to Iraq and Afghanistan, where BAT is just one of numerous biometrics collection devices.

Meanwhile, the success of the FBI's Automated Fingerprint Identification System led DoD in 2004 to build a nearly identical system, the Automated Biometrics Identification System (ABIS). The original ABIS was to be DoD's central data repository, with a copy of every fingerprint from foreign nationals or known or suspected terrorists collected by Service members. This system was replaced in 2009 with the next-generation ABIS, which matches facial images and iris images, in addition to fingerprints.

The proliferation of biometric collection throughout the battlefield demonstrated the value of biometrics. However, the uncoordinated activities of the Services also limited their effectiveness. This led the four-star commander of all U.S. forces in Southwest Asia to state in August 2005, "DoD and individual Service elements are fielding individual systems with varying degrees of interoperability and adherence to standards... ." The commander urgently asked the Pentagon to provide "a comprehensive, requirements based, multi-modal, multi-functional and multi-domain biometrics collection, storage, and matching system." This set into motion a series of events that led to the Fort Belvoir conference.

Several activities were initiated to quickly address the easy issues; however, the optimal solution called for by the commander would not be easy or quick. The optimal solution would require a series of analyses to determine the exact needs of the department, capturing these needs in a capability development document (CDD) and then starting an acquisition program to develop a system to deliver these capabilities.

The Transition to a Program of Record

The publishing of a DoD Biometrics Capstone Concept of Operations in 2006 kicked things off. This was followed by

Use of the BAT in Iraq grew rapidly. Several thousand have been sent to Iraq and Afghanistan, where BAT is just one of numerous biometrics collection devices.

a capabilities-based assessment, which culminated with an Initial Capabilities Document (ICD), approved in 2008 by the vice-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The ICD documented 21 gaps in the department's ability to provide biometrically enabled identity management services. In 2009 the under secretary of defense for AT&L gave his approval for the Army to conduct an analysis of alternatives (AoA) to examine the best ways to fill the gaps identified in the ICD. In July 2010 the results of the AoA were reviewed and an alternative selected.

The Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is capturing lessons from operations in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as results and decisions from the CBA and AoA and in two CDDs. These two CDDs will guide the Army's two major biometric information technology programs, to develop, produce, and field both the biometrics collection devices and the department's central biometrics data repository.

While TRADOC is completing the CDDs, the Army Acquisition Corps is preparing to begin development of the objective system described in the CDDs in 2012. A successful acquisition program will require a lot of preparation.

Col. Ted Jennings, the project manager for DoD Biometrics, is charged with executing the two new programs. He will need the help of the wider DoD biometrics community to be successful. This help will come largely through participation in working-level integrated product teams (WIPTs).

Enduring "Rules of the Road" for Integrated Product Teams

In July 1999, the under secretary of defense for AT&L reaffirmed the department's commitment to the integrated product and process development (IPPD) concept of using integrated product teams (IPTs) throughout the acquisition process. Those IPPD and IPT concepts are described in "Rules of the Road: A Guide for Leading Successful Integrated Product Teams." This guide is designed to assist the program manager and supporting acquisition community in developing and executing high-performance IPTs. The purpose of IPTs is to facilitate decision making by making recommendations based on timely input from the entire team. The IPT approach simultaneously takes advantage of all members' expertise and produces an acceptable product the first time.

Initially, Jennings worked with his integrating IPT (IIPT) partner, Mark Godino, from the acquisition directorate of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration, to develop a suitable WIPT structure to propose to the overarching IPT (OIPT). Consistent with the "Rules of the Road," once the structure was approved by the OIPT, the program manager selected his IPT leads and coordinated the IPT membership with the appropriate Services, OSD, and other government agency stakeholders, such as FBI and DHS. The WIPT membership gathered at the WIPT kickoff to understand DoD's biometrics leadership guidance for the program and receive some IPT training in order to begin to prepare the program documentation to support the Biometrics

Enabling Capability Full Deployment Decision (FDD) June 2011.

Conference attendees were divided into five WIPTs: cost, systems engineering, logistics, test and evaluation, and acquisition. The WIPTs, each led by an acquisition professional working for Jennings, discussed challenges the programs face and the how to work through the issues. Each WIPT will meet regularly to ensure the biometrics community is fully aware of the plans and progress of the project office's efforts to develop and field a fully interoperable enterprise biometric solution. While there is no one-size-fits-all WIPT approach, there are three basic tenets from the "Rules of the Road" to which any IPT approach should adhere:

- The PM is in charge of the program.
- IPTs are advisory bodies to the PM.
- Direct communication between the program office and all levels in the acquisition oversight and review process is expected as a means of exchanging information and building trust.

In addition, there are several important roles and responsibilities that apply to all WIPTs:

- Assistance to the PM in strategy development and program planning, as requested by the PM.
- Establishment of the IPT plan of action and milestones.
- Proposal of tailored documentation and milestone requirements.
- Review and provision of early input to documents.
- Coordination of WIPT activities with the OIPT members.
- Raising and resolution of issues in a timely manner.
- Assumption of responsibility to obtain principals' concurrence on issues, as well as with applicable documents or portions of documents.

Finally, the WIPT members began the "Rules of the Road" process of preparing IPT charters to identify the background, purpose, goals, membership, and governance of the IPT. The charter does not describe nor is it concerned with power consolidation or brokering; however, it is focused on "developing a strong framework and process to enable IPT members to achieve the PM's goals and objectives."

Now that the DoD biometrics IPTs are established, IPT members will meet as often as necessary to understand and build program strategies, to resolve issues, and, to produce a specified product—in this case, the necessary program documentation for a successful FDD.

As Army biometrics continues making strides in the current wars, the WIPTs have initiated their efforts to ensure an enduring program of record for the years ahead. "Our WIPTs are off to a great start and have established the disciplined processes and schedules to document our successful biometrics capabilities in preparation for the FDD, " said Jennings. "One of the most important roles is to personally help envision, write, review, fully understand, and communicate our program's acquisition strategy."

The authors can be contacted at **nicole.daniel2@us.army.mil** *and* **richard.hansen@dau.mil.**

Integrated Product Teams Best Practices Checklist

Open Discussions with No Secrets	
Do	**Don't**
☑ Engage all members in the IPT process by soliciting inputs and applying active listening skills.	⊘ Personalize organizational position.
☑ Know your team members' preferred methods of communication, and thoroughly understand their organizational roles and operating environments.	⊘ Isolate people. IPTs are only effective when all team members are participating.
☑ Trust and accept each person's expertise and advice.	⊘ Leave issues unaddressed. Unaddressed issues tend to resurface at higher levels and often drive major rework.
☑ State the extent of your authority/empowerment and immediately identify issues which are beyond established limits.	⊘ Forget to document actions/decisions. Documentation provides all team members an opportunity clarify issues and a historical record of decisions.
☑ Establish and stick to the agenda for the meeting. Establish operating procedures which allow any team member to redirect side issues to other forums.	
☑ Take the necessary time to prepare for the meeting in advance. Conduct research, and pre-meeting coordination necessary to optimize the time used in a group session.	
☑ State your organization's agenda and position. Openly discuss, resolve, and when required elevate issues.	

Empowered, Qualified Team Members	
Principals Must	**Don't**
☑ Ensure the IPT member is well versed in the mission and organization of the functional areas represented.	⊘ Conduct a briefing cycle separate from the overall IPT process.
☑ Provide guidance, direction and extent of authority to the members.	⊘ Principals should not overturn decisions made by empowered team members when those team members acted within their delegated authority.
☑ Provide professional education and training on a regular basis to ensure the individuals are qualified members.	
IPT members must:	
☑ Be trained in the operation of effective IPTs.	
☑ Communicate on a regular basis with their principal.	
☑ Inform the IPT of any limitations on their authority (empowerment) or on their ability to support the team's effort.	

Dedicated/Committed Proactive Participation	
Do	**Don't**
☑ Commit yourself to the objectives of the IPT.	⊘ Bring a personal agenda/negative attitude to the IPT.
☑ Represent your functional area without bias.	⊘ Bring additional support staff.
☑ Actively seek and receive input of others.	⊘ Skip meetings.
☑ Come prepared.	

Integrated Product Teams Best Practices Checklist

Issues Raised and Resolved Early	
Do	**Don't**
☑ Ensure that a structure is in place to identify issues (e.g., dedicate a portion of each meeting to raising/discussing issues).	⊘ Raise issues outside the IPT process (i.e., no end runs).
☑ Attempt to resolve issues within the IPT. When issues cannot be resolved, provide a complete description of the pros and cons of unresolved issues to decision makers.	
☑ Quickly elevate unresolved issues that are impeding program progress.	
☑ Ensure necessary functional responsibilities are represented.	

Charter, Launch, Initiation

Charter		*Launch*	
Do	**Don't**	**Do**	**Don't**
☑ Obtain senior management agreement on charter objectives.	⊘ Proceed without a written charter or establishing resources.	☑ Launch the IPT as soon as possible following charter sign-off.	⊘ Allow the launch to be cumbersome and unfocused.
☑ Ensure adequate resources are available (money, time, and people).	⊘ Make the charter too complicated.	☑ Ensure IPT agreement and understanding of the charter.	⊘ Discourage open member participation.
☑ Ensure charter goals, objectives, and schedules are realistic.		☑ Ensure IPT members are trained prior to launch.	

Goal Alignment

Do	**Don't**
☑ Develop approach(s) to provide feedback to team members and their home organizations	⊘ Ignore subpar performance
☑ Communicate this approach to the team and consistently apply	
☑ Recognize contributions of team members	