

FY 2008
Unfunded Priority List (UPL)
Feb 2007



U.S. Air Force

SAF/FMB

POC

Budget and Appropriations Liaison Office

(703) 614-8110

AIR FORCE FY 2008 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST

INDEX

FY2008 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 5

NARRATIVES FOR TOP 25

1. AIRCRAFT RECAPITALIZATION AND MODERNIZATION	19
2. COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT.....	23
3. MQ-1 (PREDATOR).....	29
4. PCS TRAVEL SHORTFALL.....	32
5. DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	35
6. COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	39
7. MINIATURE AIR LAUNCHED DECOY & JAMMER.....	43
8. FORCE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT.....	46
9. A-10 WINGS	51
10. MOBILITY AIR FORCES (MAF) AND AIR FORCE SPECIAL OPERATION COMMAND (AFSOC) AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY	55
11. AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK (AEA)	64
12. SELF-AWARENESS SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS PROGRAM ...	68
13. GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL OPERATION CENTER	71
14. ADVANCE TARGETING PODS PROCUREMENT	74
15. MULTI-PLATFORM RADAR TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	77
16. 1 ST AIR FORCE HOMELAND AIR DEFENSE CAPABILITY.....	80
17. JOINT FORCES HEADQUARTERS NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION EQUIPMENT	85
18. DISTINGUISHED VISITOR/COMBATANT COMMANDER AIRLIFT SUPPORT	89
19. THEATER DEPLOYMENT COMMUNICATIONS LOGISTICS DETAIL	97
20. AIM-120	100
21. BQM-167 SUBSCALE TARGET MUNITIONS.....	104
22. CLASSIFIED.....	107
23. GPS MODERNIZED USER EQUIPMENT.....	108
24. SPACE-BASED SPACE SURVEILLANCE BLOCK 10 ACCELERATION.	113
25. NATO C-17 PAYMENTS.....	117

NARRATIVES FOR REMAINING REQUIREMENTS

(ALPHABETIC ORDER)

AC-130 ENHANCED TRAFFIC ALERT AND COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEM 120

ACTIVE DIRECTORY (AD) AND EXCHANGE CONSOLIDATION 123

AIR FORCE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM 127

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION ANALYTIC CAPABILITY 131

AIR FORCE SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND COMMUNICATION NETWORK (CANNON AFB) 135

AIR FORCE WEATHER AGENCY BEDDOWN 140

AIR OPERATIONS CENTERS SUSTAINMENT 144

AIRBORNE NETWORKING INTEGRATION 147

ALE-47 PROCESSOR REPLACEMENT 151

ALQ-213 PROCESSOR REPLACEMENT 154

C-5A STRUCTURES PROGRAM 157

C-17 PROCUREMENT 161

C-130 EMERGENCY LOCATOR TRANSMITTER 165

C-130 MISSION CRITICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES 168

COMBAT AIR FORCE EXERCISES AND READINESS TRAINING 171

COMBAT SUPPORT DATA BASE (CSDB) 174

COMPASS CALL MISSION CREW SIMULATOR 177

CONTRACTOR LOGISTIC SUPPORT 180

CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT (CLS) AIR FORCE WEATHER AGENCY 183

COUNTER-CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, NUCLEAR OPERATIONS 186

CRITICAL EMERGENCY AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES 192

CRYPTO UPGRADE (KOV-14) 195

CYBER SPACE INTEGRATION 198

DEFENSE RED SWITCH NETWORK 201

DELIBERATE AND CRISIS ACTION PLANNING AND EXECUTION SYSTEM . 204

DEPLOYABLE AND SECURE HEADQUARTERS COMMUNICATIONS 208

E-3 JOINT STARS AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM TRAINING CONTRACTS 212

E-8C JOINT STARS RELIABILITY, MAINTABILITY, AND AVAILABILITY (RM&A) MODIFICATIONS 215

ELECTRONIC WARFARE BATTLE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONAL UTILITY STUDY 218

ENERGY COST INCREASES 221

AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 224

ENHANCED USE LEASING 228

ESSENTIAL BASE SUPPORT CONTRACTS 231

EXECUTIVE AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT 234

F-15C/D COUNTER MEASURES 237

F-15C/E DIGITAL VIDEO RECORDERS 240

FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT 244

GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-AIR FORCE 247

GEOSPATIAL PRODUCT LIBRARY (GPL) 253

GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM COMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM 256

HIGH SPEED ANTI-RADITION MISSILE DESTRUCTION OF ENEMY AIR

DEFENSE ATTACK MODULE.....	259
HIGH FREQUENCY GROUND CONTROL STATIONS ANTENNAS.....	263
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE REMOTE VISUAL ASSESSMENT.....	266
THE INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (IBD)	269
M4 CARBINES	273
MOBILITY AIR FORCES-COMBAT AIR FORCES INTEROPERABILITY	277
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	281
MOBILITY AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM.....	296
MQ-9 TECHNICAL ORDERS	300
NORTH WARNING SYSTEM SPECTRUM AND TESTER MODIFICATIONS	303
PACIFIC AIR FORCE AIR OPERATIONS CENTER	306
PACIFIC AIR FORCES FURNISHINGS.....	309
PACIFIC AIR FORCES NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS TRANSMATION	312
PACIFIC AIR FORCES QUALITY OF LIFE FURNISHINGS.....	316
PACIFIC AIR FORCES REPLACEMENT DORM FURNISHINGS.....	319
AIR FORCE PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE /COMMON ACCESS CARD	322
RAPID ATTACK IDENTIFICATION DETECTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM	327
RESTORING MISSION FACILITIES CAPABILITY.....	330
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	333
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM MISSION CONTROL STATION BACKUP	334
SECOND DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	338
SENIOR LEADER COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS-AIRBORNE UPGRADE.....	341
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB.....	345
SPACE FENCE PROGRAM.....	346
SPACE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	350
SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS	354
STORAGE AREA NETWORK	358
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	361
SYNTHETIC FUELS	364
TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL PROGRAM SIMULATOR	368
TACTICAL WEATHER RADAR SUSTAINMENT	372
TEMPORARY DUTY TO SCHOOL FUNDS	375
THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT CORE SYSTEMS.....	378
THEATER AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM (TARS) OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE	382
TRAINING MUNITIONS AND MISSILES	385
U-2 ADVANCED SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR SYSTEM (ASARS-2A).....	392
USAF ACADEMY CADET EDUCATION.....	395
WEATHER SERVICE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE.....	398
WEAPONIZING INTEL COMBAT CAPABILITY TRAINING (WICC-T).....	401
WAR RESERVE MATERIEL	404

AIR FORCE

FY 2008 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Priority	Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
1	Aircraft Recapitalization and Modernization	2,602.0	Aircraft recap/modernization is essential to continued dominance in air and space and ensure long-term support of COCOM warfighting needs. Funds 5xCV-22, 15xC-130J, 4xMC-130, 1X Bombardier Challenger 604 (C604) and 9xT-6; replacements are needed for aircraft lost/stressed in combat/contingency operations or in training for GWOT deployments. In addition, procures 5 x C-130Js to aide in recapitalization efforts on aging, restriction-prone C-130E fleet. This allows for a more stable C-130 force structure and insures continued MAF combat delivery support to the COCOMs and warfighters. All funds can be executed on current production lines.
2	Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) Capability Enhancement	24.0	Funds 22 701C Engines, 75 Dual engine contingency power shipsets, and 101 night vision goggles/Heads Up Display kits for the HH-60G, Guardian Angel combat equipment shortfall due to pararescueman/combat rescue officer pipeline increase, and MC/HC-130 loadmaster crashworthy scanner seats (33 HC-130P/N, 4 MC-130 (ANG), & 10 MC-130E (Air Force Reserve Command) shipsets).
3	MQ-1	176.3	Restores 2 yr slip of MQ-1 Total Force Integration full operational capability with an additional 6 x MQ-1 systems for COCOM support; continues transition of ANG units in CA, AZ, ND and TX to MQ-1 operations.
4	PCS Shortfall	364.0	Funds 26,700 operational and rotational military PCS moves, necessary to meet critical mission requirements (overseas assignments, force structure moves) and develop the force (commanders).

Priority	Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
5	DPEM	587.1	Increases funding level for Depot Procured Equipment Maintenance (DPEM) from 74.2% to 86%. 86% level funding for DPEM minimizes risk for aircraft PDMs and engine overhaul budgeted deferrals by “buying back” 50 acft PDMs and 91 engine overhauls.
6	Common Vertical Lift Support Platform (CVLSP)	4.2	Funds Research and Development to select replacement for 50 UH-1Ns (25 AFSPC, 6 AETC, and 19 AFDW) with 54 CVLSPs (28 AFSPC, 6 AETC, 20 AFDW).
7	Minature Air Launched Decoy & Jammer (MALD-J)	14.0	Addresses interim capability gap in Airborne Electronic Attack, by modifying existing decoys to provide increased jamming support.
8	Force Protection Equipment	250.0	Funds deployment kit replacement (supplies and equipment for Airmen supporting OIF/OEF), protective body armor/helmets and non-lethal weapons sets. Funds Integrated Base Defense transformational sensor upgrades using next generation technologies and IED defeat tool sets. Mitigates anti-terrorism vulnerabilities and replaces tactical communications for interoperability.
9	A-10 Wings	37.5	Procures 6 additional wings for A-10. Based on current structural condition and condemnation rates of the A-10 thin skin wings, the fleet will not have enough serviceable wings for every fuselage beginning in FY11 causing some A-10s to be grounded. Forty-five percent of the thin skin wings failed the service life extension inspections and cannot be repaired by current practices. Contract to be awarded in FY07.
10	MAF/AFSOC Aircraft Survivability	209.8	Provides increased survivability and access for AFSOC and MAF aircraft through multiple modifications. Procures 12 C-5A defensive systems, 111 sets of C-5 armor, and LAIRCM for 15 AC-130s, 12 MC-130s, 8 C-17s and 6 C-130s. Provides protection from IR and small arms threats.

Priority	Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
11	Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA)	35.5	Funds technology maturation for stand-off jamming arrays/pods as component to the DoD Airborne Electronic Attack System of Systems. Provides long-term, reactive jamming to meet future capability requirements.
12	Self-Awareness Space Situational Awareness (SASSA)	50.0	The recent test of the Chinese anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) demonstrated the most visible aspects of the growing counterspace efforts around the world which would exploit the heavy U.S. dependence on space assets and services. SASSA provides the sensing capability for current and future space high-value assets to detect and attribute interference or attacks. These capabilities are crucial to enabling a full range of U.S. responses from diplomatic to military in the event of hostile action against our spacecraft. Specific linkages to the threats can be provided at a higher classification level.
13	Global Command and Control Operations Centers	10.0	Provides funding for a feasibility study to determine how to develop a common cyberspace infrastructure for the Air Force.
14	ATP procurement w/ video downlink	22.0	Procures 10 ATPs required to meet CAF targeting pod requirement of 724 total. Strategy complies with an AEF rotational-based Advanced Targeting Pod Flight Plan. Provides real time cockpit video to ground control.
15	Multi-Platform Radar Technology Insertion Program (MP-RTIP)	408.3	Funds MP-RTIP Technology Demonstration to prove Air and Ground Moving Target Indicator capabilities.
16	1st AF Homeland Air Defense Capability	46.0	Provides manpower (ANG, civilian and contractor) and operations funding for 1st AF's Homeland Air Defense mission in direct support of NORTHCOM.
17	Joint Force's HQ National Capital Region Equipment	15.9	Funds \$5.0 for training and readiness support for Lead Federal Agency emergency response. \$10.9M required to upgrade Comm Hardware, Software, & Infrastructure in NCR.

Priority	Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
18	DV/COCOM Airlift Support	447.8	Procures 5 x C-37Bs to finish recapitalization of C-20B fleet and 1x C-37B to meet increased COCOM requirement, including standup of AFRICOM; repairs C-32 power loss design flaw to ensure seamless DV comm support; and modernizes remainder of C-12 fleet to meet mission requirements and FAA/ICAO directives. 16 of 27 completed.
19	Theater Deployable Communications LOGDET	32.5	Funds logistical support to make combat units deployable; reconstitutes theater deployable comm for Active Duty Logistics Detail (LOGDET) and procures initial equipment for 28 ANG units.
20	AIM-120 Upgrades (AMRAAM)	6.5	Funds rocket motor repairs for remaining 470 AIM-120B/C missiles and prevents any inventory shortfall due to motor problems. 695 motors already funded for repair as a less expensive alternative to new missile procurement (\$300M). Also funds software upgrade to increase capability against evolving threats.
21	BQM -167 Subscale Target Munitions	3.0	Funds shortfall in munitions required to launch and recover BQM-167 Subscale Targets. Prevents target shortfall and subsequent cancellation of tests.
22	zCLASSIFIED	190.0	CLASSIFIED
23	GPS Modernization User Equipment (MUE)	60.0	This multi-vendor acquisition preserves a critical industrial base of GPS expertise required to support a wide variety of warfighter airborne, maritime, ground and space weapon system applications. The additional funding will maintain this critical industrial base/expertise and ensure robust competition throughout the development and production phases of the MUE program to lower program risk, reduce future production cost via increased competition, and accelerate MUE fielding. A single vendor approach will result in the erosion of the industrial base and industry expertise as the cost of re-entry would be prohibitive.

Priority	Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
24	Space - Based Space Surveillance (SBSS) Block 10 Acceleration	35.0	SBSS is critical to our ability to persistently track potentially hostile objects in space. The recent test of the Chinese anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) demonstrated the most visible aspects of the growing counterspace efforts around the world which would exploit the heavy U.S. dependence on space assets and services. Once fielded, the warning time SBSS can provide will be critical to defeating anticipated threats. The requested funds will enable us to preserve a December 2008 launch of the SBSS Block 10 satellite, reducing the vulnerability window that exists until SBSS warning data is available.
25	NATO C-17 Payments	111.0	Funds will be used for the US monetary cost share to fund US participation in a C-17 consortium of NATO allies. This Strategic Airlift Capability was directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on 12 Jan 07.

AIR FORCE
FY 2008 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
REMAINING REQUIREMENTS

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
AC-130 Enhanced Traffic Alert & Collision Avoidance System (ETCAS)	9.0	Installs ETCAS on 12 AC-130s to complete fleet. ETCAS required to meet communications, navigation and surveillance/air traffic management (CNS/ATM) & International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) airspace mandate.
AD/Exchange Consolidation	144.0	Completes implementation of Active Directory (AD) and Exchange Consolidation which provides a single, standardized net-centric directory service for warfighter use.
AF Critical Infrastructure Program (CIP)	5.5	Maintains AF CIP baseline activities implemented to date; funds additional DoD-required CIP activities such as assessing risk of loss to AF-owned and operated critical assets and infrastructure.
AFOSI Analytic Capability	2.6	Funds 11 contract analysts/linguists plus state-of-the-art equipment and software. Provides information for commanders to make force protection level decisions and improve threat understanding.
AFSOC Communications Network (Cannon AFB)	12.0	Beddown of UAV, CV-22 and other SOF missions requires replacement of saturated land mobile radio (LMR) network and expansion of base telephone switch. Funding provides C2 infrastructure on south side of Cannon to support new/existing facilities. Provide SOF forces the ability to receive, process and disseminate accurate and timely information to/from planners and executing forces to include emergency first responders.
Air Force Weather Agency (AFWA) Beddown	8.6	Funds transition of AFWA's world-wide weather operations equipment to new mission facility.
Air Operations Center (AOC) Sustainment	80.4	Funds operations and training shortfalls at AFCENT, AFSOUTH & AFSTRAT AOCs, 505th Command and Control Wing (Nellis AFB, NV) and the AF Component Operational Support Facility.
Airborne Networking Integration	6.6	Funds development of network infrastructure used to connect airborne and ground-based networks, which supports time-sensitive targeting, close air support, and homeland defense.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
ALE-47 Programmer Memory Upgrade	3.0	Procures 1200 memory upgrade cards to enable future software updates and improve chaff/flare dispenser performance. Present capability is maxed out and will not permit future software updates.
ALQ-213 Processors	22.0	Funds replacement of the ALQ-213 electronic warfare processor, which is facing Diminished Manufacturing Source issues on the F-16 and A-10 fleet.
C-5A Structures Program (Aft Crown Skin and Contour Box Beam Fittings)	23.5	Funds 28 one-time inspections and 19 magnetic optical imaging inspections needed to determine C-5 structural integrity of aft crown skins and contour Beam Box fittings.
C-17 Procurement	1,010.1	Funds procure two additional C-17s along with advance procurement for long lead items. Also funds advance procurement of fleet spares required to sustain the entire C-17 fleet as a result of GWOT wear and tear.
C-130 Emergency Locator Transmitter	10.6	Replaces legacy Emergency Locator Transmitter (ELT) with 406 MHZ ELTs on 479 C-130s. After Feb 09 aircraft not equipped with 406MHZ ELT cannot be tracked by Search and Rescue satellites (SARSAT).
C-130 Mission Critical Computer Resources	1.4	Procures hardware/software tools to electronically transmit technical data media to the C-130 fleet Points of Maintenance (POMx).
CAF Exercises & Readiness Training	4.2	Funds advanced threat rentals for F-22 training, adversary support for weapons instructor courses, flag exercises, and contract instructors for legacy simulators, and 30 other CAF training programs.
Combat Support Database Support	2.2	Funds support for the Combat Support Database (CSDB) at the 453rd Electronic Warfare Squadron (EWS), Lackland AFB, Texas. This database is vital to mission planning for Low Observable platforms and Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM).
Compass Call Mission Crew Simulator	12.0	Upgrades the Compass Call Mission Crew Simulator (CCMCS) to the Block 35 configuration.
Contractor Logistics Support	490.2	Increases funding level for Contracted Logistics Support (CLS) from 75.2% to 85%. 85% level funding for CLS reduces risk by covering all "fixed" contract costs and maintains acceptable risk in "variable" costs.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
Contractor Logistics Support for Weather Systems	14.9	Fields and sustains tactical and strategic weather systems to required operational availability thresholds.
Counter-Chemical Biological, Radiological, Nuclear (C-CBRNE) Ops (Counter-Proliferation)	10.0	Improves oversight and synchronization of Chemical, Biological Radiological and Nuclear capabilities; develops executable CONOPS and Tactics, Techniques and Procedures for multiple threat scenarios.
Critical Emergency and Municipal Services	41.4	Provides funds to meet additional Facilities Operation (FO) requirements to include emergency municipal services including fire protection, explosive ordnance disposal, plant operations, and annual service contracts.
Crypto Upgrade (KOV14)	1.2	Replaces aging crypto card+H62 that NSA is no longer supporting with newer model KSV-21 to sustain secure voice capabilities in the Pacific theater.
Cyber Space Integration	25.0	Funds integration of multiple stand-alone systems into a global enterprise of air, space and cyberspace for Cyberspace Command as an AF-wide network and improves data-level visibility for the AF.
Defense Red-Switch Network (DRSN)	8.5	Replaces eight aging DRSN switches at Tyndall, Shaw, Langley and Offut, to ensure continued secure C2.
Deliberate and Crisis Action Planning and Execution System (DCAPES)	0.9	Funding transitions DCAPES to a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) to ensure DCAPES/Joint Operational Planning and Execution System connectivity beyond December 2008.
Deployable & Secure HQ Comm	3.3	Sustains C2 consoles and procures 69 UHF/VHF secure radios for theater deployable comm. Replaces Air Force Reserve Command non-secure HQ comm and failing, unsustainable, deployable radios which jeopardize AFR UTC and HQ comm capability, as well as secure connectivity with aircraft during missions.
E-3 Training Simulation Contracts	8.8	Funds shortfall in three E-3 training simulator contracts needed to ensure crew readiness without an increase in actual flying hours.
E-8C Reliability, Maintainability and Availability	8.2	Funds Joint STARS critical low cost modifications to end-of-life components for the aircraft systems required to achieve and maintain mission capable rate standards and worldwide fleet availability.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
Electronic Warfare Battle Management (EWBM) Operational Utility Study	0.5	Funds a study of operational utility of Electronic Warfare Battle Management (EWBM) concepts, as defined within existing "Denying Enemy Awareness through Airborne Electronic Attack" Initial Capabilities Document (ICD), and the EWBM Functional Concept. Directly supports the Joint Airborne Electronic Attack System of Systems (AEA SoS) concept.
Energy Cost Increases	84.4	Funds purchased utilities and municipal services; funds are required to meet increasing energy costs averaging over 16% in FY08 despite decline in energy consumption.
Engine Component Improvement Program (CIP)	20.0	Accelerates 25 R&M Engine CIP tasks to increase aircraft/engine affordability, availability, and reliability while helping to mitigate the effects of near and long-term effects of current contingency operations in Southwest and South Central Asia. Improvements directly support the B-1, B-2, F-15, and the F-16 weapon systems.
Enhanced Use Leasing	7.2	Provides an opportunity for the Air Force to generate tangible returns from underutilized assets, including real property, by leasing them to non-federal entities in accordance with 10 U.S.C. § 2667.
Essential Base Support Contracts	280.6	Provides in-house contractual support for day-to-day operations at installations, including Security Forces, Services, Transportation, Supply, Personnel, and Wing/Staff agencies.
Executive Airborne Communications Support	60.0	Buys a 1-year continuation for contract to provide airborne broadband service for secure/non-secure voice, data and videoteleconferencing for the OSA/VIPSAM fleet.
F-15C/D Countermeasures	39.8	Procures 178 kits and 84 rails to equip+G74ip F-15C/D with covert, continuous, preemptive infra-red countermeasures -- essential to survival against currently fielded threats.
F-15C/E Digital Video Recorders	28.0	Purchases 100 F-15E digital video recorders and 232 F-15C Multi-Stage Improvement Program (MSIP) recorders to maximize training effectiveness.
Facilities Sustainment	185.8	Funds base sustainment levels to OSD Facilities Sustainment Model (FSM) requirements.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
Global Combat Support System (GCSS)-AF	51.2	Expands Air Force's primary business migration support system. Funds second active site, expanded SIPRNet services, and improved performance. Includes new service development, enterprise arch support, contractor ops and support personnel, COTS software maintenance, DISA hosting costs and Edge Server support. Provides development of platform engineering and application service; procurement for additional servers, memory, COTS licensing and data warehouse hardware and software; and support of deployed infrastructure, including outreach services, maintenance releases, deferred maintenance from FY07 and data and edge services.
Geospatial Product Library	1.1	Implements an enterprise geospatial solution to provide a capability for mission planning, navigation, and safety of flight that can electronically store, access, and rapidly disseminate digital charting, terrain, and targeting data. Saves over 17,000 manhours/year by automating a manual process and improves mission planning to avoid threat envelopes.
GPS - Command & Control System	10.0	Funds Command & Control System (CCS) operations for GPS through 2Q FY08 when scheduled replacement is available. Validates GPS Launch Anomaly resolution and Disposal Operations (LADO) prior to CCS replacement.
HARM HDAM Production	30.8	Procures 210 HARM DEAD Attack Modules (HDAM) for retrofit on HARM missiles. Provides GPS-capable HARMs -- significant increase in critical target engagement while reducing collateral damage.
High Frequency Ground Control System Antennas	30.9	Procures 160 antennas to replace aged antennas; standardizes/modernizes antenna systems for 14 HF Global Comm System stations.
ICBM Remote Visual Assessment (RVA)	13.5	Adds funds to purchase 90 additional RVA kits in FY08. This completes RVA deployment at one ICBM wing to improve security forces' situational awareness. The RVA program sends visual signals from remote, unguarded Minuteman launch facilities to security force control facilities. The added visual information allows the security controllers to prioritize and tailor the responding security forces. In total, the 3 ICBM wings have missile launch facilities scattered across 44,600 square miles.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
Integrated Base Defense System	27.6	Procures replacement of aging and inoperable electronic security systems for AFSPC and PACAF; improves Security Forces' capability to protect mission critical assets such as C17s and F-22As.
M4 Carbine	392.0	Buys down requirement for 270K M4 carbines to augment Army in convoy operations/escort missions. Taskings require common small arms weapon across Joint Force.
MAF-CAF Interoperability	13.8	Funds software/hardware in support of mandated net-centric operations in and across unclassified, classified and coalition environments (Interoperability And Supportability Of Information Technology And National Security Systems, CJCSI 6212.01D); integrates Mobility Air Forces [TACC (intertheater), Air Mobility Division (intratheater)] missions planning and execution information with CAF (AOCs), coalition, and joint systems. Provides deployed and mobile C2 forces in comm challenged environments; enables distributed and reachback from Air Mobility Division to Tanker Airlift Control Center
MILCON Projects	6,060.0	The Military Construction (MILCON) Program provides funding for facilities supporting modernization, readiness, base support, and quality of life throughout the Air Force.
Mobility Air Intel System	2.1	Funds SIPR connectivity, INMARSAT, and Iridium phones for deployable intelligence packages supporting airlift, air refueling, aeromedical evacuation, and contingency response operations.
MQ-9 Tech Orders	10.0	Accelerates delivery of MQ-9 Tech Orders by one year. Avoids delay in training and qualifying personnel at the 174th Attack Wing, NY ANG (Syracuse, NY) for blue-suit maintainance which is needed to meet IOC in FY10.
North Warning System Spectrum & Tester Mods	7.5	Corrects out of band emissions for FPS-124 radar and modifies testers; limits interference with other systems and prevents loss of NORAD radar coverage needed for Homeland Defense.
PACAF AOC	8.4	Funds sustainment/training for three PACAF AOCs.
PACAF Furnishings	18.2	Funds furniture, fixtures and equipment for associated MILCON projects.
PACAF NAF Transformation	1.0	Procures equipment to establish connectivity to existing base infrastructure in support of new system requirements for Numbered Air Force Transformation.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
PACAF Quality of Life Furnishings	1.2	Funds furniture, fixtures and equipment required to provide complete H94ChildCare and Youth Center facilities in PACAF.
PACAF Replacement Dorm Furnishings	61.6	Funds replacement of current furnishings inventory at 14% per year, in accordance with OSD model.
Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)	2.0	Procures hardware/software to support PKI on secure networks for dramatically improved information assurance.
Rapid Attack Identification Detection and Reporting System (RAIDRS) Block 20	7.0	The recent test of the Chinese antisatellite (ASAT) demonstrated the most visible aspects of the growing counterspace efforts around the world designed to exploit the heavy U.S. dependence on space assets and services. RAIDRS Block 20 will provide a capability to characterize, assess and resolve anomalies and attacks against our space assets by accessing and fusing a variety of data sources. The requested funds will accelerate RAIDRS Block 20 Initial Operational Capability from FY11 to FY10 in order meet the emerging counterspace threats.
Restoring Mission Facilities Capability	877.4	Funds "Degraded" facility requirements; addresses key areas within the Restoration and Modernization program.
S&T Focus Areas	32.0	Adds funding to variety of AF S&T programs spread across the AFRL Technology Directorates to raise the FY08 program to 3% real growth from the FY07 PB.
Space Based Infra-red System Mission Control Station Backup (MCSB)	27.6	The current configuration of the SBIRS MCSB Backup facility will only process High Elliptical Orbit (HEO) sensor mission data. This effort will upgrade the MCSB to allow full SBIRS mission data processing , including both legacy Defense Support Program (DSP) satellite data and SBIRS Geosynchronous Earth Orbit (GEO) satellite data processing and integration of system/data for release to operational users.
Second Destination Transportation	91.0	Funds movement of AF material to support overseas locations to include subsistence items. Includes APO Mail, and AFMC Centrally Managed Account (CMA) which funds various shipments including vehicles, muntions, and ground equipment.
Senior Leader Communication Systems - Airborne Upgrade	93.0	Funds design, purchase, installation, and integration to significantly improve airborne C3 capability for POTUS, VPOTUS, and combatant commanders. Replaces obsolete STU-IIIs with STEs; modifies the aircraft to provide Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) and Voice over Secure Internet Protocol (VOSIP) capabilities.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) for B-2	17.0	Funds initial SDB II integration with B-2 platform
Space Fence	9.8	The ground-based Space Fence radar will enable detection and tracking of small potentially hostile objects in space. Once fielded, the Space Fence will detect and track objects as small as microsattellites in order to characterize the emergence of this threat and to provide advance warning to enable effective employment of countermeasures to protect our space capabilities. The requested funding will enable us to accelerate the Space Fence concept development approval milestone from June 2008 to January 2008, as well as preserve the option for further schedule acceleration in future budgets.
Space Professional Development	3.3	Funds required for 400 student backlog to attend Space 100/200/300; develops/sustains advanced courses & other space education programs.
Space Situation Awareness	9.0	Funds sustainment for AF Fence Comm Ctr, Cobra Dane, Millstone/Haystack parts, Moron normalization, GEODSS and Globus II operations. Funds help secure space domain and provide the enabling functions of counterspace activity.
Storage Area Network (SAN) Enterprise Sustainment	2.0	Provides one year O&M sustainment of SANs servicing all PACAF bases. Provides ability to support COOP mission, backup/recovery/restoral of critical data and email services.
Support Equipment	340.0	Procures aircraft support equipment (SE) and other base maintenance SE (mx stands, acft air conditioners, light-alls, electrical power units, bomb lifts, etc) needed for CENTCOM AOR and for critical shortfalls in stateside bases. Meets critical CENTCOM requirements.
Synthetic Fuels	30.0	The USAF is the largest single consumer of energy in the DoD, using over 2.56B gallons of aviation fuel in FY06. This initiative continues the aviation airworthiness certification of SynFuel as a first step to reducing dependence on imported petroleum.
Tactical Airborne Control Program (TACP) Simulator	14.8	Provides 18 DMO-capable, Joint Terminal Attack Controller simulation systems for distributed close air support training.
Tactical Weather Radar (TWR) Sustainment Costs- USAFE	0.6	Funds sustainment for radar equipment at sites providing resource protection data for EUCOM. Reduces repair times and limits data void regions. Provides early warning to ensure protection of personnel and critical resources for 147 DoD installations in EUCOM.

Requirement	FY08 (\$M)	Description
TDY to School Funds	34.0	Funds both student TDY to school and Technical Training TDY to school; quota shortfall for student TDY exists in Aerospace Basic Course, Squadron Officer School, CMSgt Leadership Course, Senior NCOA and NCO Academies. Reduces technical, educational and leadership readiness of Airmen.
Theater Battle Management Control System (TBMCS)	9.5	Funds TBMCS 1.1.4 system of record requirements mandated by Joint Configuration Management Board (distributive ops/data replication). Software upgrade is key to net-centric operations across Air Operations Centers.
Theatre Airborne Reconnaissance System (TARS) Operation & Maintenance	9.5	Provides TARS O&M funding for continuous deployment and training; repair/replacement of non-stock listed items and software improvements; provides emerging user requirements for enhanced Mission Verification Equipment and pod software.
Training Munitions and Missiles	160.1	Procures missiles (Hellfire, AIM-120D & AIM-9X) and target drones for training as well as SFW & JASSM for weapons test.
U-2 ASARS-2A Sustainment	3.6	Funds sustainment requirements for the U-2 until the Global Hawk ISR transition plan is fully implemented.
USAFA Cadet Education	4.8	Procures lab equipment/maintenance contracts to support labs used by USAFA cadets in scientific/engineering fields; buys subscriptions, books, periodicals and databases used by faculty, staff and cadets to maintain parity with other undergraduate universities/service academies.
Weather Service Equipment Maintenance	2.5	Funds shortfall in maintenance contracts for doppler-capable weather radars at 11 DoD airfields; provides mandated Army weather support and radar/equipment maintenance, including AF share of NEXRAD contract.
WICC-T/Training	0.8	Funds Weaponizing Intelligence Combat Capability-Training (WICC-T). Training certifies personnel in position skills and initiates Stan-Eval processes. Air Mobility Command has an annual rqmt for 200 Intel Formal Training Unit (IFTU) students to support ongoing operations.
WRM Non-Munitions	2.6	Funds Supplies/Parts and corrosion control efforts to bring War Reserve Materiel (WRM) assets to minimal serviceable standards.
GRAND TOTAL	16,943.6	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIRCRAFT RECAPITALIZATION AND MODERNIZATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)

Budget Activity: Various (i.e., BA04)

Program Element: Various

Potential Add: Procures 20 x C-130J, 1 x C604, 2 x C-37, 5 x CV-22, 4 x MC-130, 9 x T-6 for a net of \$2,602M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does. Aircraft recap/modernization is essential to continued dominance in air and space. This effort funds 20 x C-130J, 1 x C604, 2 x C-37, 5 x CV-22, 4 x MC-130, 9 x T-6.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

C-130 purchases aid in recapitalization of the aging, restriction-prone C-130E force and ensures a stable C-130 force structure for combat delivery. C604 purchase recapitalizes a lost Air Force Flight Standards Agency C-21 with a modern flight test aircraft identical to the current recap effort. C-37s begin recapitalization of aging, maintenance-intensive, non-STAGE III compliant small aircraft Very Important Person Special Airlift Mission (VIPSAM) fleet. CV-22 purchases accelerate procurement of CV-22 aircraft to replace capabilities from combat losses in the vertical lift fleet. T-6s replace aircraft lost in mishaps since Sept 2001.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

- C-130 / MC-130 – Lockheed Martin Aeronautics – (Md, Ga)
- C604 - Challenger – Bombardier (France)
- C-37 - Gulfstream – Savannah Georgia
- CV-22 – Bell/Boeing Bell/Textron (Tx), Boeing ADS (Pa), Rolls Royce (IN), Raytheon (Tx)
- T-6 – Raytheon (KS), Pratt & Whitney (WV)

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement (MYP) is funded in FY07 budget. MYP ends in FY08.
- MC-130 - No
- C604 - No
- C-37 - No

- CV-22 – Yes; FY08 APAF: \$573M; RDTE: \$37M; FY07 NDAA also authorized V-22 Multi-year Production (FY08-12).
- FY08 \$246M (last aircraft purchased in FY08 for delivery in FY10).

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement is funded in FY08 budget. MYP ends in FY08.
- MC-130 – No. MC-130 recapitalization Analysis of Alternative (AoA) and Joint Capability Integration Document (JCID) process is on-going and will be completed in CY07
- C604 - No
- C-37 - No
- CV-22 – FY08 PB requests five aircraft and associated support (\$593M APAF). UFR requests additional five aircraft and associated support (would also be procured under MYP).
- FY08 \$246M (last aircraft purchased in FY08 for delivery in FY10).

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

These aircraft either replace aircraft losses or recapitalize existing fleets which will be retired. Therefore, there should be no additional manpower or O&M out-year requirements. CV-22 – AF unfunded requirement of \$492.5M for 5 aircraft and support does not include the U.S. Special Operations Command Major Force Program requirement for Special Operations Force (SOF) mission equipment (\$239M for 5 aircraft and support). The total requirement is \$732M.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

These aircraft either replace aircraft losses or recapitalize existing fleets which will be retired. Therefore, there should be no additional manpower or O&M tails.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

Not R&D items

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement is funded in FY07 budget. MYP ends in FY08. The total requirement for C-130J was originally approved as a C-130E recapitalization

effort. MYP-s was terminated during the FY07 budget process. Additional C-130J aircraft would continue to fulfill this previously validated requirement.

- MC-130 - MC-130 recapitalization AoA and JCID process is on-going and will be completed in Calendar Year 07
- C604 – Yes. Effort on-going to replace the aging and performance-limited C-21 Air Force Flight Standards Agency fleet with new Challenger aircraft.
- C-37 - No
- CV-22 – Yes. Joint Requirements Oversight Council validated V-22 Block B/10 Capabilities Production Document, 19 Sep 05. CV-22 provides AF Special Operations Command extended range and vertical takeoff and landing capability essential to long range SOF insertion and extraction operations.
- T-6 – Aircraft is used for Phase I of SUPT and will be used for Combat Systems Operator (CSO) training starting in FY10

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement is funded in FY08 budget. MYP ends in FY08.
- MC-130 - No
- C604 - No
- C-37 - No
- CV-22 – The FY14-15 APAF requirement 5 CV-22s is projected to be \$412M (MFP-11 requirement is 171M). This \$583M then-year cost would be avoided by funding this UFR.
- T-6 – None to minimal additional savings. This would just increase T-6 fleet from 450 to 459.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

All are considered to be HIGH value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement is funded in FY07 budget. MYP ends in FY08.
- MC-130 - No
- C604 - No
- C-37 - No

CV-22 – 1/FY05, 4/FY06, 7/FY07, 9/FY08, 11/FY09, 15/FY10, 21/FY11, 27/FY12, 33/FY13	2%	8%	14%	18%	22%	30%	42%	54%	66%
T-6 – 206/FY05, 258/FY06, 311/FY 07, 365/FY08, 413/FY09, 452/FY10	46%	57%	69%	81%	91%	100%			

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

- C-130J – C-130 Multi-Year Procurement is funded in FY07 budget. MYP ends in FY08.
- CV-22 – Congress has appropriated procurement funds for CV-22 aircraft since FY04. NAVAIR program office executes APAF and RDT&E funds for the CV-22.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force’s limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF), Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27224F
Potential Add: \$24M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

HH-60G

\$16.9M. is for Safety of Flight for Combat (SOF-C). This funding will complete ongoing Safety related modifications, and corrects deficient areas of low power, high gross weight, poor situational awareness, and combat survivability.

Guardian Angel

\$3.2M. This is an Air Force program put in place to properly equip Battlefield Airman (BA) when they initially graduate the training pipeline and to reconstitute equipment as it wears and tears. Currently, the funding line only provides for 50% of required equipment. The equipment purchased is individually tailored basic go to war gear; BA cannot operate without it. The \$1M plus up will provide 100% of equipment required in FY08 for Guardian Angel (Pararescue/Combat Rescue Officers).

HC-MC-130

\$3.9M. The crashworthy paratroop door seat allows the loadmaster and/or scanner to be properly restrained during critical phase of flight (takeoff and landing) while being able to scan for threats.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

HH-60G

Safety of Flight for the HH-60G Pavehawk

Guardian Angel

Purchase individual equipment for Guardian Angel Forces and to procure two additional Recovery Kits.

HC-MC-130

To equip all HC-130P/N (Air National Guard included) and Air Force Reserve Command MC-130's with crashworthy paratroop door seats—47 kits at a total cost of 3.9M.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

HH-60G

Program executed thru the Warner Robins-Air Logistics Center Systems Program Office (SPO). SPO was on program to execute the money already assigned. 100%.

Guardian Angel

No specific contractor involved with Guardian Angel equipment funding.

HC-MC-130

The concept is in study at the Battlelab with SPO testing pending contract approval (WRALC-GA).

- 4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

HH-60G

No funds for this portion of HH-60 modifications are contained in the FY08 budget.

Guardian Angel

Yes. 3400 O&M. \$1.029M for Guardian Angel individual equipment.

Guardian Angel program lacks funds to procure required number Recovery Kits (7PRTM UTC). The 58th Rescue Squadron (Nellis Air Force Base, NV) and 48th Rescue Squadron (Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ) are 1 Recovery Kit short of the number required by their Doc statements. This is having a negative impact to mission readiness and real world impact by limiting availability for rescue forces in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, humanitarian relief ops, and NASA space shuttle rescue contingency. This issue has also led to longer deployment of current Recovery Kits, therefore, significantly decreasing their lifecycle.

HC/MC-130

No funding in the FY08 budget.

- 5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

HH-60G

No Funds for this portion of HH-60 modifications are contained in the FY08 budget.

Guardian Angel

<u>FY</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>FY</u>
<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
2.83	2.89	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2

HC/MC-130

No current funding in FY08 budget.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

HH-60G

None for FY08

Guardian Angel

None

HC-MC-130

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

HH-60G

100% can be executed in either FY08. No additional money needed for these mods if funds are restored. If funding not restored it will be included in the FY10 POM with increased costs.

Guardian Angel

Plus up over the FYDP is in Guardian Angel program's 09 APOM.

HC-MC-130

No, if funded it will be a one time buy.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone? R&D complete.

HH-60G

HH-60 procurement and installations in progress. Restores funding for critical Safety modifications.

Guardian Angel

N/A

HC-MC-130

Nothing has been invested to date. The item is pending source selection.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

HH-60G

Yes, the requirement to operate in high altitude environments such as Afghanistan has increased the necessity for the 701C engine upgrade and Dual Engine Contingency Power upgrade. Dusty

or brownout environments like Iraq and Afghanistan have increased the requirement for Night Vision Situational Awareness tools like the Night Vision Goggle Heads-Up Display. The requirement in ACC meets the SPG's requirement for rescue forces and is documented in the Squadron Mission statements.

Guardian Angel

Yes, the requirement is to outfit BA (Pararescue/Combat Rescue Officer) with individual equipment required for ongoing operations in support of GWOT, Humanitarian Relief operations, European Command, and Pacific Command areas of responsibilities. The requirement in Air Combat Command(ACC) meets the Strategic Planning Guidance (SPG) requirement for rescue forces and is documented in the Squadron Mission statements.

HC/MC-130

Yes. Recent real-world accidents have resulted in loss-of-life or injury from being improperly restrained during crash events. The current need to be near a window for visual threat scanning during critical phases of flight makes the loadmaster and/or scanner more vulnerable to injury/death in event of a crash. The requirement in ACC meets the SPG requirement for rescue forces and is documented in the Squadron Mission statements.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2007, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

HH-60G

Can not execute earlier than FY '08. Optimal funding profile would place 16.9M in FY'08

Guardian Angel

No savings. Majority of funds are intended for FY08 pipeline graduates; because equipment is individually tailored it cannot be purchased in advanced.

HC-MC-130

No additional savings. This is a single year procurement item.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

HH-60G

Extremely high combat military value. HH-60G Class-A mishaps and loss of life have occurred during training, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Guardian Angel

High; CSAF believes CSAR is AF's moral imperative and it's critical that we properly outfit the ground operators who execute the rescue mission.

HC-MC-130

High military value. This directly affects aircrew safety.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

HH-60G

N/A

Guardian Angel

No

HC-MC-130

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

HH-60G

Current inventory is 79 701C engine upgrades, 26 Dual Engine Power units, and 0 Block 152D Heads-Up Display/situational awareness upgrades.

Remaining items thru the FYDP for HH-60G include 22 701C engines, 75 Dual Engine Power units, 101 Block 152D Heads-Up Display/situational awareness upgrades.

Guardian Angel

Current inventory is 10. FYDP objective is 18 Recovery Kits.

HC/MC-130

No inventory—yet to be produced. 47 shipsets through the FYDP.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and

significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MQ-1 (PREDATOR)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (AFAF) & Operations & Maintenance (O&M)

Budget Activity: BP10

Program Element: 35219F, 53219F

Potential Add: \$173.5M (AFAF/35219F)

\$2.8M (O&M/53219F)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This funding will increase MQ-1 capability in order to meet growing Combatant Commanders (COCOM) demands for full motion video capabilities in Iraq and Afghanistan and for the continuing Global War On Terror (GWOT). Both Central Command (CENTCOM) and Special Operations Command (SOCOM) require persistent surveillance capability addressed in this unfunded priority. If funded, this requirement will buy 24 MQ-1 Predator aircraft and 6 ground stations plus spares and maximize production capacity of a total 48 MQ-1 aircraft and associated ground support equipment in FY 08 to meet the Air Force's requirement for combat capability. In addition it will provide funding to complete the conversion of 4 Air National Guard (ANG) units who will provide an MQ-1 capability to combatant commanders.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

\$713.5M (APAF) will purchase 6 additional MQ-1 systems (24 Aircraft and 6 ground control stations plus spares) and \$2.8M (O&M) will fund conversion costs for CA, AZ, ND, and TX MQ-1 ANG units.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

General Atomics.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funds are required.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes.

Joint Requirements Oversight Council Manual (JROCM) 283-05 supports the SOCOM and CENTCOM demand for increased unmanned aircraft system (UAS) orbits. The JROC supports the Air Force's planning and programming efforts to meet forecasted MQ-1 Predator demands and recommends the Air Force program additional funds for MQ-1 Predator procurement and sustainment in FY 2007-2011 to meet increased combatant command demand. An MQ-1 Orbit Demand Study was completed Jul 06, the results of which, "support increased MQ-1 procurement by the Air Force." This study states that the study results may be used to better inform Air Force POM deliberations regarding MQ-1 investment strategies and serve as a starting point for future intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance sensor mix analysis. Additionally, CENTCOM has submitted a Joint Urgent Operational Need for additional full motion video above and beyond the previous level validated by the JROC. While not providing cost savings, this effort will greatly increase the warfighters' capability to conduct ISR with full motion video in order to prosecute high value targets.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

We do not expect cost savings to result, but warfighter capability to conduct ISR with full motion video in order to prosecute high value target will increase greatly.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The FY08 PB, production is 24 aircraft. Requested additional funding will maximize production at 48 aircraft.

14. If Congress added FY 2007/2008 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PCS TRAVEL SHORTFALL

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Military Personnel (MILPERS)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 88731F
Potential Add: \$364M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does. The Permanent Change of Station (PCS) Travel program is part of the Military Personnel Appropriation (MPA). This proposed plus up would fund the shortfall of \$364M to pay for required mission PCS moves, equating to more than 27 thousand PCS moves.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The PCS moves would be used to fund operational and rotation PCS moves (~27K) for mission requirements. The purpose of these moves is for force structure changes, force development, meet requirements of emerging missions.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

This item is funded in FY08 PB at \$1,174M. The FY08 requirement is \$1,538M, which leaves a shortfall of \$364M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

(\$M)	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
	1,173.0	1,197.6	1,270.3	1,275.8	1,319.2	1,364.0

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The purpose of the DoD PCS program is to provide the resources to sustain Services’ military force and meet congressionally mandated end strengths through the use of accession, separation, and training moves. Operational, rotational, and unit moves are used to support the overseas presence and to move members with particular skills and experience to replace those who separate. This is further defined using two re-distribution tenants: (1) move the right skill at the right time to the right place to sustain the force and meet mission requirements, and (2) seek equity through individual sharing of risk, desirability of location, professional development, and turbulence.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
 INFORMATION PAPER
 DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
 Appropriation: Operation & Maintenance (O&M)
 Budget Activity: BA01, BA02, BA03, BA04
 Program Element: All Depot Purchase Equipment Maintenance (DPEM) PEs
 Potential Add: \$587.1M for Total Force Depot Purchased Equipment Maintenance

	FY08
Active	\$377.6M
AFRC	\$150.1M
ANG	\$59.4M
Total	\$587.1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Depot maintenance funds required depot level maintenance for aircraft, non-planned depot maintenance aircraft, engines, missiles, mission software, non-Material Support Division exchangeables, other major end items, storage, and area base support and local manufacturing. Major Commands are funded by three separate O&M appropriations (Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, and Active Air Force). Defense Planning Guidance states to fund DPEM to the optimum levels to prevent growth in backlog. The additional \$587.1M eliminates 50 aircraft deferrals and 91 engine deferrals across various platforms for FY08 and maintains deferred maintenance in other DPEM funded categories at a manageable level.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The requested dollars would provide for additional aircraft and engine depot level maintenance to eliminate deferring 50 aircraft and 91 engines.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Multiple contractors across multiple states execute DPEM requirements. Due to number of contractors involved across a variety of platforms and systems, this data is not readily available nor is it feasible to detail in this format.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

	FY08

Active	\$2695.7M
AFRC	\$399.6M
ANG	\$587.5M
Total	\$3682.8M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Active	\$2695.7M	\$2707.3M	\$3178.3M	\$3172.4M	\$3081.9M	\$3245.8M
AFRC	\$399.6M	\$429.0M	\$383.6M	\$357.3M	\$364.6M	\$371.9M
ANG	\$587.5M	\$721.4M	\$690.5M	\$578.6M	\$599.3M	\$721.2M
Total	\$3682.8M	\$3857.7M	\$4252.4M	\$4108.3M	\$4045.8M	\$4338.9M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

DPEM is reviewed each year of the POM and updated according to changes in requirements. Any year where funding does not meet the optimum level to effectively prevent/manage deferrals will be a candidate for pursuing additional funding.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not an R&D effort.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, a validated requirement exists.

All depot maintenance requirements are reviewed and validated during the Logistics Support Review (LSR) process, an annual detailed line-item review of all AF depot maintenance requirements. The LSR covers all eight major categories of depot maintenance work (i.e., aircraft, engine overhauls, missiles, mission software, non-MSD exchangeables, other major end items, area base support and local manufacture, and Aerospace Maintenance/Regeneration

Center at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona). The additional \$587.1M would purchase Air Force depot maintenance to the level required to prevent aircraft and engine deferrals due to funding as well as ensure long-term fleet readiness. Based on engineering analysis, a program of continuous, scheduled maintenance is required to maintain airworthiness and/or mission capability of critical Air Force assets. The increasing age of the fleet compounds those maintenance requirements. Low DPEM funding creates a bow wave of maintenance requirements, pushes additional work to the field and onto already stressed blue suit maintainers, interrupts the continued viability of the industrial commercial base and has dramatic negative impact on aircraft/system availability and Mission Capable Rates.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High, the funding will be used to prevent projected aircraft and engine depot maintenance deferrals of 50 and 91 respectively, which impact various platforms and the ability of the Air Force to maintain a ready fleet.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No. A significant portion of Aircraft and Engine depot maintenance is scheduled based on a maintenance cycle (i.e., programmed depot maintenance). This cycle dictates that an airplane or an engine will be due for depot maintenance whenever the weapon system achieves this time interval. In FY07, some of our most critical weapon systems are approaching the outer limits of

the maintenance time interval which lessens the margin of safety for operational needs, and in some cases, will either require extraordinary efforts to perform inspections in the field to ensure air worthiness or may require grounding the weapon system.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: TBD
Program Element: TBD
Potential Add: \$4.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This funding would resolve deficiencies in Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) Nuclear Security Vertical Lift IAW Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) Security Way Ahead and provides significant enhancement to Homeland Security (HLS). It also would address the Air Force District of Washington (AFDW) capability gap in meeting post 9/11 DoD Operational Plans (OPLAN). Replaces AFSPC and AFDW UH-1Ns. Current UH-1N does not meet speed, range, endurance, or carrying capacity requirements. Current platform has questionable survivability, poor all-weather capability, poor connectivity/Command and Control (C2) situational awareness, and increasing sustainment cost. The average AF UH-1N age is 37.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Provides FY08 funding for continued CVLSP Source Selection analysis and RDT&E. Funds will be resourced for the UH-1N replacement effort in order to comply with AFSPC DoD 5210.41M nuclear security requirements and AFDW OPLAN requirements.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) was completed and specified a 30K+ lb helicopter required to meet all requirements. AoA also specified force structure/requirements trades necessary to utilize a 20K+ lb helicopter. FYDP profile includes program office funding for a source selection. ICBM Space Wings are in North Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana. ICBM program Office is at Hill AFB Utah. AFDW is at Andrews AFB.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? None

Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM? Yes

Additional funding beyond the \$4.2M request is dependent upon analysis and source selection of a UH-1N replacement. This effort has been defined as a critical capability gap and the AF plans on pursuing procurement funding in future POMs.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

AFSPC provided \$1.4M in FY05 for the AoA.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the AoA is complete and was approved by the Jul 06 Air Force Requirements for Operational Capability Council.

Improved AFSPC vertical lift is required by DoD Nuclear Weapons Security Manual and improved AFDW vertical lift is required by DoD Operational Plans.

Resolves deficiencies in AFSPC Nuclear Security Vertical Lift in accordance with ICBM Security Way Ahead and provides significant enhancement to HLS. Resolves AFDW capability gap in meeting post 9/11 DoD OPLANS. Current UH-1N does not meet speed, range, endurance, or carrying capacity requirements. Current platform has questionable survivability, poor all-WX capability, poor connectivity/C2 situational awareness, and increasing sustainment cost. The average AF UH-1N age is 37.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Beginning the requested funding in FY08 enables the AF to postpone a service life extension program on the UH-1N that must otherwise begin by 2012 to keep the UH-1N fleet viable. FY08 start also allows the AF to take advantage of expertise resident in the CSAR-X program office. FY08 funding begins to close a critical capability gap in ICBM Nuclear Security and Operational Support Airlift in the National Capitol Region. Also provides significant enhancement to Homeland Security.

Proposed FYDP funding/quantity profile:

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding Adjustment:	\$4.2	\$16.9	\$130.2	\$295.7	\$400.7	\$405.3
Quantities:			2	4	6	6

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is 54 CVLSP for AFSPC and AFDW. Depending upon source selection and individual Major Command decisions, potential exists for additional purchase of 12 – 20 total aircraft for Pacific Air Forces, AETC, Air Force Material Command, and AFSOC (not considered in chart below). Current total UH-1N inventory is 62. (AFSPC = 25, AFDW = 19)

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
# Acft	0	0	2	6	12	18
%	0	0	4	11	22	33

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MINIATURE AIR LAUNCHED DECOY & JAMMER

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 64270F
Potential Add: \$14M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Miniature Air Launched Decoy (MALD) is a small, air launched, jet powered, expendable decoy designed to stimulate, deceive, and saturate enemy air defense networks. MALD-J adds a jamming capability to the MALD and is the stand-in jammer for the Joint Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA) Systems of Systems (SOS).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

MALD was recently added to the OSD Director, Operational Test & Evaluation (DOT&E) oversight list. The additional funds would allow for additional Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) assets and contractor test support for MALD. More funding would also benefit MALD-J risk reduction and technology maturity efforts.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson AZ is the prime contractor for the entire MALD air vehicle. Technical performance has been excellent and cost/schedule performance has been good.

Raytheon Electronic Warfare Systems, Goleta CA is a subcontractor for the electronic payload and jammer card. Technical performance has been good.

Other subcontractors developing crucial subsystems have an outstanding record of performance:

Raytheon Space Systems - CA
Composite Engineering Inc – CA
Hamilton Sundstrand – CA, IL
BAE Container Solutions – CO
ASEI - FL
Enser – FL
Engineering Fabrics Corp – GA
Eagle Picher - MO
Moog – NY
EDO – NY

Celestica – TX

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes: R-1, Line 72. \$96.2M

Since budget submittal, DOT&E has added MALD on its oversight list. Proposed add increases MALD IOT&E support as well as MALD-J risk reduction.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

RDT&E	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
FY08 PB	78.0	96.2	16.7	0.245	0.508	0.512	0.517

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional FY 08 money required.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

If funding is approved, an additional \$50.0M is required in FY 09 and \$29.2M in FY 10 due to a disconnect in MALD-J SDD funding. This disconnect will be addressed in the FY09 APOM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

\$180M RDT&E funding spent to date. The Decoy portion is currently in developmental flight test. Jettison testing as well as controlled flight testing on B-52 and F-16 has 14 of 14 tests successful. Jammer is currently in the risk reduction phase. Design prototypes and analysis have demonstrated effectiveness.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Air Force written policy validates this requirement. This position states that the Air Force conduct suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD) operations in order to gain and maintain air supremacy. The SEAD mission involves denying an integrated air defense system (IADS) its “kill chain” (find, fix, target, track, attack, and assess) by degrading, disrupting, or destroying components of the IADS. Since most IADS will minimize emissions to avoid detection, the capability to stimulate the IADS is required, as well as a capability to jam, and destroy with a

munition.

There are currently no expendable decoys in the Air Force inventory.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No. This is a sole source acquisition.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Funding is for RDT&E.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
FORCE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA 01
Program Element: 28047F
Potential Add: \$250M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Since 9/11, Air Force Integrated Base Defense (IBD) Assets have depleted dramatically due to the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) and Air Force bases ability to mitigate Anti-terrorism. Identified anti-terrorism vulnerabilities at both Continental United States and Outside the Continental United States installations remain unaddressed due to the lack of program dollars. Integration of ground based radar technologies world-wide is critical to IBD and achieving the principle concepts of "See First, Understand First and Act First." Further, Expeditionary Combat Airmen need proper deployment equipment, protective body armor, ballistic helmets, non-lethal weapons sets, tactical automated security systems, improvised explosive device (IED) defeat tools and tactical communications on the battlefield. Due to the GWOT, the burn rate of these items is causing them to be expended a higher rate than the IBD program can replenish them.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funding will integrated ground based radars, wide-area thermal imagers and installs various sensor phenomena for required detection around Protection Level (PL) 1 – 3 critical resources. It would also provide for single point of annunciation for all PL and resource protection sensors at each installation within to one common relevant operating picture. Funding will replace inefficient and aging systems identified by the Security Effectiveness Assessments (SEA) at all select bases and provide security systems to support new missions brought into area of responsibility. Additionally, logistics detail equipment for deploying airman, ballistic helmets, individual protective armor, non lethal weapons sets, tactical communications, tactical automated security systems and IED defeat tools. Funding will remedy anti-terrorism vulnerabilities identified from a host of higher headquarters assessment teams to mitigate the prevailing threat. Further, IED defeat tools such as Specialized Search Dogs and Robotics are critical to fighting the GWOT and protecting the force.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The Integrated Base Defense Security System contractors on contract to integrate ground based radars through FY 08 are Northrop Grumman, ABACUS, ECSI and L3 Communications. Potential installs are for USAF bases in North Dakota, California, Massachusetts, Alaska, Colorado, Virginia, Connecticut, Illinois, Alabama, Texas, Oklahoma, Florida, Mississippi, Arizona, Idaho, North Carolina, South Carolina, New Mexico, Nevada, Georgia, Tennessee, and Ohio.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No dedicated funding programmed for these efforts except for Specialized Search Dogs and Robotics.

FY 08 Appn

\$ 5.2M Other Procurement (OPAF)

\$2.7M O&M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Specialized Search Dogs and Robotics only.

FY 08	FY09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
-------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------

\$7.9M	\$5.1M	\$3.0M	\$3.1M	\$3.1M	\$3.2M
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None in FY08, the lead time for manufacturing capacity to replace the logistic details would take over six months. Additional funding would be required in FY 09 to complete installation and integration of ground based radars at various USAF installations and continues work to mitigate Anti-terrorism vulnerabilities.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

We anticipate FY 09 costs for completing ground based radar installations would be approximately \$24M.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes—refer to paragraph 1 above, plus the fact that existing security systems in support of Protection Level (PL) resources are beyond 10-year lifecycle or nonexistent. The IBD program mandates employment of available technology to protect Air Force personnel and PL resources. Ground based radars and wide-area thermal imagers exist at USAF installations yet funding has been absent to integrate and employ them. These systems and equipment enable USAF security forces to protect against a continually changing threat. Furthermore, current systems are decaying and not compliant with Air Force instructions. Nor do the current systems provide commanders the target-detection capability needed to properly protect personnel, PL resources, and other mission-critical assets. These problems drive an increased use of Air Force manpower in already over-stress career fields. Lack of funding will result in significant shortfalls in the ability to survey, install, activate, and maintain needed alarm systems for protection of PL resources, facilities, and other alarmed areas.

Logistic detail requirements are outlined in Air Force Instructions and individual protective equipment (i.e. helmets, body armor) requirements are in allowance tables. Non-lethal weapons sets requirements are articulated in Mission Capabilities Statements maintained by the HQ USAF Requirements Directorate.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

We could save money by using our existing IBDSS contract which expires at the end of FY 08. Funding the IBDSS installation in FY 08 mitigates future acquisition inflation costs. Our current budget is not robust enough to fund each USAF installation ground based radar installations.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium to high military value because it directly supports the 2020 IBD Concept of Operations mandating advanced hostile target detection of threats against installations. It also provides protection for mission critical assets and resources, and new missions such as the F-22A and C-17. Without funding, IBD Security System cannot be the force multiplier needed to ensure security requirements for PL resources will be met. With respect to individual protective equipment, burn rate of this item is essential to force protection and ultimately survival in a hostile environment.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

To meet logistics details requirements outlined in defined allowance table for each unit type

code. Individual protective equipment is commercial off of the shelf (COT), therefore no inventory exists. All IBD Security System integrated front-end processors and peripherals are Cots.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Congress did not add any FY07 funds for this item.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
A-10 WINGS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (AFAP)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 2070131F
Potential Add: \$37.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Thin-skin wings have exceeded their economic repair limit; it is more cost effective to replace them. The A-10/OA-10 Thunderbolt II operational requirement and the Program Management Directive extend the A-10/OA-10 aircraft service life to 16,000 hours. To meet the required aircraft service life, A-10/OA-10 thin-skin wings must be replaced with thick-wings similar to those used on the later lots of production aircraft. The overall project replaces 223 thin-skin wings on the A-10/OA-10 with new wings based on the existing thick-wing configuration, with improvements to known fatigue-critical locations. This action will prevent aircraft grounding due to shortage of serviceable wings in the inventory. Incorporates R&M enhancements to improve MC rates and increases inspection interval. Wing replacements will be installed as a part of the O&M funded Scheduled Structural Inspection (SSI). Consequently, there are no Air Force Aircraft Procurement (APAF)-funded installation costs.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Based on current structural condition and condemnation rates, the A-10/OA-10 fleet will not have enough serviceable wings for every fuselage beginning in FY11. Current FY08 funding provides for only six (6) wings in FY08. The proposed funding will enable the procurement of six (6) additional wings, buying down risk of potential groundings. The learning experienced from building the additional wings in FY08, will enable an additional wing to be procured in FY09, within the same funding.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Multiple aerospace industry contractors have expressed interest in the production of A-10 wings. No contractors have produced A-10 wings since the initial aircraft production by Fairchild. However, each contractor that submitted a proposal is a proven aircraft manufacturer with strong past performance. Contract award is targeted for May 2007.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding for the Wing replacement project is contained in the FY08 budget. The funding is in the A-10 Squadrons program element (207131F). APAF: \$69.2M. The requested \$37.5M adds six additional wings in FY2008.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes, the FY08 PB contains APAF TY\$M funding as follows:

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	Total
\$69.20	\$95.70	\$247.30	\$258.50	\$263.60	\$268.90	\$ 1,203.2

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

The FY08 PB contains funding of \$1,203.2M for the period FY08-13, exclusive of any additional FY08 funding. This funding is estimated to procure 183 of 223 wings, leaving a balance of 40 wings. The proposed \$37.5M funding reduces this balance to 33, by buying 6 wings in FY08 and reducing the cost for FY09 wings (due to learning curve pricing) such that an additional wing can be purchased in FY09. The estimated cost of these remaining 33 wings is \$200M and is beyond the FYDP.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The A-10/OA-10 operational requirement and Program Management Directive extend the A-10/OA-10 aircraft service life to 16,000 hours. This requirement is currently being met via the Service Life Extension Program (SLEP) and follow-on Scheduled Structural Inspection (SSI), which repair operational wings as well as wings that can be retrieved from Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona. By FY11, the supply of AMARC wings and routable pool will be exhausted. At that point, wings that fail in depot (35%) will not have an available replacement. To meet the required aircraft service life, A/OA-10 thin-skin wings must be replaced with thick-skin wings similar to those used on the later lots of production aircraft. The Fleet Viability Board has accomplished a

thorough review of the SLEP/SSI programs, and projects a net savings of \$1.3B due to the Wing Replacement Program.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Based on learning curve pricing (later wings are less expensive than earlier wings), the acquisition and inflation savings are \$40M (net). There are also operational savings, since 6 fewer wings will require extensive repair in FY11. The operational savings are \$16.2M. The revised funding profile is below.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Total funding (FY08 PB)	68.3	94.7	245.0	256.3	261.6	267.4
Funded wing buy	6	12	37	42	42	42

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding w/added funds	105.8	94.7	245.0	256.3	261.6	267.4
Revised wing buy	12	13	37	42	42	42

Note that, with the same amount of funding FY09, we can now buy one (1) additional wing due to cost savings from the larger buy in FY08.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

A-10 wings have high military value. The A-10 is the country's primary airframe for the Close-Air Support mission. Wing replacements increase mission capable rates, providing more support to the warfighter.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No. this simply buys down the shortfall.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Wings delivered	0	0	0	0	6	16	37	42
Inventory on hand	0	0	0	0	6	22	59	101

% of inventory objective	0	0	0	0	3	10	26	45
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

\$11M was appropriated in FY 2007 to procure an additional LRIP replacement wing. Congressional add has been released to the program via the program office and will be obligated upon contract award in May 2007.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MOBILITY AIR FORCES (MAF) AND AIR FORCE SPECIAL OPERATION COMMAND
(AFSOC) AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: Multiple
Potential Add: \$209.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.
 - C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS) offers protection against heat seeking/infrared surface to air missile systems and consists of an AAR-47 missile detection system and an ALE-47 countermeasures dispensing system. Continuing proliferation of heat seeking/infrared Man Portable Air Defense Systems (MANPADS) makes the addition of defensive systems to the C-5A fleet invaluable and urgent as the Global War on Terror (GWOT) continues. Presently, the only C-5s authorized to operate into COCOM designated hostile airfields are C-5Bs (because C-5As do not have a viable defensive capability and are vulnerable to known missile threats). Funding C-5A ADS will enable C-5A operations into hostile fields, will help relieve the heavy burden on the over-utilized C-5B fleet, and will alleviate the upcoming decrease in C-5B availability due to scheduled Aircraft Modernization Program (AMP) and Reliability Enhancement and Re-Engining Program (RERP) modifications. Funding C-5A ADS measurably increases vital strategic airlift capability in direct support of the GWOT for minimal investment (the C-5A fleet represents over 25% of U.S. outsize cargo air transport capability). This plus up modifies completes modification of 30 Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard C-5A aircraft with Group A wiring and procures Group B equipment, spares, and support equipment.
 - AC-130 Large Aircraft Infrared Counter Measures (LAIRCM). Provides IR missile protection for special operation aircraft. Funds LAIRCM retrofits for the AC-130H and AC-130U with the laser baser LAIRCM system.
 - MC-130 LAIRCM. Provides IR missile protection for special operation aircraft. Funds LAIRCM installation on 12 MC-130P aircraft and retrofits the MC-130H with the laser baser LAIRCM system.
 - AMC LAIRCM. Accelerates installation of Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) capability on 8 C-17s and 6 C-130s in full configuration. Mobility aircraft are frequently targeted by Infrared (IR) Man Portable Air Defense Systems during OIF missions. LAIRCM provides a covert and more effective means to protect these high-value assets than current flare defensive systems.
 - C-5 Armor. Due to recent intelligence threat reporting and AMC aircraft incidents, AMC has an urgent and compelling need to equip AMC, ARC, and NGB C-5A/B/C aircraft with cockpit, LOX bottle, and troop door armor. Recently revised CENTCOM theater guidance requires aircraft be equipped with armor to operate in specified areas of the Area of Responsibility (AOR). Failure to procure/equip the C-5 fleet with a minimum of

7.62mm protective armor will result in C-5 aircraft not being allowed to operate into critical locations in the AOR. Addition of armor protection to the aircraft will increase aircraft and aircrew survivability against demonstrated small arms fire threats. Loss of an aircraft and/or loss of life from small arms fire is a real threat and would impact the Air Force mission in the GWOT.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?
 - *C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS) Air Force Reserve Command will have 42 C-5s in its inventory by the end of FY07, but only 17 have ADS installed (16 B-models, one A-model); the AFRC requirement is for funding to install ADS on their remaining 25 C-5As through the 565th ACSS (C-5). The Air National Guard will have 33 C-5s in its inventory by the end of FY07 (all A models), none of which have ADS installed; the ANG requirement is for funding to install ADS on 33 C-5As through the 565th ACSS (C-5). While the full requirement is for ADS on the entire C-5A fleet, AFRC and ANG both support the lead-command sponsored “MAF C-5A ADS” program outlined below as part of the solution to the full requirement of 59 tails.*

MAF C-5A ADS program schedule

Schedule	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Kits	0	6	12	12	0
Installs	0	0	6	12	12

- AC-130 LAIRCM. Funds non recurring engineering (NRE). Corrects disconnect in retrofit program.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. Funds non recurring engineering (NRE). Funds initial installation on the MC-130P and corrects disconnect in retrofit program.
- AMC LAIRCM. Funds will be used to accelerate LAIRCM procurement/installations on 8 C-17s and 6 C-130Hs.
- C-5 Armor. This funding would procure and install cockpit, troop door, and LOX bottle armor for 100 C-5 aircraft, thus preserving their ability to operate within critical areas of the CENTCOM AOR. Small arms fire constitutes a known threat to C-5 operations worldwide. The only mitigation is to keep aircraft out of medium threat areas, which is not possible while directly supporting our warfighters

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS).

Company

L3 Communications
Alliant Techsystems

Location

Lexington, KY; Crestview, FL; Waco, TX
Edina, MN

- AC-130 LAIRCM.

Company

Northrop Grumman DSD
Northrop Grumman Electronic Systems
Lockheed Martin Systems Integration

Location

Rolling Meadows, IL
Baltimore, MD
Owego, NY

L-3 Crestview Aerospace	Crestview, FL
FLIR Systems/Indigo	Santa Barbara, CA
Ball Aerospace	Boulder, CO
Rockwell Collins	Carlsbad, CA
MOOG	Blacksburg, VA
Kuchera Defense Industries	Johnstown, PA

- MC-130 LAIRCM.

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>
Northrop Grumman DSD	Rolling Meadows, IL
Northrop Grumman Electronic Systems	Baltimore, MD
Lockheed Martin Systems Integration	Owego, NY
L-3 Crestview Aerospace	Crestview, FL
FLIR Systems/Indigo	Santa Barbara, CA
Ball Aerospace	Boulder, CO
Rockwell Collins	Carlsbad, CA
MOOG	Blacksburg, VA
Kuchera Defense Industries	Johnstown, PA

- AMC LAIRCM. C-17:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>
Northrop Grumman	Rolling Meadows, IL
Boeing Aerospace	Long Beach, CA
Lockheed Martin System Integration	Various Locations
Crestview Aerospace	Crestview, FL (LMSI subcontractor)

- C-5 Armor.

<u>Company</u>	<u>Location</u>
LastArmor (Foster-Miller, Inc.)	Waltham, MA,

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

- AC-130 LAIRCM. Adds of: FY07 \$2.3
- MC-130 LAIRCM. Add of: FY07 \$3.7
- AMC LAIRCM. No
- C-5 Armor No. However, the Air Force Reserve allocated \$2.5M of FY07 AFR NGREA that will procure 11-12 armor kits for its C-5s at Westover MA. Those funds have been approved by Congress and released by OSD, but have not yet been obligated. AFR, in conjunction with the appropriate AFMC sustainment group (579 CBSS), expects to obligate those funds (for 11-12 kits) within 6 to 8 weeks.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS): No
- C-5 Armor: No
- AC-130 LAIRCM: FY08 \$26.1M

- MC-130: No
- AMC LAIRCM: Yes

LAIRCM procurement funding (\$M)

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$212.5M	\$232.2M	\$323.2M	\$76.1M	\$53.6M	\$203.7M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). None.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. None.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. None.
- AMC LAIRCM. None.
- C-5 Armor. None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS) For cost and schedule of the proposed MAF C-5A ADS program sponsored by AMC and supported by AFRC and ANG, please see table below:

Schedule	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Cost	0	\$5.6	\$11.7	\$14.4	\$9.6
Kits	0	6	12	12	0
Installs	0	0	6	12	12

AFRC, ANG, and AMC will continue to pursue funding to address the full C-5A ADS requirement in order to meet the nation's continued airlift needs. Since the MAF C-5A ADS program detailed above ends in FY10, expect AMC (lead command) to bring forward another MAF C-5A ADS funding request in its FY10 POM submission if the requirement has not been fully funded from other sources before the FY10 POM build begins in 2008. Expect this FY10 POM submission to be fully supported by AFRC and ANG, as it was for the FY08 POM submission.

Note: As stated earlier, the final inventory objective is to equip the entire fleet of C-5A aircraft with ADS (full requirement: 26 AFRC aircraft, 33 ANG aircraft). AFRC and ANG will continue to POM for this full requirement until it is met.

- AC-130 LAIRCM \$18M to complete the AC-130
- MC-130 LAIRCM \$35.3M to complete MC-130H and P
- AMC LAIRCM. No additional investment funding would be required in FY 08 to complete these 8 C-17 and 6 C-130Hs LAIRCM modifications. However, acceleration will require additional O & M funding in the out years. AMC plans to pursue additional funding for C-17, C-130H, C-130J, C-5, C-37, C-40, and KC-135 LAIRCM in the FY09

APOM.

- C-5 Armor. None. \$18.5M would procure enough kits to complete the C-5 armor requirement for the fleet of 111 aircraft.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). This is not an R&D item. C-5 ADS is in use today on the entire C-5B fleet and one C-5A.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. No longer an R&D program. AMC is installing on their aircraft today as is AFSOC on its new acquisitions.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. No longer an R&D program. AMC is installing on their aircraft today as is AFSOC on its new acquisitions.
- AMC LAIRCM. Not applicable. This program received their Full Rate Production Decision in Apr 05.
- C-5 Armor. This is not an R&D item.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). Yes. (Ref: AMC/ACC 207-81-III Airlift Defensive Systems ORD; AMC MNS 014-92, CAF ORD 366-88-I/II-A, and MAC Statement of Operational Need for Airlift Defensive Systems. Classified documents available on request). From AMC/ACC 207-81-III, paragraph 1c (U): The worldwide proliferation of IR-guided, surface –to-air missiles (SAMs) makes airlift aircraft extremely vulnerable to attack during low-altitude operations, particularly during approach and landing. Airlift assets are not equipped to counter this threat, and even low attrition rates from hostile air defenses and terrorists can have adverse effects on mission accomplishment. Limited airlift assets must be protected to support US national objectives. Loss of even one C-5 aircraft could equate to the inability to evacuate casualties from the theater, or failure to resupply a brigade with critically needed equipment. In these situations, airlift aircraft self-protection capability is needed to detect and dispense appropriate countermeasures to decoy the threat.”
 - Presently, the lack of C-5A ADS requires transloading GWOT cargo onto ADS equipped aircraft for delivery into high threat fields (locations of fields classified). This requirement reduces cargo velocity and contributes to both the under-utilization of C-5As and the over-utilization of C-5Bs (Since 2001, the C-5A UTE is 525 hrs/yr, or 14% under glide path; the C-5B UTE is 1008 hrs/yr, or 23% over glide path). As the C-5B fleet begins full-rate AMP and RERP modifications, C-5A ADS will be needed to meet continuing GWOT airlift needs (presently, C-5As are carrying 33% of the GWOT cargo and 37% of the GWOT passengers transported by the C-5 fleet; this percentage will have to increase to keep pace as GWOT operations continue). C-5A ADS offers a high return in capability for minimal investment (58 of 59 A-models need ADS at \$1.25M per copy; 25 of these aircraft are assigned to the AFR, 33 are assigned to the ANG).
- AC-130 LAIRCM. Yes, active IR missile protection. This adjustment would increase the effectiveness of the systems currently installed on AFSOC gunships by upgrading to the

laser based system. Increases in reliability and maintainability will significantly reduce the \$25M per year we expect to spend maintaining the lamp based system. The requirement is for an active IR jammer which causes a break lock in the missile seeker creating a large miss distance. Current lamp based systems induce errors in the seeker creating small sometimes very close miss distances. Aircraft without the AAQ-24 LAIRCM have to rely on the less effective decoy ability of self protection flares.

- MC-130 LAIRCM. Yes, active IR missile protection. This adjustment would provide protection to unprotected aircraft (MC-130P) and increase the effectiveness of the systems currently installed on AFSOC aircraft (MC-130H) by upgrading to the laser based system. Increases in reliability and maintainability will significantly reduce the \$25M per year we expect to spend maintaining the lamp based system. The requirement is for an active IR jammer which causes a break lock in the missile seeker creating a large miss distance. Current lamp based systems induce errors in the seeker creating small sometimes very close miss distances. Aircraft without the AAQ-24 LAIRCM have to rely on the less effective decoy ability of self protection flares.
- AMC LAIRCM. Yes. On 3 Aug 98, the USAF VCSAF approved the operational requirement for LAIRCM. This is documented in AMC/ACC/AFSOC Operational Requirements Document (ORD) 314-92. A LAIRCM ORD Annex was validated 25 Jan 01. On 7 Nov 02, AMC issued a Combat Mission Need Statement (CMNS) for accelerated infrared countermeasure capability. This mission need was approved by AF/CC on 27 Nov 02. Today, C-17s and C-130s fly missions into areas where they are vulnerable to attack by IR-seeking surface-to-air missiles (SAMs). Current flare-based defensive systems are limited in their ability to defend against these attacks, especially from more advanced IR SAMs. LAIRCM provides an improvement over current defensive systems.
- C-5 Armor. Yes. (Ref: AF Form 1067 (number TBA), CENTOM SPINS. Classified documents available on request). The worldwide proliferation of small arms makes airlift aircraft vulnerable to attack during low-altitude operations, particularly during approach and landing. Airlift assets are not presently equipped to counter this threat, and even low attrition rates from hostile air defenses and terrorists can have adverse effects on mission accomplishment. Limited airlift assets must be protected to support US national objectives. Loss of even one C-5 aircraft could equate to an inability to evacuate casualties from the theater, or failure to resupply a brigade with critically needed equipment. In these situations, airlift aircraft self-protection capability is needed. C-5 armor offers a high return in capability for minimal investment.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). Acquisition Savings: TBD (Congress has provided no funding for this program to date). Operational Savings: Once fielded, operational savings will be generated through eliminating costly and inefficient cargo transload operations now required due to the lack of C-5A ADS (see #9 above). These transload operations cause delayed delivery of supplies and equipment to the warfighter. Please also see #14 below for detail on the documented Congressional interest in this problem.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. The savings we expect are in O&M costs. The reliability of the

current lamp based systems is driving a projected \$25M per year in CLS cost. We are expecting to reduce that by about half.

- MC-130 LAIRCM. The savings we expect are in O&M costs. The reliability of the current lamp based systems is driving a projected \$25M per year in CLS cost. We are expecting to reduce that by about half.
- AMC LAIRCM. There will be direct savings that would result by funding this acceleration. However, the requirement is to equip the entire fleet of C-17s and 150 C-130s with LAIRCM. Any savings generated by installing LAIRCM now will be directly applied to LAIRCM installations on the remaining C-17s and C-130s in the AF inventory.
- C-5 Armor. Acquisition Savings: TBD (Congress has provided no funding for this program to date). Operational Savings: Once fielded, operational savings will be generated through eliminating costly and inefficient cargo transload operations required due to the lack of C-5 armor (see #9 above). These transload operations cause delayed delivery of personnel, supplies and equipment to the warfighter.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). High Military Value. Funding the MAF C-5 ADS program will enable a significant portion of the U.S. C-5 fleet, now restricted from operating into designated high-threat airfields, to direct-deliver vital over-and-ousize cargo to the warfighter in support of the continuing GWOT. C-5A ADS offers a high return in capability for minimal investment (58 of 59 A-models need ADS at \$1.25M per copy; 25 of these aircraft are assigned to the AFR, 33 are assigned to the ANG). The C-5A fleet of 59 aircraft represents over 25% of the U.S. ousize cargo air transport capability.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. High – protection of personnel and aircraft
- MC-130 LAIRCM. High – protection of personnel and aircraft
- AMC LAIRCM. These items are assessed as high military value.
- C-5 Armor. High Military Value. Funding the C-5 armor buy will enable the U.S. C-5 fleet, now restricted from operating into critical areas, to direct-deliver vital over-and-ousize cargo to the warfighter in support of the continuing GWOT. C-5 armor offers a high return in capability for minimal investment.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). No.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. No, LAIRCM program is ongoing within AMC, this would jump start AFSOC's participation.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. No, LAIRCM program is ongoing within AMC, this would jump start AFSOC's participation.
- AMC LAIRCM. No.
- C-5 Armor. No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). The inventory objective of the MAF C-5 ADS

program submitted in the FY08 POM and FY07/08 supplemental request was for ADS on 30 C-5A aircraft by the end of FY11, per below:

Schedule	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Kits	0	6	12	12	0	0
Installs	0	0	6	12	12	0

Note: As stated earlier, the final inventory objective is to equip the entire fleet of C-5A aircraft with ADS (full requirement: 26 AFRC aircraft, 33 ANG aircraft).

- AC-130 LAIRCM. Retrofit on 25 aircraft and spares.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. New installs on 23 aircraft and spares, retrofit on another 20 others and spares.
- AMC LAIRCM. Inventory objective is for entire C-17, C-40, and C-37 fleets, 150 C-130s, 50 C-5s, and 22 KC-135 to eventually receive LAIRCM capability.

	Previous	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Assets	72	108	135	149	163	173	175
%	15.5	23.3	29.1	32.1	35.1	37.3	37.7

- C-5 Armor. The inventory objective of the C-5 armor program is to equip the entire C-5 fleet of 111 aircraft:

Schedule	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
Kits	0	111	0	0	0	0
Installs	0	111	0	0	0	0

Note: As stated earlier, AFR is planning to procure 11 armor kits with FY07 NGREA funding.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). None.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. FY06 \$2.7M has been released to the 654 AES, Wright-Patterson AFB and should be obligated next month.
- MC-130 LAIRCM. FY06 \$2.7M has been released to the 654 AES, Wright-Patterson AFB and should be obligated next month.
- AMC LAIRCM. N/A
- C-5 Armor. The Air Force Reserve allocated \$2.5M of FY07 AFR NGREA that will procure 11-12 armor kits for its C-5Bs at Westover MA. Those funds have been approved by Congress and released by OSD, but have not yet been obligated. AFR, in conjunction with the appropriate AFMC sustainment group (579 CBSS), expects to obligate those funds (for 11-12 kits) within 6 to 8 weeks.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

- C-5 Airlift Defensive System (ADS). No.
- AC-130 LAIRCM. No.

- MC-130 LAIRCM. No.
- AMC LAIRCM. No.
- C-5 Armor. No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK (AEA)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 64429F
Potential Add: \$35.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Funding provides \$30.0M to begin development of the Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA) and Core Component Jammer (CCJ). CCJ provides large high power jamming arrays installed in pods to be carried by the B-52. Associated receiver modifications and electronic warfare battle management capabilities are also part of the development effort. Additional \$5.5M supports technology maturation and reduces risk in areas essential for effective electronic attack. These risk areas are common to all components of the AEA System of Systems (SoS) and include such items as high-powered arrays and new and advanced AEA techniques development.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Money would be used for CCJ Milestone B preparation/risk reduction, and the maturation of critical AEA technologies, including high-powered arrays and advanced AEA techniques development.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

No prime contractor for CCJ has been selected yet.

Critical AEA technologies are supported by:
Northrop Grumman – Maryland; Illinois
ITT – New Jersey
Raytheon – California
BAE – Pennsylvania; New Hampshire; Indiana
EDO – New York
Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory – Maryland
ATK-Mission Research - Ohio
Georgia Tech Research Institute – Georgia

All contractor performance to date has been excellent in supporting AEA.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

RDT&E / PE: 64429F / R-1 / Line 78 / \$20M

This request would add \$35.5M in FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

PE: 64429F	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
RDT&E	20.0	24.7	11.8	11.8	12.0	12.2

Funding line only address AEA, which includes \$8M in FY08 and \$12.5 in FY09 for AEA technology maturation. The remaining funding is for AEA System of Systems management and network development. There are no funds in the current funding line for the Core Component Jammer (CCJ)

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An additional \$3.9B will be required to completely fund the Core Component Jammer program. \$1.66B of that is required within the FYDP. Additional funding for CCJ will be pursued during the FY09 APOM and FY 10 POM processes. No additional funding than that already budgeted is required for AEA technical maturation at this time.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

No funding to date has been provided to CCJ. AEA has invested \$42.4M in tech maturation and studies.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph

description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by a validated written requirement supported by an Air Combat Command Concept of Operations for Airborne Electronic Attack in Nov 03.

The Standoff component needs to deliver effective jamming (electronic attack) to a known area/location at a specified time. This is predicated on available space and power on the platform. It must also employ in a manner to directly support long-range strike (and non-strike) weapon systems and maintain required line-of-sight to the threat area. Additionally, it must have the potential to provide a reactive AEA capability to employ effective jamming in a timely manner to deny engagement of friendly forces. Other characteristics include a multi-mission/multi-role capability, self protection, and persistence over the battlespace. A platform with a multi-mission/multi-role capability gives planners and on-site commanders more flexibility to satisfy a variety of combatant commander requirements.

U.S. Navy EA-6Bs currently provides AEA expeditionary support for the USAF. These aircraft are currently scheduled to be retired from service by 2012. The USAF has agreed to provide an indigenous AEA capability in support of expeditionary missions. In light of the future threat, the CCJ (Component of the AEA) will be the only asset available and capable to meet the validated standoff component requirement for the warfighter. Currently, there is no anticipated savings; rather, derived new capability.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

There is no current program for the Core Component Jammer. Savings cannot be calculated as no baseline program exists.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No. The add-on funding does not change the acquisition plan

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is for 30 modified aircraft and 24 pod sets. Aircraft and pod deliveries begin in FY 15.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No CCJ funds were provided in FY 2007.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

None.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SELF-AWARENESS SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: 63438F
Potential Add: \$50M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Self-Awareness Space Situational Awareness (SASSA) program will develop a payload that will enhance awareness of both environmental and emerging man-made threats for critical DOD satellites. This payload will have a suite of sensors in the visible through the RF spectrum that will detect and locate threats to the satellite health. The payload's visible camera will provide notification and characterization of near-by objects. The payload will be designed to be lightweight with easy integration into a satellite bus. SASSA will interface with the Rapid Attack Identification, Detection and Response System (RAIDRS) and Integrated SSA (ISSA) which are under development.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

SASSA will procure a single Block 10 payload that will be ready for integration into the ORS/TacSat program or another space vehicle. FY08 funding would result in delivery of the payload in two years.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

SASSA would utilize several contractors that have built some of the individual sensor suites. An integrating contractor would be selected to build the payload. Potential contractors include Raytheon, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, and Northrop Grumman.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None for the Block 10 payload. However additional funding would be required for the bus, space vehicle integration, and launch. If the payload will be integrated into ORS, then funding for those additional costs will come from that program. Those costs are already part of the ORS FYDP.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

Individual sensors that will go into SASSA have been funded and developed by multiple programs in the past.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The STRATCOM Joint Capability Document for Space Control highlights the need for this capability:

Characterize, assess, and resolve anomalies/attacks on all space systems: Provide indications and warning of attack, supports resolution of anomalies, provides information sufficient to attribute sources of attack/interference and supports battle damage assessment on adversary space systems.

SASSA will provide this required capability by having a suite of sensors that will supply the necessary information to warn of environmental and man-made threats. Since SASSA will interface directly with RAIDRS and ISSA, the information from SASSA will be provided directly to JFCC Space. This will improve timeliness of data and decision making capabilities for the warfighter.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A. SASSA would be a new project.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The final inventory for SASSA is TBD. The required number would be dependent on how many DoD satellites would require this capability.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

Request for funding is for an initial payload development. The number of sensors will be tailored to the funding level (design to cost). Subsequent blocks will expand upon the initial capability.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL OPERATION CENTER

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27410F
Potential Add: \$10M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

These funds would provide a feasibility analysis to determine the way-ahead for developing a common cyberspace infrastructure for our AF. It will also lay the foundation for building a global cyber enterprise to bring optimal war-fighting effectiveness with a coinciding point of "lowest cost of ownership."

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Identification of integrated backbone to enable a net-centric environment for the global enterprise of air, space and Cyber operation centers

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule? Purchase contractor support subject matter expertise and associated costs.

The Air Force expects to employ multiple contractors if this program is funded. However, our current plan is to purchase contractor support upon approval of funds. The contractor would then be selected through the normal acquisition process.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2007 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit? No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

An Air Force validated written requirement exists for this item. The AF approach proposes to eliminate through this initiative, non-interoperability, lack of data transparency, and duplication. These funds would provide a feasibility analysis to determine the way-ahead for developing a common cyberspace infrastructure for our AF. It will also lay the foundation for building a global cyber enterprise to bring optimal war-fighting effectiveness while coinciding with the Air Force’s desire for “lowest cost of ownership.”

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High - directly supports full spectrum of integrated global effects (kinetic/non-kinetic).

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ADVANCE TARGETING PODS PROCUREMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 27249F
Potential Add: \$22M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Advanced targeting pods provide precision targeting capability for use with precision guided munitions on fighter, bomber, and attack aircraft. Also used for non-traditional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and providing real-time situational awareness to ground forces equipped with multi-channel video receivers ROVER III units for receiving video. Plus up allows procurement of 10 additional pods, associated initial spares, and retrofits existing Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) pods with video downlink (VDL) kits.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The additional funding will procure 10 pods, their initial spares, and retrofit VDL kits.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Lockheed Martin Space and Missile Systems in FL is the prime contractor for Sniper pods. Major subcontractors include BAE, NH, and Exotic Electro-Optics, GA. Performance to date has been excellent.

Northrop-Grumman is the prime for LITENING pod VDL kits. Performance to date has been excellent.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. PE 27249F – APAF – P-78, \$105.4M

Proposed add increases the number of pods to be procured in FY08 to buy down warfighter shortfall and procures retrofit VDL kits for existing pods.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Pod procurement occurs throughout FYDP.

	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
FY08 PB	66.7	105.4	123.1	164.2	145.7	121.9	79.1

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None. Add is solely for increased procurement in FY08.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A, not an R&D item.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This item is supported by a validated and written Air Force requirement.

Advanced targeting pods are required to enable precision targeting of enemy assets, particularly in the destruction of enemy air defenses. Pod provides infra-red video, laser spot tracking, laser ranging, air-to-ground and air-to-air search/track.

Current use of ATPs will continue in the future, including application for non-traditional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, and providing situational awareness to ground forces through video downlink to multi-channel video receivers ROVER III equipped units.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Accelerating procurement could produce an inflation savings by effectively pulling production in from FY13 to FY08. Estimate of 2.5% year on \$40M is approx \$5.3M.

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
------	------	------	------	------	------	------

FY08 PB	66.7	148.3	123.1	164.2	145.7	121.9	31.1
Est Quantity	30	70	59	78	69	56	13

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High. ATPs have been in top 10 COCOM priority list for last two years.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No, pod is already in procurement based on a competitive selection.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

ACC target is 724 ATP.

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Cum Qty	349	379	449	508	586	655	711	724

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Congress added \$6.5M in FY07. Funds have been released and expect to obligate in 3QFY07.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

None.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MULTI-PLATFORM RADAR TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 0207450F
Potential Add: \$408.3M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This effort funds the technology under development to continue on to satisfy a capability for a forward, net-centric node for Battle Management and C2 of joint strike assets providing fire control quality data to joint shooters. The Multi-Platform Radar Technology Insertion Program (MP-RTIP) radar provides a focused Air Moving Target Indicator (AMTI) capability for Cruise Missile Defense (CMD); an advanced, next-generation Ground Moving Target Indicator (GMTI) and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) imaging capability for surface surveillance; and an open-system architecture to facilitate dynamic Battle Management, Command & Control (BMC2).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

There are two primary goals of the MP-RTIP Wide Area Surveillance (WAS) technology demonstration. The first is to conduct developmental flight test and verification of the MP-RTIP WAS sensor. The second primary goal is to demonstrate the end-to-end CMD capabilities of the MP-RTIP WAS radar, its associated BMC2, and integrated joint fire control capabilities. These demonstrations include the prosecution of airborne cruise missiles as well as the related ground launch equipment in other words; it will target both “the arrow and the archer.”

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? For the previous work done on this program:

Weapon System Integration Contract (Battle Management Command and Control [BMC2] and Platform Integration)

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>State</u>
Nothrop Grumman (NGC)	Florida
BOEING IDS	Washington
RAYTHEON/ L3	California/ Texas
BAE SYSTEMS	Massachusetts
GDAIS	Virginia
HARRIS	Florida
ORACLE	California
ZELTECH	Virginia
NGMS DMS (NGC)	Virginia

NGMS SRD (NGC)
NGES (NGC)

California
Maryland

What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule? Contract performance is excellent in terms of product quality. Cost and schedule performance is excellent with less than a 1 % cumulative variance to date.

For MP-RTIP:

MP-RTIP Contract

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>State</u>
Northrop Grumman (NGC)/ES	Connecticut
NGC ISWR	California
NGC IS/AGS	Florida
Raytheon	California

Contract performance is excellent in terms of product quality. Cost and schedule performance is excellent with no schedule variance and a 2 % cumulative cost variance to date.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

<i>FY 2008 PB (Dollars in Millions)</i>	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	Total
Total Program Element (PE 27450F) Cost	366.012	39.703	42.568	0.000	0.000	448.283
5131 Airframe	181.429	0.371	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5132 Sensor	184.583	39.332	42.568	0.000	0.000	0.000

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years?

FY09	FY10	FY11	Total
\$453M	\$373M	\$143M	\$969M

8. How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP (FY08 PB)?

\$ 40.3M in FY08 and \$42.6M in FY09.

Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM (FY10 POM)?

The FY10 intent is unknown at this time; however, the current ACC Strategic Master Plan calls for a capability for which a MP-RTIP technology demonstration is the initial step.

9. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

The RDT&E total to date is \$1.206 B. The MP-RTIP program has already begun flight testing for a Global Hawk radar variant in Sep 06. This flight testing will provide Developmental Testing analysis to both this program, as well, as the Global Hawk Block 40 program. The Global Hawk Block 40 (MP-RTIP) development will continue towards operational fielding in 2010.

10. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the existing requirement resides within the E-10A Capability Development Document Increment 1 (JROC-M, 10 November 2004). This program will demonstrate key aspects of the warfighting capability described as an enabling force element to support joint and multinational military operations worldwide. The advanced MP-RTIP radar provides an Airborne Moving Target Indicator (AMTI) for CMD and WAS surveillance (Ground Moving Target Indicator (GMTI) and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) images) to detect and identify moving and stationary objects. The capability provides flexible and responsive tactical-level BMC2 supported with organic Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities in support of joint operations throughout the range of military operations, from a "forced entry" phase of a small-scale contingency to Major Combat Operations (MCO). The program will demonstrate the capability to provide dynamic re-planning and precision targeting for joint air, ground, and maritime forces against Time Sensitive Targets (TSTs) and can be integrated with the developing Joint Command and Control (JC2) network-centric architecture and all-source intelligence exploitation systems to achieve the highest battlespace awareness.

Currently, the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) is the only platform that provides all weather wide area ground surveillance and limited command and control platform using SAR and GMTI to track stationary ground targets and slow moving aircraft and rotating antennas. However, Joint STARS does not provide the warfighter a cruise missile defense capability with integrate joint fire control. Additionally, it does not provide net-centric BMC2 which fuses the data provided by traditional and non-traditional ISR platforms.

11. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings would be received from this item in FY07 or FY08. This item re-instates FY08

funding level for a MP-RTIP technology demonstration.

12. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value to US and joint/coalition warfare.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M), Military Personnel (MILPERS)

Budget Activity:

Program Element: 51305F

Potential Add: \$46M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does. Air Forces Northern (AFNORTH) provides an Air Force Component Headquarters for United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM), delivering operational command/control (C2) for Homeland Air Defense. AFNORTH's mission dramatically increased after 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina. The mission has been funded by Congressional supplementals through FY07.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This effort will fund military manpower reprogramming officer to enlisted and Drill Status Guardsman to Active Guard Reserve (115 actions). Additionally, it will fund sustainment and operations of Falconer Air and Space Operations Center (AOC); and fund 222 Contractor Military Equivalents (CME) to continue bridge for military personnel shortfall until the FY09 APOM.

3. What contractor(s)(CME's) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

NORTHROP /ARINC

AOC	(Florida)
AFFOR STAFF	(Florida)
NE Air Defense Sector	(New York)
Western Air Defense Sector	(Wash. State)
101 IWF for AOC/C-NAF	(Utah)

Contractor performance has been exemplary. No issues with product quality or cost schedule including high tempo exercises or Defense Support to Civilian Authorities (DSCA) event actions. High experience levels of a majority of the contract force provide 1AF exceptional capability across each the mission area.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No. PE 51305F contains funding for 1AF at Pre-9/11 mission levels. Additional funding for validated tasking has been handled through temporary funding actions and supplementals.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. PE 51305F contains funding for 1AF at Pre-9/11 mission levels. Additional funding for validated tasking has been handled through temporary PDB actions.

	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
FY08 PB		121.3	124.8	117.7	121.3	125.5	130.0

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Funding will be required to be programmed in the FY09 APOM.

	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
FY09 APOM		47.3	48.3	49.4	50.5	51.7	

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A, not an R&D item.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This effort is supported by the Defense Planning Guidance and the Chief of the Air Force decision to realign 1AF to the ANG under the Direction of Air Combat Command. 9-11 expanded the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) mission requirements and with the standup of US NORTHCOM additional DSCA mission support and corresponding planning requirements resulted. The AF Forces Command and Control Enabling Concept 25 May 06 designated 1AF (AFNORTH) as the Number Air Force (NAF) respectively to US NORTHCOM.

US NORTHCOM has developed Operations Plan (OPLAN) 0606-08 directing actions for the establishing 1AF (AFNORTH) as the Air Force Service Component with an Full Operational Capability (FOC) date of 1 Oct 06 to accomplish its aerospace-based mission responses for Homeland defense (HD) and (DSCA). Failure to receive FY 08 funding support will directly impact current mission capability to Commander, United States Northern Command

(CDRUSNORTHCOM).

Cost savings from reduced Permanent Change of Station (PCS) and mission training requirements resulting from a much lower rate of personnel turnover if the permanently assigned and specifically trained AOC/Air Forces (AFFOR) Staff/Air Defense Sector Staffing plan remains intact.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

None.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
JOINT FORCES HEADQUARTERS NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION EQUIPMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 35895F (\$10.9M); 21110F (\$5M)
Potential Add: \$15.9M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

In June 2006, the CSAF approved the consolidation of the Pentagon, Bolling AFB, and Andrews AFB communications organizations under a single Communications Group assigned to Air Force District of Washington (AFDW). In conjunction with this merger are the ongoing Air Force Network Operations (AFNetOps) initiatives to consolidate all Field Operating Agencies (FOA)/Direct Reporting Units (DRU) Non-Classified Internet Protocol Router Network (NIPRNET) and Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) services within the National Capital Region (NCR) under the 844th Communications Group. This consolidation will enable enhanced Network Centric Operations in support of the Joint Task Force (JTF)-NCR and Headquarters Air Force (HAF) missions.

HAF Operations Order (OPORD) 3-06, currently in coordination, establishes a requirement to provide a robust and redundant network architecture to support the HAF Business Continuity staff as well as the HAF Command/Control (C2) Emergency Relocation Staff during crisis. This expanded support requires the construction of a replicated datacenter with large storage capacity in order to meet the data and service requirements of the HAF. The datacenter will provide automatic failover of IT services in the event of loss of the primary datacenter. The OPORD also establishes a requirement to support large scale dispersed operations of HAF personnel. This capability requires an upgrade to our existing network infrastructure to handle the increased number of remote users. These capabilities are key to supporting the JTF-NCR Commander during a crisis situation.

AFDW has a requirement for satellite air time to support the JTF-NCR Commander during contingencies in the NCR. AFDW is currently limited to terrestrial circuits for communications during a contingency event. The ability for the AFDW staff to communicate with higher headquarters and local authorities, no matter the state of the terrestrial circuits, is a key element to carrying out one of the tenets of the AFDW mission for the JTF-NCR Commander.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Purchase network infrastructure, server hardware, and services required to consolidate the IT infrastructure within the NCR. Procure 2,300 dispersed operations kits for HAF and AFDW personnel. Funds 80 hours of International Marine/Maritime Satellite (INMARSAT) and Iridium satellite air time for AFDW staff in support of JTF-NCR taskings.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Lockheed Martin currently provides Information Technology (IT) support to the HAF in the Pentagon. We anticipate their coverage will increase to include all of AFDW in FY08.

- Contractor performance and support of current HAF systems has been Excellent for both cost/schedule and performance.

The datacenter and network consolidation will have to be competitively bid as multiple vendors can provide the service.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

None.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

None.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

\$2.2M for annual recurring service costs for dispersed operations users.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
\$12.6M	\$13.2M	\$17.1M	\$14.3M

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a

brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Network Consolidation: Yes. HAF and AFDW users throughout the NCR currently reside on 3 different networks with administration personnel for each network. Consolidation of their network services and support will allow for a reduction in required facility space, personnel, and equipment. It will also prepare the NCR for the larger AF-wide consolidation to the I-NOSC at Langley AFB.

COOP: Yes. We are providing COOP support to just the HAF C2ERS staff at Site R. There is no built-in support for HAF BC staff.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Funding will not accelerate any existing program, but fulfills capability gaps and urgent needs to the warfighter. Furthermore, continuing to manage and maintain multiple networks within the NCR will increase overall IT support costs exponentially as the years progress.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The redundant datacenters at Andrews AFB, Bolling AFB and the Pentagon will provide 100TB replicated NIPRNET storage and 30TB SIPRNET storage. All 20,000 HAF and AFDW users migrated to the consolidated network. The requirement will also create a network infrastructure capable providing multiple intra-base connections between Bolling AFB, the Pentagon, and Andrews AFB and enable robust communications in a crisis event.

We currently have 16TB of usable storage at Bolling AFB and 76TB of storage at the Pentagon. Dual links exist between the Pentagon and Bolling AFB. A single link exists between Bolling AFB and Andrews AFB.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
DISTINGUISHED VISITOR/COMBATANT COMMANDER AIRLIFT SUPPORT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)

Budget Activity: 05

Program Element: PE 41314F

Procurement Line Item: P-22

Potential Add: \$393.6 for 6 C-37B aircraft/\$15.8M for C-32 Power Load Shed/\$38.4M for Electronic Flight Information System (EFIS) modification on 16 C-12 aircraft

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

C-37

The C-37B aircraft is a military version of the Gulfstream 550 business jet. The proposed purchase would add five C-37B aircraft to the current VIP Special Airlift (VIPSAM) fleet and add one C-37B aircraft to support current Combatant Commander Requirements. This program provides airlift support to the Vice President, Cabinet Members, Congress, Foreign Heads of State, Senior Government/DoD officials, and Combatant Commanders. Procurement of a Gulfstream C-37B will replace aging C-20Bs and ensure essential airlift to six combatant commanders.

C-32

C-32 is a commercial derivative 757-200 and was not designed to handle the increased demand for power the C-32 requires (communications suite and essential systems). During start-up operations the C-32 sheds power for up to 15 minutes resulting in shutting down communication capability and essential systems. The Power Load Shed modification will isolate essential systems from being shed; resulting in uninterrupted communications/safety for DV.

C-12 EFIS

Current C-12C/D/F/J configuration does not meet mandated Federal Aviation Administration, Communication Navigation Surveillance (CNS)/Air Traffic Management (ATM), Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) Navigation/Safety (Global Positioning System/Terrain Awareness and Warning System) requirements. Existing funds are already obligated to modify 11 of 27 C-12 aircraft with the Electronic Flight Instrument System (EFIS) modification. Air Force C-12 aircraft are operated by the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), Air Force Material Command (AFMC) and Pacific Air Forces (PACAF).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

C-37

Funds will be used for purchase of six C-37B aircraft.

C-32

Place Boeing on contract to engineer and fix the load shed problem.

C-12 EFIS

Funds will be obligated to complete the EFIS modification on the remaining 16 C-12 aircraft.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

C-37

The DoD has an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Savannah GA as the prime contractor. This would be the eleventh Air Force purchase of this airframe. All work would be performed in Georgia. All deliveries to date have been on time at the negotiated price.

C-32

The Boeing Corporation in Seattle, Washington would be the prime contractor for engineering and installation of the modification. Boeing is currently prime contractor for all heavy maintenance on the C-32, quality of products delivered has been outstanding and cost/schedule performance to date has been acceptable

C-12 EFIS

The L3 Vertex Aerospace LLC in Madison, MS, is the prime contractor for engineering and installation of the EFIS modification. L3 Vertex is currently prime contractor for all heavy maintenance on the C-12. The quality of products delivered is satisfactory and cost/schedule performance to date is acceptable.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

C-37

No.

C-32

No.

C-12 EFIS

Yes. APAF, \$690K.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

C-37

No.

C-32

No.

C-12 EFIS

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

C-37

None.

C-32

None.

C-12 EFIS

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

C-37

CSAF's VIPSAM modernization/standardization plan includes replacing existing C-20Bs with C-37Bs. Operational and Support cost will be programmed through POM cycles.

C-32

Funding would support engineering and kit buys (\$15.8M in FY08)

C-12 EFIS

If \$38.4M were received, no additional funds would be required; however modifications could not be accomplished in one year. Funding would be obligated as follows: \$38.4M in FY 2008 to modify 16 C-12 aircraft. Funding would support kit buys and installation. If end of year funding is not available, we would POM for the additional requirement.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

C-37

This is not an R&D effort.

C-32

This is not an R&D effort.

C-12 EFIS

This is not an R&D effort.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

C-37

No. However, the Air Mobility Command (AMC) is initiating a Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership & Education, Personnel, and Facilities Change Recommendation (DCR) which validates the need to replace the C-20Bs and identifies the following Operational Requirements Document (ORD) as meeting the requirement for these aircraft: “Combatant Commander Support and VIPSAM Medium Airlift Replacement” ORD, 16 Dec 2004. This ORD was used to procure C-37As and C-40Bs to support the Combatant Commanders and C-40Bs for VIPSAM. Additionally, the Air Force submitted a Congressional Report, “Transport Aircraft Requirements”, Nov 2004 that states, AMC wants to replace their C-20Bs by the end of FY09.

Currently, C-37As and C-20Bs are used for low volume (12 passengers or less) transport of VIPs. Replacing C-20Bs with C-37Bs improves range and communications capability while replacing aging aircraft that have increasing support costs. This increases capability for VIP to carry out the duties of their office while en route and decreases in-transit times by reducing the

number of en route stops for fuel, crew rest, etc. It provides new aircraft that cost less to support and reduces the logistics tail by reducing the number of types of aircraft. Additionally, this will reduce aircrew training and currency requirements since the crews only require currency in one aircraft vice both the C-37 and C-20.

Additionally, AF/A9 has accomplished a study which identified the current fleet of three C-37As supporting Continental United States (CONUS)-based COCOMs stationed at MacDill AFB unable to support current and forecasted demand. The addition C-37 will assist in meeting the current and forecasted demand pattern to ensure essential airlift support to six combatant commanders.

C-32

Yes, the requirement was validated by the AMC Configuration Review Board (CRB) through AF1067 AMC-04-196. The capability desired is to stop communication loss during engine start up/ground operations. Workaround; acft engine start is delayed or the DV has no communications during start-up and ground operation. Supporting security personnel are limited to ground radios during critical operations.

If funded; DV will have full communication capability through all operations to support the war fighter.

Cost savings; minimal.

C-12 EFIS

Yes, the requirement to provide operational support airlift is directed in the Annual Planning and Programming Guidance (APPG), U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) FY04-09 Integrated Priority List, the Air Mobility Strategic Plan 2002 (Paragraph 2.3.12), and validated by the AMC Configuration Review Board (CRB) through AF1067 (AMC-05-117).

The EFIS modification will ensure current C-12C/D/F/J configuration does meet mandated FAA, CNS/ATM, SECDEF Nav/Safety (GPS/TAWS) requirements.

Failure to meet all Congressional mandates/Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) requirements could ultimately render the entire fleet incapable of any appreciable mission accomplishment once more strict FAA and ICAO guidance/directives take effect. The already outdated C-12 cockpits might significantly hinder aircrews when flying in congested areas.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

C-37

No start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented.

C-32

If funded now, program might be able to take advantage of aircraft in depot for aux fuel tank restoration effort. At this point, cost savings would be inflationary only. Basic engineering efforts are required before any true cost savings are determined.

C-12 EFIS

If funded now, the program can continue without a gap in production. Cost savings would be inflationary (FY08 vs FY10) and start-up costs to restart a production line allowed to lapse.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

C-37

High military value.

C-32

The modification has a high military value to the C2 nature of the mission.

C-12 EFIS

The modification has a medium military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

C-37

No.

C-32

No.

C-12 EFIS

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

C-37

The objective is to replace existing C-20Bs with C-37Bs as proposed by CSAF's VIPSAM modernization/standardization plan. There are currently ten C-37As in the USAF inventory. FY06 National Defense Authorization Act provided additional funding for the purchase on one C-37B. The objective is to bring C-37 fleet to 16. Gulfstream no longer manufactures C-37As.

C-32

The objective will be to have sufficient spares available for the modification.

C-12 EFIS

The objective will be an inventory of fleet wide C-12 modified aircraft.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

C-37

No funding added in FY07

C-32

No funding has been appropriated for this effort.

C-12 EFIS

No funding has been appropriated for this effort.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

C-37

No.

C-32

Funding would be executed in FY 2008 for engineering, kit-buys, spares and possibly the first install. Remaining funds would be required for the remaining installs (3).

C-12 EFIS

Funding would be executed in FY 2008 for kit-buys and installs.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
THEATER DEPLOYMENT COMMUNICATIONS LOGISTICS DETAIL

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27422F
Potential Add: \$32.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Theater Deployment Communications (TDC) program is the USAF's primary deployable communications program and provides essential ground-based C2 capabilities in support of expeditionary aerospace operations. TDC provides forward-deployed personnel, units, or bases with secure and non-secure voice, data, and other critical communications capabilities via modular, scalable Unit Type Code (UTC)s. The proposed plus-up would fund initial support equipment Logistics Detail (LOGDET) shortfalls at 5 Air Combat Command ACC wings, 8 Active Duty and 28 Air Reserve Component Combat Communications Squadrons as well as funding to support the units' day-to-day operational costs.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The funding fixes initial support equipment LOGDET shortfalls at 40 ACC Active Duty/Gained units. The lack of adequate support equipment limits the units' ability to adequately train and prepare for worldwide deployment in support of the Global War on Terror, Homeland Defense, and response to natural disasters. The units are also severely underfunded for daily operations and need increased funding for general supply system and Government Purchase Card (GPC) purchases, tech refresh (i.e. laptops) shipping costs, Iridium/ International Maritime Satellite (INMARSAT) airtime, training and travel, and miscellaneous service contracts.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Items are purchased by individual units using local commercial vendors as well as items purchased through USAF Supply Systems and Centrally-Managed contracts.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$1.0M in O&M AF, Combat Communications.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. The FY08-13 profile is:

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$1M	\$3.3M	\$29.2M	\$29.3M	\$24.5M	\$24M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding requirements are anticipated for this mission at this time.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

No R&D required.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

A validated requirement exists for the fielding of the TDC prime mission equipment which consists of commercial-off-the-shelf voice and data switches, routing, network management, information assurance, short-and long haul radios and satellite communications systems. The requirement is to reduce the size, increase the capability, decrease the airlift, and provide increased capacity bandwidth for deployed users. Currently the mission is accomplished ad hoc, with assets being borrowed, scrounged, or procured using just-in-time resources. Providing required resources to these units will improve operational readiness and assure communications services are available to USAF airpower elements. Unit taskings are detailed in the USAF Program Guidance Letter issued by the Air Force Warfighting Integration and Chief Information Office.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

If not funded, this requirement will remain and the cost of meeting it will continue to rise each year due to inflation and the rising cost of equipment. The benefit of adequately equipping the units will be manifested in increased readiness.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This line item has high military value. TDC is the Air Force's primary go-to-war communications system and without adequate support equipment its ability to provide services is degraded. This is the primary system to disseminate critical Command and Control, Intelligence, and surveillance information such as Predator and Global Hawk, as well as weather, logistics, operations and other data required to prosecute a successful air campaign.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is adequate support equipment for 41 ACC Active Duty/ACC-Gained units. Shortfalls vary from location to location.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No funds were added for this item.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No. Contract vehicles are available for all items.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIM-120

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M), Missile Procurement (MPAF)
Budget Activity: BA01, BA02
Program Element: 0207163F
Potential Add: \$2.6M (O&M), \$3.9M (MPAF)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Software -- The Air Force Material Command (AFMC) is generating a software upgrade for AIM-120C-3/4/5/6 (AMRAAM) that helps maintain missile capability against some evolving electronic attack threats. Based on a recent performance study, an additional improvement to the software will aid missile performance under degraded platform cueing conditions; additional funds (\$1.6M) are needed to add this software improvement. Additionally, Operational Test (OT) is currently under-funded (\$1.0M). Until OT is completed, AFMC cannot field upgrades. The addition of funds in FY08 will enable much needed additional software improvements and the operational testing required to field the new software tape.

Motors -- 1,165 AMRAAM, AIM-120B/C (reprogrammable) missiles have bad Aerojet rocket motors which are impacted by a service life-limiting issue. Air Force plans to cannibalize good Alliant (ATK) rocket motors with a projected 25-yr service life from older AIM-120A (non-reprogrammable missiles) and swap with current be AIM-120B/Cs Aerojet rocket motors. Program is currently funded to complete 695 of the 1,165 swaps, leaving 470 unfunded rocket motors.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Software (\$2.6M/O&M) -- Improve missile performance of fielded AIM-120C-3/4/5/6 missiles and conduct sufficient operational testing for a software fielding decision.

Motors (\$3.9M/MPAF) -- Complete the 470 AIM-120B/C rocket motor swap-outs prior to the missiles' projected service-life limiting date (11 yrs of age) in FY08.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ, provides software updates, and schedule performance on present contract. Their performance has been very good and cost has been well controlled.

For motors, Raytheon is currently on a FY07 firm fixed price contract to complete 695 missile

swap-outs. They have completed 118 swap-outs and are 22 days ahead of contract delivery schedules.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding required in out years.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Software -- Yes, Operational Requirements Document for AMRAAM Preplanned Product Improvement (Jan 04) calls for periodic software updates (SWUP) capability improvements in order to maintain weapon effectiveness in the presence of evolving threats.

Motors -- No written requirement exists for the rocket motor swap-out program, however, the program would prevent the premature retirement of 470 AIM-120B/Cs, which do have validated requirements and otherwise remaining service life. The overall AIM-120 inventory is already below Non-Nuclear Consumable Annual Analysis System requirement levels and it is expected to decline in the near term due to other age and obsolescence issues.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in

then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Software -- If the improved capability is funded, a follow-on upgrade may be avoided, which would save the fixed cost of developing a new AMRAAM tape, \$1.5M to \$2.0M.

Motors -- No savings are provided by completing this effort in FY08; however, the program would prevent the premature retirement of 470 AIM-120B/Cs. To replace these missiles with 470 new-build AIM-120C7s would require \$305.5M at current per unit costs.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Software -- The full inventory of >2,000 AIM-120C-3/4/5/6 missiles would be enhanced by the software upgrade.

Motors -- Aging issues are forecast to increase inventory shortfalls by 2,500 missiles by FY11. The requested funds would complete motor swap-out prior to the expiration of the affected rocket motors service lives in FY08.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure,

personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
BQM-167 SUBSCALE TARGET MUNITIONS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: PE 35116F
Potential Add: \$3.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This funding would procure 140 additional Rocket Assisted Takeoff Motors (RATO) for launching subscale aerial targets. There is currently a critical shortage of these munitions that has a high potential of impact missile test missions beginning in mid FY07.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Procure RATO bottles which could not be bought due to increased vendor prices. This would fully support planned Developmental and Operational Air-to-Air Testing and Title 10 Live-Fire requirements.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

BQM-167 RATO munitions are completely accomplished by ATK Tactical Systems in WV. ATK's performance has been marginal on this effort. The logistical supply effort is to be completely accomplished by OO-ALC in UT and their performance has been good.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. Budget is contained in PE 35116 / BP17 / APAF/P-1 Line #79 (War Consumable). This request would increase the quantities for FY08. The dollars are spread:

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$4M	\$4.1M	\$4.2M	\$4.3M	\$4.4M	\$4.5M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. Budget is contained in PE 35116 / BP17 / 3010. The dollars are spread:

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
------	------	------	------	------	------

\$4M \$4.1M \$4.2M \$4.3M \$4.4M \$4.5M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years or the current FYDP. Yes, ACC plans to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. Title 10 U.S.C. for Live-Fire Testing, Oct 2005 DSB Report on Aerial Targets, COMACC Plan 85, Aerial Targets MNS, AFSAT ORD.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings will be realized but, losses (equivalent to amount requested) will be realized without additional funding. Without funding, these additional assets will not be procured and will limit the accomplishment of Title 10 required Live-Fire Testing.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

The systems requested are all for the accomplishment of Title 10 required Live-Fire Testing. As such, the military utility provided is as a test support function for all new, modified, or continuation weapon system development. Based on this they provide no direct military utility but, provide “high” indirect military utility as testing can not be accomplished without them.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Buffer identified is above and beyond that procured per year. Additional items would be utilized as emergency stock. Subscale RATO Munitions – maintain a buffer inventory of ~110 assets on hand at end of year and expend ~220 assets per year (one year cycle to procure a RATO munition)

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CLASSIFIED

PRIORITY #22
(CLASSIFIED)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
GPS MODERNIZED USER EQUIPMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Missile Procurement (MPAF)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 35164F
Potential Add: \$60.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The GPS Modernized User Equipment (MUE) program develops next-generation GPS user equipment for the DoD and International military allies that will defeat existing and emerging threats to position, navigation, and timing services. Three contractors were hired to develop new M-code receivers capable of defeating denial of service technologies encountered during operations in Iraq. The multi-vendor acquisition is designed to preserve an industrial base of GPS expertise across a wide variety of domestic and international military customers spanning airborne, maritime, ground and space applications.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The GPS Wing would use the additional funding to continue the MUE development on existing contracts with Rockwell-Collins, Raytheon, and L3 Communications IEC. The advanced Information Assurance security architecture that includes robust anti-jam and anti-spoof counter threat techniques would be matured and completed through the Critical Design Review (CDR). The additional funding would ensure competition across many military GPS business sectors during the production phase of the program and has the potential to significantly drive down production costs and program developmental risks.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The GPS Wing has three prime contracts for MUE development with Rockwell Collins (33%), Raytheon (33%), and L3 Communications IEC (33%). The funding is divided equally among the three primes.

Rockwell Collins is located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa and has a number of subcontracts.

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>State</u>
Rockwell Collins	IA
Cadence	NC
Mentor Graphics	MN
Mentor Graphics	AL
Validated Software	CO

Dini Group CA

Raytheon is located in El Segundo, CA and has a number of subcontracts. The contract percentages and personnel are as follows:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>State</u>
Raytheon	CA
Raytheon	MA
Raytheon	TX
General Dynamics	AZ
Trimble	CA
IBM	NY
XILINX	CO
Cadence	CA

L3 Communications IEC is located in Anaheim, CA and has a number of subcontracts. The contract percentages and personnel are as follows:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>State</u>
L3 Comm IEC	CA
Boeing	WA
DAC	MD
IBM	NY, NC, VT
MCR	CA, VA
MS	CA
PAS	CA
Titan	VA
RF Asics	CA

All three contractors have successfully completed a Systems Requirements Review and have delivered preliminary designs that should meet military requirements. All contractors are currently on schedule and within costs.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes, funding is contained in Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E), R-1 line for PE 35164F of the FY08 PB request for \$43.8M. This amount represents an MUE single vendor program with 50% confidence level. The additional \$60.0M would fund 3 vendors with 80% confidence level in FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes, funding is contained in the FY2008 PB through the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	Total
MUE Funding contained in the FY 2008 PB (single vendor - AFROCC MUE CDD) (\$M)	43.9	23.0	10.3	9.4	33.2	19.0	138.8

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years as follows:

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	Total
MUE shortfall (3 vendors - AFROCC MUE CDD) (\$M)	(60.0)	(70.0)	(60.0)	(49.7)	0.0	0.0	(239.7)

None of the additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP. However, We plan will plan to request additional funding for the multi-vendor strategy in the FY09 APOM and FY10 POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

As of January 2007 the total of \$199M has been invested in this program to date.

Testing is TBD and depends on platform integration schedules from the services. Next milestone is System Design Review, April 2007.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the requirements are contained in the AFROCC MUE CDD (17 Mar 05) validated by ACC and AFSPACECOM. The CDD states that the MUE development must be forwards and backwards compatible and must fit airborne and ground form factors.

In addition, the Global Positioning System User Equipment Development and Procurement Policy, published by ASD/NII on 07 August 2006, defines a requirement for all military receivers to be capable of receiving the M-code signal from the GPS constellation by the time

the 24th M-code satellite is mission capable.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Significant cost savings with maintaining a three contractor competitive environment could be realized when MUE receivers are placed into production. Market analysis by the Rand Corporation and The Aerospace Corporation places the penalty for a lack of a competitive manufacturer base to be between 23% and 43%. A market analysis by The Aerospace Corporation, based on the services MUE Roadmaps, place the acquisition savings between \$340M and \$410M when all military GPS User Equipment is considered.

Also, if the MUE program does not receive additional funding, the Program office would be forced to execute a single vendor procurement. This strategy may require the purchase of unlimited data rights in FY09 for \$210M. Although operational costs are not

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No, additional funding enhances competition during the procurement phase.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A. The MUE program is currently in the development phase.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SPACE-BASED SPACE SURVEILLANCE BLOCK 10 ACCELERATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 0604425F
Potential Add: \$35.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Space-Based Space Surveillance (SBSS) program is developing a constellation of optical sensing satellites to find, detect, and track objects in Earth orbit – primarily those in Geosynchronous Earth Orbit. The system augments existing ground sensors with timely 24-hour, all-weather object search capabilities. Block 10 will field a pathfinder capability to replace the aging Space-Based Visible sensor on orbit, while Block 20 will develop additional satellites to provide simultaneous, worldwide space surveillance capabilities. The proposed add would provide \$35M in additional FY08 funds for Block 10 beyond the \$152.5M in the FY08 budget request in order to launch the spacecraft in December 2008.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The added funds would support Block 10 payload, bus, and space vehicle assembly, integration, and test activities in FY08. When added to the existing program budget, the additional money funds the program at the level necessary to ensure 80% confidence in meeting a December 2008 launch date. Without the additional funds (i.e., with only the funding provided in the FY08 PB), the 80% confidence launch date is April 2009.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Northrop Grumman of Redondo Beach, California, is the prime contractor for Block 10, but with recent restructure of the program, it is now limited to program administration functions. Boeing of Seal Beach, California, is conducting the program's ground segment and integration efforts, while Ball Aerospace & Technologies of Boulder, Colorado, is developing the payload and space vehicle. Effort is roughly divided between 80% at Ball, 16% at Boeing, and a negligible amount at Northrop Grumman and at Harris of Melbourne, Florida. (Ball has 390 staff equivalents working on the program, Boeing 77, Harris 6, and Northrop Grumman 2.) Block 10 experienced cost growth and schedule delays due to initial underestimation of technical and programmatic complexity, but management changes instituted during the program restructure in 2006 have improved the problem. Technical performance continues to be good.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in

what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$157.5M in FY08 RDT&E funding for SBSS is contained in Project 65A006, Space-Based Space Surveillance, within PE 0604425F, Space Situation Awareness Systems. Approximately \$152.5M of this is for the Block 10 effort, with the remainder for Block 20. The proposed add augments the budget submission with additional funds to provide 80% confidence in a December 2008 launch date rather than April 2009.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. RDT&E funding for SBSS continues in the outyears in the funding line noted in the preceding question. The funding for SBSS Block 10 contained in the FY08 PB is approximately as follows. (Note there is additional funding in the line beyond that shown below, but the other funds are for the Block 20 program.)

FY08 PB (\$M)	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
RDT&E, AF	152.5	86.0	3.2	2.7	0.0	0.0

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None. The FY08 PB provides enough funds to complete the Block 10 program, so no additional funding needs to be pursued.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

Approximately \$360M has been invested in the program from its inception in FY02 through FY07. The program is presently in the development phase – payload component fabrication and testing is ongoing. The next Program Executive Officer review of the program is scheduled for April 2007, after which the program will enter the fabrication phase.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. An existing Capability Development Document for the SBSS Block 10 pathfinder was approved in September 2005 by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. This outlines the need for the Block 10 system consisting of a satellite, ground station for command & control, and required communications infrastructure to transmit and receive data and commands. As noted in the document, Block 10 is envisioned as part of a system of space surveillance systems to help meet space control requirements for detection of space objects with particular size, accuracy, and timeliness (in revisiting) attributes.

Today a network of space surveillance sensors provide space object detection and tracking capabilities to assist in cataloging satellite payloads and debris, identifying the orbits of items just launched by foreign nations, and avoiding collisions between U.S. satellites and other objects. However, given emerging threats, this network needs modernization in order to detect smaller objects (amidst the expansion of microsatellite deployment), maintain greater awareness of the objects in space (such as their orbital characteristics) to identify any threatening action, and provide such data with greater timeliness to support fast U.S. action, if needed. SBSS Block 10 will help to provide increased capacity for object detection, identification, and tracking; enable search-based operations; and improve the quality of data obtained for space objects.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings are expected.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. This system is primarily intended for detection, identification, and tracking of Geosynchronous Earth Orbit objects in order to avoid damage to U.S. space assets from debris or hostile objects in those orbital regimes. SBSS Block 10 is essential for replacing the orbiting Space-Based Visible (SBV) sensor on the Midcourse Space Experiment satellite with a more capable sensor as soon as possible. SBV is the only space asset in the current space surveillance network, and thus the only one not subject to operational restrictions due to weather or daylight. Because it exceeded its five-year design life in 2001 and continues to experience equipment degradation, its operational capability is expected to last another year or two at best. SBSS Block 10 is more capable in order to not only replace SBV, but also to maintain awareness of more objects in orbit as their numbers expand due to natural events, satellite launches, and any actions of other nations. Additional details are classified but can be provided upon request.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The Block 10 program fields one pathfinder satellite. This is expected to launch in April 2009 per the funding profile provided in the FY08 PB.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Not applicable – no funds were added in FY07.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
NATO C-17 PAYMENTS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity:
Program Element:
Potential Add: \$111M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

These funds would be used for the US monetary cost share to fund our participation in a C-17 consortium of NATO allies. This Strategic Airlift Capability has been directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on 12 Jan 07. In particular, he has directed the USAF to provide an aircraft to the consortium, and fund the U.S.share of the costs. Legislation is pending on the aircraft transfer.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

In addition to providing one aircraft, the USAF also has to fund their percentage cost share toward acquisition of the support elements and beddown costs. The aircraft will be likely based at Ramstein AB in Germany.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

These costs are over and above the US in-kind contribution of a C-17 aircraft and will be used for procurement of the necessary C-17 aircraft-associated support structure that will include logistics support, operating base beddown, equipment, and training. The prime contractor for the C-17 is Boeing with plants in Long Beach CA and St Louis MO.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No. However, we have inserted \$111.7M in aircraft procurement funds in the FY 2007 GWOT Supplemental that would cover two years of acquisition costs. In addition, we will POM for additional funding in 2009.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

There will be TDY costs of approximately \$250K in Operations and Maintenance Funds (3400).

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

\$99M will be required to complete the project through Full Operational Capability. None of this additional cost is budgeted in current FYDP. We plan to seek to add funds in the FY09 APOM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. The airlift requirement is used toward the NATO Minimum Military Requirement for assured access to strategic airlift dated 4 May 06, of 8 C-17 equivalent.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

There will no savings, acquisition or otherwise; however, since this is a multinational project, it is imperative the US has funds available and authorized when the multinational Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is ready for signature. If funds are delayed, it would jeopardize the program with political implications and increase the price for the program.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

The project has high military value because it has the potential for NATO Allies to provide for their own strategic airlift. This would relieve US obligations in part, and create more capacity for NATO missions.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No, it complements our efforts, because it would add membership to the C-17 Global Sustainment Partnership, the pool of C-17 spares shared virtually by all C-17 nations. In addition, this will increase capacity at Ramstein AB.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

This funds an international partnership and will not procure items for the US inventory. However, it does add to the USAF capability by sharing the procured items with our NATO allies.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Funds were requested in the FY07 Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) Supplemental. The funds have not been appropriated to date.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AC-130 ENHANCED TRAFFIC ALERT AND COLLISION AVOIDANCE SYSTEM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP11
Program Element: 0401115F
Potential Add: \$9M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Enhanced Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System (ETCAS) is an airborne surveillance system that supports airspace situation awareness and collision avoidance. TCAS I provides traffic advisories, while Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) II additionally provides vertical collision avoidance maneuvers. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) calls the TCAS II V7 system the Airborne Collision Avoidance Systems (ACAS II) and is mandated for use March 31, 2009. \$9M completes installation on remaining Air Force Special Operations Command AC-130 Gunships and one simulator.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This additional money would purchase ETCAS kits and buys technical data, upgrade trainers, production installations, flight tests, ICS, and program support.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?
 - a. Raytheon in Baltimore, MD and Ft. Lauderdale, FL
 - b. Honeywell Int'l in Redmond, WA and OH
 - c. L3TCS in Warner Robins, GA
 - d. ARINC in Warner Robins, GA
 - e. CASE in Warner Robins, GA
 - f. Lear Siegler Services Inc in Lakehurst, NJ
 - g. Numerous Contractor Field Teams (CFT) at various AF installations

All contractors have met or exceeded program requirements.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Additional funding required if this item is funded: FY08: \$3M, FY09: \$1.5M. There are no additional costs budgeted in the current FYDP and we plan on pursuing additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. C-130 is the primary combat delivery aircraft for US military. It needs unrestricted access to airspace throughout the world. USAF C-130s do not comply with AF Navigation and Safety Master Plan or Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) requirements which are necessary for this unrestricted access.

Current missions are flown in limited/restricted airspace. Aircrews rely on ground air traffic control and installed radar. Expected improvements will increase aircrew and aircraft safety and improve mission capability due to prevention of aircraft collisions.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ACTIVE DIRECTORY (AD) AND EXCHANGE CONSOLIDATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 33112F
Potential Add: \$144M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Active Directory (AD) and Exchange Consolidation & Implementation: Microsoft completed the Active Directory & Exchange design effort in FY06 and now funding is needed to implement it.

The AD and Exchange Consolidation Program's objective is to collapse the existing disparate, Major Command (MAJCOM) centric AD and Exchange forests into a centralized enterprise structure. The enterprise design will consolidate core services to a fraction of the current number of sites; reducing costs while improving performance via centralized management and allowing collaboration across the enterprise. AF customers gain access to previously inaccessible data on both network and local file systems. All AF members will have a consistent e-mail address and mailbox which follows them throughout their career. Full implementation will also simplify and improve Global Address Listing (GAL) replication.

This project's success is vital to the AF, ensuring that core services can be maintained in the face of manpower cuts. By centralizing management and consolidating servers, the AF can reduce the manpower required to provide Active Directory and Exchange services. Currently, each MAJCOM has different architectures with differing vulnerabilities which can be exploited. By centralizing management and implementing a standardized architecture, the network will be both easier to maintain and more secure.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To migrate users from the existing MAJCOM architectures to Microsoft design enterprise architecture. Air Force Network Operations (AFNETOPS) would be the operating organization.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

This work will be competed through the NETCENTS contract administered at Gunter Annex, Maxwell AFB Alabama. A contractor has not been selected yet but eligible companies are: Virginia -- TELOS, Lockheed-Martin, Booz-Allen-Hamilton, Northrop Grumman and CENTECH Group; Maryland -- MULTIMAX; Massachusetts -- General Dynamics

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

None.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

None.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
OPAF	34.0M	62.0M	30.0M	40.0M	0M

The above amounts are not in the FYDP, and we do plan on pursuing additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Network Control Centers (NCCs) currently provide base/site-level network and information systems support. Efforts are ongoing to roll up most management functions to the regional level, allowing for increased control and remote management of base/site-level services and the creation of a centralized help desk. Small groups of “touch” maintainers will remain on-site to provide limited support as needed.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best

estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Active Directory is a key technical component for the Air Force to implement the new Air Force Network Operations initiative and be able to provide effective and reliable network services with the reduction of over 4,000 communication positions already turned in during the FY07 President's Budget.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This a high military value given the AF's dependency on Active Directory to manage security policies on client computers and servers as well as use of Exchange for its primary messaging application.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The bulk of the contract will be spent on labor, however approximately 600 servers and 750 terabytes of storage would be procured in FY08. An additional 60 servers will be procured in FY10. All equipment will be replaced on a 3 year tech refresh cycle. This is a new initiative so no assets are on hand from previous years.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

A contract protest presents the single greatest risk to FY08 execution.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on

the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR FORCE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 35125F
Potential Add: \$5.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The funding provides for the execution of the Air Force Critical Infrastructure Program, which executes DOD and national policy requirements to:

- a. Identify and prioritize those assets and infrastructures deemed “critical” to the execution of national and DOD missions, Combatant Commander (COCOM) missions and capabilities, and Air Force core functions and capabilities; identifying the “impact” to executing AF missions and capabilities caused by the loss or degradation of critical assets and infrastructures;
- b. The assessment or determination of “risk of loss” to those critical assets and infrastructures in an all-hazards / all-threats environment;
- c. Managing risk of loss to those critical assets and infrastructures through remediation, mitigation planning, or coordination with other AF programs of records for the protection and security of those assets;
- d. Planning for the reconstitution of capabilities lost through the degradation or destruction of critical assets and infrastructures;
- e. Developing, maintaining and updating the Air Force Critical Asset Management System (AF-CAMS), which is the Air Force data management systems for capturing and managing critical asset information, sharing that information with other DOD components; and support real world operations.
- f. Developing policy, guidelines, strategies and methodologies supporting the above task areas.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funding would be spent to maintain the AF CIP baseline activities implemented to date, and previously funded by Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Homeland Defense (HD) and America’s Security Affairs (ASA) through supplemental funding. It would also fund the additional DOD required CIP activities not funded to date, such as assessing risk of loss to AF

owned and operated critical assets and infrastructures.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Booz Allen Hamilton has been the contract firm engaged by the Air Force Homeland Defense/Civil Support Directorate to support the organization, stand-up and development of the AF CIP program. In excess of 95% of the prior supplemental funding has gone on contract with Booz Allen.

Contract funded has provided CIP program expertise to the Air Staff CIP Office, as well as CIP expertise to support the stand-up and execution of CIP by the MAJCOMs. Currently, CIP contract support has been fielded to Air Combat Command, Air Mobility Command, U.S. Air Forces Europe, Air Force Material Command, Pacific Air Forces and Air Force Space Command.

The contractors have preformed all assigned task in an excellent manner during this time frame. Without their expertise it is safe to say that the program would not be where it is today.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Below are the FY-08 to FY-13 funding requirements for the AF CIP Program:

USAF CIP SUPPORT	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
PROGRAM TOTALS	\$5.5M	\$5.8M	\$6.1M	\$6.4M	\$6.8M	\$7.1M

These totals are all unfunded in the current FYDP and will be submitted as an initiative in the FY10 POM.

8. If an R&D is item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A - R&D is not involved to date.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The CIP program is not engaged in purchasing equipment or weapon systems - and thus no validated requirement for these acquisition programs exists in that sense.

However, funding CIP (through O&M) is a requirement validated at the OSD level through DoD Directive 3020-.40, and a priority in the DoD Strategic Planning Guidance.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

An accurate estimate of saving can not be provided, but there will be savings throughout the entire life of the CIP. This program will identify those AF assets and infrastructures (which could include major weapon systems, C2, etc.) that are absolute essential to the execution of AF core capabilities and missions; assess their realistic risk of loss in an all threats and hazards environment; identify remediation/mitigation courses of action in a risk management framework for the protection and assurance of those assets. The information provided in this area will allow the AF to target its resources on items or program areas that have the greatest impact on AF execution of capabilities in the event of loss or disruptions to critical assets, as opposed to spending resources on areas that do not have a mission impact, or a realistic threat or hazard that could exploit identified vulnerabilities.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Very High Military Value. For example, this program analysis and data is being used by US Central Command (CENTCOM) in support of US CENTCOM operations in Iraq (force protection response planning, contingency planning).

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION ANALYTIC CAPABILITY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: 35128F
Potential Add: 2.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Historically, Air Force Office of Special Investigation (AFOSI) has done well collecting and disseminating raw intelligence, but has lacked a refined analytical capability that is predictive in nature and provides information upon which AF commanders can act. Investigation, Collections and Operations Nexus (ICON) can help alleviate this shortfall by using analysis to improve our ability to provide rapid, accurate, and actionable notification of threat indications and warning that is in context by providing tailored in-depth support driving investigations and operations while focusing counterintelligence and terrorism collections directly relevant to Air Force interests to expeditiously make targeting decisions and Force Protection Condition (FPCON)/Information Operations Condition (INFOCON) changes. This effort helps “Find, Fix, Track and Neutralize” the enemy. ICON will transcend the regional approach to conducting Counter Threat Operations to better support Counterintelligence and Terrorism investigations and operations and is a capability for the Air Force that consists of two main components:

- A central coordination and integration capability

- A systematic process for analysis, information sharing, and action that integrates AFOSI capabilities and leverages the full spectrum of national, DoD and USAF capabilities to support in garrison and deployed forces. Central to ICON’s success is an integrated intelligence capability, critical for decision-making, planning, resource allocation and targeting. ICON brings together data collected by AFOSI during the course of criminal investigations, counterespionage operations, Counterintelligence (CI) collections, and other activities and marries it with raw and finished threat information from a myriad of other sources. This information is analyzed and reports are prepared for commanders, agents and fellow airmen around the world. This analysis facilitates effective target selection and also drives action. Given our broad range of capabilities, AFOSI can step forward quickly to conduct force protection, law enforcement and CI operations in concert with other airmen, units and agencies to mitigate threats. In essence, the ICON will transform information into intelligence through the process of analysis thereby better focusing resources and improving agents’ efficiency through the reduction of case or lead overloads

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds 11 contract all-source analysts, placing them at five locations 3 Continental United States (CONUS), 1 Pacific Air Forces (PACAF), 1 U.S. Air Forces Europe (USAFE) with associated state-of-the-art equipment and link analysis and software.

Currently, AFOSI employs 39 contract analysts. Desired end state is to complete a Cyber

Integration Desk and collocate two analysts with agents at each operating location. An immediate need can be realized with the addition of 11 contractors.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Chenega Federal Systems LLC, from Lorton, VA. Performance has been excellent with no problems in delivery.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

AFOSI can execute this contract on a per year basis, depending on how many years the program is funded.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
	2.7M	2.8M	2.9M	2.9M	3M

AFOSI does plan on pursuing additional funding in the FY10 POM to acquire the remaining 188 civilian personnel.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a

brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

AFOSI is the only AF agency directed to conduct counterthreat analysis. The command has a limited capability but is not able to meet all of the worldwide requirements. This funding will allow the worldwide assignment of personnel and equipment for dedicated counterthreat analysis in support of the warfighter.

This capability does fill a need listed in the Integrated-Capability Review and Risk Assessment (I-CRRA) under the Agile Combat Support CONOPS [Tier 1L, 1N, 2A, 2G, 2K, 2N, 2M].

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

None

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No. AFOSI could execute on a pre-existing contract.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR FORCE SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND COMMUNICATION NETWORK
(CANNON AFB)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 27436F
Potential Add: \$12.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

(1) Funds required to transition Cannon AFB Land Mobile Radio (LMR) network from a conventional Very High Frequency (VHF) system to a trunked Ultra High Frequency (UHF) system. A total of \$5M 3080 broken out as follows: \$2.5M for the system controller, \$1M for the repeaters, and \$1.5M for 500 radios. Price includes installation costs and standard 1yr warranty. Because of its efficient channel usage, a trunked radio system affords users reliable, quick access to a channel during emergencies and advanced features help ensure that these calls will get through to further enhance mission objectives.

Cannon AFB's current VHF frequency assignments expire in Jan 07 (an extension proposal has been submitted to provide base with frequencies until cutover of new system). With the expected plus-up of personnel, Cannon's conventional system would become even more congested, forcing users to compete over talk/airtime more than ever. A new, more effective, efficient and flexible system would not be realized. On top of the many advanced options a trunked system has to offer, there are many built-in, failsafe features that a conventional system does not offer.

(2) A total of \$2M 3080 is required to upgrade Nortel MSL-100 telephone switch to include software and hardware. Upgrade of software to SEO-8 and hardware to XA-Core with CS2100 provides voice over Internet Protocol (IP) capability. This upgrade includes 3,000 IP licenses and 50 Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) phones with the option to expand to 5,000 licenses for drawdown of traditional voice services and future expansion.

(3) A total of \$5M 3080 is required in support of base cable and network infrastructure upgrades and communication support for new/existing facilities at Cannon AFB as identified during the Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) Site Activation Task Force (SATAF) process. The SATAF identified potential shortfalls which adversely impacts the AFSOC bed down at Cannon AFB. The current infrastructure only provides for 25% of AFSOC's requirements. Extensive upgrades to the base cable infrastructure and manhole/duct bank system must be funded to support this bed down which includes 52 new/renovated facilities supporting Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV), MC-130J/P/W, and CV-22 missions. Cannon currently has no

communications infrastructure in place on the south side of the base where several Mode Control Panels (MCP's) are projected to be sited. The performance of C2 systems such as air traffic control/landing systems, mission planning, and redundancy for UAV operations are dependent upon the condition of the base cable and network infrastructure.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

(1) Install a UHF Land Mobile Radio (LMR) system at Cannon AFB.

(2) With the beddown of AFSOC units at Cannon AFB the base population will grow beyond existing personnel. This funding will enable the use of VoIP throughout the base and provide relief to the near saturated standard voice services.

(3) Migration to high bandwidth connections which significantly improves performance of mission critical Command and Control (C2) systems, upgrade/expand the classified network and base cable infrastructure, provide support for MCP's, and diverse communication paths for critical C2 facilities (UAV, Intel, Ops, etc); all of which support AFSOC and Special Operations Forces (SOF) worldwide information operations.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

(1) Motorola – New Mexico (100%) – Excellent

(2) Nortel- Florida (100%) – Excellent

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

FY08 \$1.454M – Base Communications Infrastructure P1 Line Item #49

The FY07/08 budget falls short of funding the system controller. Additional funds would provide the delta on the controller as well as capability for LMR repeaters at Cannon AFB and the Melrose Range and the purchase of UHF capable radios along with the needed network infrastructure upgrades

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

We plan to pursue an additional \$35M over the FYDP in the next POM for Cannon AFB comm. infrastructure improvements

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Both requirements were identified during the AFSOC SATAF to Cannon AFB; requirements are validated and being documented in the Cannon communications blueprint.

(1) Cannon AFB currently uses an Astro 25 conventional VHF system with approximately 1200 radios. VHF frequencies currently in use at Cannon AFB expired in Jan 07; ACC got a verbal extension from National Telecommunications Information Administration (NTIA). VHF band in the Cannon AFB area is extremely crowded with no room for expansion; switch to a UHF system is inevitable. Upgrading current VHF conventional system to a VHF trunked system is not a smart option because of VHF frequency availability and cost. Cost to convert on hand assets to a VHF trunked system would be close to the cost of a new UHF system and it would not provide the enhanced capabilities.

(2) Funds are required in support of voice requirement for new/existing facilities at Cannon AFB as identified during the AFSOC SATAF. The SATAF identified potential shortfalls which adversely impacts the AFSOC bed down at Cannon AFB. The current infrastructure only provides for 25% of AFSOC’s requirements. Extensive upgrades to the base voice switch must be funded to support this bed down which includes 52 new/renovated facilities supporting UAV, MC-130J/P/W, and CV-22 missions. Cannon currently has no communications infrastructure in place on the south side of the base where several MCP’s are projected to be sited. A remote switch/expansion to the south side of base will be required.

(3) Funds are required in support of base cable and network infrastructure upgrades and communication support for new/existing facilities at Cannon AFB as identified during the AFSOC SATAF. The SATAF identified potential shortfalls which adversely impacts the AFSOC bed down at Cannon AFB. The current infrastructure only provides for 25% of AFSOC’s requirements. Extensive upgrades to the base cable infrastructure and manhole/duct bank system must be funded to support this bed down which includes 52 new/renovated facilities supporting UAV, MC-130J/P/W, and CV-22 missions. Cannon currently has no communications infrastructure in place on the south side of the base where several MCP’s are projected to be

sited. The performance of C2 systems such as air traffic control/landing systems, mission planning, and redundancy for UAV operations are dependent upon the condition of the base cable and network infrastructure. The current infrastructure is supporting a completely different mission and airframe. Under AFSOC, Cannon AFB will house several different fixed wing aircraft and the Unmanned Aerial Vehicle. The method of “piloting” used for the UAV requires increased bandwidth and physical redundancy over the current mission requirements at Cannon AFB.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No specific savings would result – needed capability would be fielded.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

All projects are high military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

(1)

FY05	FY06	FY07	FY07	FY08		FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
				1 – UHF LMR System Controller					
				2 – Repeaters					
				1000 – Radios					
				100% objective					

(2)

FY05	FY06	FY07	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
				1 – XA Core				
				3000 License				
				50 VoIP phones				

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR FORCE WEATHER AGENCY BEDDOWN

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 35111F
Potential Add: \$8.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Air Force Weather Agency's (AFWA) worldwide weather operations capability currently exists in a 1969 structure, built inside a 1941 B-29 bomber manufacturing plant on Offutt AFB, NE. The Air Force received approval and appropriation of \$30M of MILCON funding, and is currently constructing a new building to house the AFWA Operations Center on the same installation. The building was designed to meet the latest Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards. Ground breaking occurred in Mar 06 and MILCON is on-track for completion in Oct 07. However, funding for the project did not include required Operations and Maintenance (O&M) support to transition the Operations Center from its current location to the new building. Transition tasks include moving and upgrading the current information technology infrastructure to establish an open architecture environment that meets current and future Air Force net-centricity requirements. This will establish multiple machine-to-machine interfaces that fully utilize numerical weather forecast model and satellite data from the NPOESS and GOES-R programs for direct insertion into key operational decision-making systems. This direct integration will increase combat effectiveness and operations efficiency on the order of 20-40%. This initiative consolidates of nearly two dozen legacy systems into one, saving millions of sustainment dollars. Without O&M funding to enable these changes, Air Force and Army, Space, and National Intelligence Community Operations will not fully exploit the power of weather information in a rapid, time-sensitive targeting environment and will cause unnecessary weather impacts that jeopardize combat operations success, efficiency, and safety.

Funds are also needed for additional tasks: relocation costs; acquisition of contract personnel to plan, track, coordinate, and document daily activities that will occur during the life of the project. Funds will also satisfy the comprehensive interior design which includes demountable walls, furnishings, office workstations and IT appliances, and storage infrastructure.

Without proper funding, this new \$30M building will be underutilized, and the transition to net-centric architecture will be delayed. AFWA will have to divert in-place, warfighter support personnel to assume the transition tasks, placing operational missions at increased risk of failure.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds would be used for the transition of operations from the old building into a state-of-the-art facility, the upgrade of infrastructure in accordance with Air Force objectives and DOD standards, in preparation for a thousand-fold increase in satellite data critical for warfighting ops.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Military Construction contract awarded to Kiewit Building Group, 15 Feb 2006; notice to proceed occurred on 3 Mar 2006 with construction completion date of 24 Oct 2007. The construction is on track for 24 Oct 2007 completion.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The MILCON is documented in the DD Form 1391 for the new HQ Air Force Weather Agency Building. The O&M funds are required to satisfy those expenditures not authorized for MILCON appropriation. An O&M request was to be submitted by AFWA during Air Force FY08 PB deliberations. However, the request was inadvertently not considered.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None. Additional funds will not be needed if request is fully funded in FY08.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. AFWA's support to national intelligence community, special operation forces operating world-wide, and Air Force and Army warfighting commanders provides joint forces the complete situational awareness of battle space meteorological information.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No additional funds were added in FY07.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR OPERATIONS CENTERS SUSTAINMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)/Operations & Maintenance (O&M)

Budget Activity: BA03, BA01

Program Element: 834520 (OPAF); 07410F (O&M)

Potential Add: \$26M (OPAF), \$54.4M (O&M)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This funds the Air Operations Centers (AOCs) which provide world-wide command and control of US air power. The Combatant Commanders have requested more AOCs and the personnel to staff them; however, existing funding is insufficient to meet the demand. The funds requested will provide the necessary baseline support and equipment to make the AOCs at Central Command (CENTCOM), Southern Command (SOCOM), and Strategic Command (STRATCOM) fully functional. In addition, it allows the AOC formal training unit to generate sufficient student throughput to keep centers properly manned.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Money will be used to support AOCs at CENTCOM, SOCOM and STRATCOM as mentioned above. This also includes the procurement of an additional suite of AOC equipment to outfit the Operational Support Facility, which will provide reachback redundancy for other AOCs around the world.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

None.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An equivalent amount of 3400 funding will be required across the FYDP to sustain the AOC weapon system. No additional 3080 will be required.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. Air and Space Operations Center Program Guidance requires the AOC weapon system to provide the Joint Force Air Component Commander the capability to direct worldwide Air and Space Operations. The Command and Control Enabling Concept of March 2005, and Program Action Directive 05-03 of July 2005 refined that guidance to the current AOC organization.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value for the effective application of US air power.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIRBORNE NETWORKING INTEGRATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M); Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)

Budget Activity: BA04 (33112); BA07 (674787)

Program Element: 33112 (O&M); 674787 (RDT&E)

Potential Add: \$2.8M (O&M); \$3.8M (RDT&E)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Air Force requires \$6.6M to further the capabilities of an Airborne Network Integration (ANI) center of expertise at Scott AFB, IL to conduct technical reviews and evaluations of future ways to implement robust, survivable, and reliable airborne networks over a theater battlefield.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

ANI must participate in program management reviews, high performance team sessions, site visits, as well as recurring and ad hoc Airborne Networking (AN) meetings; ANI modeling, simulation and analysis studies; contractor support; and ANI Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) documentation with technical and management proficiency in programming, budgeting, and command level staffing. AFCA participation in AN activities is essential to 1) understand the programs, requirements, and related activities of various AN stakeholders, 2) build a core team of personnel that have knowledge and expertise in the AN domain to properly establish and advance ANI, and 3) properly represent Information, Services, and Integration interests in ANI. We will continue to pursue alternative means of participation (i.e. video teleconference, telephone conference) where possible but to fulfill our responsibilities for ANI Lead Command, ECSA must have \$6.6M in for FY 08.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Contractor support is provided by BAH (3 IL based personnel with 100% support) and 1 independent consultant (CO based, with 50% support) hired to provide unique operational and communications skill sets necessary for the evolution of ANI to include the development of ANI mission threads. This added technical expertise is instrumental in conducting technical reviews and evaluations, designing technical architecture, and identifying airborne networking solutions to deliver near-term operational capability. In addition, ANI Lead Command has roles and responsibilities as directed by the ANI O-6 Core Team to lead integration activities across multiple AF organizations. Tasking include the development and staffing documents directed by Air Staff including the AN lead efforts to develop the Air Force's integrated airborne networking investment strategy based on the high-level vision and existing roadmaps aligned to the vision.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$2.6M (RDTE funding in BPAC 674787)

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP. Yes

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
3600	2.000	1.200	0.900	0.300	0.400	0.000
3400	0.106	0.006	2.499	3.964	4.046	4.271
3080	0.500	0.470	0.550	0.200	0.100	0.300

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Additional funds required :

FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
14.700	20.000	25.900	26.000	26.100

None of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP and we do plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the airborne network is a critical enabler to bring the Global Information Grid (GIG) to the tactical edge. The GIG is a key enabler of network-centric warfare and is essential for information and decision superiority. It will enable Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence (C4I) integration of joint forces, improve interoperability of systems, and increase optimization of bandwidth capacity. The GIG will enhance operational capabilities while providing a common operational environment for conventional and nuclear command and control (C2), combat support, combat service support, intelligence, and business functions.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ALE-47 PROGRAMMER MEMORY UPGRADE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27040F
Potential Add: \$3M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This effort funds replacement of the obsolete processors for the ALE-47 Countermeasures Dispenser System (CMDS) that supports the A-10, F-16, B-1 and other aircraft.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This effort funds replacement of the obsolete processors for the ALE-47 Countermeasures Dispenser System (CMDS) that supports the A-10, F-16, B-1 and other aircraft.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Unknown

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding

would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None needed

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

The Engineering solution is complete and ready for production.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

There is a valid requirement for the ALE-47 system. This effort does a form, fit, function replacement for the obsolete processor.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Fund approximately 1200 replacement processors in FY08.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ALQ-213 PROCESSORS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27040F
Potential Add: \$22M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does. This effort funds replacement of the obsolete processors for the ALQ-213 electronic warfare controller for the A-10 and F-16 aircraft.
2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money? This effort funds replacement of the obsolete processors for the ALQ-213 electronic warfare controller for the A-10 and F-16 aircraft.
3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Unknown

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM? None.
8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing

status and next milestone?

The engineering solution is complete and ready for production.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

There is a valid requirement for the ALQ-213. This effort does a form, fit, function replacement for the obsolete processor.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

This effort funds approximately 1000 replacement processors in FY08.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
C-5A STRUCTURES PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M); Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: 54119F (O&M); 54219F (APAF)
Potential Add: 23.5 million

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The program will arrange structural inspections on 59 Air Force Reserve (AFR) and Air National Guard (ANG) C-5A aircraft, 2 Air Mobility Command C-5C aircraft, and 1 Air Mobility Command C-5M aircraft with improved Aft Crown Skins (ACSs) and Contour Box Beam Fittings (CBBFs).

Recently confirmed Stress Corrosion Cracking (SCC) of C-5A ACSs and CBBFs indicates a lead-command managed, fleet-wide replacement program is required to avoid extensive groundings and flight restrictions that are projected to start during the FY08 FYDP.

A C-5 engineering study presented to Air Mobility Command on 1 Aug 06 concluded the Air Force Mobility Command (AFMC) planned structures program is required to avoid maintenance bow-waves with the potential to simultaneously ground up to 48 C-5As (80% of the fleet), starting no later than 2013. Repair options are now deemed insufficient to prevent these bow-waves. Funding the AFMC recommended C-5A Structures Program starting in FY08 will avoid these non-availability bow-waves and preserve 62 C-5 tails worth of strategic airlift capability through the year 2040 (fleet service life, 33 years). The C-5A fleets represent over 25% of the U.S. outsize cargo air transport capability.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The funding would be used by AFMC to execute the inspection process for the planned C-5A structures program. Ensuring the future availability of 62 C-5A/C/M aircraft through their year 2040 projected service life.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Lockheed Martin Aero

Headquartered in Bethesda, Md., Lockheed Martin employs about 135,000 people worldwide and is principally engaged in the research, design, development, manufacture, integration and sustainment of advanced technology systems, products and services.

Lockheed Martin Contract Field Teams would perform the majority of the program's required MOI inspections at aircraft home stations.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No. Note: \$22M (APAF) was requested as part of the FY08 Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) supplemental.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No. See #4.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

For cost and schedule of the AFMC proposed C-5A structures program (supported by AFR and ANG), please see table below:

Line Item	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Inspections (O&M)	\$23.5	\$15.0	\$9.0	\$8.0	\$14.0	\$15.0
Modifications (APAF)	\$0.0	\$22.2	\$89.0	\$89.0	\$89.0	\$89.0
Total	\$23.5	\$37.2	\$98.0	\$97.0	\$103.0	\$104.0

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not an R&D item.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

AFMC's planned C-5A structures program was documented and briefed to AMC, ANG, AFR, and the assembled AMC C-5 Requirements and Planning Council (R&PC) on 1 and 2 August

2006. Temporary repair costs were documented in the 1 Sep 2006 JO1 and post-LSR DPEM databases. (FY 08 Funding is only being requested for inspection process of AFMC's structures program)

Non-availability of C-5A/C/M aircraft resulting from deferred ACS and CBBF structures modifications would require outsize cargo (and the majority of oversize cargo) needed to support the GWOT to be airlifted almost exclusively by the remaining C-17 fleet. This would place an unbearable burden on the C-17 fleet and would result in an inability to meet the strategic airlift needs of our Combatant Commanders. The bow waves are particularly acute in 2012-14 (47% of the C-5A fleet) and FY2021-23 (79% of the C-5A fleet).

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Acquisition Savings: TBD (Congress has provided no funding for this program to date).
Operational Savings: Once fielded, operational savings will be generated through eliminating costly and inefficient C-5A non-availability (see #9 above and attached chart). These non-availability bow waves would result in dramatic delays in the delivery of supplies and equipment to the warfighter.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value. Funding the AFMC developed C-5A structures program w/APAF funding preserves vital strategic airlift capability in direct support of the GWOT in a fiscally responsible manner with minimal non-availability. The C-5A fleet of 59 aircraft represents over 25% of the U.S. outsize cargo air transport capability.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective of the C-5A structures program developed by AFMC is for 59 Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard C-5A aircraft, 2 Air Mobility Command C-5C aircraft, and 1 Air Mobility Command C-5M aircraft to receive new Aft Crown Skins (ACSs) and Contour Box Beam Fittings (CBBFs) before fleet wide grounding and restrictions are projected to occur. The program would commence with inspections in FY08, following with installations scheduled from FY09 through FY17.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they

released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

While no funds were appropriated in FY07, \$22M was requested as part of the FY08 GWOT supplemental for FY08.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
C-17 PROCUREMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: PE 41130F
Potential Add: \$1,010.1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This \$1,010.1M funds an additional 2 C-17 aircraft (\$472.8M), spares sustainment for GWOT wear-and-tear (\$257.3M (including \$155.3M for 13 engines and quick engine change (QEC) kits), and additional funding need for production shutdown (\$280M).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds will be used to purchase 2 aircraft, funds production shutdown, procure 13 engine spares, aligned with production shutdown profile, and address aircraft spares/wear-and tear.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Prime: Boeing; Long Beach, CA - Aircraft and Peculiar Associated SE
Boeing; St Louis - Long lead, preassembly sections and training systems
Prime: Pratt & Whitney, CT - Engine

The identified aircraft and engines are currently in production by Boeing and Pratt & Whitney; the additional buy would be added to current production levels. Contractors' performance remains excellent in quality, cost, and schedule.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Production shutdown funding of \$37.3M (FY08) and \$217.6M (FY09), and funding of \$102M (FY09) for 13 spare engines are included in the FYDP.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

FY07 National Defense Authorization Act language states, “Effective October 1, 2008, the Secretary of the Air Force shall maintain a total aircraft inventory of strategic airlift aircraft of not less than 299 aircraft.” In addition, the FY07 Defense Bill language states, “The conferees direct the Department of Defense to continue funding C-17 production in the fiscal year 2008 budget.”

The additional two aircraft recover fleet aircraft wear-and-tear to meet warfighter needs while extending the production line an additional two months.

Additional funding covers over-consumption of spares and aircraft wear-and-tear during GWOT operations (\$257.3M), and production shutdown (\$280M)..

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Quantifiable financial savings are unknown at this time. This would slightly reduce risk associated with the current minimum C-17 fleet identified in the MCS.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is 192 C-17 aircraft. The table below shows programmed USAF delivery schedule, including international sales of 13 production C-17 aircraft.

	Previous	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	Total
USAF Deliveries	141	15	13	9	14	0	192
Cumulative USAF Deliveries	141	156	169	178	192	192	192
Percentage of Objective	73%	81%	88%	93%	100%	100%	100%
FMS Notional Deliveries							
Australia			2	2			4
UK	4			1			5
Canada			1	3			4
Total FMS	4		3	6	0		16
Annual Deliveries USAF + FMS		15	16	15	14	0	
Total Delivery (USAF + FMS)	145	160	176	191	205	205	205

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

A total of \$2,094M was appropriated in the FY07 GWOT Supplemental to procure 10 C-17s (190 total) and the funds were obligated in Dec 06. The prime contractor has issued contracts for long lead items.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

This is a new requirement based on updated plan to address wear-and-tear impacts on aircraft, spares, and to shutdown production. The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
C-130 EMERGENCY LOCATOR TRANSMITTER

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP11
Program Element: 041115F
Potential Add: \$10.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Legacy Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELT) installed on Air Mobility Command aircraft transmit at 121.5 and/or 243.0 Megahertz (MHz) when activated. The Search and Rescue Satellite (SARSAT) system monitors 121.5 MHz. Mission Control Centers (MCCs) receive alerts and forward them to Rescue Coordination Centers, Search and Rescue Points of Contacts, or other MCCs. SARSAT will cease monitoring 121.5 MHz on 1 Feb 09 and move to the new 406 MHz digital satellite ELT coverage. 121.5 MHz signals have false alert rates of 1,000 to 1 real emergency. The new 406 MHz signal will reduce false alerts to 8 to 1. Today's response time and search area is 6 hours and 452 square nautical mile (NM). 406 MHz ELTs with signal Global Positioning System feeds will reduce this to 5 minutes and 0.05 square NM (slightly smaller than the surface area of Charleston AFB's Runway 15-33).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Current C-130 fleet maintains legacy ELTs. This funding would procure and install 430 ELTs on existing fleet in order to ensure seamless SARSAT monitoring coverage.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Will be determined based on source selection of those responding to the Request for Proposal (RFP). The following are existing 406 ELT manufacturers within the United States: ACR Electronics (Florida), Artex Aircraft Supplies (Oregon), BAE Systems (Florida), Emergency Beacon Corporation (New York), General Dynamics C4 Systems (Arizona), KDC TechSolutions (California), Microwave Monolithics (California) and Ultra Electronics Ocean Systems (Massachusetts). Installation will be done via a combination of contract field teams (from selected manufacturer) or in conjunction with aircraft's schedule Programmed Depot Maintenance (PDM). There is no existing contract to install 406 ELTs on C-130s so performance, quality and cost are unavailable.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in

what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

N/A.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

None

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

With guidance from the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the Search and Rescue Satellite (SARSAT) system will cease monitoring the 121.5/243MHz. Emergency Locator Transmitter (ELT) and will move to the new 121.5/243/406MHz tri-mode digital signal system beginning 01 Feb 2009.

The solution is to modify 474 aircraft with the new 121.5/243/406MHz tri-mode ELT. The new ELT will allow continued international satellite monitoring for AMC aircraft beyond 01 Feb 2009. The solution will have a method to disable ELT to eliminate interference with hand-held radios and/ or facilitate evasion in high threat environments.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
C-130 MISSION CRITICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: 63720
Potential Add: \$1.4

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

C-130 Mission Critical Computer Resources (MCCR) is infrastructure directly supporting C-130 aircraft fleet for Point of Maintenance (POMx) and AMC's global visibility requirements. POMx electronically allows maintenance personnel to access Tech Data and capture/transmit vital aircraft data at the point of maintenance using off-the-shelf E-tools. Air Force has directed that all future technical data be delivered in electronic media. To meet this requirement, our plan is to purchase off-the-shelf e-tools at a rate of 1/3 per year and refresh requirement every 4 years.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Purchase off-the-shelf E-tools thru the Air Force Way Program to support the C-130 fleet. Without funding, our maintenance personnel will continue to use inefficient paper/manual process. They will be unable to use C-130 Interactive Electronic Tech Manuals (IETMs) delivering in FY09, a \$60M AF Investment.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

N/A.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Our plan is to purchase 1/3 e-tools each year for our C-130 squadrons and refresh e-tools on a 4 year schedule. We will require approximately \$1.4 per year through the FYDP. We do plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Requirement: C-130 Mission Critical Computer Resources (MCCR) is infrastructure directly supporting C-130 aircraft for Point of Maintenance (POMx) and AMC’s global visibility requirements. POMx electronically allows maintenance personnel to access Tech Data and capture/transmit vital aircraft data at the point of maintenance. Provides for contractor support to sustain hardware and software. Allows maintenance personnel to focus on aircraft sortie generation.

Mission Accomplishment Today: Currently, the C-130 fleet continues to use manual/paper process while other AMC weapon systems are funded to migrate to automated procedures. Air Force has directed that all future technical data be delivered in an electronic media. To allow our C-130 maintenance personnel to use this media, we must provide the required (e-tools).

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Providing funds in FY 2008 will allow AMC to begin purchasing of required e-tools at the rate of 1/3 requirement per year. Since we purchase items using the Air Force Way program acquisition/inflation savings would be based on yearly cost of items. Savings of having e-tools at our C-130 bases would be based on reduced cost of printing large amounts of paper and carrying many technical orders onboard the aircraft.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value. Currently, the C-130 aircraft is the only AMC fleet that is still using paper technical data versus electronic used by the C-17/C-5/KC-10/KC-135.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

No items are in the inventory for this requirement.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COMBAT AIR FORCE EXERCISES AND READINESS TRAINING

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operation & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27603F
Potential Add: \$4.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Funds Combat Air Force (CAF) Exercises and Readiness Training including: Red Flag-Nellis, Maple Flag, and Red Flag-Alaska, advanced threat support for fifth generation fighter test and training, and adversary support for the United States Air Force Weapons School.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Since FY06, the Exercise and readiness training program has lost 30% of its funding to non-programmatic reductions. At FY08 PB funding levels, the program is not executable in its entirety. Deploying aircrews will not get required pre-deployment composite force employment training and will not be fully effective upon arrival in theater.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. O&M, \$50.1M, 49% of budget requirements.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$60.9M	\$65.6M	\$69.0M	\$72.5M	\$74.4M	\$76.2M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$16.3M	\$15.0M	\$13.6M	\$13.7M	\$14.0M

None of the additional funding is budgeted. It will compete for resources in the FY09 APOM

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Chief of the Air Force (CAF) Exercises and Readiness Training is validated by the CAF 2025 Strategic Master Plan.

This training is obtained through the 34 programs funded by PE 27603, the largest of which are outlined here: Flag Exercises provide the large composite force training needed for effective combat operations; 350 Contract instructors provide aircraft simulator and classroom instruction for initial qualification and continuation training; the Air Warfare Center at Nellis AFB operates Weapons Schools for the various combat aircraft to give graduate level training in tactics, techniques, and procedures to instructor aircrews; and adversary support for the weapons schools requires TDY funding for aircrews to simulate enemy forces.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COMBAT SUPPORT DATA BASE (CSDB)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27439F
Potential Add: \$2.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

CSDB is necessary to support Combatant Commanders, Air Force Special Operations Command and provides for mission planning and execution, without which aircraft, crews and mission are compromised. Funding Combat Support Database (CSDB) with \$2.2M in O&M (3400) would provide support to the 453rd Electronic Warfare Squadron (AIA) in direct and vital support to advanced mission aircraft and weapon systems (including F-22, JSF, B-2, JASSM, and most other weapon systems).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The requested \$2.2M will be used to pay for 453rd Electronic Warfare Squadron mission support, which is vital to advance mission aircraft and weapon systems.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Contractor is unknown at this time.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2007 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

There is a valid need to provide threat/sensor data to advanced weapon systems for their pre-mission programming and execution, without which these systems are at risk for being unable to perform their mission.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

None

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COMPASS CALL MISSION CREW SIMULATOR

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP11
Program Element: 27253F
Potential Add: \$12M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Compass Call Mission Crew Simulator (CCMCS) is used to train and certify EC-130H crews (nine person) on operation of the Compass Call Prime Mission Equipment. The simulator is used to present environments, threats and geographical locations that are physically impossible to train on-board the aircraft and at a fraction of the cost of flight training. The configuration of EC-130Hs being delivered is Block 35; the simulator is currently in the older Block 30 configuration. Training using the existing CCMCS will quickly become obsolete. Training with other weapon systems is non-existent.

Funding will enable the Compass Call Mission Crew Simulator to be updated to match the weapon system configuration (Block 35) that crews need to be certified on. This will help offset some of the funding required for in-flight training of crews.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Update the Compass Call Mission Crew Simulator (CCMCS) to the Block 35 configuration

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

BAE Systems, Nashua, NH (27%)
AAI Services, Hunt Valley, MD (63%)
Raytheon Inc, Fort Wayne, IN (10%)
Contractor's performance on the prior CCMCS contract was excellent in all areas of cost, schedule and performance.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. The requirement is documented and validated in the Chief of the Air Force Operational Requirements Document 318-88-I/II/III-A .

Training for Compass Call Block 35 mission crews is currently accomplished through in flight training sorties. The quality of training is less robust due to the signal environments and signal densities presented to the aircrews during flight training. Improved training will be provided to the warfighter with a Block 35 upgrade to the CCMCS as well as a projected savings of \$2M per year in training sorties.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Savings of approximately \$2M per year would be accomplished to maintain the same training rate as currently being accomplished on the CCMCS. These are operational savings. Crews would be proficient with the prime mission equipment and the environments they expect to encounter. Distributed training will result in proficient wartime communication and force multiplication.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This item has high military value. It is a key to training of a weapon system that controls the electronic battle space.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

This item is unique to support of Compass Call. Currently the inventory objective is one, as long as it can support 24/7 operations.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CONTRACTOR LOGISTIC SUPPORT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance
Budget Activity: BA01, BA02, BA03, BA04
Program Element: All Contractor Logistics Support PEs
Potential Add: \$490.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) funds logistics support for depot maintenance, sustaining engineering and spares support, design definition, operations, maintenance, and logistics requirements applicable to the entire weapon system life cycle. The additional \$490.2M will minimize the risk associated with possible aircraft groundings and ensure availability of supported weapon systems through funding contract field teams and spare parts (overhaul/repair).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The requested dollars would cover all the "fixed" costs associated with current AF CLS contracts. Examples include: purchase C-17 flying program spares and contract field team support, expand Distributed Command Ground System support to U-2/Global Hawk missions, and improve Predator orbits to peacetime level.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Multiple contractors across multiple states execute CLS requirements. Due to number of contractors involved across a variety of platforms and systems, this data is not readily available nor is it feasible to detail in this format.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Total Force (Active/Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC)/Air National Guard (ANG)) is in the FY 2008 budget for \$3761.2M. The proposed add increases this amount by \$490.2M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Total Force	\$3761.2M	\$3730.1M	\$4018.9M	\$4259.9M	\$4307.7M	\$4378.8M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

CLS is reviewed each year of the FYDP and updated according to changes in requirements. Any year where funding does not meet the optimum level to effectively execute CLS contracts, the Air Force will pursue additional funding.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not an R&D effort.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, a validated requirement exists. All CLS requirements are reviewed and validated by the respective program offices during the annual building of the CLS “brochure.” The additional \$490.2M would purchase Air Force depot maintenance, spare parts, sustaining engineering to the level required to meet the “fixed” cost portion of all AF CLS contracts—maintaining parts supportability, aircraft readiness and availability for key AF weapons systems. Based on engineering analysis, a program of continuous, scheduled maintenance is required to maintain airworthiness and/or mission capability of critical Air Force assets. The increasing age of the fleet compounds those maintenance requirements. Low CLS funding deters preventative maintenance accomplishment, creates a bow wave of maintenance requirements, pushes additional work to the field and onto already stressed blue suit maintainers, and has dramatic negative impact on aircraft/system availability and Mission Capable Rates.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High, CLS funding directly impacts contract execution of activities that support mission readiness. The additional funding requested will improve weapon system availability for critical warfighter support weapon systems such as the C-17 and Predator.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No. A significant portion of Aircraft and Engine depot maintenance is scheduled based on a maintenance cycle (i.e., programmed depot maintenance). This cycle dictates that an airplane or an engine will be due for depot maintenance whenever the weapon system achieves this time interval. In FY07, some of our most critical weapon systems are approaching the outer limits of the maintenance time interval which lessens the margin of safety for operational needs, and in some cases, will either require extraordinary efforts to perform inspections in the field to ensure air worthiness or may require grounding the weapon system.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT (CLS) AIR FORCE WEATHER AGENCY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 0305111F
Potential Add: \$14.9M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Contractor logistics support provides full life-cycle sustainment for the Air Force Weather Weapon System including depot-level maintenance, sustainment engineering, spares support, design definition, operations, maintenance, and logistics requirements. Lack of funding greatly increases risk of failure of Air Force and Army, Space, and National Intel Community Operations by degrading the performance of the Air Force Weather Weapon System. Additional funding helps ensure the warfighter receives accurate and timely environmental situational awareness critical for safety of flight, force protection, time critical targeting, and combat/training mission planning and execution.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Additional funding of \$14.9M mitigates risk in sustainment of numerous systems critical for effective combat and peacetime operations. This funding will ensure maximum effectiveness of the New Tactical Forecast System, Fixed Based Observing System FMQ-19, Tactical Meteorological Observing System TMQ-53, Tactical Weather Radar TMS-1, Digital Ionospheric Sounding System FMQ-12, Radar Operations Center for Next Generation Radar WSR-88D, and the AF Weather Strategic Center. Without full sustainment of these programs, the risk to aircraft and satellite operations increase as a lack of real-time information could impair these warfighting systems and place lives in danger.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Among the contractors involved in CLS sustainment are SAIC, Bellevue, NE; Northrop Grumman Space and Mission Systems, Bellevue, NE; Raytheon Imagery and Geospatial Systems, Bellevue, NE; General Dynamics Advanced Information, Mountain View, CA; Raytheon Technical Services, Indianapolis, IN. Contractors are meeting or exceeding contract service expectations.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$143.0M of O&M is currently budgeted. This total includes the funding line for the entire Program Element, to include support for the Major Command level.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$143.0M	\$148.2M	\$156.0M	\$157.4M	\$160.5M	\$164.4M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional funds would be requested.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

CLS is reviewed each year during the budget process and is updated according to changes in requirements. In any year where funding does not meet the optimum level for effective execution, additional funding will be pursued for CLS contracts. Currently no additional outyear funding has been projected.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, a validated requirement exists. CLS requirements were reviewed and validated during the AF Material Command Logistics Support Review and by the AF Weather Weapon System Program Requirements Review; which covered all aspects of depot maintenance, system management, sustaining engineering, spares support, and other logistics requirements applicable to the entire life-cycle of the supported weapon system.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Additional funds will not result in cost or operational savings.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No. A significant portion of CLS funding assures that the fixed costs contracts are funded to ensure sustainment of the weapon system.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
COUNTER-CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, NUCLEAR OPERATIONS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: PE 35153F
Potential Add: \$10.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Counter-Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear (C-CBRN) Operations program (also called the Counterproliferation Program) supports oversight and synchronization of USAF offensive and defensive combating weapons of mass destruction (Cbt WMD) activities across various functional communities to counter the threat from adversary and terrorist use of WMD, both in expeditionary and Homeland Defense/CONUS contexts. Develops CBRN standards and requirements and integrates doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel and facilities (DOTMLPF) solutions. A key function of the program is to leverage research, testing, and analyses (both Joint and AF-specific) to define the hazard and threat environments and then create an operational capability to counter the threat/hazard. Develops strategies to prevent others from acquiring or using WMD. Develops methods to detect and destroy WMD. Reduces weapons effects, if used against US forces. Enables US forces to survive and operate in CBRN environment. Identifies ops readiness shortfalls and facilitates institutional fixes. Supports all levels and types of counter-CBRN education, training, and exercises (ETE) (BMT, PME, functional, senior leader, etc.). Also, develops ops policy for AF military vaccination (MILVAX) programs (Anthrax/Smallpox) vice AF Surgeon General (AF/SG). Develops science-based, executable concepts of operation (CONOPS), guidance, training, risk management tools and tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs) such as split-mission oriented protective posture (MOPP) which directly enhance warfighting capability by “buying back” sortie generation and other mission capabilities that would otherwise be lost in a CBRN attack. Although the Program’s primary purpose is to improve AF capability, many of the solutions it has produced (e.g., C-CW CONOPS, Commander’s Counter-Biological Warfare guidelines, Disease Containment Planning) have been adopted DoD-wide.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The C-CBRN Operations program is disconnected in FY08-13. Funds will be required to meet the program requirements described in question 1. Specific activities include:

- Continue efforts to complete the CSAF-approved USAF C-CBRN Master Plan and its associated Define, Organize, Train and Equip Roadmap tasks to achieve capability goals.
- Complete development and prioritization of C-CBRN Proliferation Prevention (PP), Counterforce (CF), Active Defense (AD), Passive Defensive (PD), and Consequence Management (CM) education, training, and exercise (ETE) skill competencies to ensure Airmen

are appropriately trained to survive and operate against CBRN adversaries.

- Complete gap analysis of C-CBRN PP, CF, AD, PD, and CM ETE competencies to determine scope and placement of C-CBRN courseware.
- Continue identifying C-CBRN shortfalls and requirements across the 8 mission areas identified in the National Military Strategy to Combat WMD.
- Address shortfalls and requirements in planning and programming and budgets through the Capability Review and Risk Assessment (CRRA), Master Capability List (MCL), combatant commander (COCOM) Integrated Priority Lists (IPLs), Mission Essential Task Lists (METLs), and Joint Capability Integration and Development System (JCIDS) documents such as Initial Capability Documents (ICDs), Capability Development Documents (CDDs), and Capability Production Documents (CPDs).
- Continue leading Air Force efforts to develop common C-CBRN mitigation strategies across AF, Joint, and Combined operations (USAF C-CBRN Council (chaired by 2-star A3S), Policy Working Group, Joint Working Group, Military-to-Military cooperation with the Royal Air Force and the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF).
- Lead the AF to improve ability to find, fix, track, target, and assess (F2T2EA) CBRN targets by identifying shortfalls and requirements and advocating them in Joint and AF processes, Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and Air Force Requirements for Operational Capability Council (AFROCC).
- Continue incorporating C-CBRN considerations in policy, doctrine, guidance and plans. Expand and refine the counter-chemical warfare (C-CW) and counter-biological warfare (C-BW) CONOPS to ensure continued applicability to changing threat agents, additional/new delivery systems, environments, and equipment to allow operations to continue with minimum mission degrade in a chemical environment.
- Complete the AF-wide implementation strategy for counter-biological warfare (C-BW) CONOPS, reducing infectious rates on AF installations.
- Develop and disseminate C-BW Disease Containment Plan (DCP) template and support AF MAJCOMs installations with table top exercises (TTX) and subject matter expertise to ensure DCPs are developed and exercised at AF installations.
- Assist acquisition programs in developing C-CBRN-related key performance parameters (KPPs) for new equipment/systems.
- Assist in developing/refining field testing to enhance knowledge of C-CBRN agents in all operating environments by participating in activities such as the Missile Defense Agency testing and Large Frame Aircraft Decontamination Demonstration (LFADD) with Air Mobility Command (AMC).
- Advocate for or review C-CBRN-related Advanced Technology Demonstrations (ATDs)/Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations (ACTDs).

- Provide AF technical research and operational evaluations to assess operational impacts of CBRN weapons. Continue developing modeling & simulation tools, checklists, decision tools, etc. (i.e. Biological Decision Tool, Vapor Liquid Solid Tracking, Chemical Risk Exposure Calculator) to enhance AF operations in a CBRN environment.
- Serve as the AF functional expert to develop, validate, and update Inspector General (IG) inspection criteria to assess a unit's capability to survive and operate in a CBRN environment and inject C-CBRN considerations into the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS).
- Develop/update guidance and track compliance to ensure AF meets DoD vaccination policy and DoD bio-security standards.
- Expand counter-chemical procedures to address terrorist use of toxic industrial chemicals and materials, cruise missile delivery of chemical weapons, and fourth generation chemical agents
- Implement counter-biological warfare Concept of Operations (CONOPS), disease containment planning, and vaccinations in order to decrease casualties up to 90% in a BW attack or pandemic and expand to address additional biological threats
- Develop and implement a counter-radiological CONOPS to reduce AF-identified gaps in ability to operate through and recover from a radiological dispersion device or dirty bomb
- Close AF shortfalls in ability to destroy chemical, biological, and radiological targets with minimal collateral damage through procedural and equipment solutions
- Apply AF Cbt-WMD successes to homeland defense and terrorist use of WMD

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The Analysis Group (TAG), a small, veteran-owned business, is the prime contractor and serves as the program integrator for two subcontractors, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) and Analytical Services (ANSER). The bulk of contract support is provided by SAIC.

The contractors perform four primary functions:

- 1) Science and technical (S&T): Improve understanding of the threat and AF-unique vulnerabilities; provide testing support; identify operational mission impacts and develop equipment performance parameters (8 FTE, all in Virginia)
- 2) Operational analysis: Assess operational impacts; identify how to recover mission and minimize casualties; quantify results and operational buy-back (10 FTE; all in Virginia)
- 3) Policy: Implement DOTMLP solutions to Cbt-WMD, including CONOPS, guidance, procedure and training, based on S&T analysis and operational impact assessments (16 FTE; all in Virginia)
- 4) AF-wide implementation: Provide support to the Major Commands and key organizations to implement solutions and tailor to individual missions, e.g., mobility, special ops missions (4 in Virginia; 1 in Hawaii supporting Pacific Air Force (PACAF)/Pacific Command, 1

in Illinois supporting Air Mobility Command (AMC) and U.S. Transportation Command, 2 in Colorado supporting Air Force Space Command (AFSPC), U.S. Strategic Command and Northern Command, 2 in Texas supporting Air Education and Training Command (AETC), 2 in Florida (1 each) supporting Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) and Central Air Force (CENTAF)/ Central Command, 1 in Alabama at the USAF Counterproliferation Center (associated with Air University), 1 in Ohio supporting Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC), 1 at Bolling Air Force Base supporting the Air Force District of Washington (AFDW). Until Dec 2006, an additional 1 contractor was in Germany supporting USAFE/European Command. The position is currently vacant but will be filled later in 2007.

Contractor support has been outstanding to date. Deliverables have been received on time and costs have run consistently under or on budget, providing critical subject matter expertise to improve AF capability to combat WMD.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Appropriation. PE 35153F was programmed for \$3.4M for FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

In the FY08 POM, the PE was programmed for \$13.2M in FY07, \$3.4M in FY08, \$3.2M in FY09, and \$0 in FY10 and beyond.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

Additional FY 2008 funds: \$3.5M

Combating weapons of mass destructions (WMD) and counterproliferation are currently Congressional high-interest items. The House of Representatives (of the 110th Congress) recently passed House Resolution #1 whose short title is 'Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007.' Title XII of this resolution is entitled 'Preventing Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism.'

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Based on current program status, it would need approximately \$12.0M in FY09 & FY10 to complete major efforts. Once the initial efforts are completed, the program would transition/decrease to a "caretaker" role needing about \$5.0M per year and it is envisioned that the physical implementation of the program would be forwarded to the Major Commands (MAJCOM).

Additional funding in next POM/APOM: Yes, we plan to submit requirements in the FY09 APOM and FY10 POM..

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The C-CBRN Program supports national, Joint, and AF guidance.

DoD Pandemic Influenza Implementation Plan (2006)—The top priority is the protection of DoD forces, comprised of the military, DoD civilians and contractors performing critical roles...it is critical to ensure DoD is able to sustain mission assurance and the ability to meet our strategic objectives

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. Adversary and terrorist use of WMD is the greatest threat to AF forces and population and the AF has acknowledged significant capability shortfalls to meet this threat. It underwrites all AF missions by ensuring they can be conducted in the highest threat environment.

The Program integrates material solutions and functional expertise into improved sortie rates and decreased casualties. Supports Global War on Terrorism. Program is as necessary for the short-term war effort as for the long-term warfighting credibility of the Service on future battlefields.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CRITICAL EMERGENCY AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01,BA02,BA03,BA04
Program Element: ***79F, SAG Z
Potential Add: \$41.4M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The O&M Facilities Operation (FO) program provides emergency municipal services for installations under Air Force management including fire protection, explosive ordnance disposal, plant operations, and annual service contracts.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Additional funds will be used to meet emergency municipal services requirements for installations under Air Force management including fire protection, explosive ordnance disposal, plant operations, and annual service contracts.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding

would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

N/A.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium – emergency municipal services for installations under Air Force management including fire protection, explosive ordnance disposal, plant operations, annual service contracts.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CRYPTO UPGRADE (KOV-14)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27495F
Potential Add: \$1.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

KSV-21 Enhanced Crypto Cards (ECC) will replace existing KOV-14 in secured telephone equipment phones. Per direction of the National Security Agency Director, all STE phones must be using KSV-21s by 1 January, 2010.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To buy one-for-one replacements of 3522 existing KOV-14 crypto cards across Pacific Air Forces.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Mykotronx of California has great past performance producing the KOV-14.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

There's no funding in FY08 budget.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding

would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding will be required.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. This requirement was born from an obsolescence issue. The present capability (KOV-14) is being phased out by National Security Agency (NSA), the new item (KSV-21) replaces it.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2007, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

There are no savings to be achieved.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Extremely high value – provides secure voice capability for over 3500 USAF customers.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

No assets on-hand, must have 3522 fielded and installed by 1 Jan 2010.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
CYBER SPACE INTEGRATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27449
Potential Add: 25.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

These funds will be used to transform existing stand-alone capabilities currently managed by the Air Force Command and Control, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Center (AFC2ISRC), Air Force Communication Agency (AFCA), 38th Engineering and Installation Group, and Major Command/Communication Directors into a seamless global cyberspace infrastructure. This integration of land, air, space, and cyberspace capabilities will greatly improve speed and quality of information for warfighting decision makers.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Purchase contract support subject matter expertise and associated costs.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Multiple sources TBD.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

\$25M/yr; none; yes.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

An Air Force validated written requirement exists for this item. Combatant Commanders have the requirement to deliver global warfighting effects. A critical capability required to achieve these effects can be delivered by transforming current cyber entities into a “global enterprise” optimized and agile enough to deliver air, space, and cyberspace effects for the nation as well as for the regional joint force commanders. This activity is consistent with Joint C2 direction and will put the AF in a position of continued leadership in this area.

Today’s cyberspace infrastructure systems have limited interoperability and net-centricity. These limitations directly impact their ability to operate as part of a global enterprise. A global cyber enterprise will bring optimal war-fighting effectiveness with a coinciding point of “lowest cost of ownership.” This can be accomplished through building and sustaining a single service oriented architecture for an AF global cyber enterprise which is leveraged through regional command centers.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High – directly supports full spectrum of integrated global effects (kinetic/non-kinetic).

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008? Details have not been finalized in current fiscal year.

Milestone implementation date for this effort begins 1Q/FY08.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
DEFENSE RED SWITCH NETWORK

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27595F
Potential Add: \$8.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Defense Red Switch Network (DRSN) provides the National Command Authority (NCA), the National Military Command Center (NMCC), Combatant Commander Command Centers, Warfighters, and other critical DoD and federal activities with reliable, secure, interoperable Command/Control (C2) and crisis management capabilities. DRSN is a critical tool for secure conferencing and the only multi-level secure voice system.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funding is required to replace eight (DRSN) switches at Tyndall, Shaw, Langley and Offutt. This critical C2 asset will become manufacturer discontinued/end of life cycle in FY09.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Raytheon will be contracted to provide and install all equipment. Raytheon (Utah) is the sole source of this equipment and has installed all of the DRSN equipment currently in use.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional funds required. Costs include all required equipment and installation.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Existing requirement for secure C2 service is currently being met with the DRSN switches that will become manufacturer discontinued in FY 2009. The new switches will ensure that this critical warfighting service is there when needed. New switches will also be able to provide Voice over Secure Internet Protocol (VoSIP) interface. This action will ensure that critical C2 communications provided by the DRSN will continue to support the Air Combat Command Commander, Central Command Air Forces, 1AF, 8AF, 9AF, 12AF, U.S. Strategic Command, Continental United States North American Aerospace Defense Command Region, Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses, North East Air Defense Sector, Western Air Defense Sector and Command Centers throughout Air Combat Command (ACC).

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Savings is estimated to be 16% (\$7.2M) if funded in FY 2008. Significant funding increases if funded after FY 2009. Funding costs are expected to increase by 8.2% a year.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Inventory objective is to purchase and install 8 DRSN switches at four bases throughout ACC. Current inventory becomes manufacturer discontinued in FY 2009. There are no scheduled deliveries through the FYDP.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
DELIBERATE AND CRISIS ACTION PLANNING AND EXECUTION SYSTEM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 27438F
Potential Add: \$0.9M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) has issued a directive to the Deliberate and Crisis Action Planning/Execution System (DCAPES) program in Apr 06 to loosely couple from Global Command and Control System of the Air Force (GCCS-AF) architecture to the Global Combat Support System of the Air Force (GCSS-AF) architecture by Jan 09. This action is required to allow DISA the flexibility of moving JOPES database servers to locations that are in different locations of DCAPES database servers. Today Joint Operation Planning and Execution System (JOPES) and DCAPES database servers are located in the same location and are basically hard wired or directly connected (coupled). When DCAPES achieves the loosely coupling from GCCS-AF architecture, the development of DCAPES software will no longer be dependent on the development/baseline of JOPES software. The timeline for this loosely coupling directive must be achieved to allow DCAPES to remain operational for the warfighter and ensure no loss of integrity in deployment data of Air Force wartime taskings by Combatant Commanders. Therefore, it is essential that the requested funds be provided in FY08 to allow the DCAPES program to comply with a DISA directive for DCAPES to loosely couple from JOPES database servers.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To comply with a DISA directive.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The DCAPES contractor for 100% of the program development is the Computer Science corporation (CSC) located in Merrifield Virginia. Contract modification for this project was awarded in Dec 06 and is being developed within cost and schedule projections.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

\$0.9M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY07	FY08	FY09
\$6.3M	\$6M	\$5.9M

Funding is provided in the FYDP in out years but will not be available to program manager to meet deadline of DISA Directive. (The loose coupling process must begin in FY08 to meet this deadline.)

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

\$95.6M has been invested in the DCAPES program to date. Completed In-plant testing for DCAPES v4.0.3.1 on 12 Jan 07. Development Testing for this version is scheduled in Mar 07. The next milestone is Milestone B which is scheduled for Nov 08.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The written documents that exist for this item are the DCAPES CDD and the DISA Loose Coupling Memo. Citing a memo from the DISA director "The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) is in the planning stages of relocating all of its centrally managed Joint Operation Planning and Execution System (JOPES) servers and help desk support to the DISA Defense Enterprise Computing Centers (DECC), in order to support distributed operations in the net-centric environment. The relocation of the JOPES Strategic Server Enclaves (SSE) is tentatively planned for CY 2008.

During the GCCS-J JOPES v4.0 Operational Test, the system was failing to meet the 6-minute interoperability Key Performance Parameter, in part, because of the connection between Deliberate Crisis Action Planning and Execution System (DCAPES) and JOPES. For JOPES to meet that performance parameter and allow for a fielding decision, a temporary

solution to directly connect DCAPES to the JOPES database was agreed upon with the understanding the systems would be decoupled after the GCCS-J JOPES v4.0.1 fielding. For this connection to be established, the DCAPES servers were co-located with the JOPES SSEs. DISA is requesting the Air Force take measures to modify the DCAPES software to decouple these systems in accordance with the original plan prior to the move to the DECCs.”

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2007, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Funding will not accelerate any existing program capability; however it fulfills the funds needed to comply with the DISA Directive.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value (Air Force can not deploy personnel or resources without compliance of the DISA directive.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

100% compliance with the DISA Directive.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
DEPLOYABLE AND SECURE HEADQUARTERS COMMUNICATIONS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF), Operations & Maintenance (O&M)/Reserve

Budget Activity: BA 03; BA01 for O&M (Reserve)

Program Element: PE 53012F, 55395F

Potential Add: \$2.2M (OPAF), \$1.1M (O&M)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Air Force Reserve (AFR) has a requirement to purchase and sustain parts and equipment to meet critical theater deployable/combat communications requirements from combatant commanders. Additionally, to comply with First-Responder and Force Protection requirements, AFR must procure and sustain redundant voice and secure communications radios and consoles for its Command/Control (C2) facilities and security personnel.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

\$1.1M: Obligate (O&M) to sustain digital voice recorders and C2 consoles at AFR command posts, security forces units, fire departments, and base operations facilities. \$2.2M: Spend \$1.3M to procure 44 Ultra High Frequency (UHF)/Very High Frequency (VHF) secure radios at AFR sites; spend \$0.9M to procure 25 UHF/VHF/Satellite Communications (SATCOM) deployable, air-to-ground radios for Command & Control requirements.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

C2 Consoles: Siemens Corporation, Reston VA

UHF/VHF Radios: Harris Corporation, Rochester NY

UHF/VHF Deployable Radios: Raytheon Corporation, Fort Wayne, IN

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so,

provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

O&M sustainment costs of just over \$1M per year will remain an unfunded requirement and will have to compete with other AF priorities during the next POM cycle.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes.

C2 Consoles: The requirement was driven by Air Force Policy. Integrated communications consoles provide AFR C2 facilities with rapid, flexible communications and patching capability among all voice media types including phones, HF, UHF, VHF and land mobile radios to support First-Responder, digital voice recording and console capabilities for AFR installation security forces, fire departments, and base operations. AFR current investment in these systems is in excess of \$12M.

HF/UHF/VHF Radios: AF policy requires Major Commands (MAJCOMs) to “identify requirements and program/secure the necessary funding for facility configurations, equipment, and communications for command posts to operate efficiently and reliably.” In addition, AFR policy requires command posts to have a UHF radio capability and the alternate command post to have access to the same capability as the primary.

Today, Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) unit command posts use a variety of military and commercial off the shelf radios to provide air-to-ground communications; this current mix results in a non-standardized, logistically unsupportable, often non-secure communication capability. If left unfunded AFRC’s ability to maintain reliable voice and secure connectivity with assigned aircraft at all times will be degraded. AFRC risks losing command and control of

assigned assets during critical points in tasked missions.

Deployable Radios: Requirement driven by Deployable Operational Capability (DOC) statement and Unit Type Code (UTC) taskings to provide combatant commanders with deployable warfighting communications, as well as establishing Expeditionary Operating Locations.

Non-funding degrades ability to meet UTC requirements and the support to AF Concepts of Operation (CONOPS). No repair, maintenance, or upgrade capability for legacy deployable equipment .

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium to High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Obtain two UHF/VHF radios for each of the 22 AFR unit command posts (total of 44 radios). Obtain 25 UHF/VHF/SATCOM radios for theater deployable communications of AFR unit-equipped wings. No assets currently on hand.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this

item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
E-3 JOINT STARS AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM TRAINING
CONTRACTS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27417
Potential Add: \$8.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This requirement funds the contract training simulation services (CTSS) which provide pilot and mission crew training for the E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

AWACS CTSS will be fully funded; assuring combat mission ready aircrews will continue to be available to meet Combatant Commander taskings.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

L3Com, Boeing, and Plexis are the contractors providing these training services at Tinker AFB, OK. There are approximately 175 personnel employed by the contracts, and their performance has been satisfactory.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An equivalent amount of funding will be required across the FYDP for these multi-year contracts.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

A validated written requirement does not currently exist.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value for the effective application of US air power using the E-3 AWACS.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008? No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
E-8C JOINT STARS RELIABILITY, MAINTABILITY, AND AVAILABILITY (RM&A)
MODIFICATIONS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP11
Program Element: 27581F
Potential Add: \$8.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Joint STARS reliability, maintainability & availability (RM&A) program identifies and fixes critical low cost aircraft modifications related to deficiency reports, Class A/B/C mishaps, FAA safety and airworthiness directives, and Boeing service bulletins, all having serious impacts on mission capability and availability.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Critical aircraft modifications in FY08 address the Engine Oil Pressure Transmitter, which has become an end-of life component in the fleet. The solution to replace the transmitter/indicator is common in commercial Boeing 707s and the E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS). Another modification requirement in FY08 is procurement of Ground Cooling equipment. With the E-8C Joint Stars deployed supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, ground support equipment is required for operations at ramp temperatures up to 140 degrees Fahrenheit. The purchase of an air conditioning cart set designed to operate in this extreme environment and to develop the interfaces to the E-8 to re-circulate the cool air is required immediately. This has been a Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) initiative - yet to be funded.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

TBD pending receipt of funds requested.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

FY08 PBR funding in FY08 for Joint STARS RM&A modification line is only \$3.7M. \$8.2M request brings RM&A line up to required funding level of \$12.9M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Joint STARS RM&A Modification Line Funding (FY 08 PB)

<u>APPN</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>	<u>FY09</u>	<u>FY10</u>	<u>FY11</u>	<u>FY12</u>	<u>FY13</u>
3010 (\$M)	3.105	3.709	4.693	5.781	5.946	6.855	5.261

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

See chart below that addresses initial questions. Yes, we plan on pursuing this issue in the next APOM and POM. RM&A is funded at 37% of requirements.

Shortfall	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
(\$M)	8.2	6.7	4.2	3.8	3.5

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Validated Requirement: Joint STARS ORD, Rev 5, and 28 Dec 04, and PMD 6027(29) Mar 2002

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

TBD

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium: Joint STARS is the only joint asset capable of providing wide area ground surveillance and tactical C2 for Air and Land Component Commanders.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

This request will improve the RM&A of the E-8C Fleet.

14. If Congress added FY 2006 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ELECTRONIC WARFARE BATTLE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONAL UTILITY STUDY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 64270
Potential Add: \$0.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

These funds would provide for a study of the value added to Joint Force Commander (JFC) if Electronic Warfare Battle Management (EWBM) were employed as described in the "EWBM Functional Concept (Draft)". Findings would be used to defend continued program efforts, and to help write the JCIDS requirements documents and further refine the requirement.

EWBM is intended to support the JFC by coordinating multiple capabilities into a focused, efficient, and effective operation that maximizes EW effects against an adversary. The long term objective for this functionality is to enable dominance of the Electromagnetic Environment. The EWBM is a component of the Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA) System of Systems.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To accomplish the Operational Utility Study.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

None at this time.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

EWBM Capabilities/Solutions – No
This Study - No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

EWBM Capabilities/Solutions – No
This Study - No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

EWBM Capabilities/Solutions – TBD pending the study results.
This Study - None

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

EWBM Capabilities/Solutions – \$5M (Initial studies and JCIDS documentation to date)
This Study - None

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This study is supported by a validated written requirement from Air Combat Command (The Initial Capabilities Document for Denying Enemy Awareness through Airborne Electronic Attack /Approved 8 Nov 04).

.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

NA

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium/High.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

NA

14. If Congress added FY 2008 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

NA

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ENERGY COST INCREASES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01,BA02,BA03,BA04
Program Element: ***79F, SAG Z
Potential Add: \$84.4M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This program provides purchased utilities for AF installations. This adjustment is required to meet increasing energy costs. Despite reductions in energy consumption and operating efficiencies, energy cost increases have outpaced inflation. Due to budget cycle constraints, budgets have not been adjusted to address these rapidly increasing energy costs.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This request would fund utility requirements for FY08 to pay utility bills that we receive from commercial sources.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

FY08 PB includes \$820M for O&M Utilities, which \$84M is unfunded. The total requirement is \$904M. During the FY08 POM build the Air Force Corporate Process and the Major Command (MAJCOM)'s added the following amount to fix the Active O&M utilities baseline. Adjusted Program is \$421M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

N/A.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High – utilities such as electricity are vital to mission accomplishment.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they

released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 0207268F
Potential Add: \$20M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program (CIP) is the only source of sustaining engineering for USAF engines. It recoups approximately \$43 million in life-cycle cost benefits, and improves engine availability, reliability, and reduces maintenance man-hours for the war fighter. These tasks will help to mitigate the near and long-term effects of contingency operations in Southwest and South Central Asia.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This funding would accelerate 25 reliability & maintainability (R&M) improvement projects on 5 engines supporting B-1, B-2, C-130, F-15, and F-16 aircraft. Beyond priority safety and obsolescence fixes, Engine CIP looks for high efficiency R&M projects that improve reliability, mitigate risk, and reduce cost. Requested funding will result in increased aircraft/engine reliability in the near-term while contributing to lower Air Force (AF) operating costs over the long-term.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Pratt and Whitney (65%)

East Hartford, CT.

Rated "Exceptional" on last Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting (CPAR)

General Electric (30%)

Evandale, OH.

Rated "Very Good" on last CPAR

Rolls Royce/Allison (5%)

Indianapolis, IN.

Rated "Satisfactory" on last CPAR

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in

what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

- R-1 Line 142 (PE 0207268F Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program) request \$139 in the FY08 President's Budget Request -- this \$20M would be for additional work scope in FY08
- Note: This same \$20M also included in FY08 GWOT request.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 President's Budget through the Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP?) If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes – The AF deferred these projects from FY08 to FY09/FY10 in order to balance with total obligation authority (TOA). Engine CIP requirements are racked and stacked on an annual basis using a rigorous requirements/prioritization process with priority going to those projects already in-work.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next Program Objective Memorandum (POM)?

None - additional funding only required in FY08. The current funding in the FYDP will be used to complete these tasks. Additional funding for this program will not be pursued in the next POM.

8. If a Research & Development (R&D) item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

- Since the program's inception in 1955, Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program has provided valuable sustaining engineering for aircraft engines across the USAF fleet -- in the past 8 years (2000-2007), the USAF has invested \$1.255B
- Engine CIP is a continuing 07 RDT&E budget activity (approximately \$157M/yr). As such, Engine CIP does not have formal program milestones.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by a validated written requirement. All individual Engine CIP requirements (approximately 400 individual projects from 15 major engine models) are collected

and reviewed at multiple levels prior to being approved as validated requirements at the annual Aero Executive Advisory Board. This board is chaired by the AF Material Command, Aeronautical Systems Center Commander and primary members composed of the Major Command Logistics, Installations & Mission Support Directors. Current Engine CIP program consists of over 300 funded projects. In addition to addressing all engine safety concerns, these projects collectively will produce an estimated \$2 billion in life-cycle cost reductions.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

The early start will save \$43 million over the life cycle of these engines operations & maintenance (O&M). There are no acquisition or inflation savings. If these R&M improvements were fielded through attrition from FY10-FY20, the net savings would begin to accrue 2-4 years after initial fielding.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value – besides the financial and manpower savings, these projects improve the readiness, reliability, and affordability of 5 engines supporting frontline B-1, B-2, C-130, F-15, and F-16 aircraft and mitigate the impact of sustained high-ops tempo operations.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ENHANCED USE LEASING

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 91212F
Potential Add: \$7.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus up is or does.

Enhanced Use Leasing (EUL) is a lease of underutilized land, natural infrastructure, equipment and/or buildings for consideration equal to the assets' fair market value

Provides an opportunity for the Air Force to generate tangible returns from underutilized assets, including real property, by leasing them to non-federal entities in accordance with 10 U.S.C. § 2667.

Returns can be in the form of cash or in-kind consideration such as equipment; MILCON; facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization projects; or services that could not otherwise be realized in the current austere funding environment

Returns value to the Air Force, ultimately supporting the mission and the War fighter.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To fund skilled government personnel and contract commercial real estate expertise critical to executing intricate, value-based transactions with market entities. Currently not available within the Air Force.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Jones Lang LaSalle, Booz Allen Hamilton, Staubach and Associates, Alvarez & Marsal Real Estate Advisory Services, FPS Advisory Group, LLC, Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc, MWH Americas, Inc.

These companies are well-known entities in the commercial real estate market and related industries.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

None.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

N/A.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

We plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

- This program implements expanded authorities in the Military Leasing Act and 10 USC 2667.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value; provides funding and/or services back to the Air Force.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-

on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
ESSENTIAL BASE SUPPORT CONTRACTS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01,BA02,BA03,04
Program Element: ***96F, SAG Z
Potential Add: \$280.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Provides in-house and contractual support for day-to-day operations at installations to include Security Forces, Services, Transportation, Supply, Personnel and Wing Staff agencies. Includes civilian pay, equipment/supplies and contracts. Additional funding restores funds to 90% of requirements levels to ensure adequate base operation system (BOS) services can be provided.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This funding will bring the Major Commands to 90% of requirements levels to ensure that “must-pay” contract services such as dining facilities, vehicle maintenance, vehicle leasing and linen/laundry are paid.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

FY08 “must pay” items comprise 59% of total funding (civilian pay and AF central accounts). The remaining 41% funds the non-pay areas discussed in this information paper. This 41% funds mission readiness critical contract services for vehicle maintenance, dining halls, etc. (24%) along with civilian outsourcing and privatization and in-house mission readiness support (17%). FY08 non-pay base operating support (BOS) funding is at 66% for the active component, and annual execution average is 85%, meaning all funds provided are executed and significant funds are migrated from other priorities to cover BOS requirements.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

The item is funded at 66% of requirement in FY08. Funding is \$780.1M, O&M. The proposed add (\$280.6) would bring FY08 funding to 90% of requirement, the total recommended by the Annual Planning and Programming Guidance (APPG) as the total each Major Command (MAJCOM) should fund to. This funding would alleviate the need for MAJCOMs to migrate funds from other priorities.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FYDP funding for BOS (non-pay):

FY08: \$780.1M
FY09: \$744.7M
FY10: \$1,145.7M
FY11: \$995.7M
FY12: \$822.9M
FY13: \$897.1M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Additional funds required to restore BOS non-pay funding to 90% are noted below. In the next POM, we plan to fully communicate program requirements and program impact if funding is below requirement.

FY09: \$313.5M
FY10: \$0.0
FY11: \$108.5M
FY12: \$305.6M
FY13: \$256.2M

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best

estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

In FY08, an addition of \$280.6M would bring the program to 90% of required funding. FY08 funding is at 66% of requirement, and traditional base operating support (BOS) execution is at approximately 85%, meaning significant funds will be migrated by the MAJCOMs from other priorities to cover critical BOS requirements.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium -- contributes to quality of life of our Airmen and our warfighting capability.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
EXECUTIVE AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: 41840F
Potential Add: \$60M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Provides airborne broadband C2 capability for the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Combatant Commanders and senior leaders while onboard the Operational Support Aircraft/VIP Special Airlift Mission (OSA/VIPSAM) fleet. This service provides Senior Leaders the ability to stay abreast of national security and continue to C2 while onboard aircraft. This broadband satellite communications C2 capability meets the requirement outlined in DoD Directive 4660.3 and the Jan 2002 Office of Secretary Defense (OSD)/Networks and Information Integration (NII) memo requiring OSA/VIPSAM fleet to provide seamless connectivity and interoperability (voice, data, video) for senior leaders regardless of location or threat scenario

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

FY08 funding will be used to purchase one year of airborne broadband service for the OSA/VIPSAM fleet. This will be a continuation of a current contract.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

For FY08, The Boeing Company, based out of Seattle, Washington, is the sole contractor. The program office is satisfied to date with contractor's performance.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes, under 3400 funds, PE 41840, for \$7.1M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
7.1	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.4	7.5

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

The government is now the sole customer for Boeing's airborne communications service. Under the original contract, Boeing could spread the cost of providing the service across government and private-sector customers. After FY08, this is no longer the case. The ~\$160m/year estimate is a ROM for re-establishing the capability (whether it be through Boeing or some other means).

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This broadband satellite communications C2 capability meets the requirement outlined in DoD Directive 4660.3 and the Jan 2002 OSD/NII memo requiring OSA/VIPSAM fleet to provide seamless connectivity and interoperability (voice, data, video) for senior leaders regardless of location or threat scenario.

This broadband service shall provide a mobile, two-way broadband information service to DoD and USG aircraft within the Continental U.S. (CONUS) and Outside the Continental U.S. service regions. Typical applications will include Internet, E-mail, video teleconferencing, and server access. This service shall also include access to "free-to-air" television within the CONUS.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

Yes. We are currently under-funded for this service and cannot exercise the contract until fully funded.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
F-15C/D COUNTER MEASURES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 27130
Potential Add: \$39.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

ALE-58 (BOL) is a high capacity system that provides infra-red and radar countermeasures against known advanced threats. It is principally used on the F-15C to provide an improved infra-red (IR) decoy capability.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To equip 42 F-15C/Ds with continuous covert infrared countermeasures protection from IR missiles, including Man Portable Air Defense Systems, by procuring/installing the ALE-58 BOL system.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Two contractors are involved with this procurement, BAE (Austin, TX) accounts for 80% of the effort and Boeing (St. Louis, MO) accounts for the remaining 20%. There is no current performance data; however, cost/schedule is not an issue because the kits are procured through a Firm Fixed Price contract.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

There is no funding in the FY08 budget.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

N/A

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional funding required.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

The program requires an additional \$62M to complete the planned upgrade to the long-term F-15C fleet. The program does not plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

The requirement is not an R&D item.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The ALE-58 increases F-15C survivability against IR missiles. It does this by providing additional IR decoys compared to the current IR decoy (flare) configuration. It is also more capable against modern IR missiles than the current standard flare. This increased survivability is not accomplished today.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

The program realizes no savings if FY08 funds are provided.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

The ALE-58 has high military value. It provides increased protection against advanced IR missiles.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is 178 units; however none are currently procured nor are any budgeted for in the FYDP.

14. If Congress added FY 2008 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
F-15C/E DIGITAL VIDEO RECORDERS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP11
Program Element: 27134F
Potential Add: \$28.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The proposed funding will procure 360 units (110 F-15Es and 200 C/Ds and 27 playback stations). The existing legacy 8mm Video Tape Recorder (VTR) is obsolete and inadequate. It has limited capability, is prone to failure, and hampers training. A modern digital video recorder would enhance combat capability by:

- 1) Providing enhanced reconnaissance via longer recording time with imagery across more displays in a digital medium which allows rapid dissemination.
- 2) Improving training and increasing reliability. Provides ability to reconstruct training scenarios and maneuvers no longer subject to VTR limitations and aircrew memory.
- 3) Giving us the ability to use data from a military standard (MIL-STD)1553 multiplex data bus (an integrated, centralized system control and a standard interface for all equipment) to create an integrated 'God's-eye view' for outside the aircraft perspective to display a virtual debriefing environment ('Red Flag in a box')
- 4) Providing an immense amount of debrief data which assists in the maintenance of the aircraft and assists troubleshooting and incident investigations.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This funding would Integrate Digital Video Recorders (DVRS) into the F-15C/D, procure 110 F-15E DVRS, 200 F-15C/D DVRS, and 27 playback stations.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Boeing St.Louis, Missouri (32%) integration piece under the Eagle Talon contract, nothing has been delivered to date.

Calculex, Las Cruces, New Mexico (68%, 21 from Calculex, plus subcontractors)

There are over 500 DVRS installed on 14 platforms including some rotary wing platforms in the United States Air Force, Navy and Army as well as Israeli and Japanese Air Forces. The contractor provides a warranty and the Mean Time between Failures for the 2300F15 solid state recorder is 23,812 hours.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in

what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding in FY 10-11. The DVR program has \$3.284M of 3010 funds in FY07 for F-15E procurement and outfitting one squadron with 18-24 DVRs and playback stations.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	\$M	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
F15 A/D DVR				6.371	22.804	8.731
F15 E DVR				12.379	22.042	

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional costs.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

If we received additional funds in FY08, the funding required in the FYDP would be decreased by the proportional amount. 100% of funding is within the FYDP and we will not pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not an RDT&E program.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

An Air Force validated written requirement articulates an urgent and compelling need for a digital recorder capability as legacy 8mm tape systems continue to age and become unsupportable.

The F-15A-D and F-15E DVR shall be based on a common LRU, and shall use a common recording cartridge with cartridge receptacle in the cockpit (front or rear) of the F-15E and in the cockpit or in an avionics bay for the F-15A-D. DVR shall be able to record 5 (threshold); 10

(objective) video channels for 4 hours, be able to playback any single (threshold) all (objective) recorded video channel(s) while in flight, record 1 (threshold); 2 (objective) channel(s) of audio from the aircraft communication system, and record 2 (threshold); 4 (objective) channels of MIL-STD-1553 bus data as well as be capable of high resolution and high quality video and audio recording. Playback software shall be purchased with rights to install it on any number of government computers and shall be PC-based. F-15A-D require at least 378 (plus 10% spares) DVR systems for Active Duty and Air National Guard. The F-15E require at least 224 (plus 10% spares) DVR systems. DVR cartridges shall be procured at a rate of 1.5 cartridges per DVR.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Inflation savings would equate to approx \$3.5M.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Procurement item, the quantity on hand is zero for FY 05-06.

The FY08 PB thru the FYDP will procure 232 + 23 spares for F-15C/D and 224 F-15Es + 22 spares.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? None Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure,

personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Operational & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01, BA02, BA03, BA04
Program Element: ***78F, SAG R
Potential Add: \$185.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Facilities Sustainment requirements consist of annual maintenance and life cycle repair of Air Force real property. This work is essential to maximizing the service life of facilities, utility systems, and infrastructure. The requirement directly supports Air Force missions by ensuring the operability of critical infrastructure such as runways, hangars, fire suppression, power, and fueling systems. This upward adjustment would enable the Air Force to fund 100% of the FY08 requirement projected by the Facilities Sustainment Model (FSM), in accordance with the OSD Strategic Planning Guidance. (The FSM is a tri-service model developed by OSD that uses industry standards to project sustainment requirements for real property.)

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Additional funds are needed to complete required maintenance and life-cycle repairs of Air Force facilities and infrastructure. Sustainment requirements have been carefully modeled, using industry standards, to determine the minimum investment required to maximize the life-span and prevent premature failure of building systems, utilities, runways, and other installation infrastructure. The investment in Sustainment is leveraged significantly by preserving the value of the existing investment in the Air Force's physical plant. Furthermore, the additional funds invested in Sustainment would prevent deterioration of critical infrastructure, precluding premature failures that result in negative impacts on mission performance. This upward adjustment would enable the Air Force to fund 100% of the FY08 requirement projected by the Facilities Sustainment Model (FSM), thereby meeting the OSD Strategic Planning Guidance investment target for Sustainment.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

There is no funding for this requirement across the FYDP. Yes.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Some/Medium - Accepting risk by under funding Facility Sustainment causes mission disruption resulting from premature and unplanned facility and infrastructure failures. Inadequate sustainment significantly shortens the life cycle of facilities and infrastructure, driving increased costs in future years as systems fail prematurely. Since facilities and infrastructure are critical to supporting all Air Force operations, mission effectiveness is directly related to performance of the physical plant. The reliability of runways, hangars, power distribution, fuel systems, heating plants, and other critical infrastructure is directly tied to the preventative maintenance and life cycle repairs which are funded through the Sustainment program.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-AIR FORCE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E); Operations & Maintenance (O&M); Other Procurement (OPAF)

Budget Activity: BA 675046 (RDT&E); BA 01 (O&M); BA P1#31 (OPAF)

Program Element: PE 33141F

Potential Add: \$4.8M (RDT&E); \$36.8M (O&M); \$9.6M (OPAF)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Global Combat Support System-Air Force (GCSS-AF) is a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA), software and hardware, to store and pass combat support data between applications and software objects, and provide the warfighter real-time access to accurate, current information and decision support tools. GCSS-AF is a modern, unified, integrated framework providing a secure flow of timely, accurate, and trusted Agile Combat Support (ACS) information, with the appropriate level of security. This enables any authorized process or user to train, equip, deploy, employ, sustain and redeploy Air Expeditionary Forces (AEF) worldwide during peace and war and in support of the war fighting Combatant Commanders.

GCSS-AF is the software and computing infrastructure to receive modernized, web-based systems and further reduce existing infrastructure, while delivering the Combatant Commanders Asset Visibility requirements, and integrate the combat support information for the warfighter. GCSS-AF will consolidate and integrate automated information systems to achieve cost avoidance, remove business processing inefficiencies, enable reduced deployment footprint, and improve the speed with which information flows, allowing our Expeditionary Aerospace Force to execute the Air Force mission throughout the full spectrum of military operations. The modernized systems will be implemented and sustained worldwide and support both wartime and peacetime requirements using hardware, software, and communications capabilities available from standard open systems government contracts and communications infrastructure programs. These collective systems provide the essential combat support system information to more quickly generate aircraft in support of the preparation of Air Tasking Orders.

Over the past two years additional requirements have been added to GCSS-AF. The AF is implementing an enterprise data services strategy to emulate the most successful commercial supply chain. These enterprise data services include an enterprise data warehouse for structured information and associated analytical and information services. The DoD and AF began an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) strategy in multiple business domains. GCSS-AF will natively host the Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS) and the Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS) in the logistics and finance domains respectively. Also, the AF began the Enterprise Information Management (EIM) program to provide a repository for unstructured information (e.g. documents) and associated services such as records management and workflow. These requirements have driven an urgent need for additional resources to support the

GCSS-AF program.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

- RDT&E, \$4.831M, provides for platform Engineering and application service.
- O&M, \$36.739M:
 - \$5.390M for support of: deployed infrastructure, including outreach services, maintenance release, data and edge services;
 - \$9.901M for deferred FY07 activities
 - \$8M continuity of operations -- second active site),
 - \$6.5M to stand up Secure Internet Protocol Router data services
 - \$2M for a six-month contract overlap (assuming new contract award March 08)
 - \$5M for additional Systems Program Office (SPO) for support SPO squadron standup
- OPAF, \$9.602M, provides for additional servers, memory, COTS licensing, and data warehouse hardware and software.

The additional funding supports the continued development of GCSS-AF, refreshes hardware and software for the already fielded capabilities, pays for deferred FY07 activities, and establishment of a second active site and Secret Internet Protocol Router Network data services, including services development, enterprise architecture support, contractor operations and support personnel, Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software maintenance, Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) hosting costs, and edge server support.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states?

Lockheed Martin Integrated Systems and Solutions, headquartered in Gaithersburg, MD, is the GCSS-AF prime contractor. Lockheed Martin IS&S is a Capability Maturity Model Integrated (CMMI) Level 5 certified organization and has delivered all aspects of the program within cost and schedule. LM IS&S provides a point of presence through their personnel in various locations:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Personnel</u>
Dayton, OH	110
Endicott, NY	90
Montgomery, AL	40
Virginia	12
Chicago, IL	10
California	8
Boston, MA	2

Subcontractors include:

Lockheed-Martin (Headquarters), Gaithersburg, MD 20879-3328
Lockheed-Martin, Fairborn, OH 45324

Standard Systems Group, Air Force Materiel Command, Gunter AFB, AL 36114
 IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York 10504-1722
 BroadVision Worldwide Headquarters, Redwood City, CA 94063
 World Wide Technology, Maryland Heights, MO 63043

What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

To date, the LM team (that is LM and their subcontractors) has performed well. There are no issues to report.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. R1 Line 172 (PE 33141F) has \$10.6M for FY08; P1 Line 31 has \$12.4M budgeted for Other Procurement; Operations and Maintenance has \$44M budgeted in Other Combat Operations Support. The requested increase buys the same type of capabilities and sustainment support to help us meet growing demands for GCSS-AF service and further accelerate our enterprise level service capabilities.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

This is the FY08 PB with the exception of O&M for FY07 - that number reflects a redirect from Base Communications to GCSS-AF in FY07 distro plus the amount of O&M approved in the AF Financial Plan.

(TY, \$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
3600							
Funded	24.345	10.631	4.415	3.763	4.056	3.724	3.684
3400							
Funded	51.221	44.009	42.989	47.913	53.021	53.096	54.493
3080							
Funded	11.702	12.432	10.720	18.351	15.494	15.592	14.799

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

The \$41.617M additional funding requested is above that already programmed. This requests includes \$17.895M (OPAF) and \$23.722M (O&M). None of these funds are budgeted at this time, but we do plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

From 2002 through 2007, the Air Force will have invested \$145M RDT&E and \$74M of OPAF into GCSS-AF. With over 600,000 registered customers and a world-wide footprint, GCSS-AF has fielded major capabilities and is far beyond its IOC. The SPO uses continuous developmental testing for all new releases. An Operational Test and Evaluation is being planned in support of an Full Operational Capability determination, the program's next milestone.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The GCSS-AF Operational Requirements Document dated 23 Dec 2001 states that "GCSS-AF will provide AF Commanders, their staffs, and supporting Warfighter elements with decision support and visualization tools based on Combatant Commander stated requirements. GCSS-AF will provide capabilities, not currently existing, to help Commanders decide whether operational Courses of Action (COAs) are supportable. In a peacetime context, the GCSS-AF will support Air Force, contractor, and vendor personnel in performing their daily jobs. The GCSS-AF facilitates wartime and peacetime support through increasing information interoperability among the 23 Combat Support Families of Systems. GCSS-AF will allow application of consistent business rules to provide users with accurate information, improved AIS reliability, and lower sustainment costs. Data from multiple sources will be processed, modeled, and visualized together, significantly increasing information value to the warfighter and supporting elements."

According to the GCSS Family of Systems Mission Area Initial Capabilities Document dated 25 Aug 2004, "we are currently operating with automated logistics systems that have been far surpassed by technology. Services and Defense Agencies continue to develop systems that meet specific functional Service needs in support of the warfighter. However, today the Joint Task Force (JTF) Commander must collect logistics information from multiple Service and Defense Agency functional specific stove piped systems. The JTF has no single focal point for a complete fused, integrated picture of logistics information. Even after the information is collected from multiple sources, it becomes man-hour intensive to take this huge volume of data and turn it into something meaningful from which to make decisions. All too often, the time consumed by this manual manipulation of data makes the logistician less effective in a high-paced operational environment. Thus, the information is too late to influence the joint warfighter's decision cycle. This coupled with maintenance costs and the vulnerability to the various threats, as discussed above, demand [sic] that we focus on changing not only our information architecture, but our business processes as well."

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best

estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Additional funds will allow GCSS-AF to provide the required capacity, services and support for hosting the data warehouse, ERPs, and EIM. The additional funding allows for cost avoidance. Without the additional investment the data warehouse, ERPs, and EIM will be required to procure their own infrastructure.

GCSS-AF has an AF Cost Analysis Agency-approved Economic Analysis with a calculated Return on Investment (ROI) of 650%. An average application will save \$27M over 10 years if it is hosted on GCSS-AF rather than as a stand-alone system. In addition, it is estimated that the Air Force will save over \$150M per year by migrating web content to the GCSS-AF Portal. There are also manpower reallocations possible by eliminating IT infrastructure. For example, the Installations and Logistics domain estimates it will return 200 munitions personnel to their warfighting duties due to their re-hosting of the Combat Ammunition System on GCSS-AF.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
GEOSPATIAL PRODUCT LIBRARY (GPL)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: PE 41300F
Potential Add: \$1.1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Geospatial Product Library is an Air Force worldwide digital repository of standard geospatial intelligence products -- the electronic version of maps, charts, imagery intelligence, and other products produced by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA). Many Air Mobility Commands (AMC) units still use paper a version which significantly reduces the speed intelligence is delivered to the cockpit.

This funding will provide AMC with the ability to stand-up a Major Command-level digital repository of those products, tailored for AMC needs, by outfitting AMC units with one computer with digital products instead of 20+ shelves full of paper products, tied to central servers that provide automated updates.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds the initial purchase of the hardware, software, and system administration costs to stand up and implement the Air Force's GPL capability for AMC.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

None.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None of this cost is budgeted in the current FYDP. Command-wide implementation, sustainment, and Operations & Maintenance of approximately \$1M is being pursued in the next programming cycle.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The validated requirement is spelled out in the Air Force Geospatial Transformation Plan (GTP), which mandates the AF migrate to a fully digital environment by 2010. These are validated Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) weapon system requirements.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This request has high military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Inventory objective is to support AMC Headquarters intelligence and 107 units with unencumbered access to the GPL products. Inventory will include one server and one server storage device at the headquarters/Tanker Airlift Control Center, 15 active duty AMC bases, and 72 Guard and Reserve locations. In addition, 72 external hard drives are required at AMC-gained Guard and Reserve units which are not located on or near one of the active duty bases.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM COMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA83
Program Element: 35165F
Potential Add: \$10M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Funding purchases full support of contract extension for the Command and Control System (CCS) for Global Positioning System (GPS) for first two quarters of FY08, providing launch and early orbit, anomaly resolution and disposal operations. Funding pays for contract support and maintenance of software and equipment. Funding covers only emergency fixes to hardware, software, and database updates to accommodate the launches.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

CCS is required to validate new Command and Control (C2) capability (called LADO – Launch, Anomaly, Disposal Operations) that will fully replace CCS. CCS sustainment is required until LADO is declared operational. LADO cannot be declared operational until it has performed GPS launch and early orbit operations. CCS will perform hot-backup functions for LADO during the next GPS launch in Sept 07.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Boeing North American (prime), Lockheed Martin (sub) and Braxton Technologies (sub – developer). Approximately 80% of work is Braxton, and 20% split at varying levels between BNA and LM. States are primarily Colorado and California. Performance has met standards since CCS delivery in 1991. CCS has been extended five times to accommodate slips in schedules for GPS LADO. LADO is under testing with rehearsals now and delivery will be complete once validated by an actual launch where LADO is the primary system and CCS is available to provide backup to this new system.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

This item was funded in FY07 at the level of \$19.6M and was added to the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) funding baseline. Funds are needed for first two quarters of FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by a validated written requirement.

The current mission is accomplished through the use of CCS, operated by Air Force Space Command (AFSPC). The new system, LADO, will be operated by 2 Satellite Operation Squadron (SOPS)/AFSPC at Schriever Air Force Base, Colorado. CCS was slated to be terminated due to sustainment costs in 2003, but due to development issues for alternate C2 for launch, CCS must be extended into FY08. Savings with LADO come through sustainability and centralized control by 2 SOPS/AFSPC.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings will be realized.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value – maintains GPS contribution to precisely deliver munitions against US adversaries and save lives through search and rescue (military and civilian). Funding limits risk to GPS constellation.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
HIGH SPEED ANTI-RADITION MISSILE DESTRUCTION OF ENEMY AIR DEFENSE
ATTACK MODULE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Missile Procurement, Air Force
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 27162F
Potential Add: \$30.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This plus-up provides funding for production tooling, test equipment and procurement of about 210 High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) Destruction of Enemy Air Defenses (DEAD) Modification Kits. This upgrade is also called the HARM Destruction of Enemy Air Defense Attack Module (HDAM), which is a modification to the AGM-88B/C missile control section to add precision navigation capability. A Global Positioning System (GPS) and Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) capability is integrated into a navigation set with additional processors as well as new flight control and navigation software. The modification is limited to hardware and software modification of the existing control section and reprogramming of the missile guidance section. This capability will provide a high-speed attack capability against time-critical targets while limiting collateral damage and fratricide.

HDAM has already been developed and tested, eliminating risk and documenting system level performance. HDAM has been fully integrated with the F-16 aircraft and targeting systems needed for maximum performance. Field support equipment modifications have been accomplished and successfully tested.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Procurement of 210 HDAM modification kits to add the GPS/geo specificity capability to the Air to Ground Missile (AGM)88B/C HARM.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ would be the sole source able to execute this procurement of HDAM modification kits. The development of this modification kit was conducted under a Cooperative Research and Development (CRAD) effort with the Air Force providing funds for the integration and demonstration flight testing with the F-16 M4.2+ Operational Flight Program (OFP). Delivery of test assets and accompanying software to the F-16 program office, Systems Integration Laboratory (SIL) and the test range was on-time and of excellent quality, as evidenced by three out of three very successful missile launches, fully demonstrating the increased capability of this HARM modification.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No funding for procurement of HDAM modification kits is contained in FY 2008.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None. All FY 2008 costs, including Government costs, are fully estimated in the \$30.8M.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An additional \$6.6M would be required in FY 2009 and 2010 to complete this procurement. Government flight testing to go from a CRAD effort to a fielded system would cost \$1.6M in FY 2009. Installation costs for the 210 modification kits would be \$1.4M in FY 2009 and \$2.5M in FY 2010. Program support/scientific engineering and technical assistance require \$1.1M across FY09-10. Yes, a POM submission is being considered.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not an R&D item, although some production tooling and test equipment effort will be required to be fully ready for production of this modification kit.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

No, a draft AGM-88 HARM Destruction of Enemy Air Defense Operational Requirements Document (ORD) is being prepared.

A low cost precision navigation capability integrated with the existing HARM AGM-88C will provide significant near-term (1) elimination of collateral damage and fratricide, (2) high speed ability to attack precisely located targets, (3) increased effectiveness against low power and advanced radar emitters.

Analysis of operations during IRAQI Freedom (OIF), Kosovo, Desert Storm, and Bosnia determined that existing HARM Performance does not fill current defense suppression and

destruction needs. The existing capability lacks the precision navigation capability needed to take advantage of the upgraded HARM Targeting System (R7) and the SNIPER targeting pod on the F-16 M4+ to eliminate or dramatically reduce collateral damage or fratricide and to open an entirely new target set of any precisely located targets utilizing HARM very short time from launch to impact. HDAM has already been fully integrated and flight tested with HTS R7 and SNIPER during the F-16 2004 Development, Test, and Evaluation of the Air to Air Missile (AIM) 9X at Edwards Air Force Base, California. HDAM is now in F-16 Operational, Test, and Evaluation in California.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings realized.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. HDAM is directly applicable to identified shortcomings of the HARM System. HDAM adds a new and unequaled high speed precision strike capability against a wide variety of targets.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No. This is not a competitively procured item.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

An objective of 1200 HDAM-modified missiles. No units are in inventory.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure,

personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
HIGH FREQUENCY GROUND CONTROL STATIONS ANTENNAS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: PE 33133F
Potential Add: \$30.9M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The DoD High Frequency Global Communications System (HFGCS) was merged and Air Mobility Command (AMC) was appointed the lead command in 1994. With the merger, AMC inherited over 30 different types of antennas at 14 (now 13 with the closure of Keflavik in 2006) worldwide stations. There was no standard antenna configuration among the 127 antennas at these stations and the antennas are nearing or past their design life. Numerous antenna elements are inoperative. These inoperative antenna elements mean certain HFGCS frequencies are not available to support the warfighter. This degradation in service will not only continue to impact current operations, but it also hinders the program's efforts to digitize High Frequency (HF) for its more effective use. The program is now trying to do a complete antenna replacement within the FY08-13 POM, but assistance in FY08 reduces the increasing risk of mission failure.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Additional funding will purchase and install 10 new antennas in FY08. These antennas are needed to standardize and modernize the HFGCS. It will also maintain the integrity of the HF network and provide the required level of service to the operational community.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

None selected as of January 2007. The HFGCS Program Office is developing a long-term antenna strategy to begin in FY08 with available funding. The contract strategy is to use a competitive, small-business contract to acquire, install, and maintain antennas at the HFGCS stations. Antenna work will be performed on the most critical antennas in HFGCS first. The 13 stations exist in Alaska, California, Hawaii, Guam, Nebraska, Maryland, Puerto Rico, Japan, Diego Garcia, United Kingdom, Portugal, Ascension Islands, and Italy.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

There is partial funding in the FY2008 budget. Approximately \$3.14M is included in the Other Procurement, Air Force budget justification documents in FY08 which will buy nominally 10 antennas in that year.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FDYP.

Yes. FY08-13 profile is:

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$3.1M	\$3.2M	\$3.2M	\$3.3M	\$3.3M	\$3.4M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding will be required in subsequent fiscal years. Air Mobility Command (AMC) is consolidating all the antenna requirements and will be submitting them for Air Force consideration in the FY09 POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

An Air Force validated and written requirement dated Mar 1996, ” require a radio systems capable of providing continuous, reliable communications services. These radio systems must support broad communications services ranging from single channel, simplex, non-secure voice to multi-channel, non-secure/secure, full duplex voice and data connectivity. The system must economically use the HF spectrum, placing radiated RF power where it is needed and minimizing RF power in areas where it is not needed....”

The HFGCS program provides the current HF capability through 13 stations worldwide. Unfortunately, these stations possess equipment that is at or past its life cycle and service capability continues to degrade. HF radio is the primary Air/Ground/Air communications medium for most DOD aircraft and drives the need for a modern high power HF system. The HFGCS program provides real-time secure and non-secure voice or data communications between Command and Control (C2) operations controllers and aircrews, or deployed theater units.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if

the proposal were implemented.

As HFGCS uniquely provides world-wide "flight follow" communications, the lack or a severely degraded version of this service manifests itself in lost time, fuel and-in some scenarios--lives. Moreover, as the FYDP sustainment tail does not factor in deteriorating antennas, the O&M savings is more in terms of cost avoidance than decreased sustainment.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is to procure 10 new HF antennas in FY08. This procurement results in no inventory change. The HFGCS inventory is 127 antennas. These new antennas would replace the existing inventory antennas and the old antennas will be deactivated.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Yes, \$1M for Guam was added. Funds have been issued and obligation should occur in the next 2-3 months

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE REMOTE VISUAL ASSESSMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: MPAF
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 0101213F
Potential Add: \$13.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) Security Modernization program adds delay/denial and situational awareness features to Minuteman III launch facilities (LFs). Remote Visual Assessment (RVA) allows security forces to tailor alarm response with appropriate force. In total, the 3 ICBM wings have missile launch facilities scattered across 44, 600 square miles. The proposed plus-up buys an additional 90 RVA installation kits, accelerates deployment of this vital security tool, and helps assure the security forces arrive with the appropriate force.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

We would buy an additional 90 installation kits. The resulting FY08 total would be enough to complete the equivalent of an entire ICBM wing. (The smallest ICBM wing stretches across 8,500 square miles.)

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Work to date has been performed in several areas. The contractor segment is managed via the ICBM Prime Integration Contract (IPIC) with Northrop Grumman in Clearfield, Utah. Key subcontractors include Boeing Co (Clearfield, Utah). The Air Force conducted a 6-month field evaluation of proposed RVA system components at Minot AFB ND. Development cost and schedule have been satisfactory to date. Quality is satisfactory.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding is contained in P-1 line item no. 9 for PE11213F, but the funding for the additional 90 kits are in the out-years, not in FY08. The Unfunded Priority List requested funds would accelerate \$10.1M to FY08 to buy 90 additional RVA installation kits (total 150) in FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Remote Visual Assessment (\$M)	10.1	6.6	26.1	20.6	0.0	0.0

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

This program will require any additionally funding. The Deployment of RVA Phase 1 is fully funded in the FYDP.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the requirements exist in the Capability Development Document for ICBM Security.

The RVA requirement is to remotely assess (through visual means) security alarms at unmanned ICBM launch facilities. No such assessment capability exists today. As a result, security forces are dispatched to all alarm situations across the 44,600 square miles, AOR, without knowing the threat prior to arrival.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Using RVA avoids adding significant security forces manpower to meet current DoD nuclear weapon security standards. Operational savings will accrue throughout the life of the system as spurious alarm situations are assessed and resolved remotely, without the dispatch of security forces.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Planned vs accelerated Program

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	Total
Remote Visual Assessment units	60	48	200	142	0	0	450
Percentage	13.33%	24.00%	68.44%	100.00%			
Accelerated program	150	48	200	52	0	0	450
Percentage	33.33%	44.00%	88.44%	100.00%			

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
THE INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (IBD)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)/Other Procurement (OPAF)

Budget Activity: BA04, BA03

Program Element: 27589F

Potential Add: \$9.9M (O&M), \$17.7M (OPAF)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Integrated Base Defense (IBD) Concept of Operations (CONOPS) 2020, Commander, Pacific Air Forces (COMPACAF) memo, dated 2 May 05, mandated the use of advanced hostile target detection. This IBD implementation memo recognized the challenges associated with only using Security Forces (SF) manpower to support security requirements mandated in DoD and Air Force directives. These challenges are compounded by the ongoing Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) and the ever-increasing Operations Tempo (OPSTEMPO). To help offset these compounding factors, implementation of different tactics, techniques and procedures (TTP) is needed and their success depends heavily on using technology to help protect critical resources (e.g. Protection Level resources) and to serve as a force multiplier. To be effective, as demonstrated during recent System Effectiveness Assessments (SEA), these components – TTPs and Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) – must be part of a robust Integrated Base Defense Security System (IBDSS) to provide SF with the ability to “See First” (detect), “Understand First” (assess) and “Act First” (respond and neutralize) to threats against AF resources.

The Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) IBDSS program is a centrally managed program supporting the alarm/sensor and flightline enhancement program planning and installation of PL sensors, now referred to as IBDSS, within the PACAF theatre of operation. Historically, these sensors have been piecemealed together, where they existed at all. Justifiable increases in security after 9/11 combined with improved sensor and annunciator technology have made integrated systems possible to fill identified vulnerabilities and provide advanced hostile target detection. Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) Funding for weapon system security procures camera, sensors, alarms, turnstiles, annunciator, and fiber optics. This upgrades warfighter space weapon system security by replacing failing/uncertified systems. The weapon systems security lifecycle is 8 years. These systems are 17 & 10 years old. The upgrades increase effectiveness from current 3% to 90%. The commercial gate x-ray machines increases contraband detection (explosives, weapons, controlled substances) from 15% to 95%; frees military working dogs/manpower for other critical tasks.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Adequate funding will install required lines of sensor detection around PL 1 – 3 critical resources and provide for single point of annunciation for all PL and resource protection sensors at each installation within PACAF. Funding will replace inefficient and aging systems identified by the Security Effectiveness Assessments (SEA) at all PACAF bases and provide security

systems to support new missions brought into PACAF Area of Responsibility (AOR).

In AFSPC, continue the phased replacement of electronic security systems at Schriever & Buckley and the purchase of commercial x-ray machines at FE Warren, Vandenberg, Schriever, and Buckley Air Force Bases.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A in PACAF.

In AFSPC Current contractor is Diebold, this contract is let out of the 46 TW and program management provided by ESC.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding outlined above is proposed for FY2008 and does not differ from the budget submission.

No, not for PACAF or AFSPC

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No for PACAF.

Yes, in AFSPC FY08 funding will start Phase III and IV of the Schriever project. FY09 funding will be split to complete Phase IV of the Schriever and start the Buckley project. FY10 funding will finish the Buckley project. FY11 funding will procure the commercial gate x-ray machines.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None for PACAF.

There will be approximately an additional \$22M required based on the independent review conducted by Sandia National Laboratories (SNL). They found problems with the infrastructure. These need to be fixed so it can support the new security system and growth of the unit.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

PACAFs \$9.9M in 3400 funding will meet Integrated Base Defense needs in PACAF

In AFSOC there will be approximately an additional \$22M required based on the independent review conducted by SNL. They found problems with the infrastructure. These need to be fixed so it can support the new security system and growth of the unit.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A for both commands.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes—refer to paragraph 1 above, plus the fact that existing security systems in support of Protection Level (PL) resources are beyond 10-year lifecycle or nonexistent. The IBD program mandates employment of available technology to protect Air Force personnel and PL resources. These systems and equipment enable USAF security forces to protect against a continually changing threat. Furthermore, current systems are decaying and not compliant with Air Force instructions. Nor do the current systems provide commanders the target-detection capability needed to properly protect personnel, PL resources, and other mission-critical assets. These problems drive an increased use of Air Force manpower in already over-stress career fields. Lack of funding will result in significant shortfalls in the ability to survey, install, activate, and maintain needed alarm systems for protection of PL resources, facilities, and other alarmed areas for both PACAF and AFSPC.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None in PACAF. Our current budget plan requests funding during the FYDP starting in FY08.

In AFSPC, the acquisition cost savings will be the absence of inflation costs. The longer it takes to complete the projects the more it costs due to inflation. Inflation costs are approximately 7% growth per year.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium to high military value in PACAF because it directly supports IBD CONOPS 2020 COMPACAF memorandum mandating advanced hostile target detection of threats against PACAF installations. It also provides protection for mission critical assets and resources, and new missions such as the F-22A and C-17. Without funding, IBDSS cannot be the force multiplier needed to ensure security requirements for PL resources will be met. This is a high military value line item, especially for bases supporting special weapons.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A. These equipment items are commercial of the shelf, there is no inventory for these items.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
M4 CARBINES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Ammunition Procurement (AMPAF)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27580F
Potential Add: \$392M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Procures 215K M4 carbines for AF Warfighters to replace Vietnam era M16 series rifles. Airmen need to deploy and defend with weapons that are interoperable with other US Military Services and provide the advantage over our adversaries. Our troops deserve the best equipment we can provide.

Small arms must be capable of operation in confined spaces such as vehicle operations, open gorilla/urban warfare, counter-terrorism and other non-traditional taskings. The M4 carbine inherently enhances maneuverability over legacy systems. The M4 carbine has superior upgrade capability due to the standard rail system. The rail system allows enhancement of optics and night vision attachments as technology evolves. The current AF M4 configuration has a standardized optic which simplifies firing for the warfighters.

Note: M4 Carbine System consists of carbine, combat sling, one 30-round magazine and Technical Manual. The Blank Firing Attachment will be furnished by Colt and over packed with each system. The M68 Optic with Technical Manual will be provided as Government Furnished Material (GFM) to be over packed with the system. The Back-up Iron Sight (BUIS) will be provided as GFM and mounted on the weapon; mounting instructions for the BUIS (for use in the field) will be over packed with each system. Colt will provide and over pack each weapon system with one (1) Muzzle Cap, one (1) Rifle Cover, and seven (7) Magazine covers.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Procure 215K M4 carbines to equip Active, Guard and Reserve forces. This action will result in Sustainment cost reduction eliminating four other rifle systems, which include the M16, the Advanced Assault Rifle (M16A2), the Aircraft Gun Unit (GAU), and the Air Force M16 Carbine (GUU5-P).

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Current DoD contract for M4s is 100 percent with Colt Defense, LLC employing 396 personnel located in Connecticut.

Contractor performance has been excellent. Contractual obligations have been met with 100% on-time deliveries. No defects have been identified, therefore no warranty claims. There are over 50,000 M4 carbines fielded and the majority has been in use since 2002 with stellar performance. Other Services have used the M4 extensively with similar results. The contract provides hardware and includes warranty for 365 days after factory departure.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed differ from the budget submit?

The FY08 budget does not contain any funding for this effort.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

The funding for this project is for additional M4 carbines. Because we already have 55K M4s fielded, we have budgeted \$50K per year to sustain those fielded systems.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

If the total requirement (\$392M) is approved, additional funding would be required to sustain the weapons procured. We would POM for an additional \$220K annually for the life-cycle sustainment of weapons procured.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Air Force Allowance Standard Code 538 authorizes the rifle. The same requirement for the rifle exists for the carbine. This initiative is considered a replacement to update old equipment and enhance warfighter capability and survivability.

Currently, Security Forces and select arming groups are able to operate with M4s. All Airmen without M4s (the majority of the AF) are using the Vietnam era M16s and M16A2 rifles. In

many cases the Army rejects the use of this weapon in conjunction with their operations. As a result, weapons originally purchased for Security Forces have been diverted to fill urgent and compelling requirements, leaving all affected units with non standardized equipment.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented. This initiative is singly focused on a complete replacement of the individual combat weapon (M16, M16A2, GAU, and GUU5-P) to increase combat capability, survivability, and safety for our deployed forces. Of course, because this is a complete replacement effort, the procurement of larger quantities drives cost down.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

End objective is 270K carbines with approximately 55K currently fielded of projected deliveries on current on-going contracts.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure,

personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MOBILITY AIR FORCES-COMBAT AIR FORCES INTEROPERABILITY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: 41840F
Potential Add: \$13.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This effort integrates Mobility Air Forces (MAF) [Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC) (intertheater), Air Mobility Division (AMD) (intratheater)] missions planning and execution information with Combat Air Forces (CAF) Air Operations Center (AOCs), coalition, and joint systems. Negotiates and reports MAF movement into, around and out of Combatant Commander (COCOM) Area of Responsibilities (AOR)s. It also enables mandated net-centric operations in and across unclassified, classified and coalition environments (Interoperability and Supportability of Information Technology and National Security Systems, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI 6212.01D)). Provides deployed and mobile command/control (C2) forces in communication challenged environments. Enables distributed and reachback from AMD to Tanker Airlift Control Center

Assists in implementing the following OSD transformation goals:

Goal #3: Implement Network Centric Warfare as the theory of war for the information age and the organizing principle for national military planning and joint concepts, capabilities, and systems.

Goal #4: Get the decision rules and metrics right and cause them to be applied enterprise wide.

Goal #5: Change the force and its culture from the bottom up through the use of experimentation, transformational articles (operational prototyping) and the creation and sharing of new knowledge and experiences.

The initiatives funded by this investment assists in implementing the theory of war using network-centric principles by initiating advanced service-oriented architecture technology to more effectively and efficiently enhance the interoperability of the warfighting capability between the Mobility Air Forces and it Mission Partners [such as the MAF, CAF, and Homeland Defense.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds are required to architect, design, modify software, purchase hardware, modify hardware configurations, and conduct testing providing the following capabilities:

On average \$8.M/year for capabilities listed below:

-- Information services interfaces between mission partners

- MAF applications and collaborative applications that make use of the new data provided by the information services and with the new processes the organizations can institute.
- Conduct cross-security-domain data analysis and software modifications from system-low to system-high and from system-high to system-low classifications including coalition operations
- Define and design deployed systems for the various size Contingency Response Group (CRG)s, Crisis Response Element (CRE)s, AMDs in the AOC and other deployable mobility units.

A highly mobile configuration of Global Defense Support System (GDSS)-2 for aircrews in transit, units on the move, and other AMC C2 users TDY or working at other than an AMC base. The lightweight, highly mobile client would handle limited missions and functions for mobile computing devices, PDA, Tablet PCs, etc. Client would use native OS features, like Microsoft Internet Explorer, to display limited mission data and allow the unit, if desired to update GDSS-2 through a direct connection.

- On average \$3M/year for the capabilities listed below:
 - Cross-security-domain hardware to transfer data from system-low to system-high and from system-high to system-low classifications including coalition operations
 - Deployable C2/ In-Transit Visibility (ITV) enclave (data center) hardware.
 - Training Hardware

On average \$2M/year for fielding, training, operations and maintenance

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Multiple contractors from multiple states: Federated Software Group, Missouri and Illinois, 30 people; Computer Sciences Corporation, New Jersey and Illinois, 10 people; General Dynamics, Alabama and Illinois, 5 people; The MITRE Corporation, Massachusetts and Illinois, 4 people; TRI-COR, Illinois, and Northrup Grumman, Illinois, 3 people. The contractor team performance has been out outstanding. AMC continually leads in delivering better Global C2 capabilities than anyone else in the USAF because of the innovation of these contractors.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$1.3M in O&M under Airlift Operations Command, Control and Communications (C3). The proposed add will deliver the capabilities outlined in the answers to Question 2.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Yes.

(\$M) FY09 FY10 FY11 FY12 FY13 FYDP

13.3 13.6 13.8 14.0 14.2 58.8

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This effort integrates MAF [TACC (strategic-level), AMD (Theater-level)] missions planning and execution information with CAF Combat Air Operations Centers (CAOCs), coalition, and joint systems. Negotiate and report MAF movement into, around and out of COCOM AORs. It also enable mandated net-centric operations in and across unclassified, classified and coalition environments (Interoperability and Supportability of Information Technology and National Security Systems, CJCSI 6212.01D). Provide deployed and mobile mobility forces C2 in communication challenged environments. Enable distributed and reach back from AMD to Tanker Airlift Control Center

Mission is accomplished today by manual coordination across C2 centers and headquarters organizations. Crews must call ahead and are manually provided the information to complete there missions. Data from one system is “hand-jammed” from one system to another.

MAF Theater moves into, around and out of the all theaters is facilitated with net-centric operations. Crews are protected from friendly fire. MAF missions in the Air Tasking Order, Identification Friend or Foe/Selective Identification Feature (IFF/SIF) are passed through C2 systems to the crews and C2 personnel. AMC crews will land at locations that can physically and operationally support airlift and air refueling missions. Impact to Combat Air Forces: Severely increased airlift and air refueling velocity.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Funding does not accelerate any existing program, but fulfills gaps and needs of the warfighter. Furthermore, the existing capabilities are over 12-years old and introduce numerous manual-intensive processes prone to human error that could result in loss of valuable assets.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2008 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

Military Construction: \$6,060M

MAJCOM	BASE	State	Title	COST (\$000)	Cumulative
PACAF	Eareckson	AK	Repair Runway Ph1	14,000	14,000
PACAF	Eielson	AK	Replace Youth Center	11,100	25,100
PACAF	Oliktok LRRS	AK	Site Access Road	2,517	27,617
PACAF	Cape Lisburne LRR	AK	Repair Infrastr Ph 1, Water Storage	7,000	34,617
PACAF	Eielson	AK	Repair Utilidors Phase 8 of 10	9,900	44,517
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Automated Vehicle Wash/Ops Facility	5,339	49,856
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Entomology Facility	2,532	52,388
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Rpr Arctic Utilities and Infrastr, Ph 1of 10	9,900	62,288
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Segregated Magazine Storage	7,200	69,488
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Joint Regional Fire Training Fac	6,000	75,488
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Renovate Denali Hall	16,500	91,988
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	C-17 Maint Training Device Facility	15,500	107,488
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Replace Avionics Shop	12,509	119,997
PACAF	Fort Greely	AK	C-17 SAAF (Allen AAF)	16,000	135,997
PACAF	Eielson	AK	Dormitory	13,200	149,197
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	F-22 Projects	164,000	313,197
AETC	Maxwell	AL	Add To & Alter Air University Library	13,200	326,397
AETC	Maxwell	AL	Gunter Fitness Center, Phase 1	14,200	340,597
AETC	Maxwell	AL	ADAL Fitness Center	\$5,000	345,597
AFRC	Maxwell AFB	AL	Aircraft Parking Ramp	\$13,200	358,797
ANG	Montgomery IAP	AL	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control	\$7,830	366,627
ANG	Montgomery	AL	Replace Squadron Operations	\$8,200	374,827
AETC	Little Rock	AR	Repair Airfield	9,800	384,627
AETC	Little Rock	AR	48 Squad Ops/AMU	9,100	393,727
AMC	Little Rock	AR	C-130 Engine Storage Facility	3,000	396,727
ANG	Little Rock	AR	Replace Engine Shop	\$3,600	400,327
ANG	Little Rock	AR	Replace Engine Shop	\$3,600	403,927
ACC	Davis-Monthan	AZ	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	13,400	417,327
AETC	Luke	AZ	Repair Airfield Pavements	15,000	432,327
AETC	Luke	AZ	Realign Road with Traffic Circle, Kachina	2,616	434,943

AETC	Luke	AZ	Fitness Center	\$11,000	445,943
AFMC	Davis-Monthan	AZ	AMARC Hangar	17,000	462,943
AFMC	Davis-Monthan	AZ	Consolidated Mission Support Center	7,200	470,143
AFRC	Luke AFB	AZ	Maintenance Storage	\$1,900	472,043
ANG	Davis Monthan AFB	AZ	Predator Beddwon- FOC	\$5,600	477,643
ANG	Fort Huachuca	AZ	Predator LRE Beddown	\$11,000	488,643
ACC	Beale	CA	Child Development Center	10,000	498,643
ACC	Beale	CA	Fitness Center	\$8,600	507,243
AFMC	Edwards	CA	46th TW - Flight Test Admin Facility	20,400	527,643
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Fitness Center	27,500	555,143
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Dormitory (96RM)	13,147	568,290
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Replace Engineering Technical Facility	19,554	587,844
AFMC	Edwards	CA	South Base Water Loop	1,530	589,374
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Upgrade Munitions Complex	16,500	605,874
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Main Base Runway, Phase 4	28,000	633,874
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Dormitory	12,000	645,874
AFRC	Travis AFB	CA	C-17 & C-5 Alter For Reserve Training	\$6,700	652,574
AFRC	March ARB	CA	Widen Taxiway "A"	\$4,650	657,224
AFRC	March ARB	CA	Joint Deployment Processing	\$10,300	667,524
AFRC	Travis AFB	CA	C-17 & C-5 Squadron Operations and AGS Training	\$13,500	681,024
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	Logistics Operations Resource Center	13,000	694,024
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	30th Space Wing HQ Facility	9,800	703,824
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	AT/FP Consolidated Parking Area	34,600	738,424
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	Fitness Center/HAWC Annex	6,404	744,828
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	Fitness Center Addition	13,872	758,700
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	Construct Child Development Center	12,500	771,200
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	Replace 13th Street Bridge	18,500	789,700
AMC	Travis	CA	Global Support Squadron (GSS) Facility	10,800	800,500
AMC	Travis	CA	Large Fire/Rescue Station	11,900	812,400
AMC	Travis	CA	Child Development Center	14,000	826,400
AMC	Travis	CA	Add to Fitness Center	\$11,800	838,200
ANG	South CA Logistics Apt	CA	Predator FTU LRE beddown	\$8,400	846,600
ANG	Fresno	CA	Construct ECM Pod Shop	\$1,500	848,100

ANG	Fresno	CA	Munitions Storage Addition	\$1,650	849,750
ANG	Fresno	CA	Medical Training and Security	\$6,100	855,850
AFSPC	Cavalier	CL	Fitness Center	\$5,900	861,750
AFSPC	Clear	CL	Fitness Center	\$11,300	873,050
AETC	USAFA	CO	Base Operations Facility	5,000	878,050
AFSPC	Buckley	CO	Logistics Readiness Center	8,639	886,689
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	Land Acquisition 23 Acres	4,900	891,589
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	National Security Space Institute	37,300	928,889
AFSPC	Schriever	CO	ADAL Fitness Center	14,500	943,389
AFSPC	Buckley	CO	Education Center/Library	8,800	952,189
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	East Gate Realignment	4,500	956,689
AFSPC	Schriever	CO	Consolidate SF Training Complex	9,200	965,889
AFSPC	Buckley	CO	Add/Alt Fitness Center	13,252	979,141
AFSPC	Schriever	CO	SF Operations Facility	9,500	988,641
AFSPC	Buckley	CO	Security Forces Operations Facility	9,700	998,341
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	HQ Air Force Space Command Annex	36,340	1,034,681
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	Pete East Storm Water Drainage	8,000	1,042,681
AFSPC	Peterson	CO	Fitness Center Annex	\$5,000	1,047,681
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Add to Cadet Fitness Center	11,478	1,059,159
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Upgrade Academic Facility, Phase V	15,000	1,074,159
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Emergency Ops Center	9,996	1,084,155
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Const S. Gate Vehicle Search	7,433	1,091,588
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Add to Community Center Gym	8,884	1,100,472
USAFA	AF Academy	CO	Add to Community Gym	\$9,429	1,109,901
ANG	Bradley	CT	Security Improvements-Road Relocation	\$5,800	1,115,701
ANG	Bradley	CT	AFCHQ Beddown	\$3,500	1,119,201
11 WG	Bolling	DC	Child Development Center	10,000	1,129,201
11 WG	Bolling	DC	Construct Fitness Center	\$13,600	1,142,801
AFDW	Bolling	DC	AT/FP South Gate	7,800	1,150,601
AFRC	Dover AFB	DE	Wing Headquarters	\$2,600	1,153,201
AMC	Dover	DE	Consolidated Communications Facility	12,000	1,165,201
AMC	Dover	DE	Chapel Center	4,500	1,169,701
AMC	Dover	DE	Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory	4,000	1,173,701

AMC	Dover	DE	Child Development Center	7,000	1,180,701
ANG	New Castle MAP	DE	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	\$10,800	1,191,501
ANG	New Castle MAP	DE	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	\$10,800	1,202,301
ACC	Hurlburt	FL	RED HORSE Mobility Processing Center	4,500	1,206,801
ACC	Hurlburt	FL	505th Warfighting Headquarters Exercise Facility	10,000	1,216,801
AETC	Tyndall	FL	ACS Ops and Classroom Facilities	8,700	1,225,501
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Child Development Center	11,000	1,236,501
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Ground Combat Training Squadron	14,400	1,250,901
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Land Mass Restoration, Santa Rosa Island Range Complex	38,000	1,288,901
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory Facility	7,600	1,296,501
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Fitness Center	24,700	1,321,201
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Replace Base Engineer Facility 666	4,000	1,325,201
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Fire Station	10,000	1,335,201
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Construct Water Tank Field 6	1,771	1,336,972
AFRC	Patrick AFB	FL	ISP/Phase Dock Extension, Hangar 630	\$3,000	1,339,972
AFRC	Homestead ARS	FL	Add/Alter Aerial Port Training	\$3,700	1,343,672
AFRC	Eglin AFB, Aux 3	FL	Joint Service Lodging - Phase 1	\$6,300	1,349,972
AFRC	Patrick AFB	FL	920th Rescue Wing Support and Training Facility	\$12,150	1,362,122
AFRC	Patrick AFB	FL	Maintenance Workshop Complex	\$8,700	1,370,822
AFRC	Patrick AFB	FL	Corrosion Control	\$10,000	1,380,822
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	Add/Alter Visiting Quarters	4,500	1,385,322
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	Vehicle Operations Administration Facility	4,800	1,390,122
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	Visiting Quarters (40 PN)	4,450	1,394,572
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	Airman Leadership School	6,879	1,401,451
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	16th Contracting Squadron Facility	2,800	1,404,251
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	HQ Ops Group	5,421	1,409,672
AFSOC	Hurlburt	FL	Child Development Center	8,000	1,417,672
AFSPC	Patrick	FL	Firing Range	9,800	1,427,472
AFSPC	Cape Canaveral AFS	FL	Satellite Operations Support Facility	6,200	1,433,672
AFSPC	Cape Canaveral	FL	Physical Fitness Center Annex, CCAFS	\$1,000	1,434,672
AFSPC	Patrick	FL	Consolidated Fitness Center	\$12,200	1,446,872
AMC	MacDill	FL	Consolidated Base Support Facility	11,255	1,458,127

AMC	MacDill	FL	EOD Facility	3,450	1,461,577
ANG	Jacksonville IAP	FL	Communications Training Facility	\$6,000	1,467,577
ANG	Jacksonville IAP	FL	Communications Training Facility	\$6,000	1,473,577
ANG	Jacksonville	FL	Security Forces Support Compl	\$7,300	1,480,877
ANG	MacDill	FL	Construct Vehicle Maintenance	\$2,600	1,483,477
ACC	Moody	GA	Commercial Access Gate	7,600	1,491,077
ACC	Moody	GA	Operations/Maintenance Group Facility	8,900	1,499,977
ACC	Robins	GA	116 ACW Avionics Facility	5,000	1,504,977
ACC	Robins	GA	54th Combat Communications Squadron Operations	9,600	1,514,577
AFMC	Robins	GA	Software Support Facility	24,000	1,538,577
AFMC	Robins	GA	Consolidated Logistics Facility, Depot Operations	13,600	1,552,177
AFMC	Robins	GA	Command Post Facility	3,150	1,555,327
AFMC	Robins	GA	Add to Fitness Center	2,500	1,557,827
AFRC	Dobbins ARB	GA	Joint Service Lodging	\$7,700	1,565,527
AFRC	Robins AFB	GA	Consolidated Headquarters	\$7,400	1,572,927
AFRC	Robins AFB	GA	AFR Band Complex	\$7,650	1,580,577
AFSOC	Moody	GA	Child Development Center	8,000	1,588,577
ANG	Savannah IAP	GA	Troop Training Quarters	\$7,200	1,595,777
ANG	Savannah	GA	Squad Operations Facility	\$8,100	1,603,877
USAFE	RAF Alconbury	GB	Indoor Swimming Pool	\$1,000	1,604,877
USAFE	RAF Fairford	GB	ADAL Gymnasium	\$3,600	1,608,477
USAFE	Spangdahlem	GE	Construct High School Complex	19,921	1,628,398
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Construct AGE Maintenance Complex	10,100	1,638,498
USAFE	Spangdahlem	GE	Construct Child Development Center	11,000	1,649,498
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Construct 37 AS Squadron Ops/AMU	11,933	1,661,431
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Construct Contingency Response Group, Ph 2	20,600	1,682,031
USAFE	Spangdahlem AB	GE	Fitness Center	21,000	1,703,031
USAFE	Sembach	GE	Child Development Center	12,000	1,715,031
USAFE	Vogelweh	GE	Child Development Center	9,000	1,724,031
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Dormitory	12,300	1,736,331
USAFE	Spangdahlem	GE	Dormitory	42,000	1,778,331
AFSPC	Thule	GR	Fitness Center	\$19,300	1,797,631
USAFE	Thule	GR	Dormitory	20,500	1,818,131

AMC	Andersen	GU	Air Freight Terminal Complex	20,334	1,838,465
PACAF	Andersen	GU	Munitions Storage Igloos, Ph2 (10ea)	15,000	1,853,465
PACAF	Andersen	GU	NW Field Combat Support Vehicle Maint Fac	14,800	1,868,265
PACAF	Andersen	GU	NW Field Technical Training Facility	5,816	1,874,081
PACAF	Andersen	GU	AEF FOL Munitions Igloos, Ph 3 (10ea)	16,500	1,890,581
PACAF	Andersen	GU	AEF FOL Munitions Igloos, Ph 4 (20ea)	33,419	1,924,000
PACAF	Andersen	GU	ATFP Base Perimeter Fence/Road	5,562	1,929,562
PACAF	Andersen	GU	NW Field Expeditionary Combat Spt Facility	6,942	1,936,504
PACAF	Andersen	GU	Realign Arc Light Blvd	4,800	1,941,304
PACAF	Andersen	GU	Outdoor Sports Complex	\$6,000	1,947,304
PACAF	Andersen	GU	Dormitory	16,300	1,963,604
ANG	Hickam AFB	HI	F 22 LO/Corrosion Control Facility	\$24,600	1,988,204
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22- Hangar/Squad Ops /AMU	\$46,000	2,034,204
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22- Hangar/Squad Ops /AMU	\$46,000	2,080,204
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22 Add/Alter AGE Shop	\$1,800	2,082,004
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22- External Fuel Tanks St	\$1,600	2,083,604
ANG	Hickam	HI	F 22 Flight Simulator Facility	\$16,500	2,100,104
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22 Weapons Load Crew	\$10,000	2,110,104
ANG	Hickam	HI	F-22 Upgrade Munitions Complex	\$11,500	2,121,604
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Hawaii Joint Regional CATM Fac	7,700	2,129,304
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Main Fire/Crash Rescue Station	22,638	2,151,942
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Repair Airfield Pvmt, Phase 1	9,500	2,161,442
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Upgrade Elec Distribution Sys, Ph 5 of 6	10,000	2,171,442
PACAF	Hickam	HI	C-17 Maint Training Device Fac	12,100	2,183,542
PACAF	Kona IAP	HI	C-17 SAAF (Kona Airport)	28,000	2,211,542
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Fitness Center (ADAL)	22,000	2,233,542
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Homeland Defense Fighter Alert Hanger	21,500	2,255,042
PACAF	Hickam	HI	Child Development Center	37,000	2,292,042
ANG	Hickam	HI	KC-135 Hangar	10,200	2,302,242
ANG	Sioux City	IA	KC-135 Engine Test Apron	\$3,000	2,305,242
ANG	Des Moines IAP	IA	Replace Communications Facility	\$5,850	2,311,092
ANG	Sioux City	IA	KC-135 Engine Test Apron	\$3,000	2,314,092
ANG	Des Moines	IA	ADAL Security Forces	\$4,400	2,318,492

ACC	Mt Home	ID	Logistics Readiness Center	17,500	2,335,992
ACC	Mountain Home	ID	Child Development Center	10,500	2,346,492
ANG	Boise MAP	ID	Operations and Training Facility	\$9,600	2,356,092
ANG	Boise MAP	ID	Operations and Training Facility	\$9,600	2,365,692
AMC	Scott	IL	Child Development Center	8,200	2,373,892
AMC	Scott	IL	HQ AMC/USTRANSCOM Facility, Ph 1	15,000	2,388,892
AMC	Scott	IL	Fitness Center	\$10,000	2,398,892
ANG	Capital MAP	IL	Security Improvements-Relocate Base Entrance	\$6,100	2,404,992
ANG	Capital MAP	IL	Security Improvements-Relocate Base Entrance	\$6,100	2,411,092
ANG	Greater Peoria	IL	Squadron Ops Facility	\$7,900	2,418,992
ANG	Capital	IL	AFCHQ Beddown	\$3,500	2,422,492
AFRC	Grissom ARB	IN	Control Tower	\$6,000	2,428,492
AFRC	Grissom ARB	IN	Add/Alter Maintenance Hangar	\$8,800	2,437,292
AFRC	Grissom ARB	IN	Power Check Pad	\$1,700	2,438,992
ANG	Fort Wayne IAP	IN	Aircraft Ready Shelters	\$5,143	2,444,135
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Construct 555 FS Squad Ops	4,650	2,448,785
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Construct Base Operations	3,550	2,452,335
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Construct Satellite Crash Fire Station	2,700	2,455,035
USAFE	Camp Darby	IT	Construct Munitions Railhead	18,000	2,473,035
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Expand North Ramp Ph I	1,700	2,474,735
USAFE	Moron	IT	Construct Large Vehicle Inspection Station	2,275	2,477,010
USAFE	Moron	IT	Construct Water Treatment Plant	4,127	2,481,137
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Fitness Center Addition/Lap Pool	\$14,400	2,495,537
PACAF	Yokota	JA	Install HVAC, East Gym	\$900	2,496,437
PACAF	Misawa	JP	Health/Physical Training Center	\$17,500	2,513,937
PACAF	Osan	KO	ADAL Fitness Center (HAWC)	\$1,800	2,515,737
PACAF	Osan	KO	Construct Athletic Fields	\$5,500	2,521,237
PACAF	Kunsan	KO	Dormitory	12,600	2,533,837
PACAF	Kunsan	KO	Dormitory	12,600	2,546,437
PACAF	Osan	KO	Dormitory	12,800	2,559,237
PACAF	Osan	KO	Dormitory	12,800	2,572,037
AMC	McConnell	KS	Corrosion Control Facility Ph II	41,541	2,613,578
AMC	McConnell	KS	MXG Consolidation & Forward Logistics Center, Ph 1	6,300	2,619,878

ANG	Smoky Hill Range	KS	ASOS Beddown	\$9,000	2,628,878
ANG	Forbes Field	KS	Replace Squad Ops Facility	\$9,500	2,638,378
ANG	Smoky Hill Range	KS	Upgrade Range Support Complex	\$7,000	2,645,378
ANG	Louisville	KY	ADAL Composite Support Facil	\$7,000	2,652,378
ACC	Barksdale	LA	Security Forces Squadron Complex	14,800	2,667,178
ACC	Barksdale	LA	Security Forces Military Working Dog Kennel	1,400	2,668,578
ACC	Barksdale	LA	Fitness Center	\$9,300	2,677,878
ACC	Barksdale	LA	Fitness Center Annex	\$6,700	2,684,578
AFRC	Barksdale AFB	LA	Red Horse Vehicle Maintenance Facility	\$3,200	2,687,778
AFRC	Barksdale AFB	LA	B-52 Fuel Cell Maintenance	\$12,100	2,699,878
ANG	Hammond ANGCS	LA	Upgrade Communications Complex	\$5,000	2,704,878
AFMC	Hanscom	MA	Repair Central Heat Plant - Bldg 1201	5,000	2,709,878
AFMC	Hanscom	MA	Erosion Control Stabilization systems	10,000	2,719,878
AFMC	Hanscom	MA	Renovate Acquisition Mgt Fac-B 1600	16,700	2,736,578
AFRC	Westover ARB	MA	Joint Service Lodging - Phase 1	\$10,800	2,747,378
ANG	Otis	MA	DGS FOC Beddown	\$7,000	2,754,378
AMC	Andrews	MD	Consolidated Command Post	18,863	2,773,241
AMC	Andrews	MD	New Fitness Center	\$20,000	2,793,241
ANG	Martin State Airport	MD	Composite Training Facility	\$6,116	2,799,357
ANG	Martin State Airport	MD	Composite Training Facility	\$6,116	2,805,473
ANG	Andrews	MD	Replace Munitions Complex	\$12,000	2,817,473
ANG	Bangor IAP	ME	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Shops	\$13,450	2,830,923
ANG	Bangor IAP	ME	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Shops	\$13,450	2,844,373
ANG	Alpena MAP	MI	Replace Troop Training Quarters	\$8,500	2,852,873
ANG	Selfridge ANGB	MI	Replace Jet Fuel Storage Complex	\$11,000	2,863,873
ANG	Alpena MAP	MI	Replace Troop Training Quarters	\$8,500	2,872,373
ANG	Selfridge ANGB	MI	Replace Jet Fuel Storage Complex	\$11,000	2,883,373
ANG	Alpena	MI	Replace Troop Quarters	\$9,900	2,893,273
ANG	W.K. Kellog	MI	AFCHQ Beddown	\$3,500	2,896,773
ANG	Duluth	MN	Munition Load Crew Facility	\$3,450	2,900,223
ACC	Whiteman	MO	Consolidated Communications Facility	12,244	2,912,467
ACC	Whiteman	MO	Consolidated Air Operations Facility	24,000	2,936,467
ACC	Whiteman	MO	Dormitory (120 RM)	14,511	2,950,978

ACC	Whiteman	MO	Fitness Center	\$18,100	2,969,078
ANG	Rosecrans MAP	MO	Replace Fire Station	\$8,600	2,977,678
ANG	Rosecrans MAP	MO	Replace Fire Station	\$8,600	2,986,278
ANG	Rosecrans	MO	Repl Comm and Access Road	\$9,300	2,995,578
ANG	Whiteman	MO	B-2 Support Ops & Trng	\$6,500	3,002,078
AETC	Columbus	MS	Mission Support Complex, Phase 2	9,800	3,011,878
AETC	Keesler	MS	ATFP Division Street Gate	4,602	3,016,480
AETC	Keesler	MS	Dormitory (144 Rm)	14,000	3,030,480
AETC	Keesler	MS	Indoor Firing Range	5,000	3,035,480
AETC	Columbus	MS	Fitness Center	\$15,000	3,050,480
AETC	Keesler	MS	Student /Fitness Center	\$13,800	3,064,280
AETC	Keesler	MS	Dormitory	10,000	3,074,280
AFRC	Keesler AFB	MS	Aerial Port Training	\$9,200	3,083,480
ANG	Key Field MAP	MS	Upgrade ASOS Communications Trg Complex	\$7,324	3,090,804
ANG	Key Field MAP	MS	Upgrade ASOS Communications Trg Complex	\$7,324	3,098,128
ANG	Key Field	MS	AFCHQ Beddown	\$4,000	3,102,128
AFSPC	Malmstrom	MT	Community Activity Center	5,700	3,107,828
AFSPC	Malmstrom	MT	Upgrade Weapons Storage Area (Phase 1)	8,500	3,116,328
AFSPC	Malmstrom	MT	Fitness Center, Phase 2	15,700	3,132,028
AFSPC	Malmstrom	MT	Replace MWD Kennel Facility	2,450	3,134,478
ACC	Offut	NB	Dormitory	9,700	3,144,178
ACC	Pope	NC	682nd Air Support Operations Squadron Complex	14,800	3,158,978
ACC	Seymour Johnson	NC	Tower/RAPCON/Base Operations Complex	12,000	3,170,978
ACC	Seymour Johnson	NC	Consolidated Support Center	20,000	3,190,978
ACC	Seymour-Johnson	NC	ADAL Fitness Center	\$5,600	3,196,578
AFRC	Seymour Johnson AFB	NC	Civil Engineering Training	\$3,800	3,200,378
AFSOC	Pope	NC	Special Operations Facility	6,122	3,206,500
AMC	Pope	NC	Control Tower	7,400	3,213,900
AMC	Pope	NC	ADAL Fitness Center	\$5,000	3,218,900
ANG	Stanly County	NC	Construct Air Traffic Control Facility	\$3,750	3,222,650
ANG	Stanly County	NC	Construct Air Traffic Control Facility	\$3,750	3,226,400
ACC	Minot	ND	Dormitory (144 RM)	17,500	3,243,900
ACC	Minot	ND	Air Traffic Control Complex, Phase 2	13,000	3,256,900

ACC	Minot	ND	Dormitory (144 RM)	18,400	3,275,300
ACC	Minot	ND	Add/Alter Dock 3	14,600	3,289,900
AFSPC	Minot	ND	Missile Operations Complex	15,500	3,305,400
AFSPC	Minot	ND	Security Forces Complex	18,900	3,324,300
AFSPC	Minot	ND	Proof Load Test Pit	5,900	3,330,200
AMC	Grand Forks	ND	Control Tower / RAPCON	13,000	3,343,200
AMC	Grand Forks	ND	Fire Station	12,800	3,356,000
ANG	Hector Field	ND	Replace Fire Station	\$6,900	3,362,900
ANG	Hector Field	ND	Relocate Base Main Entrance	\$1,500	3,364,400
ANG	Hector Field	ND	Replace Fire Station	\$6,900	3,371,300
ANG	Hector Field	ND	Relocate Base Main Entrance	\$1,500	3,372,800
ACC	Offutt	NE	Consolidated Training Complex	23,000	3,395,800
ANG	Lincoln MAP	NE	Add/Alter Security and Comm	\$8,400	3,404,200
ANG	Lincoln MAP	NE	Add/Alter Security and Comm	\$8,400	3,412,600
ANG	Pease Tradeport	NH	Replace Ops and Training	\$9,200	3,421,800
ANG	Pease Tradeport	NH	Replace Ops and Training	\$9,200	3,431,000
AFRC	McGuire AFB	NJ	Civil Engineering Training	\$4,100	3,435,100
AMC	McGuire	NJ	Unified Security Forces Operations Facility	13,000	3,448,100
ANG	Atlantic City IAP	NJ	ASOS Beddown	\$9,835	3,457,935
ANG	Atlantic City	NJ	Ops and Training Facility	\$8,300	3,466,235
ANG	Atlantic City	NJ	Dining Hall and Services	\$7,000	3,473,235
ANG	McGuire	NJ	Replace Base Civil Engineer	\$7,400	3,480,635
ACC	Holloman	NM	BEAR Asset Storage Facility	13,200	3,493,835
ACC	Holloman	NM	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	6,000	3,499,835
ACC	Holloman	NM	Child Development Center	11,500	3,511,335
ACC	Holloman	NM	Fitness Center	\$11,100	3,522,435
AETC	Kirtland	NM	Construct Armament Shop	5,122	3,527,557
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Fitness Center	14,040	3,541,597
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Reconstruct/Widen Wyoming Blvd Ph I	11,600	3,553,197
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Space Vehicles Component Development Lab	17,800	3,570,997
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Visiting Officers Quarters	13,800	3,584,797
ACC	Nellis	NV	JTAC Virtual Training Facility	5,199	3,589,996
ACC	Nellis	NV	Consolidated Communications Facility	33,000	3,622,996

ACC	Nellis	NV	Child Development Center	15,000	3,637,996
ANG	Reno	NV	Fire Station	\$9,700	3,647,696
ANG	Reno	NV	Fire Station	\$9,700	3,657,396
ANG	Reno-Taho	NV	Repl Acft Support Equipment Shop	\$3,900	3,661,296
ANG	Gabreski Airport	NY	Replace Pararescue Trg Facility	\$8,400	3,669,696
ANG	Hancock Field	NY	Upgrade ASOS Facility	\$5,000	3,674,696
ANG	Hancock Field	NY	Predator IOC/FOC Beddown	\$5,000	3,679,696
ANG	Gabreski Airport	NY	Replace Pararescue Trg Facility	\$8,400	3,688,096
ANG	Schenectady	NY	Replace Base Supply Complex	\$7,300	3,695,396
AETC	WPAFB	OH	Add/Alter AFIT Library/Academic	13,584	3,708,980
AFMC	WPAFB	OH	Conversion for Advanced Power Research Laboratory	17,000	3,725,980
AFMC	WPAFB	OH	Information Technology Complex, Phase 1	23,000	3,748,980
AFMC	WPAFB	OH	Consolidate AFMC Law Offices	9,811	3,758,791
AFMC	WPAFB	OH	Replace West Ramp	10,200	3,768,991
AFMC	WPAFB	OH	Security Forces Operations Facility	12,800	3,781,791
AFRC	Youngstown ARS	OH	Joint Service Lodging - Phase 2	\$11,400	3,793,191
ANG	Toledo IAP	OH	Security Forces Facility	\$7,900	3,801,091
ANG	Toledo IAP	OH	Security Forces Facility	\$7,900	3,808,991
ANG	Rickenbacker	OH	Constr Small Arms Indoor Range	\$3,400	3,812,391
ANG	Toledo	OH	Replace Fire and Rescue Sta	\$5,400	3,817,791
ACC	Tinker	OK	32nd Combat Communications Squadron Operations	13,200	3,830,991
ACC	Tinker	OK	AWACS Aircraft Parking Apron	12,300	3,843,291
AETC	Altus	OK	Consolidated DASR/OSS Facility	8,900	3,852,191
AETC	Vance	OK	Fuels System Maintenance Hangar	7,700	3,859,891
AETC	Vance	OK	ADAL Squadron Facilities	14,900	3,874,791
AETC	Altus	OK	Expand Fitness Center	\$5,000	3,879,791
AETC	Vance	OK	ADAL Physical Fitness / HAWC	\$5,000	3,884,791
AETC	Vance	OK	Dormitory	6,200	3,890,991
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Building 3001, Revitalization, Phase 3	24,641	3,915,632
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Consolidated Wing Headquarters	15,000	3,930,632
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Fitness Center	10,800	3,941,432
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Construct Air Traffic Control Tower	9,100	3,950,532
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Electrical Substation #6	8,300	3,958,832

AFMC	Tinker	OK	Realign Air Depot at Tinker Gate	5,400	3,964,232
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Dormitory (144RM)	9,853	3,974,085
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Child Development Center	13,000	3,987,085
ANG	Will Rogers World Apt	OK	ASOS Beddown	\$6,800	3,993,885
ANG	Tinker	Ok	General Maintenance Hangar	35,000	4,028,885
ANG	Klamath Falls Airport	OR	Replace Security Forces Facility	\$4,961	4,033,846
ANG	Klamath Falls Airport	OR	Replace Security Forces Facility	\$4,961	4,038,807
ANG	Portland	OR	Construct Alert Bay Hangar	\$2,800	4,041,607
AFRC	Pittsburgh ARS	PA	Reserve Lodging Facility	\$8,800	4,050,407
ANG	Willow Grove	PA	AFCHQ Beddown	\$3,500	4,053,907
USAFE	Lajes	PO	Construct Fire Crash/Rescue Station, Phase 2	7,000	4,060,907
ANG	Quonset MAP	RI	Special Operations Facility	\$5,000	4,065,907
ANG	Quonset MAP	RI	Special Operations Facility	\$5,000	4,070,907
ACC	Shaw	SC	Air Defense Alert Shelters & Crew Quarters	9,000	4,079,907
ACC	Shaw	SC	Base Infrastructure	8,741	4,088,648
ACC	Shaw	SC	ADAL Fitness Center	\$24,000	4,112,648
ACC	Shaw	SC	Dormitory	8,800	4,121,448
AMC	Charleston	SC	C-17 Flight Simulator Addition	5,600	4,127,048
AMC	Charleston	SC	Base Civil Engineer/Contracting Complex, Ph 1	10,000	4,137,048
AMC	Charleston	SC	Fire/Rescue Station	12,400	4,149,448
AMC	Charleston	SC	Child Development Center	10,200	4,159,648
AMC	Charleston	SC	Base Civil Engineer/Contracting Complex, Ph 2	10,990	4,170,638
ANG	McEntire ANGB	SC	Replace Operations & Training Complex	\$11,200	4,181,838
ANG	McEntire ANGB	SC	Replace Operations & Training Complex	\$11,200	4,193,038
ANG	McEntire	SC	ADAL Squadron Ops	\$4,400	4,197,438
ACC	Ellsworth	SD	Civil Engineer Administrative Facility	16,000	4,213,438
USAFE	Incirlik	TK	Fitness Center	\$5,600	4,219,038
AFMC	Arnold	TN	Fitness Center	7,000	4,226,038
AFMC	Arnold	TN	Consolidated Laboratory Complex	15,500	4,241,538
AFMC	Arnold	TN	Facility Maintenance Complex	18,600	4,260,138
ANG	Lovell ANGS	TN	Comm Training Facility	\$8,200	4,268,338
ANG	Lovell ANGS	TN	Comm Training Facility	\$8,200	4,276,538

ANG	Memphis	TN	Replace BCE Complex	\$6,900	4,283,438
ANG	Nashville	TN	ISR Production	\$5,100	4,288,538
USAFE	Incirlik	TU	Construct Consolidated Community Center	8,400	4,296,938
USAFE	Incirlik	TU	Upgrade Base Main Road, "A" Street	4,400	4,301,338
ACC	Dyess	TX	Consolidated Support Facility	19,000	4,320,338
ACC	Dyess	TX	Repair Runway Pavements	19,000	4,339,338
ACC	Lackland Annex	TX	33rd Intelligence Operations Squadron Facility (AIA)	11,000	4,350,338
AETC	Goodfellow	TX	Joint Intel Technical Training Facility, Phase 1	15,500	4,365,838
AETC	Lackland	TX	Security Forces Ops Center	14,000	4,379,838
AETC	Goodfellow	TX	ADAL Fitness Center	5,800	4,385,638
AETC	Lackland	TX	Replace BMT Facilities	178,053	4,563,691
AETC	Laughlin	TX	Student Event and Community Complex	7,600	4,571,291
AETC	Randolph	TX	Construct Approach Lights and Taxiway West	5,800	4,577,091
AETC	Randolph	TX	Fire Crash Rescue Station	10,800	4,587,891
AETC	Sheppard	TX	Technical Training Support Facility	16,026	4,603,917
AETC	Goodfellow	TX	Consolidated Communications Operation Center, Phase 1	8,800	4,612,717
AETC	Lackland	TX	Replace BMT Facilities	181,732	4,794,449
AETC	Laughlin	TX	Consolidated Student Activity Center/Library	3,800	4,798,249
AETC	Goodfellow	TX	Student Dormitory (200 Rm)	24,000	4,822,249
AETC	Lackland	TX	Pipeline Student Dorm (300 Rm)	32,814	4,855,063
AETC	Lackland	TX	Replace BMT Facilities	107,882	4,962,945
AETC	Lackland	TX	Child Development Center	12,000	4,974,945
AETC	Randolph	TX	Child Development Center	11,000	4,985,945
AETC	Lackland	TX	Dormitory	12,000	4,997,945
AFMC	Brooks	TX	ADAL Fitness Center	\$6,100	5,004,045
AFRC	Lackland AFB	TX	Wing Headquarters Facility	\$4,200	5,008,245
AFRC	Lackland AFB	TX	Consolidated Maintenance Facility	\$11,200	5,019,445
AMC	Dyess	TX	C-130 Multipurpose Maintenance Hangar	18,800	5,038,245
ANG	JRB Fort Worth	TX	Composite Support Complex	\$6,200	5,044,445
ANG	Ellington Field	TX	Replace Fire Station	\$7,000	5,051,445
ANG	JRB Fort Worth	TX	Composite Support Complex	\$6,200	5,057,645
ANG	Ellington Field	TX	Upgrade Predator Launch/Recovery Element (LRE)	\$7,000	5,064,645

ANG	Ellington Field	TX	Replace Fire Station	\$7,000	5,071,645
USAFE	Alconbury	UK	Construct Base Entry Control Point	5,000	5,076,645
USAFE	Croughton	UK	Construct Large Vehicle Security Inspection Station	3,500	5,080,145
USAFE	Croughton	UK	Construct Perimeter Link Road	2,392	5,082,537
USAFE	RAF Mildenhall	UK	Construct Mobility Processing Center	10,400	5,092,937
USAFE	RAF Lakenheath	UK	Field Training Detachment Complex	15,200	5,108,137
USAFE	RAF Mildenhall	UK	Construct Base Engineer Complex, Ph2	16,354	5,124,491
USAFE	Fairford	UK	Construct Consolidated Mission Support Fac	14,500	5,138,991
USAFE	RAF Menwith Hill	UK	Menwith Hill - CCP	22,798	5,161,789
USAFE	RAF Fairford	UK	Construct Large Vehicle Inspection Station	3,400	5,165,189
ACC	Hill	UT	Munitions Maintenance Facility	6,000	5,171,189
AFMC	Hill	UT	Fire Crash Rescue Station	16,400	5,187,589
AFMC	Hill	UT	Consolidated Transportation Facility	16,500	5,204,089
AFMC	Hill	UT	Consolidate Missile Storage Facility, Phase 2	10,000	5,214,089
AFMC	Hill	UT	Consolidated OO-ALC Warehouse	25,000	5,239,089
AFRC	Hill AFB	UT	Reserve Training Complex	\$7,300	5,246,389
ANG	Salt Lake City IAP	UT	Replace Fire Station/Mobility Processing	\$10,200	5,256,589
ANG	Salt Lake City IAP	UT	Replace Fire Station/Mobility Processing	\$10,200	5,266,789
ACC	Hill	UT	Combat Hammer Bomb Build Facilities	2,100	5,268,889
ACC	Langley	VA	West & LaSalle Gates Force Protection/Access	8,400	5,277,289
ACC	Langley	VA	Dormitory (96 RM)	12,000	5,289,289
ACC	Langley	VA	Fuel Systems Maintenance Dock	18,200	5,307,489
ACC	Langley	VA	Child Development Center	10,000	5,317,489
ANG	Langley AFB	VA	Operation and Training Facility	\$6,500	5,323,989
AFRC	Various	Var	Unfunded BRAC MILCON (Constr & P&D)	\$8,800	5,332,789
A7C	Various	VL	Crystal City Move to Andrews	1,100	5,333,889
USAFE	Classified	VL	Construct Dorms - 44 PN	3,800	5,337,689
A7C	Various	VL	Planning and Design	480,392	5,818,081
USAFE	Classified	VL	Global Hawk Hangar	36,000	5,854,081
AETC	Fairchild	WA	Mission Support Complex, Phase 1	10,000	5,864,081
AFRC	McChord AFB	WA	Aeromedical Training	\$2,600	5,866,681
AMC	Fairchild	WA	Civil Engineer Complex	33,000	5,899,681

AMC	Fairchild	WA	Physiological Training Facility	4,250	5,903,931
AMC	McChord	WA	Collocated Chapel/Family Support Center	11,600	5,915,531
AMC	McChord	WA	Physical Fitness Center	20,000	5,935,531
AMC	Fairchild	WA	New Fitness Center	\$20,000	5,955,531
ANG	McCord AFB	WA	262 Information Warfare Aggressor Sq Facility	\$7,400	5,962,931
ANG	McCord AFB	WA	262 Information Warfare Aggressor Sq Facility	\$7,400	5,970,331
ANG	Truax Field ANGB	WI	Construct Communications Facility	\$5,900	5,976,231
ANG	Truax Field ANGB	WI	Construct Communications Facility	\$5,900	5,982,131
ANG	General Mitchell	WI	Upgr Corrosion Control Hangar	\$4,700	5,986,831
ANG	Volk Field	WI	Replace Troop Trng Quarters	\$8,800	5,995,631
ANG	Yeager Municipal Apt	WV	Replace Communications Facility	\$4,400	6,000,031
ANG	Yeager Municipal Apt	WV	Replace Communications Facility	\$4,400	6,004,431
ANG	EWVRA Martinsburg	WV	C-5 Parking Apron Addition	\$9,403	6,013,834
AFSPC	FE Warren AFB	WY	ADAL Missile Service Complex	8,100	6,021,934
AFSPC	FE Warren AFB	WY	Consolidated Fire Station	6,600	6,028,534
AFSPC	FE Warren	WY	Storm Drainage System, Phase 2	10,000	6,038,534
AFSPC	FE Warren	WY	Child Development Center	8,000	6,046,534
ANG	Cheyenne MAP	WY	Vehicle Mx & Deployment Processing Facility	\$6,500	6,053,034
ANG	Cheyenne MAP	WY	Vehicle Mx & Deployment Processing Facility	\$6,500	6,059,534

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MOBILITY AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: PE 41300F
Potential Add: \$2.1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Mobility Air Intelligence System (MAIS) provides threat data and geospatial intelligence to Air Mobility Command (AMC) mission planning and flight following systems at the warfighting headquarters, Air Operations Center (AOC), and unit level. The system ties together AMC's global enroute structure, forward operating bases, and 107 active, Guard, and Reserve units with the Intel, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Division (ISRD) in the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC), Air Mobility Command (AMC's), Air Operations Center (AOC). Leveraging and tailoring intelligence from the larger community, MAIS is the backbone for processing, analyzing, and disseminating intelligence, both data based and near-real-time (NRT), in direct support of airlift, air refueling, aero medical evacuation, and contingency response operations worldwide. MAIS operates at the SECRET-level and uses a variety of communications methods to include Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) at home station or robust forward locations and public telecommunications via secure terminals for contingency or bare-base operations.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This would fund gaps in sustainment and maintenance for fielded intel systems, including hardware and software, linking threat data and geospatial intel to AMC's mission planning and flight following systems at the warfighting headquarters, Air Operations Center, and global enroute locations. The TACC controls an average of 800 aircraft sorties worldwide on a daily basis, more than the five geographic theater AOCs control each day combined.

60% of AMC units are Air National Guard and Reserves. Key to this effort is insuring they operate with same intelligence information, equipment, and level of support as Active duty forces. Crypto upgrades mandated by CJCS Instruction in June 2005 would also be incorporated into the purchase to start meeting the FY09 deadline for full compliance with this new requirement.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

SAIC, 100% of software development/sustainment, and General Dynamics, 100% of hardware

maintenance, both supported out of local Illinois offices. Excellent performance/product quality, on-target with costs/schedules.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

The existing PE funding in O&M is \$2.2M (as reflected in the FY 2008 budget) only covers half of the sustainment costs. AMC mission growth in FY 2008 requires additional funds to cover replacement and sustainment for unexpectedly rapid wear and tear due to expanded operational requirements, to include supporting 21 AMC deployed operations locations worldwide. In FY 2005, AMC intelligence forces became the most heavily deployed of any AF major command, with 34% of expeditionary-qualified intelligence personnel deployed at any one time around the world.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

The figures below show the total current program of record for a total of 14.4M across the FYDP. Funding is sufficient to cover approximately half of the newly increased requirements.

Y08	Y09	Y10	Y11	Y12	Y13
3M	3M	4M	4M	5M	5M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional resources in FY 2008 beyond this request are required to alleviate the disconnect in equipment sustainment.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Maintaining the level of funding reflected in this request, plus adjustments for inflation per subsequent years, would cover the disconnect that has developed between requirements and resources. This long-term level of effort is not reflected in the current program over the FYDP, but will be addressed in the FY 2009-2013 APOM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph

description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, MAIS provides the intel support that is required by the following Joint Requirements Oversight Council documents: C-5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-Engineering Program Capabilities Production Document (CPD), C-17 Operational Requirements Document, C-130 Aircraft Maintenance Program (AMP) CPD, KC-10 AMP Capabilities Development Document (CDD), KC-135 AMP CDD, KC-X Initial Capabilities Documents, Air Operations Center CDD. This is not a new system, but sustainment and maintenance, with upgrades when necessary, of an existing one.

The current delta in mission support is being partially accomplished with supplemental fallout funds.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This request has extremely high military value. Per U.S. Central Command Air Forces (CENTAF) data, mobility aircraft are fired on at twice the rate of any other AF platform, an average of 4-5 times a week. In FY06, they were actually hit by enemy fire and sustained damage an average of every other month. 65% of U.S. CENTAF' daily air activity is mobility aircraft, and AMC's Air Operations Center at Scott AFB, IL controls the strategic lift assets flying in U.S. Central Command airspace, responsible for threat analysis and flight following from halfway around the globe.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
MQ-9 TECHNICAL ORDERS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 25219F
Potential Add: \$10M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The MQ-9 Reaper is a "Hunter-Killer" Remotely Piloted Aircraft capable of automatic cueing and prosecuting of critical, emerging time-sensitive targets with self-contained hard-kill capability. Plus-up develops aircraft technical orders (TO) to establish a Field Training Detachment with 174th Attack Wing, New York Air National Guard (ANG), to meet training requirements for ANG maintenance personnel.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds would be spent to develop aircraft TOs for the MQ-9 Reaper.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

General Atomics Aeronautical Systems Incorporated will develop the TOs. General Atomics is located in California. These are the initial TOs for the MQ-9; there is no performance history.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

TO development is a 2-year effort. The TOs will be developed over the course of FY08-09. \$12M is budgeted for this effort in FY09; this additional funding in FY08 will fully fund all TO development.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding is required in subsequent fiscal years. \$12M is budgeted for this effort in FY09; This additional funding in FY08 will fully fund all TOs. The Air Force does not plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The MQ-9 Capability Development Document states, “Technical orders, training, and procedures must support maintenance of all system components by Air Force or other service personnel.”

Currently, the maintenance mission is contracted through Contractor Logistics Support (CLS). CLS was originally programmed until FY13. At that time the maintenance Field Training Detachment (FTD) would stand up and begin producing blue suit maintainers. F-16s are programmed to depart by the end of 2QFY09. To drastically reduce the gap of ANG maintenance for the unit at Syracuse, these funds accelerate the production of TOs and the stand up of the FTD.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

There are no savings associated with this effort.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or

procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
NORTH WARNING SYSTEM SPECTRUM AND TESTER MODIFICATIONS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 12412F
Potential Add: \$7.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This program element funds the North Warning System Fixed Position System (FPS)-124 Radars which provide North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) with threat warning and attack assessment capability along the northern tier. The 1993 Omnibus Reconciliation Act (OBRA) divested some of the frequencies on which these radars operate. As greater numbers of electronic systems such as Global Positioning System (GPS) and cell phones have come into use, the radars are beginning to interfere and must be modified or they may have to be shut down. In addition, the test sets used to maintain these radars are beginning to fail due to diminishing manufacturing sources. They must be modified to keep the radars viable for homeland security.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The money would procure the necessary modification kits and spares for FPS-124 short range radars and 39 test sets.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The modifications would be performed by the existing maintenance force. Contractor support is not required.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. It is required by the OBRA of 1993. To date, the interference has not compromised the mission, but the rapid growth of other incompatible electronic systems now requires this frequency modification to preclude the possibility of losing radar coverage for the northern tier.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings are anticipated.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value for NORAD homeland security and air sovereignty missions.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Modification kits for 69 radars and 39 test sets provide 100% of required inventory.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PACIFIC AIR FORCE AIR OPERATIONS CENTER

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27410F
Potential Add: \$8.4M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

- This additional funding would buy \$1.4M in PACAF Training at the Air Operations Center (AOC) Formal Training Unit (FTU). This also will pay for FTU training for personnel at two Falconer AOCs at Hickam and Osan, and one Tailored-Falconer AOC at Elmendorf, Alaska. The remaining \$7M in the request will fund other O&M disconnects including shortfalls in CLS, training, hardware maintenance support, and required internal/external infrastructure maintenance.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

- \$1.4M funds AOC FTU TDY costs for all PACAF AOC crewmembers.
- \$2.3M funds AOC contractor support, which includes: three PACAF AOCs require contractor logistics support (CLS) for continuation training, operations, and technical hardware maintenance support, and required internal/external infrastructure upgrades to maintain the theater AOC weapon systems. The requirement is based upon the A3/5-approved O&M methodology.
- \$4.0M funds purchase of required equipment for surge/contingency ops capability in accordance with the O&M Methodology.
- \$0.3M funds an additional O&M unit for the Alaskan AOC. This funding is to augment the partial funding the 611th AOC receives from Northern Command.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

There is no contractor involvement for this requirement. The training that would be funded by this request is for active duty personnel assigned to position within the AOC.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

We do plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM cycle.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. Air Force requires that AOC crewmembers assigned to a UTC will accomplish Initial Qualification Training through the AOC FTU." (Reference: Air Force Instruction 13-1, AOC Volume 1)

This is an established requirement; however, funding responsibility is shifting to individual Major Command, rather than a single command responsible for all.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This has extremely high military value. As the Air Force is restructuring its command and control structure around the AOCs, it is vital that they maintain as high a level of operational capability and readiness as possible. Therefore, FTU Training is of extreme importance to the AOC commanders.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PACIFIC AIR FORCES FURNISHINGS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27596F
Potential Add: \$18.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Funding for Military Construction (MILCON) and O&M construction projects does not include funding for furniture, fixtures and equipment (FF&E) that is required to provide complete and usable facilities. The FF&E costs associated with future facility construction projects should be programmed for the respective fiscal year or be designated as a funding wedge for out-year projected projects. It is the base and Major Command's (MAJCOM) responsibility to program and advocate for funding to support FF&E requirements. Anticipated funding for future year facility construction projects drives need for FF&E requirements.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Procurement of needed FF&E requirements to support future year construction projects to support the Air Force Services Mission throughout PACAF.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Procurement is a future year requirement, no contractor has been selected. Upon confirmation of funding, GSA approved vendors would be selected to supply the FF&E requirements.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding would be required for the projects listed. All requirements to meet the FF&E needs for the specific projects have been included in this request. If funding is provided for these projects no additional funding will be pursued in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A. Currently, FF&E projects are funded utilizing the existing baseline of the MAJCOM and assuming risk by unfunding other programs. The alternative is to delay beneficial occupancy of the facilities due to lack of FF&E funds to outfit them. Retrofitting facilities is rarely cost effective or feasible.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings would be realized. Funds currently not available. Savings realized in the form of preserving programs unfunded in execution year to accomplish acquisition of the FF&E utilizing the baseline.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

No inventory objective. Items requested are to support new facilities.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PACIFIC AIR FORCES NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS TRANSFORMATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27596F
Potential Add: \$1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

ISSUE: In order for activities to implement the new system requirements for Non-Appropriated Funds (NAF) Transformation, new equipment is required to establish connectivity to the existing base infrastructure.

BACKGROUND: NAF Transformation is a 4-phase AF Services Enterprise Resource Plan to implement industry's best practices by replacing archaic current operating systems (1) accounting system, time management and payroll (2) retail sales operations/Management Information System; (3) Supply chain management and (4) Customer relations management. The first phase implements the financial accounting, payroll and time management functions by replacing existing software with Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Oracle; improving standardized business practices; providing timely financial information; establishing the Air Force Services Agency (AFSVA) Shared Service Center (SSC) to centralize accounting duties and responsibilities; decreasing overhead, and beginning interface of business/management systems all with the goal of eliminating redundancy and improving/expediting managements and leaderships access to financial information.

SOLUTION: As a result of the NAF Transformation initiative, connectivity solution, using existing infrastructure at each base is required. Each Services activity must connect to the base Point of Presence (PoP), where a selected Internet Service Provider (ISP) will connect to the AFSVA SSC. The Information Technology (IT) solution was developed in coordination with Financial Management and Computer Services (CS) to make modifications to existing infrastructure to satisfy connectivity requirements. Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) NAF-T implementation is scheduled to deploy in Aug FY08 with connectivity required no later than the 1st Quarter of FY08. Following initial increase of costs, AF savings are estimated at \$1M per month due to reduction of personnel and elimination of redundancy, decreased overhead, and improvement of standardized business practices.

NAF-T is a \$50M OSD approved AF wide Lean Initiative. Phase I includes connectivity from base activities to POP (point of presence) requiring \$2.3M for all PACAF Services activities. \$1.3M is funded; shortfall of \$1M.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This funding would execute the Lean Initiative for NAF Transformation using current infrastructure and state of the art technologies.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

A contract will be used to provide the most cost effective IT solution using the existing infrastructure on the base to connect to the Point of Presence. No performance has been accomplished to-date as this is a new initiative expected to result in efficiencies due to transmittal and use of a shared service center.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Partial funding for Phase 1 has been absorbed by PACAF existing baseline by assuming risk and unfunding other programs in Base Operating Support Program Element 27596 in order to begin contract let/execution to prepare for deployment.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional funds required during purchase year. See below for Information Support Plan (ISP) support across FYDP.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

If funds are provided to achieve connectivity, additional requirement would be reduced to \$.4M for ISP provider across the FYDP.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph

description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A.

The mission is accomplished today as decentralized processing on antiquated system batch processing procedures which require a longer lead time and manpower to provide end result financial data for reporting and decision making purposes. The expected improvement is to centralize accounting processes, reduce manpower, provide AF wide cost savings, and reduce lead time through use of real-time data using high speed internet transmittals to a shared service center.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Cost savings by providing additional funds would preserve current programs supported as this item is only partially funded due to risk assumed by unfunding other programs supported by PACAF. If PACAF is unable to fund the remaining \$1M, the lean initiatives to implement would not be executable at the scope required. The partial funding to-date only covers primary service activities at the bases so additional manpower and workload would be required to perform the manual functions and the AF cost savings for the initiative will not be realized.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Item has value as a support function of military objective. Services activities provide troop support in the form of food, fitness, and morale and recreation programs for both direct mission support and for the indirect support of military and dependents. This lean initiative supports a more efficient accounting system, transmittal and reporting requirements which support program/functional objectives.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

Deferred risk of \$1M results in degradation of projected efficiencies tied directly to a reduction of 9 Manpower positions in Jul 07 and continuation of old processes where no connectivity exists.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2008 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PACIFIC AIR FORCES QUALITY OF LIFE FURNISHINGS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 28719F
Potential Add: 1.2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Funding for Military Contraction (MILCON) and O&M construction projects does not include funding for furniture, fixtures and equipment (FF&E) that is required to provide complete and usable facilities. The FF&E costs associated with future facility construction projects should be programmed for the respective fiscal year or be designated as a funding wedge for out-year projected projects. It is the base and Major Command's (MAJCOM) responsibility to program and advocate for funding to support FF&E requirements. Anticipated funding for future year facility construction projects drives need for FF&E requirements.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Procurement of needed FF&E requirements to support future year construction projects to support the Child Care and Youth Center facilities throughout PACAF.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Procurement is a future year requirement, no contractor has been selected. Upon confirmation of funding, GSA approved vendors would be selected to supply the FF&E requirements.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

No additional funding would be required for the projects listed. All requirements to meet the FF&E needs for the specific projects have been included in this request. If funding is provided for these projects no additional funding will be pursued in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A. Currently, FF&E projects are funded utilizing the existing baseline of the MAJCOM and assuming risk by unfunding other programs. The alternative is to delay beneficial occupancy of the facilities due to lack of FF&E funds to outfit them. Retrofitting facilities is rarely cost effective or feasible.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings would be realized. Funds currently not available. Savings realized in the form of preserving programs unfunded in execution year to accomplish acquisition of the FF&E utilizing the baseline.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

No inventory objective. Items requested are to support new facilities.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
PACIFIC AIR FORCES REPLACEMENT DORM FURNISHINGS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27679
Potential Add: \$61.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Program was created in FY06 to ensure that adequate Operations and Furnishings funds were budgeted in order for unaccompanied personnel to live in dormitories. Millions of construction dollars are spent building new dorms and/or renovating existing dorms yet the cost to furnish and operate those facilities were often overlooked, causing the dorms to be uninhabitable. Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) has 14,734 dorm rooms (close to the number of hotel rooms in Boston), the largest number of permanent party dorms of any Major Command (MAJCOM) due to several locations being unaccompanied. The furniture and appliances in these rooms must be replaced as their life expectancy reaches its end. Life expectancy for furniture is 7-10 years and appliances range from 7-12 years. PACAF has had little to no funding for replacement furnishings in the past several years (dorm money used first for operations and initial furniture issue so rooms don't sit vacant), so much of the current inventory has already exceeded its life expectancy resulting in numerous failures and breakdowns. Plus-up through the Five-Year Defense Plan (FYDP) updates our current furnishings inventory at 14% per year, in accordance with the OSD model.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Plus-up through the FYDP updates our current dormitory furnishings, most of which is reaching critical condition and at the end or past its life-cycle. Replacement is at 14% per year, in accordance with the OSD model.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No

5. Is funding for this program contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes, FY08- 5.7M, FY09- 6.0M, FY10-6.6M, FY11-6.5M, FY12- 6.6M, FY13- 6.8M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in the FYDP for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

NA

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. OSD developed a UHO model to predict O&M requirements. The UHO model requires furnishings replacement at a rate of 14% per year. Furnishings in short tour areas and where dual occupancy per room exist, experience shorter life expectancy due to greater wear and tear. Much of the current inventory has already exceeded its life expectancy and is subject to more frequent breakdown and failure.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the program rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Providing the additional funds is primarily a quality of life issue for our airmen, trying to keep their focus on the mission rather than disturbed about conditions where they live. Energy savings are expected as the appliance inventory is updated to newer and more energy efficient models.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

There is high value to this item due to Command priority to house our airmen in quality facilities.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is to have operational furnishings in the rooms and adequate stock on hand for back-up when maintenance is required.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

NA

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FYDP?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
AIR FORCE PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE /COMMON ACCESS CARD

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M), Other Procurement (OPAF)

Budget Activity: BA03 P1#13(OPAF), BA04 (O&M)

Program Element: 33135F

Potential Add: \$4.6M (O&M), \$2.4M (OPAF)

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Air Force Public Key Infrastructure (AF PKI) & AF Common Access Card (CAC) Program provides the framework and services for generation, production, distribution, control, tracking and destruction of public key certificates. PKI is a DoD-wide program that provides the critical underpinning to the Department's Information Assurance (IA) capabilities and is a vital element in achieving a secure IA posture for the Global Information Grid (GIG). PKI provides services to ensure information will be accessed securely in the 21st century for the collective needs of the warfighter.

Common Access Card (CAC) is Defense Manpower Data Center's (DMDC) new standard DoD identification card and Geneva Convention card. It is also specifically mandated as the token vehicle where the PKI ICC chip resides. Successful implementation of this program will allow for the issuance of 700,000+ CACs AF-wide to include active duty, Selected Reserve, DoD civilian employees and eligible contractors. The CAC will serve as the user's PKI token which will be used to store the user's private key identity and email signing and encryption certificates. These certificates are used to gain access to PKI-related services such as Leave Web, Defense Travel System, and the AF Portal.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

- Support PKI

-- Program Management functions, i.e., engineering support to include current architecture, help desk functions, Public Key (PK) enabling of applications, future capabilities, and test/evaluation of infrastructure/end user components implemented within the Air Force.

-- Procure Hardware tokens, Middleware & Readers for Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) users. The DoD PKI plans to maintain a parallel infrastructure on SIPRNET, including Certificate Authorities and Directory Servers. There currently are applications on the SIPRNET that require the security services provided by the DoD PKI. The expected Air Force population is 150,000 users. Air Force implementation of SIPRNET registration infrastructure will provide ability for AF SIPRNET users/applications to receive DoD PKI certificates for use on SIPRNET. PKI will enhance the capability to enhance Community of Interest (COIs) for data on web sites and restrict access to only personnel with the need to know.

-- Support Deployable/Tactical PKI. Proper fielding of equipment and resources will be used to aid the end user in a tactical environment. Estimate includes support for developing

infrastructure, tactical pilot evaluations, inclusion in large scale exercises such as the Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment (JEFX) and known DoD milestones. Effort involves the piloting, testing and refinement and eventual fielding of AF equipment to support deployable and tactical PKI systems.

- Support CAC sustainment, i.e., tokens, Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System/Real-Time Automated Personnel Identification System workstation consumables, printer ribbons, cleaning kits, laminate, etc.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

- PKI lead contractor on this program is Booz-Allen & Hamilton. Contract is out for re-compete with contract award March 2007

- PKI procurement of hardware tokens and middleware/readers. Contractor is dependent on who is awarded contract as vendor of items procured. All are COTS items and past performance and quality have been very good.

- CAC / DMDC in coord with GSA to manage the sustainment of the CAC Bill for each of the services.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. Operations and Maintenance is funded for this information assurance program in the amount of \$32M within the Servicewide Communications Sub-Activity Group. Other Procurement is funded for \$1.496M within the Communication Security (COMSEC) (P1#13) line. Both within the Air Force and the Joint Community, the need for increased network security is requiring majority of customers to sign on with a Common Access Card, not just an individual pass-word. Also, the cards themselves have more capability and more storage space but they do cost more than the old cards. Within the Procurement account, we need to acquire the latest certification workstations to meet the newly emerging security standards coming from Homeland Security.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
PKI Program Management	\$14M	\$13M	\$16.8M	\$19.6M	\$20.5M	\$21.9M	\$22.9M
CACs	\$4.5M	\$5.2M	\$4.9M	\$5.2M	\$5.2M	\$5.3M	\$5.4M
SIPRNET	\$0.3M	\$0.5M	\$0.4M	\$0.5M	0	0	0

Deployable
/Tactical

PKI \$0.1M \$0.5M \$0.5M \$0.4M \$0.3M \$0.3M \$0.3M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

- None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Additional CAC 3400 funding required has been identified as unfunded in FY08-13 as follows:

FY08: \$2.198M

FY09: \$2.844M

FY10: \$2.984M

FY11: \$3.364M

FY12: \$3.678M

FY13: \$4.010M

We plan to pursue additional funding in the next APOM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

- The PKI program provides the framework and services for generation, production, distribution, control, tracking and destruction of public key certificates. PKI is a DoD-wide program that provides the critical underpinning to the Department’s Information Assurance (IA) capabilities and is a vital element in achieving a secure IA posture for the Global Information Grid (GIG). PKI support critical DoD applications with public key certificates. Public Key-enabled applications afford confidentiality and authentication services to communications and/or network transactions, as well as verification of the data integrity and non-repudiation of these transactions.

-- PKI Program Management functions support engineering support to include current

architecture, help desk functions, future capabilities, PK-enabling of applications, web site support, and test/evaluation of infrastructure/end user components implemented within the Air Force. Also, representation at DoD working group meetings/coordination of DoD & AF policy/procedures.

-- The expected warfighting improvements are confidentiality and integrity of mission data as well as authentication and non-repudiation of information/orders received. Savings will occur through mission success, avoidance of costs associated with following false orders, and costs associated with hacker intrusions.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Specific dollar savings cannot be measured at this time. All are expected to be operational savings.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Both PKI and CAC provide high military value as it provides an Information Assurance (IA) infrastructure that directly impacts command and control.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Estimated total inventory through the AF is expected to be 150,000

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
RAPID ATTACK IDENTIFICATION DETECTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 0604421F
Potential Add: \$7.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Rapid Attack Identification Detection and Reporting System (RAIDRS) Block 20 is a defensive counterspace program designed to rapidly detect, identify, characterize and report attacks on our space capabilities. Block 20 will provide a capability against hostile Kinetic Energy (KE) and Directed Energy (DE) anti-satellite weapons. RAIDRS Block 10 provides capability against Radio Frequency jamming and interference to be delivered in FY08. This adjustment would provide funding to accelerate RAIDRS Block 20 concept capability requirement definition and concept definition one year early, allowing development to begin in FY09.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funds would be used to develop the Capability Development Document (CDD) and begin Concept Definition (CD). Funds enable development of Concept of Operations for RAIDRS Block 20, which is required to initiate system design. Lack of funds pushes these activities to FY09.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Currently there are no contracts awarded. The contract for this effort is currently in source-selection; anticipate award in Feb 07. New funds will accelerate Block 20 Initial Operating Capability by approximately one year (end of FY11 to end of FY10) and will allow completion of the CDD in FY08; funds necessary contract to complete these activities.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. Current funding for this effort is contained in RDT&E, AF, R-76, \$4.6M in FY08. The proposed add of +\$7.0M would increase the FY08 request to \$11.6M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Program	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FYDP
FY08 PB	4.6	35.0	71.2	72.3	73.6	75.1	331.8
Adjusted Program	11.6	35.0	71.2	72.3	73.6	75.1	338.8

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Current out year funding is sufficient at this time, pending completion of concept definition.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

To date, \$2.0M has been expended for vulnerability studies; these studies addressed pre-acquisition alternatives and requirements development. Testing will not begin until entering the system design phase. Next major milestone is Key Decision Point-B (KDP-B) scheduled for 2nd Qtr FY 09. KDP-B gives the approval to begin system design. Requested funding will move KDP-B to 3rd Qtr FY 08.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by a validated written requirement.

Currently the assessment process is done manually, requires large numbers of subject matter experts, and can take months to complete a single assessment. RAIDRS Block 20 will provide real-time access to relevant supporting data and some automated assessment, providing assessments to warfighters in operationally relevant timeframes.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No monetary savings anticipated. The purpose is to field an increased assessment capability earlier (FY10 from FY11).

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. RAIDRS provides the warfighter with timely information needed to respond to threats in an effective manner.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

No.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
RESTORING MISSION FACILITIES CAPABILITY

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01, BA02, BA03, BA04
Program Element: ***76F, SAG R
Potential Add: \$877.4M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This item addresses key requirements within the Restoration and Modernization (R&M) program. Restoration and Modernization requirements consist of projects designed to repair key installation facilities and infrastructure. The requirements include projects designed to restore damaged or decayed facilities and infrastructure as well as projects designed to modernize facilities to meet current mission requirements and standards. This funding would be used to ensure facilities and infrastructure adequately supports mission requirements, safety, and the quality of life of Airmen.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This upward adjustment would be used to specifically target restoration and modernization projects for operations, training, maintenance, and production facilities, as well as key utility systems. Infrastructure earmarked for work includes airfield pavements, aircraft hangars, corrosion control facilities, fuel cell maintenance hangars, petroleum distribution systems, electrical distribution systems, and other key facilities. FY08 R&M funding levels are adequate to address only R&M requirements classified as "Critical". Critical requirements are defined as those causing significant loss of installation mission capability and involve significant safety concerns and/or costly workarounds. The additional funding would be used to address R&M requirements classified as "Degraded". Degraded requirements are defined as those causing limited or localized loss of installation capability or involve less serious safety concerns, but still involve costly workarounds.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

We keep a validated list of facility restoration and modernization requirements.

This item addresses key requirements within the Restoration and Modernization (R&M) program. Restoration and Modernization requirements consist of projects designed to repair key installation facilities and infrastructure. The requirements include projects designed to restore damaged or decayed facilities and infrastructure as well as projects designed to modernize facilities to meet current mission requirements and standards. This funding would be used to ensure facilities and infrastructure adequately support mission requirements, safety, and the quality of life of Airmen.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Some/Medium – Unfunded Restoration and Modernization requirements cause loss of installation mission capability and involve costly work arounds. If not addressed, these requirements deteriorate further into "Critical" requirements, halting operations, increasing risk to safety, and require more costly workarounds. Such actions frequently involve safety waivers and increased operating costs--decreasing effectiveness and increasing risk. Historically, 29% of "Critical" requirements were previously rated "Degraded". If supported, the requested adjustment will satisfy 51% of outstanding requirements.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY: \$32M

Title of Effort	PE	BPAC	\$M
Robust Decision Making	61102F	2313	4.8
Hypersonic Materials	62102F	4347	0.6
Integrated Vehicle Health Monitoring	62102F	4349	0.6
Assessment and Classification of Cognitive Decrements Associated with High Workload and Extended Work Periods in an Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle Setting	62202F	1123	1.2
Integrated Thermal Management and Power and System Technologies for Tactical Air Platforms	62203F	3145	5.4
Laser Radar (LADAR) Development and Demonstration	62204F	2003	1.0
Secure, Multi-Modal Collaboration (SMMC) for Sensor Technology Research	62204F	6095	1.0
Radiation Belt Remediation	62601F	1010	0.5
Plasma on Demand for DCS	62601F	1010	0.5
Outdoor LADAR Test Range Preparations	62602F	2068	0.6
Cyber Persistence and Intel Reporting	62702F	4519	1.0
MASINT Warfighter Tools	62702F	4594	1.0
Predictive Network Planning/Management for Airborne Ad Hoc Networks	62702F	5581	0.6
Joint High-Power Solid State Laser (JHPSSL)	62890F	5096	2.0
Sensor Protection	63112F	2100	2.4
Sensor-Aided Vigilance for Defense and Triage from Airborne Sensors	63203F	69DF	1.0
Sense and Avoid Development and Demonstration	63211F	4920	4.5
Collateral Effects Decision Support for High Energy Lasers	63231F	5020	0.4
"Super" Anechoic Chamber Design Study	63270F	431G	0.4
TacSat-2 Operations Support	63401F	3834	0.7
Miniature Radio Frequency (RF) Transmitter/ Signal Processor	63401F	4400	0.5
Active Defense	63401F	4400	0.5
Modeling and Simulation for Integrated, Synergistic Concepts	63401F	2181	0.8

TOTAL:

32.0

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM MISSION CONTROL STATION BACKUP

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: 0604441F
Potential Add: \$27.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Mission Control Station Backup (MCSB) is identified in the 1996 Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) Operational Requirements Document (ORD) as the primary peacetime backup to the MCS. It must have the same global and theater mission processing, communications, battlespace characterization, anomaly resolution, command and control, launch, early orbit test, and mission planning capabilities as the MCS.

An MCSB-HEO (MCSB-H) facility is funded/fit-up to process and control the SBIRS HEO payloads. Current funding is inadequate to evolve the HEO-only MCSB to full Inc 2 capabilities. Restoring these funds will allow us to continue an MCSB mission.

The plus-up amount will modify the remainder of the MCSB-H facility to meet all Inc 2 ORD requirements and provide an Inc 2 capable backup facility.

An interim backup facility for the SBIRS program exists. However, there are two main drawbacks to this facility that make it undesirable for it to be the permanent backup. The first is the ability to provide force protection. The interim backup is located within the Lockheed-Martin contractor's leased facility in Boulder, CO. As a result, the Air Force cannot provide the required level of force protection. The highest level of protection -- Protection Level 1 (PL1) -- is required for facilities that are integral to command and control of U.S. nuclear forces. As the backup to the facility providing primary strategic missile warning, the MCS-B is a critical node which would provide data for decision-making to the President, Secretary of Defense, USSTRATCOM Commander, and others. Air Force Space Command has waived the force protection requirements for interim operations with the caveat to move out of the interim facility as soon as possible. The second reason is, as mentioned above, the interim backup is within the contractor's leased facility. This arrangement exposes the government to potential significant cost increases due to contractor or leasing company exploiting the arrangement.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funding would be used to upgrade the current MCSB-H facility for Inc 2 operations. Inc 2 operations includes SBIRS ground control, SBIRS telemetry, tracking and control (TT&C), SBIRS mission management/sensor tasking, and SBIRS mission processing/reporting, of residual DSPs, SBIRS HEO/GEO sensors and spacecrafts.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Lockheed Martin. Colorado (ground/integration) and California (management, verification/validation, testing)

Contractor performance/cost/schedule for MCSB-H initial fit-up (HEO only) has been excellent. 100% award fee has been granted on each review since program start.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

There is an additional requirement for O&M funds in the future. These funds would cover the contractor logistics support, critical space operations and numerous other sustainment activities related to providing Increment 2 capability at this facility.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

Yes, this would be an R&D item as the first SBIRS fully Increment 2 capability for operations. No funds have been invested in this specific facility to date for this effort. Final plans would have to be coordinated between the program office and the contractor before we would have specific testing or schedule milestones.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The 1996 Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) approved SBIRS Operational Requirements Document (ORD). The MCSB is the primary peacetime backup to the MCS...it

will have the same global and theater mission processing, communications, technical intelligence, battlespace characterization, anomaly resolution, command and control, launch, early orbit test, and mission planning capabilities as the MCS

CJCSI 6211.01A and 6210.02 and 1999 National Security Space Architecture Policy Backup requirements for mission critical facilities will include continuous, timely, valid and accurate missile warning. Recommends Hot (24/7/365 round the clock operations) backup facilities for nuclear command and control systems

Currently, the SBIRS program has an interim catastrophic MCS backup located in a contractor's leased facility in Boulder, CO. This facility (current lease expires in 2009) is also utilized by the SBIRS contractor for Inc 2 development when not required for operations. This catastrophic backup does not meet mission requirements by design as the facility was originally intended to be an interim backup until a fully-mission capable MCSB could be constructed and certified.

Improvement to Warfighter support would include an immediate failover facility for the MCS for strategic missile warning (regeneration of other missions as manpower allows) in the event of a facility/mission outage. An Inc 2 MCSB would avoid operating out of the contractor's leased facility for 18-24 months while the primary MCS is retrofitted for Inc 2. An Inc 2 MCSB ensures reliable, accurate and timely missile warning data to all users.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

If plus-up occurs, the program will avoid certifying the leased contractor facility in Boulder, CO at a savings of ~\$15M. Additional savings would also be realized by avoiding a potential slip to the baseline contract for a potential savings of ~\$9M. And significant TDY costs would be avoided by not having to provide training and operations from the Interim MCSB contractor facility for up to 45 months, saving up to \$19M.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. If funded, the MCSB-2 will be the first Inc 2 certified facility for the SBIRS program. The MCSB-2 will control and process critical AFSPC GEO/HEO/DSP assets and also control the SBIRS Inc 2 ground relay/processing/distribution architecture. The MCSB-2 will be the first SBIRS backup facility that meets all AF and AFSPC security protection level requirements levied upon critical mission facilities and their backups. From a Critical Infrastructure Protection perspective, this will ensure there is adequate backup to the DSP-SBIRS ground processing. This will ensure uninterrupted missile warning support to the warfighter.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is an Increment 2 capability for the MCSB. Inventory objective is one facility capable of controlling all DSP/HEO/GEO satellites in the constellation. Not a procurement item.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SECOND DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: Various 778010
Potential Add: \$91M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus up is or does.

Funds the movement of AF material for all overseas AF personnel and subsistence items; includes Army & Air Force Post Office (APO) Mail and Air Force Material Command (AFMC) Centrally Managed Account (CMA).

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

To provide for shipping of mail to theater, and shipment of items to include vehicle, munitions, equipment.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding in the budget at \$129 for FY08 (APO Mail and AFMC CMA). Funding is in addition to that contained in FY2008 budget.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

2008 PB	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
O&M	129.9	137.6	141	143.4	147.4	151.3

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding

would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None, though a UFR is estimated at \$91M each year through the FYDP at this point. SDT program in general is subject to much volatility – fuel increases, etc.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

N/A.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. Without replacing shortfalls in funding for transportation, vehicles, engines, and other equipment will be shipped via slower means, and perhaps not at all, as funding is expected to be consumed by mid-year.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SENIOR LEADER COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS-AIRBORNE UPGRADE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: (Line Numbers 42/41/50/52)
Program Element: 41845F
Potential Add: \$93M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Provides research, development, test & evaluation (RDT&E), procurement, aircraft modification, operations and maintenance, service, sustainment, manpower, and systems architecture support for Senior Leader airborne command, control, and communications to principals as approved by the Office of the Assistant Secretary Defense (OASD) for Networks and Information Integration (NII) and defined within the Senior Leader Command, Control, and Communications System-Airborne (SLC3S-A) Initial Capabilities Document (ICD) and OASD/ Networks and Information Integration (NII) policy, i.e. President of the U.S.; Vice President U.S.; Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; Director of National Intelligence; Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff and Vice-Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ; and Unified Combatant Commanders (COCOM)s. This support encompasses SLC3S-A fixed and rotary wing primary platforms, roll-on/roll-off communications and network systems that enable other aircraft to augment or supplement SLC3S-A primary platforms in tactical and operational environments as well as the SLC3S-A supporting ground infrastructure and network operations center services. This Program Element (PE) excludes support for Nuclear Command and Control (NC2) missions, which will be addressed through NC2 PEs (including SLC3S-A-unique NC2 requirements). Baseline SLC3S-A capabilities include secure and non-secure voice, data, and video connectivity into Defense Information System Network/Global Information Grid, Defense Switched Network, Defense Red Switch Network, Voice Over Secure Internet Protocol Networks, National Security Council's Crisis Management System, and commercial networks up to the Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information security classification level. This PE is the portion of the DoD SLC3S PE that supports the Air Force's airborne enterprise communications capabilities.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The money would be used for the design, purchase, installation, and integration of critical communication components to significantly improve airborne Command, Control, and Communication (C3) capability for the nation's Senior Leaders. These components include the replacement of obsolete STU-IIIs with STEs and modifying the aircraft to provide Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) and Voice over Secure Internet Protocol (VOSIP) capabilities.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The primary contractor for the C-32 and C-40 is The Boeing Company while the primary contractor for the C-20 and C-37 is Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation (GAC). Both contractors partner with other contractors, to include (but not limited to) Ball Corporation, L-3 Communication Systems, and Cisco Systems, Inc. These contractors provide the bulk of their service in Washington, Georgia, Maryland, Illinois, Oklahoma, and Washington D.C. Both program offices are satisfied to date with contractors' performance.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An additional \$93.0M (projected for FY08) would be required to upgrade all communication systems to provide state-of-the-art communications capability for the nation's Senior Leaders. An extra \$596.1M (projected for FY09-FY13) would be required to provide year-round O&M support to ensure all equipment is providing its utmost capability. Since this PE is still new, no monies have been budgeted in the current FYDP, but a FYDP has been developed to support execution should funding be provided for the PE. We plan to pursue additional funding in the next POM cycle as well.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

There has been no R&D accomplished to date. There is an effort underway to expand the mission capabilities of the Test Tanker II and the Gulfstream Test Vehicle to serve as R&D platforms for future SLC3S-A developments.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This request is a composite of 60+ validated requirements to address airborne voice, video, and data capabilities for national senior leadership. These requirements were written to capture the SLC3S communications support outlined by the CSAF Strategic Planning Guidance of 2006.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

The biggest savings would be realized by avoiding the cost of inflation due to later execution. This capability is not supported yet by the FYDP.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

There is no inventory objective associated with this request.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

No FY07 funds have been added for this item.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008? No

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (B-2)

17 QUESTIONS PENDING

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation:

Budget Activity:

Program Element:

Potential Add: \$17M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.
2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?
3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?
4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SPACE FENCE PROGRAM

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA05
Program Element: 0604425F
Potential Add: \$9.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Space Fence program will develop and field a network of ground radars in order to detect and track small objects in Earth orbit with a focus on those in Low Earth Orbit regimes inhabited by many U.S. environmental and intelligence spacecraft. As a result of its ability to detect smaller objects than the legacy Air Force Space Surveillance System, the Space Fence replaces the legacy system with radars using higher radio frequencies, allowing it to detect an order of magnitude more objects (on the order of 100,000 versus 10,000) that could pose collision or counterspace threats to U.S. spacecraft. The proposed add would provide additional FY08 funds beyond the \$4.1M in the FY08 budget request in order to accelerate system development.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The added funds would support acquisition planning, technology assessment, requirements analysis, and siting consideration activities in FY08.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The program is presently in the very early concept stages, so no prime contract has been awarded. (The three requirements definition contracts awarded in 2006 to Lockheed Martin of Moorestown, New Jersey; Northrop Grumman of Linthicum, Maryland; and Raytheon of Colorado Springs, Colorado, completed last year. Any future awards will be competitively awarded.)

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. \$4.1M in FY08 RDT&E funding for this activity is contained R-1 line no. 77 in Project 65A009, Space Fence, within PE 0604425F, Space Situation Awareness Systems, for this effort. The proposed add augments the budget submission with additional funds to complete more initial design and development tasks in FY08.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. RDT&E funding continues in the outyears in the funding line noted in the preceding question. Other Procurement funding is contained within Weapon System Code 836790, Space Mods Space. The funding for the effort contained in the FY08 PB is as follows.

FY08 PB (\$M)	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
RDT&E, AF	4.1	14.7	66.6	95.7	81.2	82.8
OPAF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	63.9

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None. 08PB provides enough funds for FY15 initial operating capability.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

Approximately \$12.1M has been invested in this program to date via congressional adds in FY05 and FY06. The program is conducting initial concept studies and planning activities. The next major schedule event will be Key Decision Point A (Jun 08) for the acquisition program to be given approval to enter the concept development phase.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes. An existing Initial Capabilities Document for the Space Fence program was approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council in Jul 06. This outlines the need for uncued surveillance of Low Earth Orbit and Middle Earth Orbit objects to detect and track smaller objects in orbit. The system envisioned will have dispersed sites within and outside the continental U.S. to enhance coverage.

Today a network of space surveillance sensors provide space object detection and tracking capabilities to assist in cataloguing satellite payloads and debris, identifying the orbits of items just launched by foreign nations, and avoiding collisions between U.S. satellites and other objects. However, given emerging threats, this network needs modernization in order to detect smaller objects (amidst the expansion of microsatellite deployment), maintain greater awareness of the objects in space (such as their orbital characteristics) to identify any threatening action,

and provide such data with greater timeliness to support fast U.S. action, if needed. For example, the legacy Air Force Space Surveillance System consists of three radio frequency transmitter and six receiver sites spread across the southern U.S. that detect any object crossing the virtual radar “fence” created by the system. However, it is aging (it was fielded in the early 1960s) and lacks the capability to provide the data required to detect small debris caused by natural phenomena, collision, or satellite disintegration as well as the ability to track objects in orbit.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No acquisition savings are expected.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. This system is primarily intended for detection and tracking of Low Earth Orbit objects in order to avoid damage to U.S. assets from debris or hostile objects in those orbital regimes. The Space Fence will be essential for maintaining awareness of the objects in those orbits as their numbers expand due to satellite launches, natural debris, and any actions of other nations.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The system is expected to field three ground radars. The first site will be funded via RDT&E and be fielded in mid-FY15 under the FY08 PB funding profile.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Not applicable – no funds were added in FY07.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SPACE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA83
Program Element: 35907F
Potential Add: \$3.3M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The National Security Space Institute (NSSI) is the DoD focal point for space education and training—developing the AF’s Credentialed Space Professionals (CSP). Plus-up develops additional advanced courses and expands throughput to ensure space professional certification requirements. The advanced courses are the Space Professional Functional Authority’s (SPFA) means to address the “depth of experience in their field and more extensive education in training” called for by the January 2001 Space Commission. The Space Professional Development Program (SPDP) and NSSI are using the advanced courses to provide individuals a path to focus their continued technical development and mission area concentration.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The \$3.3M will be used to provide money for increased throughput of students (400 backlogged students at \$2M). The remaining \$1.3M would be used to sustain current programs and start to develop Distance Learning for advanced academic degrees; continuing education TDY, and class costs for credentialed space professional students.

The three advanced courses are for Space Superiority, Spacelift and Satellite Command. The funding will enable development and 2 course offerings each year (\$650K/course x 3 = \$2M.) The \$650K per advanced course launches the development and initial prototype for the listed advanced courses.

The Space Education Consortium, led by the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) just began a 5-course space certificate program designed to meet the needs of the Air Force and its space professionals. The program provides a foundation of space-related technical and managerial coursework with associated course credit that can be applied to one of four master’s degree programs (Master of Engineering in Space Operations, Systems Engineering, Engineering Management, or MBA with Space emphasis), available through UCCS. The current offering is a pilot program, in which Air Force Space Command (AFSPC) is paying for 20 CSPs to attend. Additional funds would help expand the program to the entire CSP community.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

This is an O&M program—there is contractor technical support (curriculum development support personnel and instructors) resident at the NSSI. There is also contractor support for the Space Professional Development Program at Headquarters (HQ) AFSPC. RS Information Systems is the prime contractor support for NSSI. Scitor owns the contract for support to the SPDP at HQ Air Force Space Command. Contractor performance to date has been excellent in terms of quality, cost/schedule, etc. In addition, contractors have provided much-needed continuity and experience.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes/3400/\$17.3M. Current budget only enables ~760 students to attend Space 100/200/300 and enables the NSSI to execute the existing Space Professional and operational courses. Proposed add funds for 400 student backlog for the Space Professional courses and enables the NSSI to develop 1 or 2 additional advanced courses in FY08 covering Space Superiority, Spacelift and SATCOM, as well as continuing education, distance learning and advanced academic degree programs. The distance learning will reduce the TDYs by 2 weeks which will also reduce the manning strain on units by only losing the individual for 2 weeks vice 4 weeks.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. FY08 PB funds as follows:

FY08 \$17.3M

FY09 \$18.5M

FY10 \$19.7M

FY11 \$20.5M

FY12 \$20.5M

FY12 \$21M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None. The additional funds will enable a throughput of 400 students for FY08. The development of additional courseware and developing distance learning opportunities for this project are one-time expenses.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by validated written requirements.

The Space Professional Development Program is an AF-level Program directed by DoD and policy and provides the framework to ensure that the Air Force can meet the challenge of developing the right people to acquire, operate and employ military space capabilities. SPDP is designed to expand knowledge, increase understanding and raise the overall qualifications of the AF Credentialed Space Professionals to serve as equal partners with other warfighting components in the joint warfare environment. The NSSI is the executing arm for the courses required for certification as outlined in the Space Professional Development Program. The NSSI is also chartered with developing advanced courses in order to provide mission area depth for the Space Professionals.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium; training and development of Space Professionals. The Space Commission report identified the need for career-long education programs due to critical lack of space educated personnel in leadership positions which will put US at risk. Developing and providing the courses and courseware will increase student throughput closing the critical gap, increasing the number of space professionals, meeting the requirements of the Space Commission, and improving support to the warfighters.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

A Congressional add of \$1.65M was appropriated and released to the National Security Space Institute. Current obligation status is zero percent, however funds will be fully obligated in second quarter 2007.

Related Congressional language (SASC) accompanied the additional funds: "expand the instructor base, accelerate development of advanced space course, develop a distance learning laboratory, and enhance NSSI interaction with space educational efforts outside the AF to include universities, colleges, and primary education."

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA83
Program Element: 35940
Potential Add: \$9.0M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Space Situation Awareness (SSA) is the cornerstone of space superiority. The basic elements of SSA include surveillance, reconnaissance, intelligence, environment and fusion/C2. The Space Surveillance Network (SSN), a family of dedicated, contributing and collateral sensors which conducts surveillance and reconnaissance of objects in space, provides the United States Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM)'s Joint Space Operations Center the ability to detect, track, identify, characterize and catalog Earth-orbiting objects. SSA is a key enabler for defensive and offensive counterspace missions. The proposed add would continue current operational capability in FY08 at several sensors in the SSN as well as provide for the dissemination of space surveillance to commercial and foreign entities.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Funding increase would go to the following:

- Cobra Dane: \$2.1M to maintain full-power radar operations at a sensitivity required for tracking small debris; funding necessary to cover increasing fuel costs.

- Commercial and Foreign Entities (CFE): \$1.2M to continue pilot program for providing space surveillance data to commercial and foreign entities (stipulated by Congress in the FY04 National Defense Authorization Act), as well as begin transition pilot program to an operational system.

- Lincoln Space Surveillance Complex (MIT LSSC): \$4.2M to buy radar parts -- including X-Band tubes, Ku-Band tubes, and Klystron tubes -- in order to maintain current operations for tracking, identification and characterization of New Foreign Launches (NFLs) and payloads on orbit; funding necessary to cover increased radar parts costs and replace obsolete parts before failure.

- Moron Optical Space Surveillance (MOSS) system: \$1.5M to cover costs of normalization (following transfer of operations and sustainment from MIT/LL to the 850th Electronics Systems Group on 1 Oct 06) in order to continue operations for detecting and tracking space objects in Geosynchronous Orbit; funding necessary to cover costs associated with transition of ops and sustainment from a development lab to an operational unit.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

ITT SENSOR in Colorado Springs, CO, holds the sustainment contract for MOSS. This contractor has performed well to date. There is no current contract involvement with LSSC or CFE. Cobra Dane performs space surveillance as a secondary mission. No contractor is involved with the purchase of fuel for this mission.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

- Cobra Dane: \$3.2M (O&M)

- Commercial and Foreign Entities (CFE): \$0

- Lincoln Space Surveillance Complex (MIT LSSC): \$10.5M (O&M)

- Moron Optical Space Surveillance (MOSS) system: \$1.2M (O&M)

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

- Cobra Dane: \$3.2M (O&M) per year FY09-FY13

- Commercial and Foreign Entities (CFE): \$0 per year FY09-FY13

- Lincoln Space Surveillance Complex (MIT LSSC): \$10.5M (O&M) per year FY09-FY13

- Moron Optical Space Surveillance (MOSS) system: \$1.2M (O&M) per year FY09-FY13

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

The increases requested are a requirement for FY08. SSN architecture funding options are being reviewed in the FY09 APOM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This program is supported by a validated written requirement.

The SSN performs the space surveillance and space reconnaissance portions of SSA today. The systems currently funded by the SSA operations program element include:

- Dedicated radar sites: Air Force Space Surveillance System (AFSSS) – a.k.a. VHF Fence, Eglin Phased-Array Radar and Globus II (Vardo, Norway)
- Dedicated optical sites: Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance (GEODSS) sites at Maui, Socorro and Diego Garcia and the Moron Optical Space Surveillance (MOSS) site in Spain
- Dedicated space-based: Midcourse Space Experiment/Space Based Visible (MSX/SBV)
- Contributing radar sites: Cobra Dane (Shemya), Lincoln-Laboratory Space Surveillance Complex (LSSC) and the Ronald Regan Test Site (Kwajalein)
- Contributing optical site: Maui Space Surveillance System (MSSS)

The proposed add will not improve warfighting capability but will maintain the current capability which is already stressed by emerging threats.

There will be no cost savings.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings are expected.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
STORAGE AREA NETWORK

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 27595F
Potential Add: \$2M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Answer: The funding required over the Fiscal Year Defense Plan (FYDP) sustains the Storage Area Network (SAN) Enterprise. The \$2M required per year pays for the annual operations/maintenance bill at all nine Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) bases and software needed to centrally manage the SAN. This provides the Command the ability to support Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) mission, backup/recovery/restoral of critical data, and email service.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Answer: The money will be spent for annual operations/ maintenance for the SAN Enterprise across the PACAF Theater.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Answer: EMC2 Corporation provides hardware, software, maintenance, and technical assistance. Contractor performance has been excellent.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2007 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

As an Operations and Maintenance shortfall, it currently competes for Base Communications sustainment funding in the year of execution. This network was recently purchased in FY2007 and will require follow-on sustainment support startng in FY08 (new requirement).

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

If Congress provided the additional amount indicated, no additional funding would be required. The O&M requirement is \$2M/year across the FYDP. If fully funded across the FYDP, we will not require additional funding with the current projections.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

This is not a R&D item.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The funding required over the FYDP sustains the SAN Enterprise. The \$2M required per year pays for the annual operations/ maintenance bill at all nine PACAF bases and software needed to centrally manage the SAN. This provides the Command the ability to support COOP mission, backup/recovery/restoral of critical data, and email service. The mission is accomplished by the contractor. This is an O&M requirement.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings will incur with the funding of this requirement.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. This is necessary for support of continuity of operations capability across the PACAF enterprise network.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2007?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01, BA02, BA03, BA04
Program Element: Various: PE 22834F; 42834F, 72834F, 82834F
Potential Add: \$340M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus up is or does.

Procures aircraft support equipment and other base maintenance support equipment. Equipment (maintenance stands, aircraft air conditioners light-alls, generators/electrical power units, bomb lifts, testers, etc) provides direct support to generating aircraft sorties.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This funding will replace worn support equipment in the Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility. Additionally, it will fill critical mobility and WRM (War Reserve Materials) shortfalls at stateside and overseas bases; driven by deploying assets to the CENTCOM area of responsibility, and excessive wear and tear.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

This effort involves multiple contractors, encompassing almost all states. To date the majority have performed to expectations.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

All PEs are O&M

	FY08 PB	UPL ADD BY PE/BA (\$340M)
PE 22834F: SAG 011A BA01	\$154M	\$254M
PE 42834F: SAG 021A BA02	\$8.3M	\$26.3M
PE 72834F: SAG 041A BA04	\$16.7M	\$46.1M
PE 82834F: SAG 033A BA03	\$15.4M	\$13.2M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.
6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

This is not a single project. Support equipment funding in the referenced PEs procures thousands of different types of equipment items. The USAF will continue to fund this program in order of appropriate required levels based on needs/priorities of the Air Force.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

There's a continual need for replacement support equipment. The current shortfall for O&M funded support equipment, FY07 is \$1.8B. The FY08 Unfunded Priority List request helps to reduce the shortfall. This figure includes Mobility and WRM holes as well as items which are replacement eligible due to forecasted usage/wear.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

There are no dollar savings, but it is estimated that the maintenance man-hours required to keep aircraft support equipment serviceable has increased by 31% over the past 5 years. Therefore, this will help to reduce maintenance man-hours for support equipment.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value. Without replacing shortfalls in aircraft and other base maintenance support equipment, sortie support operations will eventually be impacted.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or

procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

None.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
SYNTHETIC FUELS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: Air Force
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA04
Program Element: 78070F
Potential Add: \$30M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

To certify SynFuels manufactured from domestic supplies in military aviation and Air Force ground support equipment, and the logistics supply chain. Goal is to have the entire aviation fleet certified for SynFuels use by FY10. Program envisions procuring up to 1 M gal of SynFuels in FY08 for the certification process. Laboratory testing of SynFuels, and an aviation demonstration in a B-52 Bomber occurred in FY06 to ensure the certification process is practicable, and as a risk-reduction measure. A limited FY07 initiative continues, through Congressional interest. (KY, IL, ND, PA, OK and OH). This energy security initiative serves to establish the AF's SynFuel program. Safety of flight demands thorough flight-testing prior to weapon system airworthiness certification. Program ensures human toxicology testing as well as fire protection criteria is examined for same handling and human health is assured.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This energy security initiative serves to establish the AF's SynFuel program. It procures engineering services to ensure manned flight safety of the SynFuels, and procures a modest amount of SyFuels at market rates for purposes of conducting ground static engine runs, as well as an appropriate level of on-board aircraft fuel use to ensure airworthiness certification of this novel fuel. Also pays for the coordination between military and commercial aviation fuels dialogue to ensure that AF efforts are in synchronism with the Commercial Aviation Alternative Fuels Initiative (CAAFI) coordinated by the Federal Aviation Administration.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Various aerospace industry contractors in various states, in particular OH, CT, WA, and IL. Since the only US manufacturer of aviation SynFuels closed its plant last year, it is anticipated that overseas sources of supply will be required. Several US manufacturers are building a domestic capability with an initial operational capability in FY10. An exhaustive Request for Information from DLA last year indicated that a domestic industry could produce several hundred million gallons within 10 years.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in

what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes, there is currently \$1M budgeted in FY08. Total requirement is for FY08 is \$30M.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding in PB:	\$1.0M	\$1.0M	\$11.56M	\$9.80M	\$6.35M	\$2.77M
Requirement:	\$30.0M	\$30.0M	\$30.0M	\$50.0M	\$50.0M	\$30.0M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No additional funding; all costs reflected in the FY08 requirement of \$30.0M.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

A total of \$220M is required from FY08-FY13. Currently, only \$32.48M is supported in the President's Budget request. A modest increase in FY11 and FY12 is required to ensure the logistics infrastructure and ground support equipment necessary to use this unique fuel. Yes, we plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Currently, our aircraft are fueled with conventional (crude oil) based aviation fuel. The price of crude oil is volatile, and as world demand for limited crude oil increases in the latter part of this decade, fuel prices will increase further. By preparing the USAF to use SynFuels from domestic sources of fuel, and particularly renewable (sustainable) sources of biomass, the AF (and DOD) will be less impacted by economic shocks in the energy sector. This is a National Security issue, an economic security issue for the DOD.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under

your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

It is too soon to determine cost savings. At this point this is a National Security issue and an economic and supply insurance policy for the future.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

Current funding level severely hinders our ability to certify the fleet for SynFuel use by FY10.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Inventory objective is to procure up to 50% of AF CONUS jet fuel requirements as Synthetic-blend by 2016, if domestically available, and economical. In FY06 100,000 gallons of blended SynFuel were procured, plan is procure 200,000 gallons in FY07. Goal is to procure up to 1 M gallons/year in FY08-10 for the purpose to certify the fleet. Long term purchases depend on domestic availability.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
 INFORMATION PAPER
 TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL PROGRAM SIMULATOR

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
 Appropriation: Other Procurement (OPAF)
 Budget Activity: BA03
 Program Element: 27418F
 Potential Add: \$14.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

The Joint Terminal Controller Training and Rehearsal System (JTC TRS) program under the Tactical Airborne Control System funds development of Distributed Mission Operations (DMO)-capable, high-fidelity Joint Terminal Attack Controller (JTAC) training. It will be designed to provide accredited training to meet designated annual special operations and conventional JTAC training requirements. The plus-up will pay for unfunded in-garrison trainers and associated Research/Development (R&D) for testing and equipment integration, DMO architecture integration and network costs.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Additional funding will procure 18 remaining JTC TRS DMO-capable trainers, support associated testing and equipment integration, and support DMO architecture integration and network costs.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Contract not yet awarded.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes. PE 27418F, APPN 3600: \$4.8M, APPN 3080: \$10.9M Line 44 Tactical CE Equipment

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
3600	3.3	1.5		
3080		7.3	1.8	1.8

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

Total AF additional funding is \$25.8M (Air Force Special Operations Command Combat Controllers are now added to the total Air Force requirement). We will continue to seek this shortfall in future POM cycles until the capability is achieved.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

\$2.5M has been spent to stand up the System Program office and facilitate transfer of acquisition management functions from the USA to the USAF. System specifications are being written and RFP will go out to industry by Jul 07. The test plan has not been developed

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes; it is validated in Joint Terminal Control Training and Rehearsal System Operational Requirements Document.

The Joint Terminal Control Training and Rehearsal System (JTC TRS) is a virtual, distributed training and rehearsal system designed to train Joint Terminal Attack Controllers (JTACS) in the Joint Close Air Support (JCAS) mission area. It will have the capability to use mission equipment in the simulator that will either be stimulated or simulated. In addition it will allow users to develop tailored scenarios; export and/or import scenarios and databases. Databases will be geo-specific to allow JTACs to train and rehearse in regions to which they will deploy. In addition, it will integrate with the DMO Network to allow distributed training with aircrews using Mission Training Centers (MTCs) and Full Mission Trainers (FMT). It will have a brief and debrief capability as dictated by DMO standards and a performance assessment capability. Security standards will be met per DMO requirements. Finally, JTC TRS will have 3 Versions; Dome, Fixed and Deployable.

Current training is provided through live-fly events. The ability to curtail live-fly by a minimum of 10% (1.2 sorties) would still support all terminal controller training and based on A-10 flying hour cost supporting a force structure of 904 JTACs (Active Duty and Guard) would save over \$14.9M per year. (A-10 flying/hr cost \$4,130.00 x 2 hours x 2 sorties x 904 JTACs = \$14,934,080.00)

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then

year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No expected savings would be realized. Added funding will procure JTC TRS for unfunded operational units and schoolhouses.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The inventory objective is to provide a fixed system to each operational TACP Air Support Operations Squadron, Special Tactics Squadron, and two schoolhouses. In addition each Air Support Operations Group and each Schoolhouse will have one fully immersive Dome for Type 1 CAS training. This equates to 38 Fixed/deployable and 5 Dome systems. Procurement dollars currently start in FY09 so no inventory is on hand. Objective is to have all trainers fielded by FY11.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
TACTICAL WEATHER RADAR SUSTAINMENT

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 35111F
Potential Add: \$0.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Tactical Weather Radars (TWR) are located at 6 installations across the European theater—one each in Britain, Turkey, and Italy and three (3) in Germany. The radar data is used to assess the state of the environment and ensure safe conduct of Air Force and Army aviation operations.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) Weather Division now requires sustainment funding for the network of six TWRs in Europe.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

Unknown.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An equivalent amount of funding will be required across the FYDP for these multi-year contracts as long as TWR exists as the radar solution for the European Command. Alternate solutions are being pursued but not projected to be in place until FY09 at the earliest.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

No.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value for safe and effective aircraft operations across the EUCOM theater.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the

obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list? No.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
TEMPORARY DUTY TO SCHOOL FUNDS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 84731F; 84751F
Potential Add: \$34M for TDY to School

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does. Temporary Duty (TDY) to School provides travel and per diem cost for; Professional Military Education, Air and Space Basic Course, Squadron Officer School, Chief Master Sergeant Leadership School, Senior Non-Commissioned Officer Academy, and Non-Commissioned Officer Academy. Funds 7-level (journeyman qualification) training, AF directed non 7-level (journeyman qualification) training and Major Command level 1 (initial qualification) training.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

This addition will fund a \$5M shortfall PME TDY to School and a \$29M shortfall Training TDY to School.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

-N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Yes at \$84.3M (O&M).

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
\$84.3M	\$90.0M	\$144.3M	\$146.2M	\$149.3M	\$152.3M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

-None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

N/A

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Chief of the Air Force policy on Professional Military Education drives the prescribed education and training quotas through the annual Air Force budget process.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

-N/A

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

-High military value

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

-N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

-N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2006 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

-None

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT CORE SYSTEMS

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E)
Budget Activity: BA07
Program Element: 27410F
Potential Add: \$9.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS) is the engine of the Air and Space Operations Center (AOC) that plans and executes air, space, and cyber mission for the Joint/Combined Force Air Component Commander (C/JFACC). TBMCS is the joint system of record for air tasking planning and execution. Proposed plus-up allows TBMCS version 1.1.4 to meet joint configuration management standards (i.e. Joint Standard Air Operations Software (JSOAS) Configuration Management Board (JCMB) for data replication and distributed operations. This is required to meet CSAF vision to globally link AOCs.

The Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS) develops command, control and intelligence applications and infrastructure providing core air battle planning, management and execution capabilities. TBMCS is the JSOAS system of record for the Air Force and other Services and is governed in accordance with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 6271.01B. The Air Force is executive agent for TBMCS. This development effort focuses on, but is not limited to support of the Joint Forces Air Component Commander, the Air and Space Operations Center (AOC) and the wing and unit levels to include: planning and re-planning of the Air Battle Plan; generation and dissemination of the Air Tasking Order; air and space defensive planning and execution; targeting; weaponeering; and numerous other applications supporting air operations command and control. It also evaluates future air and space command and control concepts identified through real world operations, exercises and demonstrations and incorporates new capability via evolutionary acquisition.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Meet remaining Joint/AF requirements for TBMCS 1.1.4 (System of Record for Air Tasking Planning and Execution)

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

100% Lockheed-Martin, Colorado Springs, CO

Contractor performance to date: Meeting requirements and schedule

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

Funding is not contained in current program to develop data replication and distributed operations capabilities for TBMCS 1.1.4 as mandated by the JCMB.

The funding is contained in FY2008 President's budget to develop TBMCS 1.1.4, but no funding identified to meet JCMB #14 & 19 (data replication/distributed ops) requirements.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP?

Yes, funding to develop TBMCS 1.1.4 (excluding funding to develop data replication and distributed operations JCMB requirements)

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? \$71.4M What is the testing status and next milestone?

TBMCS 1.1.4 Developmental Testing is planned for Mar 08; however, to meet all JCMB requirements (unfunded submission), it will likely slip to Aug 08.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? Yes. If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

(TBMCS ORD, para 1.2.1) TBMCS will support command, control, and intelligence nodes at the force, component, and unit-level elements in support of distributed, collaborative planning (DCP) and decision-makers at and below the level of JFACC. TBMCS provides the capability to support the responsibilities of the JFACC, Airspace Control Authority (ACA) and Area Air Defense Commander (AADC) as described in JP3-30. It will be specifically designed to interface with command, control, communications, computer, and intelligence (C4I) systems from the US Air Force, US Army, US Navy, US Marine Corps, NATO, and selected allied/coalition nations. TBMCS will provide automated air operations planning, execution management and intelligence capabilities. It will support a full range of functions including:

development of the JFACC Course of Action (COA) for approval by the JFC, Joint Air and Space Operations Plan (JASOP), Air Tasking Order (ATO), Airspace Control Order (ACO), production and replanning, threat assessment, target selection, mission execution, battle damage assessment, resource management, time critical target identification and prosecution, theater critical asset prioritization and developing the area air defense plan. Critical warfighting capabilities are highly dependent upon TBMCS mission support. Combat capabilities include bomber and fighter aircraft, surface-to-air missile weapons systems, air and ground based sensors, surface-to-surface missiles, special operations forces, or information operations and next generation weapon systems (e.g., Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) and Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM)). It will also support interaction with subordinate/command units for mission execution, and a capability to obtain resource information to plan and execute the next day's missions. It will provide a capability to rapidly receive, correlate, manipulate, display and disseminate intelligence data from multi-discipline sources and natural environmental data and then apply the resulting information to the battle planning, mission execution and assessment processes. This document describes the requirements for the JFACC and Joint/Coalition (or Combined) Aerospace Operations Center (J/CAOC) to include the transfer from one J/CAOC to another. The TBMCS software will be capable of supporting the JFACC in any theater and under all conditions. Note: For this document, Air Battle Plan (ABP) will be used to refer to the information contained within the ATO, ACO, and ATO/ACO change messages.

Mission is partially performed manually and remaining requirements are not being met today. AOCs have ability to copy information, but not replicate it. This inhibits ability of another AOC from using that data and picking up those operations with available information (Continuity Of Operations). Current system of record (TBMCS 1.1.3) does not have capability for distributed operations with AF and joint users, using the same databases and each must manually provide the other data information.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No operational savings projected from this effort; anticipate O&M and manpower cost avoidance due to increased functionality (AOC WS currently has about \$500M O&M shortfalls across the FYDP and cannot man AOCs to required UTC and require augmentation).

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High Military Value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-

on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
THEATER AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM (TARS) OPERATIONS &
MAINTENANCE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity:
Program Element: 27217F
Potential Add: \$9.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This funding will provide TARS O&M funding for continuous deployment and training; repair/replacement of non-stock listed items and software improvements; emerging user requirements for advanced software. Additionally, this funding provides Contracted Support maintenance and logistics support for continuous TARS deployment, equipment maintenance and maintenance training, for which no "blue suit" capability exists.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The additional funds would provide continuous TARS deployment/ training and provide tactical reconnaissance to U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) in accordance with the request for forces.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule.

BAE, Greenlawn NY prime TARS contractor. Also L3Com East, NJ, for solid state recorders and L3Com West, UT, for wideband datalinks.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next budget cycle?

If the required \$9.5M is received for FY08, to remain viable an additional \$9.5M per year, plus inflation, would be required. None of these funds are currently budgeted. Plans are to address this shortfall in the next POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, U.S. Central Command requires continuous TARS precedence in theater.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2007, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings. These are costs to sustain the capability as requested.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

Medium. TARS is the only USAF tactical reconnaissance capability, and the sole source for some of the taskings levied by CENTCOM.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-

on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Currently there are 9 legacy TARS pods in use. Expect to have 13 operational TARS pods with data link and 8 ground stations by end of FY07. End state is 14 data link pods.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
TRAINING MUNITIONS AND MISSILES

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Multiple
Budget Activity: Multiple
Program Element: Multiple
Potential Add: \$160.1M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

To meet Chief of Staff, United States Air Force (CSAF)'s realistic training directive, the request funds: Sensor Fuzed Weapon procurement (50 units for \$25M), Wind Corrected Munitions Dispenser kit harvesting O&M (\$25K), AIM-120D procurement (74 missiles for \$70M), AIM-9X procurement (15 missiles for \$13.7M), Target Drone procurement (3x QF-4 for \$16.8M and 6x BQM-167 for \$3.4M, totaling \$20.2M). AGM-158 JASSM procurement and associated costs for 4 additional test shots (\$4M for contractor support, \$2M for test execution, \$2.8M for JASSM-Basic missiles, and \$2M for instrumentation kits, totaling \$10.8M), and AGM-114 Hellfire (270 missiles for \$20.3M).

Sensor Fuzed Weapon (SFW) provides DoD's only air-delivered anti-armor multiple kills per pass capability. SFW is the only weapon that meets or exceeds OSD's policy requiring 99% or better submunition functioning rate with no unexploded ordnance. SFW is combat proven (68 weapons) with outstanding results in OIF.

The AIM-120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is the premier air-to-air missile with advanced radar-guided capability against all airborne targets. Coupled with the F-22A, it delivers the warfighter unmatched air dominance. The AIM-9X Sidewinder is the US' premier heat-seeking air-to-air missile. The AIM-9X brings US aerial forces high off-boresight capability. Additional full-scale and sub-scale target drones are necessary to keep pace with current air-to-air training.

The AGM-158 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) provides the warfighter access to high threat and highly-defended targets on the modern battlefield. It is a force multiplier for combatant commanders, ensuring rapid battlespace access early in conflicts.

The AGM-114 Hellfire is an air-to-ground missile providing Unmanned Aerial Systems precision-kill capability. It is a key weapon in the Global War on Terror.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

CSAF identified necessary increases in test & training munitions procurement & expenditure based on the FY06 Weapon System Evaluation Program (WSEP) annual out-briefing. Findings highlighted current and projected shortfalls in front-line weapons training readiness. USAF aircrews receive limited opportunity to employ actual rounds of the most complicated air-to-air

and air-to-ground weapons prior to combat.

Projected Sensor Fuzed Weapon stockpiles will be insufficient to allow robust testing of the weapon's newly fielded over-water capabilities. The weapon is now able to attack small watercraft operating in littoral waters.

Air-to-air missile stockpiles are stressed by a combination of aging missiles, advancing threats, and limited quantities of the most advanced missiles. Additional missiles and drones will increase confidence in the missiles' ability to successfully defeat the most advanced threats and increase aircrew "first live shot" opportunity prior to combat.

Additional JASSM buys and test shots will allow the Air Force to further develop and validate JASSM concepts of operation in support of rapid, short-notice targeting as well as increase confidence in the later production lots.

The requested Hellfire buy will support MQ-1 and MQ-9 initial qualification and continuation training for one year, as well as one year's test requirement. Currently, insufficient missiles exist to shoot prior to combat employment. The USAF's goal is for all MQ-1 and MQ-9 operators to shoot prior to combat employment.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

The prime contractor for the Sensor Fuzed Weapon (SFW) is Textron Systems (TSC) of Wilmington, MA. Their performance has consistently been to deliver 100% weapons on/ahead of schedule on cost. There are 7 major subcontractors across four states (MN, WV, KS, WA) and two foreign countries (Israel & Canada) supplying parts for SFW builds. Sixty-eight domestic subcontractors support SFW production. Approximate value of subcontracted effort (expressed in percentage of contract value): Alliant Tech: 4.3%, Day & Zimmerman: 6.2%, Perkin Elmer Optoelectronics: 3.0%, General Dynamics: 2.1%, Rafael: 2.6%, and Kurt Manufacturing: 1.2%.

The AIM-120 AMRAAM prime contractors are Raytheon Missile Systems (Tucson, AZ - Missile System Design & Missile Production), Marvin Engineering (Inglewood, CA - launchers), Harris Corporation (Melbourne, FL - Warhead Replacement Tactical Telemetry Module), and Manufacturing Technology (Crestview, FL - shipping/storage containers). Subcontractors include Stellex (Palo Alto, CA - radio frequency components, data link), ATK Rocket Center (Rocket City, WV - rocket motor and warhead), and Eagle Picher (Joplin, MO - batteries).

The prime contractor for the AIM-9X Sidewinder is Raytheon Missile systems of Tucson, AZ. Major subcontractors on this effort include: HR Textron (CA), Alliant Technology systems (WV), ENSER (FL), L3-KDI Precision Products (OH), and Engineered Plastic Designs (CO).

The prime contractor for QF-4 is BAE Systems of Mojave, CA. F-4 airframes are refurbished at

AMARC and provided to the contractor as GFE. There are 7 subcontractors (one is a foreign vendor providing a commercially available item). BAE's performance has consistently been to deliver 100% of drones on schedule and cost. Quality is high.

The prime contractor for BQM-167A Air Force Subscale Aerial Target (AFSAT) is Composite Engineering Inc. (CEI) of Sacramento, CA. There are 5 subcontractors. Product has not yet reached Milestone C (full rate production). Cost performance has been fine (firm fixed price contract). Schedule is approx one year behind. The product is experiencing some technical issues (related to launch-phase reliability), but system maturity is improving.

JASSM's prime contractor is Lockheed-Martin Missile Systems, headquartered in Orlando, FL. JASSM final assembly takes place in Troy, AL. Major subcontractors include Teledyne Motors (JASSM-Basic engine - Toledo, OH), Williams International (JASSM-ER engine - Ogden, UT), Fiber Innovations (missile body - Walpole, MA), Klune (composites and frames - Spanish Fork, UT), Kaman Dayron (fuze - Orlando, FL), L-3 Telemetry (Bomb Impact Assessment subsystem - Newton, PA), and Wyman-Gordon Forgings (warhead - Houston, TX). To date, Lockheed-Martin's JASSM contract performance has been good, despite early missile reliability issues.

Lockheed Martin Missile Systems is also the Hellfire missile primary contractor. Subcontractors include Moog (Utah), Alliant Tech (West Virginia), and L3 (Illinois). Hellfire contract performance to date is exemplary.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

SFW funding is not included in the FY08 budget request.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FYDP AIM-120 Missile Funding:

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding (\$M)						
FY08 PB R-1	36.8	45.9	40.3	40.7	23.0	12.9
FY08 PB P-1	230.6	281.8	291.1	304.1	310.0	316.7
Quantity (purchase)						
FY08 PB	206	301	334	319	346	377

FYDP AIM-9X Missile Funding:

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding (\$M)						
FY08 PB R-1	7.9	5.8	6.1	6.3	6.4	6.5
FY08 PB P-1	58.9	80.4	80.6	63.4	64.6	66.0
Quantity (purchase)						
FY08 PB	172	242	301	207	217	202

FYDP Aerial Target Funding (P-1):

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding (\$M)						
FY08 PB	85.6	90.3	92.4	93.5	95.3	151.5
Quantity						
FY08 PB (QF-4)	16	17	16	15	16	15

FYDP JASSM Funding (P-1):

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding (\$M)						
FY08 PB	201.1	242.2	243.3	244.1	252.3	256.8
Quantity						
FY08 PB	210	250	255	260	260	260

* Funding for the additional 4 JASSM missiles and associated test shots is not included in the above FY08 budget request.

FYDP AGM-114 Hellfire (P-1):

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Funding (\$M)						
FY08 PB	64.1	63.6	80.5	36.3	37.1	37.9
Quantity (purchase)						
FY08 PB	662	642	792	355	355	355

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a "validated" written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

The Sensor Fuzed Weapon Operational Requirements Document, dated August 1996 states the requirement for stand-off anti-armor/vehicle multiple kills per single pass capability.

JASSM enables the Joint Force Air Component Commander (JFACC) to place an adversary's "center-of-gravity" targets at risk theater-wide. The missile can inflict required levels of damage

on these campaign-critical, high value assets even while the targets are under the "umbrella" of next generation air defense systems. Aircraft employing the missile are able to launch JASSM from safe standoff distances. The missile paves the way for the employment of level of effort munitions (e.g., Joint Direct Attack Munition and Sensor Fuzed Weapon). The missile is envisioned to be employed heavily in the initial phase of a conflict before air superiority is established. In subsequent stages of a conflict, the missile may be employed against selected high value targets remaining heavily defended.

COMACC 90 (January 2001) is the overarching plan governing air-to-ground weapons evaluations. It states, "Air Combat Command (ACC) is committed to conducting a continuous evaluation of the reliability, maintainability, suitability, and accuracy of A/G weapon systems. These evaluations are conducted while performing tactical deliveries of Precision-Guided Munitions (PGMs), other high technology munitions, and some selected munitions and fuses on realistic targets with realistic enemy defenses. To effectively validate (to an 80 percent confidence level) the probability of success, it is necessary to exercise the total integrated A/G weapon system which includes the aircraft, munitions, aircrew, weapon delivery system, maintenance and munitions personnel, technical data, training devices, tactics manuals, and associated weapon test and delivery support systems. The mission of A/G WSEP is to assess the operational effectiveness (reliability, maintainability, suitability, and accuracy) of these A/G weapon systems for overall delivery success on realistic tactical targets with enemy defenses. To assure an accurate and thorough assessment of operational effectiveness, every attempt will be made to use telemetry-equipped weapons."

Commander, Air Combat Command (COMACC) 85 (April 2003) is the overarching plan which provides the requirements driving the increase in air-to-air weapons allocation. It defines Air-to-Air (A/A) WSEP's (Combat Archer) mission as: In a realistic operational environment, the Combat Archer mission is to exercise and evaluate, through a continuing program, the total A/A weapon system capability of combat fighter aircraft, against targets simulating representative threats. Evaluation focuses on units with primary or secondary A/A missions. Combat Archer may conduct limited evaluations of units with a tertiary A/A mission. Specific mission objectives include:

- Develop statistically significant data, over a 3-year period, to verify weapon system performance at an 85 percent confidence level against threat representative targets. This includes 50 percent of missile firings against targets that employ representative infrared and electronic attack measures and vary in radar cross-section.

In the past, WSEP has not achieved its 85% confidence level in AIM-120B/C and AIM-9X. Additionally, aircrews have not been able to employ 1 missile/year. In fact, most aircrew will have 2 operational assignments (tours) prior to employing a live missile. To correct this, CSAF directed an increase in weapons allocation to WSEP. The requested funding increase will replace the increase in weapons expended and fund the increase in targets required to support live fires.

Additionally, Air Force Instruction (AFI) 11-2F-15 Volume 1 states: Live ordnance training is essential to pilot combat capability. Every attempt should be made to give each pilot the opportunity to employ as many types of weapons inventoried on the Unit Committed Munitions List (UCML) as possible. To provide this opportunity, as a goal, all Combat Mission Ready (CMR) pilots should expend the following ordnance. (Reference AFI 36-2217, Munitions Requirements for Aircrew Training: Paragraph 5.6.1. For units tasked with Defensive Counterair

(DCA), Strategic Defense, and/or Offensive Counterair (OCA) missions: One live A/A missile employment per year.)

The Aerial Target requirement is divided between full scale targets and subscale targets. The full scale Aerial Targets fulfill the following needs:

- High fidelity weapons testing and evaluation
- Supersonic flight, high-G maneuvering
- Heavy payload capability
- Electronic attack, infrared (IR) countermeasures
- Multi-ship formations

The subscale Aerial Targets fulfill the following additional requirements:

- Low cost, reusable target
- Subsonic flight, moderate maneuvering
 - Future supersonic upgrade
- Electronic attack, countermeasures, IR
- Multi-ship formations

The MQ-1/Hellfire weapon system is being used daily in the Global War on Terror. Central Command (CENTCOM) provided Air Staff a classified paper in Jan 07 discussing their ongoing requirement for Hellfire, as well as anticipated increases in required assets to conduct operations, testing, and training associated with fielding the MQ-9 Reaper Unmanned Aerial System this year.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

ITEM	FYDP Test & Training	INV OBJ	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
CBU-105 SFW+WCMD	490	6657	3550 53%	3831 58%	4102 62%	4155 62%	4127 62%	4099 62%	4071 61%	4043 61%
AIM-120D AMRAAM	165	4056	0 0%	6 0%	129 3%	246 6%	399 10%	457 11%	738 18%	968 24%
AGM-158 JASSM	42	4363	438 10%	643 15%	847 19%	1100 25%	1469 34%	1837 42%	2116 48%	2386 55%
AGM-114 HELLFIRE	966	4700	125 3%	312 7%	447 10%	887 19%	1738 37%	2281 49%	2962 63%	3195 68%

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

Hellfire: FY07 PB requested \$65.7M for procurement (MPAF). The appropriation conference moved \$32.65M to Title IX. This funding has been released from OSD to the Air Force. The Air Force has transmitted the funding to the Army to place on contract.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
U-2 ADVANCED SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR SYSTEM (ASARS-2A)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement (APAF)
Budget Activity: BP19
Program Element: 35202F
Potential Add: \$3.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Restores required funding for limited Visible Infrared Imager Radiometer Suite Vegetation Index (VVI) resolution. This resource is critical to maintaining the viability of U-2 sensors through Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) transformation. Sensors will be unable to sustain future U-2 current & contingency ops; beginning as early as 08. The U-2 current program of record is to conduct operations until second quarter FY12, when the RQ-4 is programmed to be fully operational.

Based on conservative engineering judgment, AF estimate that the U-2 program will start to cannibalize the Advanced Synthetic Aperture Radar System (ASARS-2A) by 2008

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Vanished Vendor Mitigation for ASARS-2A, \$3.6M

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

ASARS-2A – Raytheon, California. Initial deliveries of ASARS-2A were delayed approximately two years and required additional funding to complete. However, issues were due to system inter-dependencies with the ground processing elements, technical complexity, and unanticipated technological challenges associated with the integration of COTS equipment in the high altitude operating environment.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional

funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

None.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

Yes, the capabilities and numbers of each sensor system required are listed in their pertinent Operational Requirement Document for Improved Synthetic Aperture Radar for U-2. However, the current requirement is based on current operations tempo and sustainability of existing systems. Sensors are allocated to theaters today by the Joint Functional Component Command ISR, and specific sensor tasking is determined by theater collection managers based on sensor applicability to intelligence requirements.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

None.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

These items have high military value as reflected in current intelligence reporting. U-2 sensors are used in countering IEDs, pre-determining hostile intent, locating hostile threats, and maintaining ‘order-of-battle’ information in the main operating theaters.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

This effort will sustain the current inventory of 9 ASARS-2A systems through mid-FY 12.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
USAF ACADEMY CADET EDUCATION

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF Academy
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA03
Program Element: 84721F
Potential Add: \$4.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.
-Lab Equipment provides for those equipment type purchases (non 3080) and equipment maintenance contracts to support the multiple labs that exist in the Dean of Faculty. These labs are for instruction and in-house research.
-Plus-up would allow the USAF Academy to upgrade and replace aging lab equipment. We need the latest equipment in order to attract/inspire cadets into the scientific and engineering fields.
-The McDermott (Cadet) Library provides academic library resources and services to faculty, staff, and cadets at the United States Air Force Academy.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?
-Purchase additional, replacement, and accessories for current lab equipment.
-To increase the level of subscriptions, books, periodicals, and databases to a level consistent with other undergraduate universities and service academies

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?
-N/A

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2007 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?
-Yes at \$1.495M
-3400, R-1/P-1 are N/A

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
2.178M	1.880M	2.065M	2.089M	2.144M	2.199M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

-None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

-Additional funding was requested in the FY08 POM and will be requested in the next POM.

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
4.745M	5.101M	5.419M	5.807M	6.086M	6.877M

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

- Lab equipment costs are continually rising partly driven by the 3080 threshold changes in previous fiscal years from \$50K to \$100K and then \$250K with no corresponding increase in baseline. These equipment purchases were partially captured within 3080 funding in previous years.

-Mission is currently accomplished by extending as much as possible the life of lab equipment. Where equipment does fail, the number of cadets using a piece of equipment at the same time increases, which decreases individual hands-on time and negatively affects the learning environment. - The current library materials budget projection for FY 2007 is \$995K which is a \$473K shortfall. This funding level does not allow the library to support curriculum and faculty. While inflation is currently moving at 1 to 3 per cent per year, book costs are increasing at 3 to 5 per cent while serials (journals, standing orders, on-line databases, etc.) are escalating at 10 to 12 per cent per year.

- Mission is currently accomplished by reducing the number of periodicals, books, journals, etc. purchased. If library funds are not furnished, we will have to reduce periodicals by 50% or purchase zero books.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2007, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2007 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

\$1.290M added in FY06 from the Air Staff

100% obligated

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

None.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
WEATHER SERVICE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA01
Program Element: 35111F
Potential Add: \$2.5M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

This request funds the weather service contracts which provide mission planning, targeting, flight safety, and resource protection for the Army and the Air Force, and funds the Air Force share of the Next Generation Radar (NEXRAD) weather maintenance contract. The contracts were originally awarded as an A-76 action.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The additional funds will assure the continued availability of weather services for DoD operations at 42 Army and Air Force bases, and also honor DoD's commitment to sustaining NEXRAD in the June 04 Tri-Agency Memorandum of Agreement with the Departments of Transportation and Commerce.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

3D Research Corp., K-Mar Industries, and McCauley-Brown Inc. provide these weather services. There are approximately 60 personnel employed by the contracts in 10 different states (AL, AZ, GA, KY, LA, MO, NY, OK, TX, and VA) and their performance has been satisfactory.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

An equivalent amount of funding will be required across the FYDP for these multi-year contracts.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

No.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

No savings are projected for this project.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value for safe and effective aircraft operations

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

No

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the

resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them? N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008? No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
WEAPONIZING INTEL COMBAT CAPABILITY TRAINING (WICC-T)

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: PE 41300F
Potential Add: \$0.8M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

Weaponizing Intel Combat Capability-Training (WICC-T) will certify personnel in position skills and initiate standardization/evaluation functions, in accordance with existing processes for USAF pilots, navigators, and other positions, so that intelligence personnel can be concretely measured as wartime-ready. WICC-T will rectify current intel training for officer and enlisted personnel designed to support mobility missions in non-hostile environments. Air Mobility Command (AMC) assets now fly into the threat envelope hundreds of time each day in Iraq and Afghanistan in order to maintain the logistics flow of supplies for the ongoing war effort.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

The money would fund Air Mobility Command (AMC) implementation of this new USAF requirement as gap-filler until funds can be programmed. It specifically covers Intel Formal Training Units courses for ~200 AMC intelligence personnel annually, and stand-up of the Major Command (MAJCOM)/Air Force intelligence standardization/evaluation function.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

N/A.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

No.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No.

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

None.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

\$800K per year is being budgeted over the FYDP.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A.

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

This is a new requirement based on Air Staff/Intelligence Directorate written directive signed 1 Mar 2006. This Air Force Policy directs AF MAJCOMs of Intelligence Formal Training and standard/evaluation functions to insure all AF intel personnel meet accredited standards. Training and evaluation functions are currently being conducted on an ad-hoc basis, with no set standards for units or evaluators. With AMC aircraft at highest risk of any in the AF (fired on at twice the rate of any other AF platform), AMC intelligence personnel are the “first line of defense” that must be as well trained as possible.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

N/A.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

This has high military value. Current “just in time” training of personnel about to deploy to Iraq or Afghanistan has not proved sufficient to meet mission needs once on the ground in-country, since they are book-smart at that point, but haven’t yet been able to apply their learning in a variety of situations. This has forced the AF to develop a comprehensive plan that will develop the combat skills needed as part of the normal intel career skill set.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A.

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2005, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A.

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

We could not execute additional money above the \$800K requested for this requirement due to the limited throughput of necessary training schools.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
INFORMATION PAPER
WAR RESERVE MATERIEL

Date: 16 FEB 07

Service/Agency: USAF
Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (O&M)
Budget Activity: BA02
Program Element: 28031
Potential Add: \$2.6M

1. Provide a description of what this item is and what the proposed plus-up is or does.

\$2.7M is needed in Supplies/Parts and corrosion control efforts to bring War Reserve Materiel (WRM) assets to minimal serviceable standards.

2. For what purpose would your Service/Agency spend the additional money?

Money would be used to provide direct support/maintenance on WRM major end items.

3. What contractor(s) is involved (indicate percent of contract and associated personnel employed) and in which states? What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule?

All funding would be used to purchase supplies and parts in direct support of asset maintenance. Approximately 20% of the funding would be used to establish corrosion control contracts at locations where organic capability does not exist to provide the level of effort in-house. No contract has been awarded to date.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2008 budget? If so, please identify in what appropriation, R-1/P-1 line-item, and at what dollar value. If so, how does the proposed add differ from the budget submit?

The FY 2008 budget for this program provides partial funding (\$723K); however, the amount programmed is not enough to sustain the storage and routine maintenance of over 8000 major end items prepositioned throughout the command in support of contingency plans.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2008 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Same as item 4. Approximately with funding breakdown as follows (in \$M):

FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
\$0.7M	\$0.8M	\$1.5M	\$1.5M	\$1.6M	\$1.6M

6. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much more additional funding would be required in FY 2008 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

Approximately \$200K for management oversight and travel throughout the command to validate and verify the additional funding is being executed appropriately.

7. If Congress were to provide the additional amount indicated, how much additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years? How much of this additional cost is budgeted in the current FYDP? Do you plan to pursue additional funding for this item in the next POM?

WRM O&M is underfunded by \$3M-\$4M over they FYDP. Same additional level of funding is needed throughout the FYDP to sustain War Reserve Materiel. We will continue to pursue funding in the next POM cycle.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date? What is the testing status and next milestone?

N/A

9. Does a “validated” written requirement already exist for this item? If so, please provide a brief one-paragraph summary of the requirement. Also, provide a brief one-paragraph description of how the mission is accomplished today and the expected warfighting improvements or cost savings through acquisition of the new system.

A validated requirement exists for this item as it is part of our normal and routine maintenance program. It is necessary to keep WRM in serviceable and ready to use state. Today’s funded amount provides only a fraction of the routine maintenance needed on WRM. Maintenance of assets are prioritized and what can not be accomplished with the funding provided, is deferred until funding becomes available, further adding to the amount of maintenance needed to bring assets back to a serviceable standard. These assets directly support the warfighters and any increase in the amount of serviceable assets improves our readiness.

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2008, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2008 rather than under your current plan? How much are acquisition savings? How much are expected operational savings once fielded? How much are inflation savings? Please list any other savings and a best estimate of what the revised FYDP funding/quantity profile would be if the proposal were implemented.

Biggest savings would be in less additional maintenance needed as a result of those assets where maintenance was deferred. Less rework or less additional maintenance will be accomplished because preventative measures can be taken to avert major repair work.

11. Do you assess that the line item has no/low, some/medium, or high military value?

High military value.

12. Does funding for the proposed add-on interfere with your plans to competitively develop or procure such equipment?

N/A

13. What is the inventory objective for this item? If procurement item, please indicate assets-on-hand at the end of FY 2006, FY 2007, and end of FY 2008 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

N/A

14. If Congress added FY 2007 funds for this item: How much was appropriated? Are they released by OSD to you? Have they been sent to a field activity for obligation? What is the obligation status of the funds? If unobligated, when do you plan to obligate them?

N/A

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2008?

No.

16. Why are (additional) funds for this item not in your budget request?

The Air Force carefully balanced the FY08 budget across modernization, infrastructure, personnel and readiness accounts. The impact of increasing personnel and operations costs, an aging fleet and 16 years of combat have put pressure on the Air Force's limited funding, and significant requirements remain unfunded.

17. If the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has submitted an unfunded priority list, is this item on the priority list?

Yes.