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What is DAI?

Defense Agency Initiative - DAI

Mission/Function:

DFAS provides leadership in transforming the finance and accounting function through the implementation of standard requirements and streamlined processes embodied within the application. The scope extends to requirements definition, system design, reports development, interface development, data conversion, data cleansing, training, testing, change management, site preparation, and post deployment support activities.
DAI at a Glance

- Post Implementation Challenges
  - Pre-validation

- FY 2011 Deploying Agency Status

- FY 2011 DAI Data Conversion Status
  - Data Conversion Status
  - General Ledger Reconciliation Process
  - Volume Counts
  - Data Cleansing Metrics
  - Watch Items and Updates
## Post Implementation Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPAC</td>
<td><em>In progress:</em> Obtained agreement on finalized system change requirements for the various IPAC Scenarios. Awaiting testing timeline after SCR approval at SDI CCB on May 3, 2011. Requirements include Document Reference Number, Preposting, and Reimbursement Disbursement Receipt field.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAS Supplemental data</td>
<td><em>In progress:</em> Once the IPAC changes are implemented, DCAS Supplemental issues will be mitigated with the transfer of 1080 bills to IPAC.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Data In Procurement (FDIP) LOA Requirement</td>
<td><em>In progress:</em> A concurrent test which includes mapping SFIS data to MOCAS is scheduled between mid-February and early March. This test is being conducted by DCMA and will include representatives from DFAS and DLA.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDRS</td>
<td><em>In progress:</em> DFAS is updating the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) to include DDRS reporting requirements. The first reporting month for the 2011 Implementing Agencies will be November 2011.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noetix and DAI Licenses</td>
<td><em>In Progress:</em> The PMO is re-evaluating end user licenses as the number of users have exceeded the number of licenses purchased. Confirming customer needs with BTA, DTIC MDA, USU, and DFAS.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-validation</td>
<td><em>In Progress:</em> Pre-validation continues to have operational challenges in meeting timeliness goals. A tiger team has been established to remedy these challenges. DAI is currently achieving 75%-80% pass rate on pre-validation requests.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-validation Systemic Interface

- **Release 1.1.2**, implemented Pre-validation 76 - 80% automated
  - Automated Reservation of fund (Receipt accrual)
  - (MDA) 11703 Line items reviewed 2742 errors MDA
  - (DTIC) 2806 Line items reviewed 334 errors

- **Errors and Resolutions**
  - Contracts not present in DAI for special projects but pre-val from MOCAS was pointed to DAI because of prior mass-Mod
    - **Action**: MDA has Tiger team working to Achieve required Contract Modifications
  - Contracts not in approved status
    - **Action**: These errors are caused by MDA adjusting contract at the time of pre-validation. Several contracts are tied to help desk tickets
  - Contracts Informational SLIN issue
    - **Action**: Improvements to the DAI Pre-validation program are being worked by the PMO office
DTIC Pre-validation

DTIC Prevalidation Transactions Processed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Processed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DTIC Prevalidation Processing Error Rate Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Process %</th>
<th>Error %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2011 Agencies include: DTRA, DTSA, DISA-CSD, TMA, and DPMO

- DISA-CSD on 30-day pause with Oct 2011 deployment decision pending

PMO conducted Agency Solution Reviews during December and January

CCB held on February 3rd

- Pending final requirements approval from Stakeholders meeting February 18

Plan to start doing Process Mocks to get the Agencies more exposure to DAI

- Results from lesson learned with MDA and USU deployments

IPT for sensitive data scheduled to conclude February 24
## GL Reconciliation Process – Conversion Accounts

**Agency Trial Balance Counts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DPMO</th>
<th>DTSA</th>
<th>DTRA</th>
<th>TMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund/Year</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limit</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Line Item</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Trial Balances</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacy GL Recon</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informatica GL Recon</strong></td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Templates and/or POET structure have not been completed.

** = The majority of the validation errors are a result of line item information not being stored in Legacy system. Must be manually collected.
## Accounting – Volumes/Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Conversion Documents</th>
<th>DPMO (Document)</th>
<th>DTSA (Document)</th>
<th>DTRA (Contract+ACRN)</th>
<th>TMA (Document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2974</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Additional Research Required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIPR</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2246</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS (Travel)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Obligations</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>7317</strong></td>
<td><strong>5976</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Additional Research Required
1. Confirm if MIPR
2. Confirm Obligation in Entitlement system
Data Cleansing – by DFAS Operations:
DTRA formed a team of 10 people to work MOCAS Contract reconciliation on site in Virginia
- No NULO’s
- 4 UMD’s = $113,014.00
- 25 Suspense Transactions = $22,180.31
Data Cleansing Metrics – TMA

Data Cleansing – by DFAS Operations:
Data Cleansing Strategy and notification were sent out to all the Agencies converting to DAI on DFAS-IN way forward with the newly developed Data Cleansing Team.

- NULO’s - 19 Transactions = $95,128.80
- No UMD’s
- 15 Suspense Transactions = ($38,683.09)

4/27/2011
## Watch Items and Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental contract information must be manually collected for DAI conversion, or payment process will be manual for related transactions in production.</td>
<td>Teams are collecting information from Electronic Document Access (EDA) and Agencies are establishing procedures to collect information in supplemental file upon creation of new records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources dedicated to data cleansing may lead to poor data quality being introduced into Production</td>
<td>DFAS-IN Accounting Operations established a data cleansing team for the support for the October 2012 DAI deployments of DFAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If discrepancies between Accounting system and Entitlement systems are not reconciled prior to conversion it will affect our ability to process payments in production</td>
<td>DFAS Operations and ERO Resources are performing contract reconciliations and corrections in coordination with Defense Agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DAI Deployments and Lessons Learned to date

- Deployed to the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS) in October 2010

**Lessons Learned**

- Identify all business partners for each agency
- Validate master data against authoritative sources
- Model agency business scenarios and interactions with all business partners
- Records to be converted to DAI must be supported by an entitlement (source) system record
- MOCAS/CAPS mod updates and corrections should be carefully tracked and posted in a timely manner

**Impact**

- Comprehensive and accurate validation of master data
- Master data must be complete, accurate, and consistent in order to allow for the creation and consumption of transactions within DAI
- Required data elements for conversion templates were not clearly understood by agency data owners (i.e. DoDAAC), resulting in data errors
- Establish relationships with contract/vendor/travel pay offices – know the payers
- Discrepancies in transaction processing and reconciliation
Lessons Learned cont.

Evaluate agency data thoroughly – record count and dollar totals of sub-ledger details

Establish comprehensive General Ledger with complete set of budgetary and proprietary accounts

Communicate early and with clarity all cleansing tasks and unconvertible data (i.e., open balances only, unsupported records, payables, negative open amounts)

Identify problem areas in the recording of data and eliminate errors on the “Front End” – KEEP TRACK OF FUNDS

Identify all Contracts/POs issued by the Agency for a given period (EDA) and verify the completeness and correctness of the obligations recorded in both the accounting and entitlement systems

Impact

Significant manual work required to reconcile GL summary to sub-ledger details – time consuming and leaves room for errors

Incomplete USSGL to DAI SFIS crosswalks will affect proper loading and reporting of converted data

Late addition of and/or manual entries for conversion

Reduces the occurrence of Prevalidation (A/P) issues

Corrects the over-understatement of obligations

Reduces the occurrence of NULO (overpayment) conditions

Keeps both accounting and entitlement records in balance
Upcoming DAI Deployments

**October 2011**
- CBDP-JSTO/BA6
- DPMO
- DTRA
- DTSA
- TMA

**October 2012**
- CCM
- DARPA
- DAU
- DMA
- DSS
- NDU
- DISA – GF
- OEA

**October 2013**
- DFAS
- DHRA
- DISA – NSD
- DLSA
- DODIG
- DOT&E
- DTRMC
- PFPA
- WHS
- DSCA

**October 2014**
- DCAA
- DCMA
- DECA
- DODEA
Proposed Next Steps for DeCA

- Determination if DAI is ERP that will be used (DeCA Management and OSD)
  - Movement from BTA to DLA may have impact on this decision
- Solutioning meetings to occur beginning FY13
- Data cleansing begin as soon as possible prior and up to deployment
- Engage with DeCA and senior management over next few years to determine progress
What is DEAMS?

- Defense Enterprise Accounting Management System – DEAMS

**Mission/Function:**

*DFAS provides full-time, on-site expertise in the United States Standard General Ledger (USSGL), cash management, financial reporting, data conversion, contract pay, data cleansing, and Standard Financial Information Structure (SFIS) implementation.*
Overview

- Changing Environment
- Why DEAMS?
- Current Status
- Acquisition Strategy
- Roll Out Strategy
- Parting Thoughts
Air Force 1968

$30B Enterprise

20th Century Weapon Systems

60s Accounting

Integrity - Service - Innovation
Air Force 2011

$170B+ Enterprise

21st Century Weapon Systems

PBD 720

60s Accounting

Integrity - Service - Innovation
The Problem

- Multiple independent financial management systems created to support unique requirements of specific agencies
- Little or no compatibility between systems
- Inefficient legacy systems that lack the accuracy and timeliness supported by modern software and processes
- No central data source
- Overall system fails to comply with federally mandated audit standards

“I’m challenged with ... lack of integrated financial systems, limited visibility of financial data and broken audit trails ... my ability to make efficient business decisions and fulfill my fiduciary responsibilities is limited by long term issues stemming from outdated financial systems.” John W. Handy, General, USAF
The Solution

- One integrated system with standardized business rules, processes and language
- A single entry system avoids errors caused by multiple data entry points, and that goes a long ways toward providing a fully auditable system that complies with existing laws and regulations
- DEAMS…
Support the Warfighter with timely, accurate and reliable financial information to enable efficient and effective decision making by Defense managers ……
DEAMS Organization

AFFSC – Air Force Financial Services Center
AFPEO EIS – Air Force Program Executive Office
   – Enterprise Information Systems
Maxwell-Gunter AFB, Ala.
AFPEO EIS/HIQ (program management)
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
643 Electronic Systems Squadron
Maxwell-Gunter AFB, Ala.
AFOTEC – Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center Eglin AFB, Fla.
CIE – Capabilities Integration Environment
DFAS – Defense Finance and Accounting Service
FMO – Functional Management Office
PMO – Program Management Office
RTO – Responsible Test Organization

DEAMS Government Team
DEAMS Contractor Team
DEAMS Oversight Organizations

DEAMS Organization
Why DEAMS?

- COTS based, automated, integrated, transaction-driven, general ledger system
  - USAF compliant (GCSS-AF, ESB, AFKS)
  - USTC compliant (JDDA, TFMS)
  - DFAS compliant (DFAS 7900.4G, DFAS OA)
  - DoD compliant (BTA, BEA, SFIS, FMR)
  - Legislatively compliant (CFO, USSGL)
DEAMS Provides Cost Management and Decision Support

- Large, diverse user community means many different cost management requirements
- Powerful software accommodates several costing methodologies
  - Allows costs to be charged directly to job project or customer order
  - Improves cost visibility to provide more complete information to decision makers
  - Captures detailed transaction-level information (both financial and non-financial) to support cost analysis
- Time and Labor Module
  - Provides capability for civilians to enter hours for cost accounting and project management
  - Allows users to assign their hours to projects for full costing

DEAMS = Real-time Information for Leadership Decision Making
DEAMS Impact to Legacy Systems

As of January 2011

Legend:
- ABSS - Automated Business Services System
- ASIFICS - Airlift Service Industrial Fund Integrated Computer System
- BARS - Base Accounts Receivable System
- CAB - Cargo and Billing System
- CPAIS - Civilian Pay Accounting Interface System
- CPAB - Civilian Pay Accounting Bridge
- DCBS - DEAMS Component Billing System
- eMTS - eManagement Tracking System
- GAFS-BL/R - General Accounting and Finance System (Base-Level/Rehost)
- GAFS-DTS - GAFS Defense Travel System
- IAPS - Integrated Accounts Payable System
- OARS - Obligation Adjustment Reporting System
- TFMS-M - Transportation Financial Management System
*Note: A portion of GAFS-BL will remain to handle classified manual transactions.
*Note: Army will continue to use eMTS
*Note: "M" stands for Military Traffic Management Command replaced by SDDC in 2004

As of January 2011
Current Status

- Deployed initial DEAMS commitment accounting functionality to ~700 users at Scott AFB July 2007
- More than 6,500 documents processed in Spiral 1
- Outstanding FY09 close out, > $5.4B
- Deployed full Oracle functionality to ~1,000 users at Scott AFB May 2010
- Difficult but successful FY10 closeout
- Stabilizing system, capturing “lessons learned”
DEAMS Successes

- As of Sept. 30, 2010, DEAMS Spiral 2 …
  - Processed >16,000 vendor payments - total of more than $1.7B
  - Processed > 9,400 Reserve Travel System vouchers worth $11.8M (ANG, AFRC and some active-duty travel)
  - Identified 184 collections (travel overpayments) totaling ~$172K

- Data cleansing is a major success story
  - Identifies and prevents inaccurate or invalid legacy system data from entering the system
  - 250,000 items examined in GAFS and IAPS before go-live
    - GAFS: 18,422 anomalies identified; 99.7 percent cleared
    - IAPS: 3,873 anomalies identified; 99.1 percent removed
  - Significant progress on remaining AMC bases; beginning AETC
DEAMS Successes cont.

- First SFIS implementation in the Air Force
  - 60,000 legacy lines of accounting translated into the SFIS format
    - Converted 1,223,814 supplier and customer records; 67,647 open purchasing, accounts payable and accounts receivable records; 115,402 projects and tasks; and 21,054 budgets
- First ERP program to integrate into GCSS-AF
  - Breaking new ground; learning many lessons
- Automatic or manual processing as needed
- Provides reconciliation reports to identify discrepancies
Lessons Learned

- Not unexpectedly, there are issues
- No show stoppers but many smaller concerns
  - Balancing more difficult than we expected
  - Learning curve steeper than expected
  - System latency more pronounced than we like
  - Experiencing interface data issues
  - Standard desktop – Isn’t
Way Ahead

- Oracle Time & Labor (OTL) being phased in at Scott AFB
- Increment 1, Spiral 1 & 2 Technology Demonstration phase will culminate with acceptance of full Oracle capability at Scott AFB, IL in 2011
- DEAMS deploys to USTRANSCOM components and most AF MAJCOMS in Spirals 3 & 4 beginning FY2012
- Increment 2, Spiral 5 will complete DEAMS deployment to all remaining AF MAJCOMs in FY2016
Potential CoA: Incremental Approach

Maintain Cost, Schedule, Contractor Oversight
DEAMS Architecture Concurrence with BEA, FMEA
Global Blueprinting/Business Process Reengineering

Maintain Requirements, System Engineering, Configuration, & Testing Oversight

Gov't Rqmt Activity

INC 1-BASELINE
Scott AFB, AMC wo/TWCF

INCREMENT 2
AMC w/TWCF

INCREMENT 3
USTC, SDDC

INCREMENT 4
AF CONUS

INCREMENT 5
PACAF/USAFE

INCREMENT 6
AFSPC/AFMC (RDT&E and Proc Acctg)

INCREMENT 7
FMS & Contingency Ops

FY11 FY12 FY13 FY14 FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY19 FY20

298 SCD Capabilities
Scott AFB + 6 New Sites

8 New Capabilities
1 Pilot + 4 Sites

6 New Capabilities
0 New Sites

25 New Capabilities
1 Pilot + 43 Sites

7 New Capabilities
1 Pilot + 15 Sites

72 New Capabilities
1 Pilot + 15 Sites

For official Use Only

Integrity - Service - Innovation
Spiral 3 & 4 Roll Out Strategy (includes ANG/AFRC Units)

AMC Bases (3.6K Users)
1. Scott AFB, IL (OT&E)
2. JB Charleston, SC
3. Pope AFB, NC
4. MacDill AFB, FL
5. Dover AFB, DE
6. JB McGuire, NJ
7. McConnell AFB, KS
8. Fairchild AFB, WA
9. JB Lewis-McChord, WA
10. Travis AFB, CA
11. Little Rock AFB, AR
12. Grand Forks AFB, ND

Plus 43 ANG/AFRC Units

AFSOC Bases (.5K)
1. Hurlburt Field, FL
2. Cannon AFB, NM

Plus 1 ANG Unit

SOF Funds - All AFSOC Units

AETC Bases (3.2K)
1. Keesler AFB, MS
2. Goodfellow AFB, TX
3. Maxwell AFB, AL
4. Columbus AFB, MS
5. Vance AFB, OK
6. Laughlin AFB, TX
7. Altus AFB, OK
8. Randolph AFB (JB SA), TX
9. Lackland AFB (JB SA), TX
10. Tyndall AFB, FL
11. Sheppard AFB, TX
12. Luke AFB, AZ

Plus 11 ANG/AFRC Units

ACC Bases (2.7K)
1. Dyess AFB, TX
2. JB Langley, VA
3. Mountain Home AFB, ID
4. Nellis AFB, NV
5. Seymour Johnson AFB, NC
6. Shaw AFB, SC
7. Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ
8. Offutt AFB, NE
9. Ellsworth AFB, SD
10. Beale AFB, CA
11. Holloman AFB, NM
12. Moody AFB, GA

Plus 20 ANG/AFRC Units

AFGRSC Bases (3K)
1. Minneapolis-St Paul, MN
2. Homestead, FL
3. Grissom, IN
4. March, CA
5. Dobbins, GA
6. Westover, MA
7. Youngstown, OH
8. Niagara, NY
9. Pittsburgh, PA
10. Carswell, TX

Plus 8 ANG/AFRC Units

AEDW Bases (1.1K)
1. JB Bolling - DC (Includes Pentagon)
2. JB Andrews-Naval Air Facility, MD

Plus 4 ANG/AFRC Units

DFAS Limestone
DFAS Japan
DFAS Rome
DFAS Europe

Others (USTC)
1. Military Sealift Command
2. Surface Deployment Distribution Center
3. Others (USAF)
1. USAFA, CO (.3K)

Others (USAF)

Roll Out begins with Remaining USTRANSCOM Units before Going AF Wide

Integrity - Service - Innovation
Spiral 5 Roll Out Strategy (includes ANG/AFRC Units)

AFSPC Bases (1.8K)
1. Patrick AFB, FL
2. Vandenberg AFB, CA
3. Peterson AFB, CO
4. Schriever AFB, CO
5. Buckley AFB, CO
6. Los Angeles AFB, CA

Plus 6 ANG/AFRC Units

AFMC Bases (8.6K)
1. Kirtland AFB, NM
2. Eglin AFB, FL
3. Hanscom AFB, MA
4. Wright Patterson AFB, OH
5. Edwards AFB, CA
6. Arnold AFB, TN
7. Robins AFB, GA
8. Hill AFB, UT
9. Tinker AFB, OK

Plus 17 ANG/AFRC Units
Today

- Long paper trail from deployed locations to home-station
- Manual record keeping—accountability kept on Excel spreadsheets and paper forms
- Home-station training and day-to-day jobs don’t always prepare FMers for what they do in the field

DEAMS Delivers

- Initial FM operations will be manual until connectivity is established
- DEAMS will be available to personnel in a bare-base or contingency (includes natural disasters) environment
- Web-based system available 24/7
- Ability to transmit data files during periods of limited connectivity
Things to Think About

- Need to move beyond the 60s accounting systems--our financial/resource management needs have changed
- Decision makers need the most timely and accurate information possible--we need to deliver
- There have been and will continue to be challenges (this stuff is hard) - total team effort is essential
- DEAMS no panacea for clean audit opinion, but a major step forward
- DEAMS is the future for AF Financial Management
A Word From Leadership

“We work hard every day to improve the global transportation system and we absolutely depend on timely, accurate, and reliable financial information. **DEAMS is a key part of our future and is critical to our success.**”

Gen. Duncan McNabb
Commander, USTRANSCOM

“**The need for timely, accurate and reliable financial information has never been more critical than in these challenging fiscal times. DEAMS will meet that need through the most significant improvement to Air Force accounting in more than 30 years.**”

Dr. Jamie Morin
Assistant Secretary for Financial Management and Comptroller Headquarters, U.S. Air Force

"**DEAMS is a critical part of the overall DFAS strategy to provide timely and accurate financial information to decision makers. We look forward to working with our USTRANSCOM and Air Force partners in implementing this exciting capability.**"

Teresa McKay
Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service
What is GFEBS?

• General Fund Enterprise Business System – GFEBS

**Mission/Function:**

*DFAS is providing skilled subject matter expertise in financial policy and processes as they pertain to system blueprinting, data verification & validation, and acceptance testing situational awareness. DFAS is actively involved in the GFEBS development and implementation of finance and accounting standards and procedures. The role extends to system development processes such as: requirements definition, change management facilitation, system testing & validation, and transition readiness support.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HQDA/OA22</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
<th>Wave 5</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
<th>Wave 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORSCOM</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADOC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARNO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARSO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARPAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAREUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCYBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDCOM</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETCOM</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMCOM</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNG</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHCOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIEDDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accomplishments

• 20,000+ GFEBS Users
  ✓ DFAS Sites include: DFAS-IN, DFAS-RO, and DFAS-CO
  ✓ CONUS sites include: Military District of Washington; Arlington National Cemetery; Ft Hood, TX; Ft Bragg, NC; Ft. Knox, KY; MEDCOM; Army National Guard: KY, OK, ID, MS & IN
  ✓ Europe and Pacific in April 2011

• During the past year:
  ✓ FFMIA Compliance (Sep 2010)
  ✓ MEDCOM mini-deployment completed (Jan 2010)
  ✓ Release 1.4.1 and Wave 2 deployment completed (Apr 2010)
  ✓ Release 1.4.2 and Wave 3 deployment completed (Oct 2010)
  ✓ Wave 4 deployment completed (Jan 2011)
  ✓ Release 1.4.3 Design, Build, and Test Phases started
DFAS Rep: DFAS-CO Rebecca Beck

Issues: Current GFEBS entitlement process is manual and labor intensive

Objectives:
• Identify and eliminate problems impacting the reliability of vendor pay entitlements
• Develop standard operating procedures for certification and payment of GFEBS vendor pay entitlements

Current status, issues, concerns:
• The current process will create a significant increase in resources in order to process payments timely as additional Waves deploy
  • 70% of good receipts are manually entered
  • 65% of invoices are manually entered
• Performed review of EBS payment proposal and certification process to implement best practices
• Completed DFAS-Columbus entitlement training with assistance from SME’s at DFAS-Rome
• Continue to complete actions items on developed POAM

Performance Measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems requiring Corrective Action</th>
<th>31 March Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Payments Entitled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payments Manually Reviewed</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS Interface Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Quality Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions in Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete a trial payment run kicking off at 12:01am</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit a Goods Receipt/Invoice Receipt separation of duties waiver</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete analysis of green light payment proposal errors</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ACL to determine sample population of invoices that need to be reviewed</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vendor Payment: WAWF Interface Errors

**DFAS Rep:** DFAS-CO Rebecca Beck

**Issues:**
- High WAWF interface error rate for goods receipt and invoices creates rework. No method to track data flow between interfacing systems.

**Objectives:**
- Review current interface design and processes, identify deficiencies, implement corrective actions to reduce interface error rates, and improve data flow between systems.

**Current status, issues, concerns:**

- **Transaction flow from WAWF to GEX to GFEBS**
  - Identified two items within GFEBS XI Logic creating issues with rounding and supplemental charges. Working with WAWF to develop alternatives to resolve issues.
  - 2-in-1 Invoice: Majority create only Invoice and not goods receipt
    - Policy drafted and sent to DASA-P for review
    - Evaluate ability to create GR off 2-in-1

- **Failed IDOCs (Invoice Receipts)**
  - PIIN/SPIIN not found
  - Invoice Already Exists:
    - Timing related – If invoice already exists, move IDOC to Archived status.

**Performance Measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failed IDOCs</th>
<th>Failed IDOCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 March</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goods Receipts: 2,310
Invoice Receipts: 6,311

**Actions in Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish WAWF Working Group</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop E2E process maps for EDA, WAWF, and GFEBS</td>
<td>8 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an interface monitoring process to account for all data</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform root cause analysis for failed IDOCs</td>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issues:** Comprehensive cash reconciliation procedures need to be developed. Abnormally high in-transit balances and failed DCAS IDOCs.

**Objectives:**
- Map all E2E cash reconciliation business processes
- Develop detailed procedures to clear in-transit disbursements
- Cash reconciliation procedures aligned with E2E process maps

**Current status, issues, concerns:**
- Participating in meetings with Subject Matter Experts for DCAS, Ops, GFEBS and ADS to gather information for process mapping the ‘As Is’ data flow and related processes.
- Incorporating updated POAMs into the Comprehensive Cash Reconciliation POAM for inclusion in to the Army FBWT FIP.

**Performance Measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Processes to be Mapped</th>
<th>Maps Started</th>
<th>Maps Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions in Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete full Discovery &amp; Evaluation Phase for each of the seven reconciliation points (IAW FIAR Guidance)</td>
<td>Updating FIP ECDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and test (control assessments, identify deficiencies, validate accuracy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate supporting documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define audit ready environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Cash Reconciliation – Failed DCAS IDOCs

**DFAS Rep:** DFAS IN, Jason Monday

**Issues:**
- Large volume of failed DCAS IDOC transactions causing improper general ledger and expenditure reporting

**Objectives:**
- Clear backlog of failed DCAS IDOC transactions
- Develop comprehensive reconciliation procedures
- Identify and correct systemic disconnects

**Performance Measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 March Baseline</th>
<th>Current (as of Feb. 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count of failed IDOCs</td>
<td>40,442</td>
<td>33,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of failed IDOCs</td>
<td>$895M absolute</td>
<td>$778M absolute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current status, issues, concerns:**
- Initialized corrections for self entitled failed DCAS IDOCs with a line of accounting error
- Continued developing comprehensive user guides and identified root cause issues
  - Incorrect Fund postings for National Guard Interfund transactions
  - Duplicate transactions from DCAS/GFEBES interface
- Developed baseline metric for DCAS IDOC reporting

**Actions in Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize action plan for clearing backlog</td>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate self entitled reporting process</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing comprehensive user guides and</td>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorize root causes and implement system</td>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess staffing solution in accounting</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cash Reconciliation – Abnormally High In-transit Balances

**DFAS Rep:** DFAS IN, Jason Monday

**Issues:**
- Immature cash reconciliation process
- Abnormally high intransit balance resulting from failed DCAS IDOCs and GFEBS/DCAS posting disconnects

**Objectives:**
- Reduce intransit balance
- Develop comprehensive cash reconciliation and Treasury reporting procedures

**Current status, issues, concerns:**
- Identified erroneous clearances caused by GFEBS “brown out” files and inaccurate clearance reversals.
  - Continuing to create reversal files for March EOM expenditure reporting.
- Initiated GLAC research to identify successfully posted payroll transactions
  - Processing manual expenditure clearances

**Performance Measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of TBO Intransits</th>
<th>31 March Baseline</th>
<th>Current (as of Feb. 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Amount of TBO Intransits | $3.82B absolute | $3.15B absolute |

**Actions in Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate TBO posting results process and expenditure reporting</td>
<td>5/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement payroll posting SCR</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate self entitled reporting process</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess staffing solutions in accounting operations</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unmatched Disbursement and Collections

**DFAS Rep:** DFAS IN, Jenny Willis

**Issues:**
- Volume of Unmatched Disbursements and Unmatched Collections (UMDs/UMCs) continues to grow at 6% rate. Primary reason is missing or insufficient obligations. Management reports focus only on inventory, failing to provide meaningful and actionable data.

**Objectives:**
- Develop and utilize management reports providing detailed error analysis, by command and installation
- Identify root causes of insufficient or missing obligations and implement improvements, stemming inflow of UMD/UMC

**Current status, issues, concerns:**
- Monitor unmatched status routinely and coordinate corrective actions with responsible parties
- Increase in Interfund (obligating interfaces/failed IDOCs) trying to identify root causes
- Aggressively tracking, researching, identifying root causes, and resolving UMDs/UMCs timely.
- Working on finding Web Base solution for UMD/UMC
- Review PreVal process to identify scenarios resulting in UMD/UMCs (i.e., interest versus payment).

**Performance Measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 March Baseline</th>
<th>Current March 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count of UMDs</td>
<td>64,252</td>
<td>64,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of UMDs</td>
<td>$109.75M ABS</td>
<td>$109.75M ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of UMCs</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>6,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of UMCs</td>
<td>$41.38M ABS</td>
<td>$41.38M ABS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions in Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize UMD/UMC managerial reports</td>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy management reports and track improvements against baseline</td>
<td>5/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a solution for consolidated UMD/UMC database (WEB Base)</td>
<td>5/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate impact that clearing of DCAS Intransit IDOCs will have on UMD/UMC</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host workshops to identify root causes of &quot;unknown&quot; category of UMD/UMC inventory</td>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and correcting system interfaces</td>
<td>10/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess staffing solutions in accounting operations</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDI Update

- GFEBS Wave 5 Support
  - ADS Collections Training (CONUS) – on track
  - Testing
    - Off-Cycle Release (DDS) testing is on track
    - Delinquent Debt Management (DDM) Testing - Test files are being mocked up to reflect Treasury interface
  - IPAC Changes
    - ERO is collecting data
    - Cleveland Disbursing will process SCR to create an IPAC Wizard for DFAS-CO and DFAS-JA
DFAS Rep: DFAS RO Debra Stallings

Issues:
• Contract options not properly exercised in GFEBS cause current year option to post in legacy

Objectives:
• Exercise contract options in GFEBS citing current year funds where GFEBS is deployed
• Perform entitlement functions in GFEBS to minimize “By Others” entitlements

Performance Measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Contracts with options</th>
<th>Options exercised in GFEBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar value of contracts obligated in GFEBS</th>
<th>Dollar value entitled in legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current status, issues, concerns:
• Received list of first 5 contracts for reconciliation from Army on March 22 (after hours)
• Contracts were different than the 5 agreed upon
• Recons have been assigned
• Documenting requirements for tracking time requirements is still to be determined
• Experiencing communication issues

Actions in Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and test business rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify contracts with options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

• Testing:
  ✓ Foreign Currency
    • Testing is complete; ADS will not be used as an interim solution due to unresolved functionality issues within GFEBS
    • Local National Vendors & Payroll process varies by Nation.
    • DDS Testing
      • Assembly Test Completed
      • Product Test thru 22 April
      • Integrated End-to-End Testing 25 Apr – 17 June
      • Deploy July 2011
  ✓ Delinquent Debt Management (DDM)– new requirement for ADS
    • Testing began February 15th
    • Target implementation date is April 1st
    • Focusing on DTS Travel Debts

• CRA remains a constraint
  ✓ Waves 6 thru 8 require additional funding

• Japan

• Business Intelligence – Added capability delayed to Jul 11
ERPs & The Road Ahead – Some Final Thoughts

• All ERPs have similar – if not the SAME - issues
  ✓ Trial Balance and Tie Point Issues
  ✓ Procure to Pay, Order to Cash, Acquire to Retire, etc.
  ✓ Balancing more difficult than we expected
  ✓ Learning curve steeper than expected
  ✓ System latency more pronounced than we like
  ✓ Standard desktop – Isn’t

• Timeliness, reporting and data access are elusive

• Business Intelligence – a vision on the horizon

• Change management is critical
  ✓ We must embrace new ways of doing business
  ✓ Ties to legacy processes must be cut
  ✓ Manual efforts are required – but are short term
  ✓ This is NOT transparent

• Be unique in your contribution - Be standard in your execution
QUESTIONS?
### Upcoming DAI Deployments—back-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDPJ STO/BA6</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISA - CSD</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPMO</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRA</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSA</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARPA</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAU</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISA - GF</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAS</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHRA</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISA - NSD</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLSA</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoDIG</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT&amp;E</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRMC</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRMC</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCA</td>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAA</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMA</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECA</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoDEA</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GFEBS Backup

Making Every Day Count
Wave 5 OCONUS Way Forward: GFEBS vs. Legacy Transactions
### Transactions Processed on 01 April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>GFEBS</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All DTS transactions initiated and paid in USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCPS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All DCPS transactions initiated and paid in USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound MIPR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All obligated in USD, disbursement received via DCAS as TBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Interfund transactions initiated and paid in USD; this includes SARSS, DoD email, GSA Advantage, and IRM transactions passing through FCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEWLS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All TEWLS transactions initiated and paid in USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS Debt Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>All DTS transactions initiated and collected in USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Debt Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>To include USD and Non-USD Collections from CONUS and OCONUS Vendors, Soldiers, Civilians and Foreign Nationals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXOL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current schedule with USB has cards being issued on 18 Jun w/ first billing cycle in GFEBS in July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powertrack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powertrack transactions record ODC which is required for FC transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Payroll</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Payroll transactions are not paid in USD; GFEBS and system partner interfaces will not be operational at Wave 5 go-live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DTS Travel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-DTS Travel overseas is not always pay in USD. DASA-FO's current guidance is that all IATS transactions will remain in legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National Travel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Travel transactions are not paid in USD; GFEBS and system partner interfaces will not be operational at Wave 5 go-live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Wave 5 GFEBS vs. Legacy Transactions
Europe, Japan, Korea on 1 Apr 2011

## Transactions Processed on 01 April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>GFEBS</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DDS/GFEBS interface will not be ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG 411</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Current guidance is that all SAG 411 funding and execution will remain in legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Users may not know at time of PR if the contract will be awarded in foreign currency. For foreign currency obligations, users do not know if ITS or non-ITS rate will be used until time of invoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMLSS PRs/POs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DMLSS contracts may be awarded in FC and paid in FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound MIPRs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There could be situations where purchases or labor is transacted against the Reimbursable Order in FC. Reimbursements for transactions processed in GFEBS should have inbound MIPR recorded in GFEBS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Work management activities are dependent upon real property data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Plant Maintenance execution is directly linked to Foreign National Payroll for Labor Confirmations as well as Contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept Disbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>These payments are made in FC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Enhanced Reporting Capabilities: Issue #: 50997

**Problem:**
- Additional GFEBS current reporting capabilities required to support Army Commands daily operations and period/year end processing

**Goal:** Add additional reporting capabilities to GFEBS to support user community.

**Participants:** All

**Start date:** January 2010  
**End date:** July 2011

**Impact:**
- Users are not able to run reports that meet the needs of day, month, and year end activities

**Objectives:**
1. Work with GFEBS key stakeholders to define reporting strategy and implementation approach
2. Organize a reporting development council to define and prioritize reporting requirements

**Status:**
- Red

### Last 4 Weeks / Actions Completed
- Held DFAS Reporting Workshop for 16 February to focus prioritizing and clarifying DFAS data requirements.
- Initiated BI Release 4 Analysis Phase
- Continued stabilization activities

### Next 4 Weeks
- Build and test environment stabilization activities
- Provide details on Reporting Workshop outcomes and identified actions at February ESC session
- Continue development of BI Release 4
- Conduct Wave 4 BI DCO Events
- Design an IDOC Report that will summarize funding errors by Total Dollar Amount and Budget Address. This will help identify where funds can be moved to resolve errors.
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## BI R4 & R5 Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Operational Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | U.S. Standard General Ledger Data Architecture and Reporting Capability | a) Enables UMD and UMC Reporting in BI  
b) Critical to Tie Point Analysis  
c) Critical to Status of Funds Reporting based on budgetary ledger account postings  
d) Critical to BI reporting by SFIS element  
e) Undergirds DASA-FO and DFAS reports |
| 2   | DCAS IDOC Management Capability                  | Enables searches of DOC error records over the entire data set using any combination of a wide range of selection variables. |
| 3   | Accounts Receivable Data Architecture with one report | a) Enables status of funds reports on reimbursable activity.  
b) Critical to reimbursable activity reports that require data from multiple SAP modules (e.g. project systems, financials, cost and funds management)  
c) Supports UMC/UMD Reports  
d) Critical for debt management reports |
| 4   | Accounts Payable Data Architecture with one report | a) Enables Prompt Payment Act penalty interest financial management and performance management (scorecard) reports.  
b) Enables invoice aging and invoice reports |

**BI R4**  
(Design underway)  
Jul 2011  

**BI R5**  
(recommended candidates)  
Oct 2011