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DoD publishes military standards to ensure defense contractors and suppliers employ consistent, efficient, and effective processes and conform to government policy. Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996, Public Law 104-113, directed the federal government to use technical standards developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies as a means to carry out policy objectives or activities determined by the agencies and departments.


However, some of the commercial process standards were not developed or structured for use on defense contracts. The foreword of the current version of SAE International’s ANSI/EIA-649-B, “Configuration Management Standard,” states that “because of the broad scope of its applicability, this standard is not written as a requirements document, per se, but as the foundation document upon which requirements may be structured.” The foreword goes on to address the “per se”:

In the acquirer/supplier context there are several methodologies to conformance by a supplier: …

- Acquirer uses 649 as the basis for developing either, or both, an enterprise CM requirements document or a specific project CM requirements document to impose on suppliers.
- The requirements documents may state 649 principles as requirements and reference 649 paragraphs. Compliance with the contractual requirements constitutes conformance with 649.

Because ANSI/EIA-649-B contains the text “this standard is not written as a requirements document, per se,” it has been applied inconsistently in DoD contracts.

**Gap Analyses and Development of EIA-649-1**

In 2010, the Air Force briefed the Defense Standardization Council (DSC) regarding the need to reinstate several military standards, including the canceled MIL-STD-973 for CM. The DSC, which champions standardization throughout DoD to reduce costs and improve operational effectiveness, agreed that having some select standards applicable across DoD acquisition programs could improve program execution. The DSC directed DSPO to work with the services to form a CM gap analysis working group to confirm
the need for an enterprise-wide approach to certain process standards, including CM. In 2011, the CM gap analysis working group submitted its findings indicating that suitable standards do not exist to meet DoD’s requirements. The DSC agreed with the findings.

In March 2012, the Defense Standardization Executive directed that the first course of action should be to engage organizations that develop non-government standards (NGSs) to determine whether existing NGSs could be modified or whether the organizations may be interested in developing new standards to meet DoD’s requirements. This direction complies with Public Law 104-113, which states that

Federal agencies and departments shall consult with voluntary, private sector, consensus standards bodies and shall, when such participation is in the public interest and is compatible with agency and departmental missions, authorities, priorities, and budget resources, participate with such bodies in the development of technical standards.

Understanding the length of time it takes to develop a standard, the Army requested and received DSC approval to release MIL-STD-3046, “Interim Standard Practice for Configuration Management,” for use on contracts while the CM NGS was developed. Released on March 6, 2013, MIL-STD-3046 will be canceled when the CM NGS is published, or after 2 years.

The Navy stood up and led the chartered Configuration Management Standards Working Group (CMSWG) to develop the CM NGS. The CMSWG comprises participants from the uniformed services, including the U.S. Coast Guard, and from other DoD agencies, such as the Defense Contract Management Agency, National Security Agency, and Defense Logistics Agency. The CMSWG generated an initial draft standard, which was presented to the SAE G-33 Committee on Configuration Management in October 2013. The SAE G-33 Committee initiated a formal project in November 2013 to develop the EIA-649-B addendum, referred to as EIA-649-1, “Configuration Management Requirements for Defense Contracts.”

The CMSWG distributed multiple drafts of the EIA 649-1 for review across DoD and industry. To date, this group has adjudicated more than 3,750 comments to provide a standard compliant with DoD policy and supported by both DoD and industry. In addition to writing the EIA-649-1, the CMSWG modified 19 CM-related data item descriptions (DIDs) to prescribe deliverables compliant with EIA-649-1. In addition, the CMSWG reviewed and updated five CM-related DoD forms—DD Form 1692, Engineering Change Proposal (ECP); DD Form 1694, Request for Variance (RFV); DD Form 1695, Notice of Revision (NOR); DD Form 1696, Specification Change Notice (SCN); and DD Form 2617, Engineering Release Record (ERR)—and added detailed instructions to support consistent implementation and use in support of EIA-649-1.
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Consistent with ANSI/EIA-649-B, EIA-649-1 makes use of the acquirer and supplier roles to define requirements. The SAE G-33 website contains the following information describing the scope of EIA-649-1:

This document defines configuration management requirements which are to be applied, based on program needs, in contracts with suppliers for products and/or their designs during the contract period of any Configuration Item (CI) which meets the following criteria:

a. Developed wholly or in part with Acquirer funds, including non-developmental items when the development of technical data is required to support the products or services being acquired or

b. Designated for configuration management for reason of integration, logistics support or interface controls.

By defining how CM requirements are to be applied in contracts with suppliers, EIA-649-1 drives the program to understand and quantify the requirements as accurately and as early as possible to support effective CM and control of the system baseline.

The foreword to the EIA-649-1 further emphasizes the standard’s purpose and inherent linkage to EIA-649-B:

This document defines requirements for a Defense enterprise implementation of the American National Standards Institute/Electronics Industry Association, ANSI/EIA-649 in an Acquirer/Supplier contractual relationship.

The requirements are intended to be tailored by the Acquirer and cited in contracts or similar agreements with Suppliers to establish requirements for Configuration Management tasks consistent with ANSI/EIA-649 and each of its functions and principles.

Unless otherwise indicated, the requirements described herein apply to both hardware and software systems.
It is the responsibility of the Acquirer to determine the specific needs for their respective programs and ensure that their contracts or agreements sufficiently communicate those requirements.

This standard also applies when other types of agreements exist, such as agreements between government organizations who play the roles of acquirer and supplier.

Finally, this document is intended to be used as a stand-alone reference, invoked on a contract where the acquirer intends to be consistent with ANSI/EIA-649 Principles, and may be used for Department of Defense (DoD) programs in all phases of the acquisition life cycle.

Even though EIA-649-1 is intended to satisfy DoD contracting requirements, this CM standard applies to any commercial or government enterprise engaged in acquirer/supplier CM activities.

**Appropriate CM, the “Goldilocks Factor”**

EIA-649-1 is intended to help the government and industry in the acquirer role place CM requirements on DoD contracts by supplying the “shall” statements for implementing the EIA-649-B CM functions and principles.

The standard is intended to be tailored to fit the unique needs of a defense acquisition or sustainment program. To help facilitate this, EIA-649-1 contains a tailoring worksheet listing all the CM requirements, or “shall” statements, by paragraph number. Figure 1 is an example. CM practitioners may use the worksheet to help tailor the requirements of this standard to fit their program’s phase, acquisition strategy, and system development approach. This worksheet is not intended to be part of the contract but to help determine which requirements, i.e., activities and deliverables, are needed for placement on contract.

**Status**

EIA-649-1 successfully completed two rounds of formal voting at the SAE G-33 Committee level in September 2014. The SAE Aerospace Council formally approved EIA-649-1 in October, and the DSC CMSWG officially issued the standard in November.

The standard will be synchronized with the cancellation of the interim MIL-STD-3046 and associated DIDs.
ANNEX B Tailoring Worksheet

B.1 General
This Annex is a tool for practitioners to use to aid them in tailoring requirements of this standard and is not intended to be part of the contract.

B.2 Matrix Description
A check mark in the column entitled "Applies" indicates where the Acquirer has determined the applicability of the SAE Configuration Management Requirements for Defense Contracts, EIA-649-1.
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Complementary Coordinated Family of CM Principles and Processes

The acquirer should use EIA-649-1 in concert with EIA-649-B and leverage the guidance provided in associated handbooks, such as EIA-HB-649 and MIL-HDBK-61A. With this arsenal of collaborative and standardized CM requirements, processes, principles, and guiding information, the CM professional should have a strategic advantage in implementing and executing acquirer/supplier (i.e., government/contractor) CM more efficiently and effectively.
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