COMNAVRESFOR INSTRUCTION 7100.5C

From: Commander, Navy Reserve Force

Subj: REQUIREMENT DEVELOPMENT, CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION BOARD, AND REQUIREMENT REVIEW BOARD PROCESSES

Ref: (a) DoD 7000.14-R Financial Management Regulation

Encl: (1) Requirement Development and Review Process
(2) Annual Requirement Development Timeline CNRF POM Process Flowchart
(3) Requirement Development Guidance
(4) Standard Presentation Format: The “Dualie”

1. **Purpose.** To establish policy, guidance, and procedures for the Commander, Navy Reserve Force (COMNAVRESFOR) requirement development process and resourcing decision forum. This instruction provides guidance in the command’s decision-making process to ensure requirements are resourced properly in accordance with reference (a).

2. **Cancellation.** COMNAVRESFORINST 7100.5B.

3. **Discussion.** Due to fiscal constraints, it is essential that all funding decisions utilize a consistent and efficient process that takes into account the Reserve Force view of resources and requirements. This instruction pertains to requirement development, the Consolidated Evaluation Board (CEB), and the Requirement Review Board (RRB). The following outlines guidance necessary to ensure Reserve Force requirements are funded using a consistent, objective, prioritized, and focused process.

4. **General.** The overall intent of this instruction is for COMNAVRESFOR stakeholders to have completely developed requirements before being brought forward for funding. Funding may be through the CEB/RRB for execution year funding, National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation process, or the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) submission. Enclosures (1) through (4) provide process flow and consistency for departments with regards to requirement development and resource issues forwarded for consideration by the command. Execution year funding that is under executed by the echelon 3 will be redirected by COMNAVRESFOR to optimize unfunded requirements prioritized by the CEB/RRB. CEB/RRB membership utilizes personnel from echelon 3 commands due to their experience as leaders of the Reserve Force to act as representatives of COMNAVRESFOR. As echelon 3 working groups, the CEB & RRB should work toward creating the best outcome for the Reserve Force as a whole.
5. **Board Membership**

a. The CEB permanent voting members are as follows:

   (1) Commander, Navy Reserve Forces Command (COMNAVRESFORCOM) Financial Resources (N8) - Chairman

   (2) COMNAVRESFORCOM Manpower and Personnel (N1)

   (3) COMNAVRESFORCOM Intelligence/Information/Operations (N2)

   (4) COMNAVRESFORCOM Operations (N3)

   (5) COMNAVRESFORCOM Logistics (N4)

   (6) COMNAVRESFORCOM Plans and Policy (N5)

   (7) COMNAVRESFORCOM Information Technology (N6)

   (8) COMNAVRESFORCOM Education and Training (N7)

   (9) COMNAVRESFORCOM Force Medical (N9)

   (10) Commander, Naval Air Force Reserve (COMNAVAIRFOR) Operations (N3)

   (11) COMNAVAIRFOR Aviation Supply and Logistics (N41)

   (12) COMNAVAIRFOR Aviation Maintenance (N42)

   (13) COMNAVAIRFOR Marine Aviation (4MAW)

b. COMNAVRESFORCOM General Counsel (N00L) and COMNAVRESFOR Contracts Office (N00CT) serve as advisors to the CEB.

c. The RRB permanent members are as follows:

   (1) COMNAVRESFOR Executive Director (N00ED) – chairman

   (2) COMNAVRESFORCOM Chief of Staff (N01)

   (3) COMNAVAIRFOR Chief of Staff (N001)

d. COMNAVRESFORCOM Financial Resources (N8) and COMNAVRESFOR Chief Information Officer will serve as advisors to the RRB.
6. **Process**

   a. CEB voting members will:

      (1) Solicit inputs from the field and build/evaluate requirements, based on inputs or known deficiencies, using enclosures (1) and (3). When it is determined a POM submission is required, the submission must be completed to meet the timeline in enclosure (2).

      (2) Request that the chairman convene a CEB in the event an emergent requirement needs to be added to the COMNAVRESFOR Unfunded Priority List (UPL). Any additions will require prioritization against items already on the list.

      (3) Present proposed unfunded requirements to the CEB/RRB and be prepared to defend the proposed issue based on enclosure (3).

      (4) Execute all approved/funded requirements using established process management standards.

      (5) Forward appropriate POM issues as determined during requirement development process to COMNAVRESFOR POM Director (N84) for action during the POM Cycle. Enclosure (4) must be included.

   b. COMNAVRESFOR Comptroller (N8) will:

      (1) Ensure all funding requirements are developed and reviewed per enclosures (1) through (3).

      (2) Chair the CEB and ensure it meets, as required, to review emergent requirements and key events in a timely manner. Administrative support for the CEB and requirements development review process resides with COMNAVRESFOR (N84).

      (3) Determine/monitor proper composition of the CEB, ensuring all members are promptly informed of meetings and a quorum attends.

      (4) Maintain the UPL as generated by the CEB and RRB and approved by COMNAVRESFOR.

      (5) Fund issues based on the UPL as resources become available. Periodically brief UPL status to COMNAVRESFOR/COMNAVRESFORCOM leadership and board members.

   c. COMNAVRESFOR Executive Director (N00ED) will:
(1) Chair the RRB and ensure the RRB meets as required to review emergent requirements and key events in a timely manner. Administrative support for the RRB and requirement development review process resides with COMNAVRESFOR (N84).

(2) Provide additional resource guidance as required.

(3) Forward RRB recommendations to Deputy, COMNAVRESFOR for evaluation and approval or coordination with COMNAVRESFOR as required.

7. Business Rules

   a. A quorum must be present for a valid CEB. A quorum is defined as a simple majority plus the chairman. A majority vote of attending CEB members is required to approve a requirement to forward to the RRB. If the requirement receives less than a majority vote it will be disapproved or returned pending more research.

   b. Voting members may authorize substitutes if a member will be absent. The chairman must be notified prior to the start of the CEB.

   c. The CEB meets to review all requirements developed using enclosures (1) and (3) whether for POM submission or execution year funding. The CEB will review each requirement and take one of the following actions:

       (1) Approve the requirement.

       (2) Return the item pending more research. The item is returned to the department for more research based on the questions asked by CEB members. Once all questions have been fully answered, the item will be presented at a future CEB. CEB members are encouraged not to use this as a means to passively disapprove a requirement.

       (3) Disapprove the item. If disapproved, the item is returned to the originator with an explanation as to why it was disapproved and not to be resubmitted.

       d. Approved requirements will be prioritized by each voting member and forwarded to COMNAVRESFOR (N84) for consolidation. The resulting UPL, or approved NGREA list, will be forwarded to RRB members with a copy to all CEB members.

       e. The CEB and RRB chairmen serve as the tie breaker vote. For example, when the CEB results are tallied and two items received the same number of total votes, the item the chairman voted as the higher priority wins the tie breaker.

       f. All CEB approved and prioritized requirements are forwarded to the RRB. The RRB will review each requirement and take the same actions as the CEB (e.g., approve/prioritize, reprioritize, return pending more research, and disapprove).
(1) If the requirement needs more research, it will be returned to the submitting department for research and resubmission back to the RRB. The item does not need to go through the entire CEB process.

(2) If the requirement is disapproved, it is returned to the originator with a copy to all CEB/RRB voting members. An explanation of why it is disapproved will be included and it may not be resubmitted.

g. COMNAVRESFOR (N8) will coordinate with the sponsoring department to provide funding, as it comes available, for all projects on the UPL.

8. Scheduling

a. For mid-year review (MYR), N8 should establish a deadline of early February to receive inputs from the field. After inputs are received from the field, it takes a minimum of 2 weeks for N8 to review and consolidate the MYR inputs.

b. Contracting agency suspense dates should be considered when scheduling a CEB and/or a RRB. For example, in previous years, Fleet and Industrial Supply Center’s deadline for contracts greater than one million dollars was 1 April.

9. Records Management. Records created as a result of this instruction, regardless of media or format, must be managed per Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) Manual 5210.1 of January 2012.

10. Review and Effective Date. Per OPNAVINST 5215.17A, COMNAVRESFOR IG will review this instruction annually on the anniversary of its effective date to ensure applicability, currency, and consistency with Federal, Department of Defense, SECNAV, Navy policy and statutory authority using OPNAV 5215/40 Review of Instruction. This instruction will automatically expire 10 years after effective date unless reissued or cancelled prior to the 10-year anniversary date, or an extension has been granted.

T. W. LUSCHER
Deputy

Releasability and Distribution:
This instruction is cleared for public release and is available electronically only via COMNAVRESFOR Web site, https://navyreserve.navy.mil
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### Annual Requirement Development Timeline

**CNRF POM Process Flowchart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNRF POM kickoff brief</td>
<td></td>
<td>NLT 01 Jul</td>
<td>15 Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement Development (owners)</td>
<td></td>
<td>01 Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCOS Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Aug</td>
<td>15 Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRF N8 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Sep</td>
<td>01 Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCOS/Owner Requirement Rework (as required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final input to N84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPNAV N80 POM Guidance Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N84 Finalize POM Submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Oct</td>
<td>01 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRF N8 Final Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01 Nov</td>
<td>15 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8 POM Submissions and Briefs to OPNAV N-codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enclosure (2)
Requirement Development Guidance

The following list of questions, while intended to capture as much background as possible, may not be comprehensive.

Questions for developing requirements:

1. What is driving the requirement (e.g., new capability, meeting new guidance, mission scope increase, obsolescence)?

2. What capability does the issue provide to the Navy?

3. What current guidance (OPNAV, RESFOR, etc.) does the issue support?

4. What is the cost associated with the requirement? How was the cost estimate derived? How long will the funding be required? When is funding needed? If funding is needed in the execution year, which month? Provide an optimal date and a no later than date.

5. How are the funds going to be executed (i.e. MIPR, contract, etc.)? If it is a contract, what is the period of performance, vehicle, and need by date?

6. How does the Reserve Component requirement tie to the Active Component?

7. Are there alternatives which may meet the requirement? Are there any alternative sources of funding? Can/will an offset be found if additional funding is not available?

8. Is the OPNAV Resource Sponsor familiar with the requirement? Has the requirement been socialized with chain of command, including COMNAVRESFORCOM/COMNAVAIRFORES staff?

9. Is the requirement an expense or investment? If it is an equipment investment item, has NGREA been explored as a possible source of funding? Consult Volume 2A, Chapter 1, section 010201 of reference (a) to assist in determining if the requirement is an investment or an expense.

10. Has an impact statement been written detailing consequences if unable to be funded? Is an impact statement is required for an issue to be brought forward.

11. Is the requirement a one-time current need? If not funded, does impact statement reflect immediate negative impact?

12. Will funding this issue result in recurring costs (e.g., increased manpower, operating, or life-cycle maintenance costs)?

Enclosure (3)
13. If there are recurring costs, the requirement owner must show costs and generate POM inputs (enclosure 4) to be forwarded to COMNAVRESFORCOM (N84).

14. Does the issue have a Return on Investment or associated metrics?

15. Is the requirement fully executable within the timeframe of available funding (Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve-1yr, Reserve Personnel, Navy-1yr, NGREA-3yr)?

16. Flowchart created by Professor Phil Candreva (Naval Post-graduate School) based upon the logic of the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulations section on expense/investment decisions.

17. This flowchart is NOT in the Financial Management Regulation. It is simply a tool to help determine whether purchases should be classified as an expense or investment. Investment vs. Expense criteria in FMR, Volume 2A, Chapter 1, Section 010201, OCT 2008
Standard Presentation Format: The "Dualie"

PBIS Issue: xxxxx / IW#: xxxxx  
RS: xx / BSO:xx / PERS BSO: xx  
APPN: xxxx  SPP Funded, AC or Unfunded  
PE: xxxxxxxN / LI or PERS LI: xxxx

Issue Title
Title should be descriptive and specific

- Capability/Program Description: A short description of the program and the function(s) it supports.
- Rationale for Adjustments: Why this change should be made now. Cite sources.
- Warfighting Capability Impact of Adjustment:
- COCOM/Joint Impact:
- MOA Required:
- Significant Congressional or Industrial Impact
- Stakeholder/Seams Issues:
- CFFC Review:
- Note: Provide additional details in the notes page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Title</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FYDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB18 APPN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 19 APPN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR18 APPN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 19 APPN</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add/delete rows for MPN,RPN,DHAN/R,OMN/R funding as appropriate. PB18 FY23 is the Baseline inflated in issue 000000 for delta calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Title</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB18 E/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 19 E/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB18 FTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 19 FTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add/delete rows for MPN,RPN,DHAN/R,OMN/R funding as appropriate. PB18 FY23 e/s or FTE is the same as FY22 for delta calculation.

- RO: Name, Code, Phone
- RS Approval: Name, Code, Phone
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