This appendix illustrates the goal fabric analysis framework described in Chapter 4. It presents a single example, starting with three related issues (see Appendix C for the complete list of DES issues), and identifies two desired results associated with the issues, five actions that support the desired results, and one objective that the desired results suggest. This appendix then presents the full set of objectives and the goals they support, based on this issues-based, bottom-up analytic approach. We also illustrate the relationships between issues, desired results, actions, actual results, objectives, and goals.

The illustrative example begins with the following three related issues:

- The military departments adhere to different philosophies when referring service members for Medical Evaluation Boards.
- In the Department of the Navy, the Medical Evaluation Board fairly frequently (in 5 to 10 percent of the cases) refers medical boards that do not qualify for the DES to the Informal PEB because the referring physicians and commanders do not communicate with each other and the physicians play such a strong patient advocate role.
- Service member patients perceive variability in application of disability policy because both the DoD and VA rate the physician’s diagnosis using the VASRD, but each department actually evaluates different things for different purposes at different times.

The first two issues listed here suggest the following desired result: Physicians understand the purpose and role of the Medical Evaluation Board in the overall Disability Evaluation System (the purpose and role could differ among the services). The third issue suggests the following desired result: Service members understand the different purposes of DoD and VA disability evaluation. Figure D.1 portrays the relationships between the issues and results.

After examining the complete list of 41 issues (see Appendix C) and their associated desired results using the bottom-up, issues-based goal fabric analytic technique, we conjectured an initial set of objectives that the group of desired results seemed to suggest. For the sake of illustration, the two desired results shown in Figure D.1 seem
to suggest the following objective: Communicate the purpose and role of the Disability Evaluation System.

For both of the desired results shown in Figure D.1, we also specified actions that could bring about those results. For example, to ensure that physicians understand the purpose and role of the Medical Evaluation Board in the overall Disability Evaluation System (the purpose and role could differ among the services), we suggest two actions: In coordination with the ASD/RA and the ASD/HA, the ASD/FMP should direct the Director of Officer and Enlisted Personnel Management to (1) consult with a small group of experienced DES experts representing the military departments’ PEBs and the Office of the Surgeons General to produce recommendations upon which the ASD/FMP, in coordination with the ASD/HA and ASD/RA, can decide on a purpose and role of the Medical Evaluation Board and (2) develop and promulgate the clearly stated purpose and role of the Medical Evaluation Board within the overall DES.

For the second desired result—service members understand the different purposes of DoD and VA disability evaluations—the suggested actions include (1) the OSD develops a brochure and/or Web site for individuals who are separated or retired for disability that focuses on the differences between the DoD and VA systems; services would present the brochure and/or Web site to members during outprocessing at the transition points; (2) the OSD develops a PEBLO and/or service member Web site.
and lists the differences between the DoD and the VA disability systems under Frequently Asked Questions; (3) the OSD includes the differences between the DoD and VA systems as a just-in-time training and information topic (on a CD-ROM or Web site); and (4) the OSD makes understanding of DoD and VA systems part of the PEBLO certification process.

All the individual parts—desired results and actions—fit together and become operational when “actual results” are added to the picture (see Figure D.2). Desired results suggest both objectives and actions to achieve them; when the actions are carried out, actual results are obtained. If the actual results when compared with the desired results are consistent with the desired results, those actions clearly contribute to achievement of the stated objective. If they are not consistent with the desired results, the actions (or action) should be modified to produce actual results that are consistent with desired results. Figure D.2 portrays the relationships between actions and results in light of the stated system objective “Communicate purpose and role of Disability Evaluation System.”

---

**Figure D.2—Relationship Between Actions and Desired and Actual Results**
The 41 issues identified during the goal fabric analysis led to a variety of desired results, actions, and objectives. The relationships among them became quite complex. Figure D.2 portrays the kinds of complex relationships that build up to goals. In addition, Figure D.3 illustrates how multiple desired results can serve one objective, and how more than one objective can support a single goal. Each issue suggests one desired result; also, several issues may suggest the same desired result. Each desired result can suggest multiple actions and, although not illustrated here, can serve multiple objectives.

In the example illustrated in Figure D.3, Objectives A and B support the following goal: Develop a shared understanding of the DES and its application within and across the military departments.

As noted earlier, by using this process iteratively, we identified an initial set of objectives and goals. Then, from the perspective of achieving the goals, we examined the set of objectives and the relationships we had posited to the goals to assess their completeness and specificity. Similarly, we examined the desired results supporting the objectives and, lastly, we examined the actions that supported achieving the desired results to assess their completeness and specificity.
When we felt comfortable that the relationships between the issues and the initial sets of desired results, actions, objectives, and goals were logical and complete, we arrived at a final set of objectives. Appendix C lists all of the issues we identified, and Appendix E links the final set of recommended actions (organized into ten categories of interventions) with the eight objectives they are designed to support. The actions provide specificity for achieving the stated objectives. The final set of objectives and goals is shown in Figure D.4.

**Objectives**

1. Communicate purpose and role of Disability Evaluation System
2. Clarify and promulgate standards
3. Enhance communications
4. Deliver timely services within the Disability Evaluation System
5. Deliver effective services to customers
6. Expedite decisionmaking
7. Assign accountability
8. Monitor status and performance

**Goals**

Develop a shared understanding of the system and its application within and across the military departments

Connect activities so that cases flow seamlessly through the system

Enable continuous process improvement

---

*Figure D.4—Multiple Objectives Contributing to Specific Goals*