

**FY 2007**  
**Unfunded Priority List (UPL)**  
**Feb 2006**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

**SAF/FMB**

**POC**

**Budget and Appropriations Liaison Office**

**(703) 614-8110**



# FY 2007 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST

## INDEX

***FY2007 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*** ..... 4

**NARRATIVES FOR TOP 16 PRIORITIES**

- 1. National Defense Airlift Fund Capability Upgrades..... 10
- 2. AFSOC Predator..... 13
- 3. A-10 Modifications ..... 16
- 4. Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) ..... 21
- 5. Armored Security Vehicles ..... 34
- 6. M-4 Carbine..... 37
- 7. SNIPER Pod Procurement and Advanced Targeting Pod (ATP) Research ..... 41
- 8. Guardian Angel Combat Equipment ..... 45
- 9. ICBM Security Modernization ..... 49
- 10. Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) - Focused Lethality Munition (FLM)..... 53
- 11. AF Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Emergency Response ..... 56
- 12. B-1/B-52 Deployable Phase Maintenance Kits ..... 61
- 13. B-2 Satellite Terminal Synchronization ..... 64
- 14. B-2 Engine Blade Repair ..... 67
- 15. C-37 Procurement..... 70
- 16. Range Infrastructure Improvements ..... 73

**NARRATIVES FOR UNPRIORITIZED REQUIREMENTS (ALPHABETIC ORDER)**

- Aerial Targets ..... 77
- AF Reserve & Air National Guard New Mission Vehicles and Support Equipment ..... 84
- AF Reserve Critical Command and Control (C2)..... 87
- AF Space Command Security Upgrades..... 91
- AF Space Surveillance System (AFSSS) / Space Fence ..... 94
- Aircrew Training Systems (ATS)..... 97
- Battle Control Systems - Mobile (BCS-M) ..... 101
- C-9C / C-40C Sustainment (Scott AFB) ..... 106
- Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Land Mobile Radios (LMRs)..... 110

Combat Air Intel System Global Information and Services (GI&S).....	113
Combat Flight Inspection Aircraft.....	117
Command and Control System - Consolidated (CCS-C).....	121
Contractor Logistics Support (CLS).....	124
Control & Reporting Center (CRC) Essential Equipment .....	127
Defense Support Program (DSP) Flight 23 Launch Operations .....	130
Defense Support Program (DSP) Optical Data Modernization .....	133
Depot Purchased Equipment Maintenance (DPEM) .....	134
Eagle Vision.....	138
Geospatial Mapping Capability .....	142
Global Combat Support System (GCSS) AF .....	145
Halvorsen Loader .....	149
High Frequency Ground Control Stations (HFGCS) Antennas.....	153
Joint Threat Emitter (JTE).....	157
JSTARS Block 20 Trainer.....	160
Logistics Information Technology (IT) System Sustainment.....	163
MC-130J / AC-130U Flight Data Recorders (FDR).....	166
Midcourse Space Experiment / Space Based Visible (MSX/SBV) Operations .....	169
Military Construction (MILCON).....	172
Minuteman REACT Console Operator Input Devices (OID) Modernization .....	175
Missile Defense Security Upgrades.....	178
Mobility Air Intel System .....	181
Netcentric Communication Security (COMSEC) Buys .....	185
Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) Air Operations Center (AOC) Exercise.....	188
Passive Radio Frequency Identification Devices (RFID) .....	192
Science and Technology (S&T) .....	195
Tactical Terminal Modernization.....	196
Upgraded Early Warning Radar (UEWR) System Program Agency (SPA) .....	199
VC-25 Modification .....	204

## FY2007 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### TOP SIXTEEN PRIORITIZED REQUIREMENTS

Priority	Requirement	FY07 (\$M)	Description
1	National Defense Airlift Fund Capability Upgrades	2,433.9	Resets/Recapitalizes mobility assets for wartime use and COCOM needs. This includes funding for 7 C-17s, 4 C-130Js, 16 C-130 Center Wing Box Replacement, 1 CV-22 Acceleration, C-130 Support Equipment/Modifications and Other mobility assets.
2	AFSOC Predator	80.0	Initiative procures 8 MQ-1 Predator aircraft, 2 ground control stations (GCS), one dual launch and recovery GCS, initial spares, and required deployable spares.
3	A-10 Modifications	83.4	Funds Precision Engagement installation shortfall, 309 ARC-210 Beyond-Line-Of-Sight radios, and 20 AAR-47 infrared countermeasure kits that provide critical C2 connectivity, increase lethality by 25%, and enhance survivability against man-portable threats.
4	Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM)	105.8	Accelerates purchase and installation of LAIRCM modification on C-130s, HC/MC-130s and C-37s. Non-recurring engineering on HC/MC tankers. LAIRCM provides protection against man-portable air defense systems and surface-to-air missiles.
5	Up-Armored HMMWVs	51.8	Procures 205 Up-Armored HMMWVs to support new Security Forces requirements in the AOR. AF Security Forces are receiving new sister service in lieu of missions requiring additional UA-HMMWVs.
6	M-4 Carbine	61.0	Procures 25K carbines for deployment and 10K for training. Expeditionary Airmen need to deploy with weapons, which are interoperable with Army counterparts and capable of being operated in confined spaces due to non-traditional convoy taskings.
7	SNIPER Pod Procurement and ATP Research	54.0	Procures 30 additional SNIPER pods and funds research on data transfer and video downlink aircraft integration.
8	Guardian Angel Combat Equipment	12.7	Procures night vision goggles and three categories of weapons (.45 caliber hand-gun, stand alone 40mm grenade launcher, and MK15 .50 caliber anti-vehicle weapons) and weapons modification kit for their existing M-4s. This suite of weapons will enable Guardian Angel forces to defend against current global threats while conducting personnel recovery.
9	ICBM Security Modernization	18.9	Funds Remote Visual Assessment (RVA) development and buys 12 access door kits.
10	Small Diameter Bomb (SDB)- Focused Lethality Munition (FLM)	40.2	SDB FLM Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) offers potential for precisely delivering lethal blasts against soft targets and dramatically reduces collateral damage. Capability provided to warfighter in 22 months.

Priority	Requirement	FY07 (\$M)	Description
11	AF Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Emergency Response	30.4	Procures Individual Protective equip, medical treatment equip, supplies, decon and detection/identification equip, and funds training for multifunctional (Fire, EOD, SF, Med, Readiness) comprehensive program. Preserves combat capability and protect lives in first 12-24 hours after an incident.
12	B-1/B-52 Deployable Phase Maintenance Kit	35.0	Funds eliminate requirement to rotate jets from overseas to CONUS for recurring phase maintenance, thus driving higher ops tempo and lower mission capable rates. Deployable phase kits are needed to increase supportability of B-1s/B-52s at two locations.
13	B-2 Satellite Terminal Synchronization	30.0	Funds enable Extended Data Rate capability on B-2 during planned flight test window – avoids increased costs and protected communications capability delay.
14	B-2 Engine Blade Repair	5.9	Funds B-2 engine fan blade modification - corrects deficiencies, which have the potential to cause serious injury or extensive damage to systems or equipment. Engine inlet fan blades present a risk of blade separation due to high air inlet distortion levels.
15	C-37 Procurement	61.0	Procures C-37 aircraft as a one-for-one VIP Special Airlift C-20 replacement.
16	Range Infrastructure Improvements	20.5	Funds start-up of a Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain (MOUT) training facility (O&M tail covered in current FYDP funding). Provides realistic training for OIF. Improves range infrastructure through threat environment modernization.

**FY2007 UNFUNDED PRIORITY LIST EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**UNPRIORITIZED REQUIREMENTS (ALPHABETICAL ORDER)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>FY07 (\$M)</b>
Aerial Targets	38.0	Funds aerial targets and associated systems - utilized to accomplish mandatory Title 10 test and evaluation of weapon systems. Multiple shortfalls in aerial target program exist - limits AF's ability to test and evaluate.
AFR & ANG New Mission Vehicles and Support Equipment	14.0	Funds critical special purpose vehicles, support equipment and maintenance stands necessary to support Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve daily flying operations at new mission beddown locations (Memphis, TN; Martinsburg WV; Wright-Patterson AFB and others).
Air Force Reserve Critical Command and Control (C2)	6.0	AF Reserve has requirement to purchase/sustain parts, personnel mobility gear, fuel, oil, vehicle maintenance, and other equipment to meet critical theater deployable/combat communications requirements from combatant commanders.
AF Space Command Security Upgrades	15.0	Funds warfighter space weapon system security upgrades - replaces failing/uncertified systems, which protect priority level-1 assets. Continues phased replacement of electronic security systems at Schriever AFB & Buckley AFB.
AF Space Surveillance System (AFSSS)/ Space Fence	4.8	Funds sustainment shortfalls in environment, computer infrastructure and remote operations discovered after mission transfer from Navy.
Aircrew Training Systems (ATS)	47.2	ATS provides Mobility Air Forces (MAF) aircrew members essential simulator and courseware training necessary to maintain basic currency in the aircraft. Funds Contractor Logistics Support contract supporting MAF ATS for C-5, C-17, C-130, and C-130J.
Battle Control System - Mobile (BCS-M)	38.2	Funds one Battle Control Center and two rapid reaction Expeditionary Command and Control Centers in support of the CENTAF Warfighter Urgent Capability Need request. Current mobile command and control assets have significant capability gaps.
C-9C/C-40C sustainment (Scott AFB)	57.6	Funds manpower / O&M for 3 C-9Cs and 2 C-40Cs at Scott AFB.
Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Land Mobile Radios (LMRs)	6.9	Funds purchase CAP LMRs to meet National Telecommunications & Information Administration nationwide mandate to convert to narrowband usage by 2008.
Combat Air Intel System Global Information and Services (GI&S)	1.1	Funds USAFE and PACAF GI&S Geospatial product libraries. These libraries provide near real-time data and targeting imagery to Air Operation Centers and Joint Task Force Commanders.
Combat Flight Inspection Aircraft (CFIN)	30.0	FAA/Air Force agreement for AF to fund one of six aircraft. Add is required to complete conversion to eliminate C-29 range, reliability and cargo shortfalls and enhance combat airfield operations in Iraq/Afghanistan.

Priority	Requirement	FY07 (\$M)
Command and Control System – Consolidated (CCS - C)	8.7	Funds system integration/test of new Wideband Gapfiller Satellite and Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellites into CCS-C. CCS-C integration must begin a minimum of 18 months in advance of AEHF-1 launch.
Contractor Logistics Support (CLS)	214.9	Funds various CLS programs (C-40, VC-25, C-21, KC-10 & C-130J) to minimize existing mission readiness shortfalls.
Control & Reporting Center (CRC) Essential Equipment	4.7	Funds wartime replenishment items for CRC personnel including weapons, chemical warfare, life support and comm equipment. LD/HD system has exceeded max surge deployment since 9/11 exacerbating pre-existing equipment shortfalls.
Defense Support Program (DSP) Flight 23 Launch Ops	21.0	Funds one quarter of contractor launch support, on-orbit test and contract termination costs in FY07 due to continuing flight delays.
Defense Support Program (DSP) Optical Data Modernization	5.0	Classified input
Depot Purchased Equipment Maintenance (DPEM)	220.4	Funding eliminates the deferral of 20 aircraft Program Depot Maintenance and 28 engine overhauls, funds additional ICBM guidance repair, and provides software updates for Electronic Warfare, cruise missiles, and AWACS navigational system.
Eagle Vision	2.7	Funds CSAF Innovation Program, which provides commercial imagery to operational commanders for mission planning /rehearsal /visualization and intel gathering.
Geospatial Mapping Capability	2.5	Geobase is a net-centric geospatial mapping capability used in contingency planning, force beddown and installation support processes. Funds annual software maintenance and technical support bill to sustain this capability for the warfighter.
Global Combat Support System (GCSS) AF	22.0	GCSS-AF provides a secure flow of timely, accurate and trusted combat support information, with the appropriate level of security, to any authorized process or user AF-wide.
Halvorsen Loader	8.2	Procures 9 additional Halvorsens to meet growing OEF and OIF demands resulting from failing 1960s 25K loaders.
High Frequency Ground Control Stations (HFGCS) Antennas	5.0	Replaces antennas that are past their design life at all 14 stations worldwide and assessments rated current overall antenna conditions as poor.
Joint Threat Emitter (JTE)	7.0	JTE provides dispersed threat signals to aircrews during simulated penetrations of hostile airspace for surveillance and bombing runs for the purpose of aircrew tactics and Electronic Combat training. Funding accelerates delivery by two years.

Priority	Requirement	FY07 (\$M)
JSTARS Block 20 Trainer	16.9	Funds 2nd late-to-need Block-20 mission crew trainer in FY07 to support 12 aircrew specialties. Personnel and fleet growth rapidly outpaced existing training capability.
Logistics Information Technology (IT) System Sustainment	30.2	Funds continue sustainment of logistics IT systems currently maintained at minimal operational levels until transition to Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS).
MC-130H / AC-130U Flight Data Recorders (FDR)	9.8	Funds FDR for MC-130H and AC-130U aircraft. As a result of several Class-A mishaps involving loss of life and equipment, Mishap Prevention Panel, CDRUSSOCOM voiced concerns about not having FDRs on aircraft.
Midcourse Space Experiment/Space Based Visible (MSX/SBV) Operations	6.9	Funds critical space surveillance sensor and only on-orbit asset. Fills gap due to Spaced Based Space Surveillance launch delay to FY09.
Military Construction (MILCON)	1,505.0	MILCON program funds construction, improvement, planning, and design of facilities required for mission beddown and recapitalization of real property.
Minuteman REACT Console Operator Input Devices (OID) Modernization	8.5	Funds "just-in-time replacement" of Minuteman REACT Console OID - critical for day-to-day and wartime functioning of the weapon system.
Missile Defense Security Upgrades	14.0	Procures delay and early-detection technology at Vandenberg AFB. Funding increases effectiveness of security response and avoids additional security manpower requirements.
Mobility Air Intel System	2.1	Funds sustainment and maintenance of AMC Intel Information Systems and intel databases supporting 115 AMC units, the Global Mobility Air Ops Center, and Contingency Response Groups.
Netcentric Communication Security (COMSEC) Buys	25.2	Funds all critical functions related to component commodities that support DoD's and AF's need for Information Superiority. Air and Ground COMSEC directly supports Air Force's global strike and defense in-depth strategies.
Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) AOC Exercise	2.9	Funds facilitate air warfare simulation support for both Ulchi Focus Lens and Terminal Fury Joint exercise in the Air Operations Center - exercises and validates PACAF Operation Plans.
Passive Radio Frequency Identification Devices (RFID)	1.7	Initiates pilot program for OSD-directed passive RFID implementation - allows lessons learned prior to full program funding/implementation in the FY08 POM.



Priority	Requirement	FY07 (\$M)
Science and Technology (S&T)	40.0	Funds additional requirements, balanced between tech directorates; brings S&T portfolio in compliance with FY06 SPG goal of 3% annual real growth from FY06-09.
Tactical Terminal Modernization	4.6	Enables AF Integrated Broadcast Service (IBS) migration for meeting crypto modernization mandate by FY09. Allows sensors/weapon systems (RC-135, RC-130, and AF DCGS) to transmit critical intelligence data into IBS.
Upgraded Early Warning Radar (UEWR) System Program Agency (SPA)	55.8	Funds establishment of a UEWR SPA for hardware and software development. Ensures highest operational availability of missile warning and space surveillance assets.
VC-25 Mod	14.4	VC-25 Forward Lower Lobe Equipment Cooling. Funds prevent continued critical equipment systems failure/shutdown during use and avoids increased cost for equipment repair/replacement.
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$5,643.4</b>	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: Air Force

Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement and RDT&E

Budget Activity: BA02

Program Elements: PE 41330F, 41132F, 44011F, 41115F, 41314F, 41119F, 41318F, 27223F

Potential Add: \$2,433.9M for National Defense Airlift Fund Capability Upgrades

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

Provides funds to recapitalize Special Operations, Combat Search and Rescue, and Mobility aircraft/equipment, which are required to preserve capability in the national military strategy to support two critical areas of aggression in an overlapping timeframe while protecting the US homeland and conducting smaller-small contingency operations.

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

Funds will be used to purchase Special Operations, Combat Search and Rescue, and Mobility aircraft/equipment.

**\*\* Answers to remaining questions will be provided as required. There are multiple line items in this unfunded submission and the detailed line items are provided as a separate attachment.**

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 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?

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.

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?

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?

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

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.

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

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

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.

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 2007?

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

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #1 priority

<b>Title of Replacement Equipment</b>	<b>Appn</b>	<b>Amount (\$M)</b>
APN-232 Combined Altitude Radar Altimeter (CARA) for MC-130E Aircraft	3010	\$ 5.4
APN-241 Radar for C-130 H2	3010	\$ 5.5
C-130 AAR-47 Missile Warning Sensors	3010	\$ 9.4
C-130 Center Wing Box (CWB) Replacement	3010	\$148.6
C-130 Electronic Flight Indicators (EFI)	3010	\$18.0
C-130 Lighting Control Units (LCU)	3010	\$19.0
C-130 Radar Display Units (RDU)	3010	\$13.0
C-130H2/H3/J Support Equipment Requirements	3010	\$90.1
C-130J Readiness Spares Packages (RSP) Kits	3010	\$36.0
7 C-17s to replace excessive combat use	3010	\$1,608.5
C-32 Auxiliary Fuel Tanks	3010	\$16.5
C-5A Defensive Systems for AFRC (\$18.4M) and ANG (\$21.25M)	3010	\$39.7
CV-22 Acceleration replaces MH-53M losses	3010	\$146.3
KC-135 Aeromedical Upgrades	3010	\$ 0.7
4 C-130Js to replace C-130 Combat Losses	3010	\$275.0
Develop & Field Test Deployable Closed-Loop C-130 Aircraft Engine Wash Equipment	3600	\$ 0.5
KC-135 Aeromedical Upgrades	3600	\$1.7
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 2,433.9</b>

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
 Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
 Budget Activity: BA04  
 Program Element: 35219F  
 Procurement Line Item: P-25  
 Potential Add: \$80M AFSOC Predator Acceleration

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

Procures 8 MQ-1 Predator aircraft, 2 ground control stations (GCS), one dual launch and recovery GCS, initial spares, and required deployable spares.

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

Accelerates full operational capability of organic SOCOM Predator assets by one year from FY10 to FY09. Funds required to meet USSOCOM Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) UAV requirement for urgent fielding of SOF-dedicated Predator capability.

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 of California is the prime contractor. Performance to date as sole-source provider to ACC has been dynamic during fielding of an Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration aircraft and control systems into semi-full rate production.

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 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

Yes. Current funding plan resulting from QDR/PDM adds.

Program	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FYDP
FY07 PB	692.8	837.1	1050.4	859.7	738.6	4178.6

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. Additional O&M sustainment funding (MFP-11) will be requested in the FY08 POM for the FYDP at increased levels to meet earlier fielding.

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.

Yes. (U) USSOCOM Hunter/Killer MQ-1 Predator CDD Annex X to Air Combat Command CDD for MQ-1 Predator Multi-Role Remotely Piloted Aircraft System (Incr. 2), dated 23 May 05, ver 1.4. Validated 22 Jun 05. Requirement was further endorsed by the JROC on 17 Nov 05 for six AFSOC Predator orbits worldwide.

AFSOC does not currently have organic capability and therefore are not accomplishing this mission today.

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 apparent savings. Aircraft / systems procurements intended for AFSOC will go to other units requiring Predator

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.

Inventory objective procures 8 MQ-1 Predator aircraft, 2 ground control stations (GCS), one dual launch and recovery GCS, initial spares, and required deployable spares.

Procurement new start – 0 inventory FY05-FY07 (no assets on-hand)

Program	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FYDP
FY07 PB Procurement						
Qty's	6	10	8	4	7	35
Adjustment	8	0	-4	3	0	7
Total	14	10	4	7	7	42

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?

No FY06 funds budgeted for this program. FY06 GWOT Supplemental submitted – pending Congressional approval.

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?

Program accelerates a new start provided in the FY07 PB.

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

Yes, the AFSOC Predator is the SECAF/CSAF #2 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: BA05  
Program Element: 27131F  
Procurement Line Item: P-30  
Potential Add: \$83.4M A-10 Modifications  
(\$48.5M ARC-210 Radio; \$28.6M Precision Engagement (PE) disconnect; \$6.3M AAR-47 Missile Warning System (MWS))

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

Continued AF commitment to expeditionary operations deploys our forces to austere locations. In these situations, airborne communications and datalink connectivity is problematic. A recent Urgent Needs Request (UNR) exists for an A/OA-10 robust, frequency-selectable, Line-of-Sight (LOS) and Beyond-Line-of-Sight (BLOS) secure capability. The ARC 210 radio meets this need and provides reliable means of disseminating real-time updates with isolated forces, Command and Control (C2) and other supporting assets. Current combat operations in isolated mountainous terrain and extreme weather conditions with challenging logistical support requires a radio like the ARC-210. The net effect of this improved communications capability will be highly reliable, responsive air support of joint, coalition, and multi-national ground forces, and lower maintenance provided by materiel improvement.

The Precision Engagement (PE) program upgrades the A-10 to permit employment and integration in the current battlespace. Enhancements include: A digital Stores Management System (DSMS), MIL-STD-1760 Munitions Bus, SNIPER/Litening Targeting Pods integration, modified throttle and control stick to provide improved Hands on Throttle and Stick (HOTAS) control, new cockpit displays to include two new Multi-Functional Colored Displays, improved head-up displays, and digital datalink. Additionally, PE will permit the A-10 to employ GPS-guided munitions such as the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) and the Wind Corrected Munitions Dispenser (WCMD). Original estimates for PE installation was 1500 hours. However, experience installing this modification in 10-prototype aircraft has shown this figure to be 3512 hours. Funding will offset the additional cost associated with the increased installation hours and meet the Combat Air Forces (CAF) AEF requirement schedule.

AAR-47 MWS - The A/OA-10 aircraft requires an extended duration, covert infrared (IR) countermeasures (EDCICS) capability to protect the aircraft from IR surface-to-air missile (IRSAM) threats during typical air-to-surface missions. EDCICS modification allows A/OA-10s to counter IRSAM threats and provides the A-10 with a system to detect and automatically dispense optimum countermeasures to defeat the threat. The pilot can effectively manage and dispense countermeasures to operate at optimal performance and improve A/OA-10 survivability in an offensive envelope. Optimal



performance and efficiency will be maintained via spiral development and modifications to meet the changes in threat.

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

Purchase ARC-210 Beyond Line-Of-Sight (BLOS) aircraft radios to equip 309 combat coded Active, Guard, and Reserve A/OA-10 aircraft. Fund PE installation hours. Procure AAR-47 passive, electro-optical MWS to equip up to 50 combat coded Active, Guard, and Reserve A/OA-10 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?

ARC-210 Radios: Rockwell-Collins; Cedar Rapids, IA 52498

- Contractor performance has been excellent. Contractual obligations have been met with 100% on-time deliveries, <5% warranty return rate, and excellent on-site contractor support. There are over 18,000 ARC-210(V) fielded and they have been installed on over 140 platforms (including 11 rotary wing platforms) in the US Navy/US Marine Corps, US Army, US Air Force, Dept. of Homeland Defense, and internationally in over 35 countries. The contract provides hardware and includes warranty and extensive integration support for all radios and ancillary devices.

Precision Engagement: Lockheed-Martin Systems Integration, Owego, NY

- Contractor performance and support of A-10 upgrades and Precision Engagement has been excellent.

AAR-47 Missile Warning System: Alliant Defense Electronics Systems, Inc., Clearwater, FL

- Contractor performance has been excellent. Contractual obligations have been met with 100% on-time deliveries. There are over 1,600 AAR-47 fielded between the AF and the Navy. The Navy has also sold this system to several FMS countries and the Army is becoming an active user in this program. Currently, the AF has fielded this system on C-130E/H/N/P, C-130J, C-5, C-17, MH-53 and HH-60s. The contract provides hardware and includes a five year warranty for the AAR-47 Sensors.

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 for Precision Engagement, P-30.

ARC-210 and AAR-47 are not contained in the FY 2007 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.

- ARC-210 BLOS Radio: N/A
- Precision Engagement: APAF

FY07	FY08	FY09
72.555M	74.009M	29.863M

- AAR-47 MWS: N/A

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?

- Precision Engagement Funding FY07 PB:

RDT&E

FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07
9.297M	7.650M	29.476	22.590M	16.333M	9.222M

RDT&E Total- \$94.568

Suite 3.2B software test review completed February 06 and PE Kit proofing accomplished by April 06. The next program major milestone is Full Rate Production.

- ARC-210 and AAR-47 A-10 Operational Utility Evaluation was accomplished in Fall 05. Both systems are in full rate production with numerous other weapon systems.

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.

- ARC-210 BLOS Radio: Yes. Warfighter Urgent Need Request (UNR) - CENTAF requests a robust beyond line-of-sight (BLOS) and line-of-sight (LOS) encrypted radio capability to fully integrate with composite combat forces. The ARC-210/231 radio is the best permanent solution to meet this need.

- AAR-47 MWS: Yes. For increased A-10 survivability in IR threat environment, to add missile warning system tied to onboard manager (Countermeasures Set), and use current, effective, reactive flare programs.
- Precision Engagement: Yes. PE consolidates numerous validated requirements for the A-10 including datalink, joint-series munitions employment, and advanced targeting pod integration. These requirements were validated prior to program inception in 2002.

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, but fulfills capability gaps and urgent needs to the warfighter. Furthermore, the current 23-year-old legacy radio suffers from vanishing vendor support and increasing repair and replacement 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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The minimum requirement for ARC-210 BLOS radios equip 309 combat coded and test aircraft (including spares). Ultimately, it is desired to replace the radios in the entire A-10 fleet (additional 47 radios plus spares). There are no assets on hand at this time, with no scheduled deliveries through the FYDP. Providing the radios for the additional aircraft will give the pilots the ability to train like they fight. It also alleviates maintenance issues due to different aircraft configurations.

Precision Engagement will update the entire A-10 fleet (356 aircraft) with new hardware and software.

Total desired AAR-47 will be 356 warning kits and installations. Installation of 50 systems procured through FY05 GWOT is scheduled to begin 1st Qtr FY07. Deliveries of systems procured through this action will begin approximately 18 months after contract.

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 2007?

No.

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

Beyond Line-Of-Sight communications capability is a new requirement for the A-10. Different BLOS options were analyzed over the last year. The ARC-210 radio was determined to be the best option too late for inclusion in the FY07 APOM cycle.

Precision Engagement hardware installation funding shortfalls were not identified until installations began in late FY05. This new discovery occurred too late for inclusion in the FY07 APOM.

AAR-47 MWS was only compatible with large aircraft and rotary wing aircraft until recently. Changes to the warning algorithms now allow system use on fighter/attack aircraft.

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

Yes, the A-10 Modifications are the SECSAF/CSAF #3 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 53122F  
Procurement Line Item: P-53  
Potential Add: \$15M to purchase LAIRCM for 3 HC-130s

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

Current fielded defensive systems do not effectively protect the aircraft from all current and future IR threats. The AN/AAQ-24 LAIRCM System uses a laser beam to defeat the missile and does not rely on hazardous and politically sensitive expendables, which highlight the aircraft to additional threat.

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

Complete Modification of 920th Rescue Wing (Patrick AFB, FL) HC-130 Aircraft with Group B kits (3), spares and support 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?

Northrop Grumman, Rolling Meadows, IL is the prime contractor. One-third of the work will be done in each of the following three states: Florida (installation), Illinois (jammers) and Maryland (sensors).

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 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?

None, the total cost is reflected in the potential add above.

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.

The requirement is in AMC/ACC/AFSOC LAIRCM Operational Requirements Document (ORD) 319-92, AFSOC Mission Need Statement (MNS) 001-91, and AMC MNS 014-92. Current fielded defensive systems do not effectively protect the aircraft from new and future infrared threats. Aircraft and aircrews are operating without an effective infrared countermeasures capability in areas where fielded infrared-guided surface-to-air missiles have been confirmed, and as such the aircraft and crew are at great risk. The AN/AQQ-24V (13) Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) System uses a laser beam to defeat missile threats and does not rely on hazardous and politically sensitive expendables, as are currently used, which highlight the aircraft to additional threats. Installation of the LAIRCM system will provide protection for the aircraft and aircrews during all phases of flight against the widely proliferated, latest generation of infrared-guided surface-to-air missiles.

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.

Potential shoot-down of an aircraft can be averted, thus saving total replacement cost of a \$50M+ aircraft. No other savings expected.

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 2004, FY 2005, and end of FY 2006 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

LAIRCM installed on 5 HC-130 aircraft by the end of FY 2007.

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?

None.

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?

Constrained resources.

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

Yes, LAIRCM is the SECSAF/CSAF #4 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: RDT&E  
Budget Activity: 07  
Program Element: PE 41134F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-220  
Potential Add: \$10M for LAIRCM on AFSOC H/MC-130s

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

The purpose is to provide RDT&E funds for the non-recurring engineering of Northrop Grumman's new LAIRCM mini-turret (called Guardian turret by Northrop) on AFSOC H/MC-130 aircraft.

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

Complete non-recurring engineering for LAIRCM install on AFSOC H/MC-130 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?

Northrop Grumman Corp (Rolling Meadows, IL) and Crestview Aerospace (Crestview, FL). Northrop builds the components and has approximately 80% of contract funding. Crestview does the installations and has the remaining 20% of contract value. Number of associated personnel is unknown.

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?

There is no LAIRCM funding in the FY 2007 PB for AFSOC's H/MC-130 aircraft. There is RDAF (R-216) and APAF (P-33, 49) funding in the PB for Guardian development and for LAIRCM's ongoing Phase I equipment (SLTAs) installations on MAF C-17s and C-130s.

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?



No additional funding would be 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?

There are 46 H/MC-130s in AF inventory (incl. ANG & AFRC aircraft) that are being submitted by AFSOC in the FY 2008-2013 POM for installation of the LAIRCM system. Total LAIRCM H/MC-130 POM request across the FYDP is \$348M to be reduced by \$10M if this FY 2007 UPL is approved.

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

\$22.21M invested to date in Guardian mini-turret development. AF anticipates testing will begin in Feb/Mar 06 with a production decision in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter FY06. First production deliveries are scheduled for mid FY 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. 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.

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.

This submission will fund the non-recurring expenses on 5 AFSOC HC/MC-130 MDS.

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, development will continue on the Guardian turret thru FY 2006 regardless of this proposed add.

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.

AFSOC requires all of its AC/HC/MC-130s to have MANPADS protective equipment. Today, AFSOC's HC/MC-130 fleets have no laser DIRCM or LAIRCM equipment installed.

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?

In FY 2005, Congress added \$3M to install LAIRCM on AFRC's HC-130s. This was AFRC's first LAIRCM funding and will be used to install Group A equipment (boxes and wiring) on 4 HC-130s assigned to Patrick AFB, FL. The install of the Patrick Group A equipment is schedule for the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of FY06. The AFSOC FY 2008 POM input addresses the LAIRCM Group B for Patrick as well as the remaining AFSOC Guard/Reserve and Active Duty HC/MC-130 aircraft.

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

No reason known why funds could not be executed in a timely manner.

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

AFSOC did request LAIRCM funds in their FY07 APOM submittal (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, LAIRCM is the SECSAF/CSAF #4 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 41134F  
Procurement Line Item: P-41  
Potential Add: \$43.0M for 4 VIP & Special Airlift Mission (SAM) C-37A LAIRCM

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

The Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) system will provide an increase in the level of protection for DVs aboard OSA/VIPSAM aircraft against MANPADS and SAMs to ensure safe operations into high-threat areas.

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

Funds will be used for purchase of four C-37A LAIRCM 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?

These would be the first Air Force LAIRCM modifications on this airframe. The U.S. Army has modified a C-37 with this system using the Gulfstream Corporation, Savannah GA. Northrop Grumman, Rolling Meadows IL produces the LAIRCM hardware. Percentage between contractors is expected to be roughly 50/50.

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. Although there is funding for LAIRCM is in the FY 2007 budget for other Air Force aircraft, C-37s are not currently programmed to receive this modification.

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. Funding for other MDSs (C-17s, C-130s, etc) receiving the modification are contained within the FYDP, but C-37s are not currently programmed

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?

Six additional aircraft would remain unfunded, cost of \$60M still needed. Additional LAIRCM for C-37s will compete within the AF's priorities during the FY 2008 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?

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 current 1067 requesting DS on C-37 aircraft has been approved and requires funding. The C-37 fleet supports VIP Special Airlift Missions to many areas deemed as high threat to MANPADS. C-37s require LAIRCM to ensure safe operation within these high threat areas around the globe.

C-37 operations are currently inhibited by the need for waivers to fly into the high threat areas, or if denied waivers, dropping the DV off at a secure location to transfer to a DS equipped cargo transport aircraft. This transfer also degrades the comm capability of the DV to a lesser system for the duration of travel until return to the C-37. The addition of LAIRCM on the C-37 would greatly reduce the already over tasking of equipped cargo transport aircraft for DV travel thus allowing the transport aircraft to continue focusing efforts directly to the warfighters. It would also expedite the travel required by the DV into high threat areas uninterrupted.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented.

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.

The objective is to equip 100% of the Air Force C-37 fleet with LAIRCM; however, there is no funding identified through the FYDP for C-37 LAIRCM.

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?

Congress did not add FY 2006 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 2007?

No.

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

Other AF priorities took precedence for FY 2007 funding. Approving this request will enhance airlift support and safety for our nation's senior civilian and military leaders.

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

Yes, LAIRCM is the SECSAF/CSAF #4 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 41134F  
Program Line Element: P-53  
Potential Add: \$37.8M for 9 C-130 LAIRCM

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

Accelerates installation of Large Aircraft Infrared Countermeasures (LAIRCM) capability on 9 C-130 aircraft 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.

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

Funds will be used to accelerate LAIRCM installations.

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

Lockheed Martin System Integration (LMSI) is the C-130 prime contractor for installation of the Group A and Group B equipment. Crestview Aerospace (Crestview, FL) is a subcontractor to LMSI performing the work. LMSI has executed on time delivery of LAIRCM equipped C-130 aircraft in conjunction with the Group B contractor, Northrop Grumman. LMSI executes approximately 23% of the C-130 procurement per aircraft modification.

The NG/LMSI/Crestview team has achieved great success over the years in fielding and accelerating delivery of very capable weapon systems. Their demonstrated performance to this point in both development and hardware delivery makes the acceleration of 6 C-130s very achievable.

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, this funding is in addition to the LAIRCM funding in FY07 for procurement. The procurement funding in the FY 2007 PB continues installation of LAIRCM on the C-130s.

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.

Yes.

LAIRCM procurement funding throughout the FYDP (\$M):

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
233.7	247.7	247.3	101.5	25.3

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?

No additional investment funding would be required in FY 2007 to complete these 9 C-130 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, KC-135, and KC-10 LAIRCM in the FY 2008 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?

Not applicable. This program received their Full Rate Production Decision in Apr 05.

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. 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-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.

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 will be direct savings that would result by funding this acceleration. However, the requirement is to equip the entire fleet of 150 C-130s with LAIRCM. Any savings generated by installing LAIRCM now will be directly applied to LAIRCM installations on the remaining C-130s in the AF inventory.

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

These items are assessed as 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.

Inventory objective is for entire C-130 fleet to eventually receive LAIRCM capability

	Previous	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Assets	75	91	118	127	135	142	142
%	22.7	27.6	35.8	38.5	40.9	43.0	43.0

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 2007?

No

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

Funds are available in the LAIRCM program. This request is to accelerate installation of LAIRCM capability on 9 C-130s in response to the high-threat environments in which they operate today.



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

Yes, LAIRCM is the SECSAF/CSAF #4 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF (Security Forces)  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 02  
Program Element: 27588F  
Procurement Line Item: P-17  
Potential Add: \$51.8M for Armored Security Vehicles

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

Requirements based on current planning in 1041 plan for Air Force to absorb more ILO (in lieu of) missions currently being performed by Sister Services. This also meets the requirements of transformation within Security Forces (SF) with the SF teams being tasked with performing "outside the wire missions in the theater," now and in the future.

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

All funds will be used to purchase 205 Armored Security Vehicles.

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?

US Army / AM General / South Bell, IN

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, \$11.334M (3080 appropriation, P-1 line item 17) of Armored Security Vehicles funding is in the FY 2007 budget to meet previously established steady-state procurement. The proposed add is for new mission requirements since the FY 2007 budget was developed.

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.

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
11.3M	4.3M	7.3M	7.5M	8.3M

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. Standard maintenance/repairs and fittings for weapons, communication requirements, and identification equipment ...i.e., Blue force tracker and IED Jammers are included in requested funding.

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 to complete this request. However, if the Security Force mission grows in the future, additional requirements for Armored Security Vehicles will be generated and we will pursue these requirements in subsequent 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?

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.

These vehicles are loaded for deployments, required for safety in defeating improvised explosive devices (IED) in Iraq and Afghanistan. SF members are the designated and authorized personnel within the Air Force who are trained/equipped to analyze and defeat criminal/terrorist IED threats. AF Security Forces are presently patrolling and escorting in these areas, which is among the most dangerous duties in the AOR. Proper equipment with protection is a necessity.

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--life saving--value as Security Forces are in high-demand in the AOR.

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.

The previous inventory objective for Armored Security Vehicles is 1,045. Armored Security Vehicles on hand @ the end of:

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Total	884	928	981	990	1015	1025	1025***
% Objective	84%	88%	93%	94%	97%	98%	100%

\*\*\*Total takes into account new procurement and projected disposals.

This inventory objective does not take into account an increase of 205 Armored Security Vehicles vehicles due to the expanded Air Force mission.

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 2007?

No, program is fully executable.

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

New requirements and mission growth since FY 2007 budget built

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #5 top priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Procurement of Ammunition  
Budget Activity: BA 02  
Program Element: PE 27580F  
Procurement Line Item: P-16  
Potential Add: \$61M M-4 Carbine Rifle Requirement

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

As Expeditionary Combat Airmen, AF personnel will be trained, equipped, and deployed with a weapon in common with their Army counterparts. Airmen are deploying for In-Lieu Of (ILO) taskings in support of the AF and Army combat convoys in Iraq under high probability of ground attack. The M-4 is the Army's weapon of choice for convoy missions, but Airmen are currently trained and equipped with the M-16, which is more difficult to employ from the cab of a vehicle. The M-4 carbine allows greater maneuverability within the close confines of tactical vehicles, thereby offering greater self-defense and reaction capability. Additionally, Expeditionary Combat Airmen will understand operating requirements of their mission partners' weapons, greatly improving combat capability in the chaos and confusion of an enemy attack.

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

Funds purchase of 35,000 M-4 Carbines for training and issue to deploying Air Force Expeditionary Combat Airmen.

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?

Colt Defense Inc. West Hartford, CT. Colt Defense Inc is sole source supplier of the M4 Carbine and the only manufacturer worldwide that meets or exceeds all US military specifications for the weapon.

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. To date, the USAF has purchased 45,324 M-4s from Colt Manufacturing, Inc. The first M-4s were purchased in FY 2002 with Defense Emergency Relief Funds (DERF). Additional quantities have been purchased with funds received in FY 2003, 2004, and 2005. \$1M from program funds is expected in FY06 and no funding is programmed in FY 2007.

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. There is no programmed funding to replace M-16s across the current FYDP. Previous M4 money came from DERF and GWOT funds.

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. Weapons maintenance and logistics support currently provided for the M-16 would transfer in support of the M-4 as it replaces 35,000 M-16s.

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 this phase of M-4 purchases. The AF intends to pursue additional funding for the M-4 during 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. A requirement is established for an M-16 equivalent weapon. The current mission is accomplished today with the existing M-16 inventory, but the M-16 is older and less flexible in vehicle deployments in urban operations. In addition, the M-16 is not a common weapon between Expeditionary Combat Airmen paired with the Army on tactical missions.

Deployment orders and operational plans now mandate the use of the M-4 carbine. OSD directed mission changes and the need for quick reaction under the confusion of combat have resulted in the need for carbines for all Expeditionary Combat Airmen, totaling 25K carbines. Requirement includes strategic placement of training weapons at all installations to account for those exceptions where an Airman, not equipped with the M-4 is required to deploy in a rotation to replace an individual whose M-4 will remain in place. 10K carbines will cover this training requirement AF-wide, to include regional training centers.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented. This initiative is singly focused on increasing combat capability, survivability, and safety for our airman who deploy ILO, and are often integrated with Army Soldiers for ground missions. This initiative is consistent with Special Forces and AF transformation.

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.

To date, the USAF has purchased 45,324 M-4s from Colt Manufacturing, Inc. This purchase of 35,000 will build the deployable objective inventory to 80,324 M-4s.

The AF total requirement for M-4s is 270,000, inclusive of Group A, B, and C shooters. The existing 45,324 plus this requirement of 35,000 (if funded) will leave the AF with 189,676 remaining to fund over the 08-13 FYDP.

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 2007?

None.

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

Initially, only select USAF functional AFSCs (Category A shooters) were scheduled to receive M-4s, such as Security Forces, Red Horse, OSI, etc. The need for more M-4s as a common weapon is required due to the increasing number of ILO taskings for Expeditionary Combat Airman who are deployed and operating side by side with their Army counterparts.

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

Yes, this is the SECAF/CSAF #6 priority.



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement & RDT&E  
Budget Activity: 07  
Program Element: PE 27249F  
Procurement Line Item: P-80; RDT&E Line Item: New  
Potential Add: \$54.0M (\$47M Aircraft Procurement; \$7M RDT&E) - SNIPER Pod  
Procurement and ATP Research

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

The Combat Air Force has capitalized on its flexibility to perform Non-Traditional Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (NTISR) with Advanced Targeting Pods and its new Video Downlink (ATP-VDL) in support of OIF/OEF ground forces. Proven to save lives, A-10, F-16 and F-15E missions with ATP-VDL range from Convoy Support to Night-time Raid Support by providing real-time streaming video from aircraft sensors down to ground receivers/combatants. This leap forward in battlefield situational awareness enables faster reaction to time-sensitive-targeting with bombs on target 10 times faster than traditional targeting methods. Even in a benign role, ATP-VDL provides responsive NTISR of suspected enemy activity, surveillance of important locations, monitoring of vulnerable pipeline segments and more. Funding further accelerates the integration of new technologies into the ATPs as well as additional unit procurement.

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

Purchase ATPs and fund ATP technology development for Active Duty, ANG, and AFRES legacy attack aircraft such as the F-16, F-15E, A-10, B-1, and B-52.

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?

SNIPER ATP Prime: Lockheed-Martin; Orlando, FL. The SNIPER pod provides the greatest combat capability of all ATPs available today.

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. Aircraft Procurement, P-80, \$53.2M Aircraft Procurement in FY06 for SNIPER.

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.

(\$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
SNIPER Procurement	65.7	153.4	172.9	104.8	48.2

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?

Over 100 pods are currently on the ATP unfunded requirement. ATP will compete within AF's 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. ATPs are not an R&D item; however, RDT&E funding is required for development and testing of new ATP operational flight programs (OFP), improvements in technology (i.e., new hardware for improved ATP reliability), or new operational requirements (i.e., providing actionable data to ground forces via VDL). The next Sniper OFP upgrade will be released during summer 2006. Future updates to ATP OFPs coinciding with aircraft OFP upgrades (every 2-3 years) are anticipated. RDT&E funding allows deliberate planning to modernize and keep relevant the growing ATP inventory.

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.

Operational Requirements Document (TAF 303-76-I/II/III) for F-16 C/D, 16 Jul 91; Operations Requirements Document (TAF 301-01-B) for F-16 C/D Block 25/30/32, 16 Dec 04. ORD 4.1.6.2.2. Targeting Capability: A targeting pod system must be integrated with the aircraft to provide electro-optical and infrared imagery. It must provide target acquisition and designation in both air-to-air and air-to-ground modes adequate to employ weapons at maximum range. Additionally, it must perform with little or no degradation in the presence of battlefield obscurants. It must provide laser spot search and track capability beyond maximum weapons employment envelope sufficient to provide 30 seconds of acquisition time for all weapons employment options. It must

provide a laser marker that can be detected with night vision goggles by a ground or air controller with sufficient brightness and accuracy to visually confirm weapons aim point prior to maximum weapons employment release. ORD 4.1.7.2 Air-to-Ground Weapons: The aircraft must have an integrated targeting capability that provides: The aircraft must have an integrated targeting capability that provides target detection, acquisition, identification, designation, and position/coordinate generation to enable employment of current and future precision and near precision weapons.

Operationally, the targeting pod gets the “warfighter’s eyes on target.” Once the target is acquired, the targeting pod can guide precision munitions and program geo-precise coordinates into inertial aided munitions. Additionally, the improved FLIR makes target identification possible at greater ranges and higher altitudes. This reduces the aircraft’s exposure to enemy defenses and facilitates the destruction (not just the suppression) of enemy air defenses. With the introduction of the VDL capability, a sea change in modern close air support on a fluid battlefield has taken place. For the first time, the ground parties can “see in real time” what the strike aircraft are looking at and correct/update targeting prior to release. This revolution is shortening the response time by as much as 90% while minimizing fratricide and collateral. The Combatant Commanders have been very vocal in their request for more and better targeting pods.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if proposal is implemented.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

ACC’s inventory objective for the CAF (both Active and ARC) is over 720 ATPs. This requirement will be met with both the SNIPER ATP and ARC-possessed LITENING pods.

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
<b>SNIPER</b>	112	126	156	217	286	325	340
<b>LITENING</b>	204	212	212	212	212	212	212
<b>Total</b>	316	338	368	429	498	537	552
<b>% of Requirement</b>	43.6%	46.7%	50.8%	59.3%	68.8%	74.2%	76.2%

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?

\$12.4M for LITENING pods for the ANG. Anticipate funding release and obligation by FY06/2nd Quarter.

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?

To remain within a constrained budget top-line, the Air Force had to judiciously allocate its resources. The ATP program was funded to about 82% of CAF requirements; however, the need to fund other high priority programs prevented the procurement of additional pods.

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

Yes, this is the SECAF/CSAF #7 priority

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: NVG: Other Procurement, Weapon Systems: Procurement of Ammunition

Budget Activity: NVG: BA 04 Weapon Systems: BA 02

Program Element: NVG: 72833F, Weapon Systems: 27580F

Procurement Line Item: NVG: P-80, Weapon Systems: P-16

Potential Add: \$12.7M (\$4.8M Procurement of Ammunition; \$7.9M Other Procurement) Guardian Angel Combat Equipment

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

Guardian Angel forces provide the full spectrum of personnel recovery missions for the Air Force and Combatant Commanders. The following equipment increases mission effectiveness.

PVS-15 and PVS-18 Night Vision Goggles are specifically designed for Ground Operators working in low-light combat operations. PVS-15's are a waterproof dual tube NVG capable of subsurface operations down to 66 feet. PVS-18's are a waterproof single monocular unit that can be helmet or weapon mounted. Both units are designed with a rugged housing for ground operations. These NVGs will replace current generation I PVS-7 ground goggles and generation II AN-4949 goggles that are designed for aircrew operations.

Additionally, Guardian Angel forces require updated weapon system equipment to defend against existing and emerging threats. This additional equipment includes .45 caliber hand-gun, stand alone 40mm grenade launcher, MK15 .50 caliber anti-vehicle weapons and a weapons modification kit for their existing M-4s.

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

Procures Night Vision Goggles updating personnel recovery forces to latest technology critical for safe execution of recovery operations (\$7.9M)

Procures and sustains small arms weapons (\$4.8M). Funds procure 388 SOPMOD kits for existing M-4s minimizing signature on battlefield, 388 (.45 cal) hand-gun replacements for Beretta 9mm which lacks the stopping power to engage / defend against today's enemy, 120 EGLMs (stand alone 40mm grenade launcher) to use as a stand-off weapon and for marking targets, and 36 MK15 .50 caliber anti-vehicle weapons to defend against vehicle born threats during surface recovery 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?

NVG: NSN listed items purchased through Navy Crane in Ohio

Weapon Systems: NSN listed items

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. \$19.3M to procure NVGs for ground and aircrews only, P-Line # 80

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? See table below. 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? No

NVG:

None. FY08 POM input for AFSOC currently competing within command for resources.

Weapon Systems:

Beyond FY07, there are no funds for weapons procurement for other MAJCOM Guardian Angel forces or sustainment in the FYDP.

	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	TOTAL
Weapons Procurement	4.557					4.557
Weapons Sustainment	.228					.228

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.

NVG: Allowance Standard 450C  
Weapon Systems: Allowance Standard 536

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.

NVG: Savings are approximately \$500K by purchasing bulk in a single year versus smaller numbers over FYDP

Weapon Systems: Savings are approximately \$403K in inflation costs over FYDP by accelerating procurement one year.

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

NVG: High - Provides critical night vision improvements / capabilities for battlefield airmen conducting Rescue Operations

Weapon Systems: High - Provides critical force protection capability for Guardian Angel forces while conducting personnel recovery operations

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.

NVG:  
The objective is to provide full basis of issue for Guardian Angel forces DOD wide. PVS-15 full requirement – 720 units, and PVS-18 full requirement – 720 units; based on 12ea per 9PJLR UTC. AFSOC requirement – 30 UTCs; PACAF – 3 UTCs; USAFE – 1 UTC; ANG – 12 UTCs; and AFRC – 14 UTCs. Total shortfall of 359 PVS-15s and 556 PVS-18s.

Weapon Systems:  
The objective is to provide full basis of issue for Guardian Angel forces DOD wide. SOPMOD full requirement – 776 kits, .45 caliber hand gun replacement – 776 ea, EGLM 40mm grenade launcher – 240 ea, and MK15 full requirement – 72 ea.

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?

No FY06 funds were added.

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?

NVG:

The CSAR transfer from ACC to AFSOC was finalized in October 2003. Once AFSOC gained CSAR assets and began evaluating operational capability, the shortfall was not identified in time to make the FY06 POM submission. The FY07 APOM only allowed minimal program adjustments. An FY05 UFR was approved for 183 sets of PVS-15s for AFSOC forces.

Weapon Systems:

The Guardian Angel Weapons System requirements document was recently approved by AFSOC. Adjustment funds a "get well" plan to modernize personnel recovery ground forces to operate with their sister service counterparts. Earliest opportunity for funding is the FY08 POM.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #8 priority.



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: RDT&E and Missile Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05 and 03  
Program Element: 64851F and 11213F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-93; Procurement Line Item: P-11  
Potential Add: \$18.9M (\$9.2 for Missile Procurement; \$9.7M for RDT&E) for ICBM Security Modification Program (ISMP)

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

Program adds delay/denial and situational awareness features to Minuteman III launch facilities (LFs). The Fast Rising Secondary Door (B-Plug) secures Minuteman III LF greater than 10 times faster than the current system. Remote Visual Assessment (RVA) allows Security Forces to tailor alarm response with appropriate force.

Proposed plus-up of \$9.7M in RDT&E completes development of the RVA system. The remaining \$9.2M of missile procurement procures 12 fast rising secondary door kits.

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

We would use the funds for design, development, test, evaluation, technical orders and validation activities to develop an RVA capability. We would also use the funds to procure 12 fast rising secondary door kits in FY07 raising the total number of B-plug kits procured to 112.

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) and Beaver Aerospace (Livonia, MI). 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 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?

RVA development funding is not contained in the FY 2007 budget. The ICBM Security Modernization Program is funded in missile procurement, Air Force, P-11, mod number 5914 for \$76.068M in FY 2007. This includes funding for 100 fast rising secondary door kits. Proposed add procures another 12 fast rising secondary door kits and funds remainder of RVA development activities.

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.

RVA development funding is not contained in the FY 2007 budget. The fast rising secondary door kits and deployment efforts are currently funded as follows:

(\$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Fast Rising Secondary Door Funding	72.5	67.8	63.5	53.6	27.0
Fast Rising Secondary Door Quantity	100	80	75	65	30

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 additional funding would be required for in-house or other 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?

Additional funding would complete RVA development in FY 2007. Approximately \$326M would be required in the next POM to complete RVA production/fielding. An additional \$15M would be required in the next POM to complete fast rising secondary door production/fielding.

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

So far, \$12M has been spent on RVA. The next major activity will be System Design Review.

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 the unmanned ICBM launch facilities. No such assessment capability exists today. As a result, security forces are dispatched to every alarm situation, never knowing what may await them.

The fast rising secondary door requirement is to secure an opened LF faster in order to delay or deny an intruder entry. Further details are classified.

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.

If Congress funds FY 2007, the program will avoid technical refresh/program restart costs of approximately \$10M. 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. Also avoids adding significant manpower to meet current DoD nuclear weapon security standards.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The RVA request is for development funds. The inventory objective of the fast rising secondary door program is 458 kits (overall). Procurement is detailed below.

(\$M)	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Fast Rising Secondary Door Quantity	30	46	100	80	75	65	30
Cumulative Percentage of Total	7%	17%	38%	56%	72%	86%	93%

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 2007?

No.

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

Higher priority AF programs

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #9 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: RDT&E  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 64329F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-75 for \$36.6M  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 63601F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-29 for \$3.6M  
Potential Add: \$40.2M for Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) Focused Lethality Munition (FLM)

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

This funding will incorporate alternate bomb fills and casings into SDB I. The technology promises to limit collateral damage in sensitive environments while providing additional blast margin to kill intended targets at the point of detonation. The additional funding allows Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) and Air Armament Center (AAC) to continue development of a Focused Lethality Munition (FLM) using the Dense Inert Metal Explosive (DIME) technology integrated into SDB I.

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

This funding will fund two parallel paths. AFRL will continue to mature FLM technology. AAC will integrate the technology with the SDB I baseline model within the Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) construct and demonstrates utility through a flight test program.

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 is a New Start. It will be managed by AFRL and AAC located at Eglin AFB FL. The SDB I contractor, Boeing, will be involved in the integration effort in St Louis, MO.

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 funding is contained in the FY 2007 budget for this effort. SDB I production started in FY 2005, with ongoing development for a fixed target variant. RDT&E, R-Line # 75 (FY05 \$73.5M, FY06 \$38.4, FY07 \$13.4).

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?

FY08 ACTD: \$13.0M

FY09 ACTD: \$2.5M

No additional costs are budgeted in the current FYDP.

Additional funding for this item will be pursued 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?

AFRL has invested \$4M to mature this technology. The ACTD effort is a new start.

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 FLM program is a SecAF high interest item. USCENCOM has identified a capability gap and expressed an urgent need to fill that gap. USCENCOM released the following Capability Need Statement:

"There is an urgent operational need to provide airborne platforms, including the F-15E, the ability to kill targets having collateral damage sensitivity. Small Diameter Bomb, modified to incorporate a composite case and Dense Inert Metal Explosive (DIME) fill, offers the potential for precisely delivering a lethal blast against soft targets and dramatically reducing collateral damage. This reduction in collateral damage will allow CoCOM's to place previously off limits targets at risk. USCENCOM fully supports the use of a composite case warhead with a DIME fill integrated on the Small Diameter Bomb I airframe to engage collateral damage sensitive targets. This capability is needed today and USCENCOM requests it be provided as soon as possible."

With today's technology, missions to prosecute targets in close proximity to collateral damage sensitive targets would be accomplished with weapons that create a level of damage unacceptable to CoCOMs. With FLM technology, CoCOMs will be able to prosecute targets previously off limits to the warfighter.

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.

Program is a New Start. The benefits of the technology are a decrease in innocent civilian and allied personnel lives lost within the warfighter's operations area. CoCOM's available target list expands resulting in a more efficient air war...potentially reducing conflict length.

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.

Objective - 450, 450 assets on-hand through the FYDP, 100-percent of inventory.

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 2007?

No.

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

Late-breaking, top-down direction by SecAF and requested from CENTCOM.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #10 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: O&M

Budget Activity: BA: 01,02,03,04

Program Element: PE 27574F, 28036F, 55165F

Potential Add: \$30.4M for Emergency Responder Personal Protection, Training, and Equipment

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

\$7.6M for Medical WMD response- The USAF has a current requirement to provide CBRNE emergency response. PBD 736 DERF (\$66M) accelerated medical WMD-ER capability at 75 AD MTFs and partial capability at 11 AFRC and 39 ANG installations with very little sustainment (FY05-\$.7M, FY06-\$4.0M, FY07-09-\$1.5M each year). New SG PE (Medical C-CBRNE Programs) established in FY05. Funds equipment/supplies for 6 approved and published Home Station Medical Response Allowance Standards (HMSR AS), equipment specific training, MeRET (the follow-on to CODE SILVER) and contract support. Additional funds would be used to fully fund the sustainment of current programs.

\$22.8M for Non-Medical WMD response- The AF WMD Emergency Responder Preparedness Program (PE 27574) enhances first responder (firefighters, CE Readiness, and explosive ordnance disposal) planning, training and equipment capabilities to the level where an installation can detect, assess, contain and recover from a peacetime Chemical, Biological, Nuclear and Enhanced Conventional Weapons (CBRNE) incident. FY03 Defense Emergency Relief Fund (DERF) money purchased most active duty essential WMD response equipment items. This unfunded would procure additional equipment items needed for the ANG and the remainder of the AD. It would also provide FY06 MAJCOM equipment sustainment and additional training.

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

Non-Med funding will buy additional essential WMD response equipment items and sustain the program through consumable purchases, additional program development, equipment and CONOPS training

Medical funding will sustain the \$65 M initial procurement by replenishing supplies and consumables, refreshing equipment, and providing the medical centric, cross-functional "CODE SILVER" training exercise to 25 installations. Plus up would also fund toxin identification capability and the associated training at 25 bases. Funding would provide the initial purchase of medical WMD ER equipment at ANG bases. Purchase AF-wide training for HMSR AS items to include JBAIDS fielding and to refresh/upgrade equipment based on evolving HLD mission.



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?

Batelle. Prime: JBAIDS (Joint Biological Agent Identification Detection System) being fielded FY07. This is the FDA approved replacement from the legacy non-FDA approved RAPIDS (Ruggedized Advanced Pathogen Identification and Diagnostic System)

Additional equipment to be purchased is available from a host of prime vendors, all total 240 items on the Essential WMD equipment item list from many companies.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2006 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?

Partially, WMD ER funding has been provided in the FY06 budget to fund ongoing training at locations that have already received equipment, some funding is available to purchase consumables and sustain through initial purchase or replacement, some of the equipment items on the list.

<u>APPN</u>	<u>FY06</u>
O&M Non Med (PE 27574)	\$2.72M
O&M Medical (PE 28036)	\$7.9M

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2006 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

WMD response is minimally funded in the FYDP for equipment sustainment and training, FYDP funding below reflects all money in those PEs with the exception of the Guardian sustainment dollars, which are earmarked against the installation protection program

PE	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	PE Totals
27574 (non-medical)	2.72	2.842	2.897	2.954	3.013	14.426
28036 (Medical C-CBRNE)	7.89	9.2	8.8	8.9	9	43.79
Totals	10.61	12.042	11.697	11.854	12.013	46.203

(In millions)

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?

This additional cost is not budgeted in the current FYDP, and it is unfunded. The AF will be advocating for equipment sustainment, consumable purchases and continued training necessary to support the program as part of the PPBE process. Additional funding for WMD emergency response will be reflected in the FY08-13 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.

In 1999 OSD required the Services to develop a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) First Responder Program that includes training and equipment requirements. Biological agent identification capability has been developed under the auspices of: Combat-Mission Needs Statement (C-MNS) For Ruggedized Advanced Pathogen Identification Device (RAPID), 6 Nov 01; Mission Needs Statement, CAF 314-97 For Enhanced Force Protection Capabilities, ACAT Level III, 30 Jun 98; Air Force Agile Combat Support, (ACS) MAP, 8 Aug 01; Joint Biological Agent Identification and Diagnostic System (JBAIDS) MS B ORD, ACAT III, 1 April 2003. CODE SILVER supports CSAF's Biological Defense Task Force program goals.

For the medical component (PE 28036F): Represents actual medical WMD-ER capability to prevent casualties by detecting and identifying the threat agents, managing casualties with patient decontamination, CBRNE treatment specific equipment and supplies and chemical, biological, nuclear and radiological pharmaceutical countermeasures. Sustainment of these programs maintains AF installations' AT/FP and CBRNE response capabilities, and solidifies their response plans and posture through training and exercise.

CBRN Defense and WMD response have been high on Combatant Commander's Integrated Priority Lists for the last two years and were identified specifically in the Strategic Planning Guidance.

In addition WMD ER funding shortfall is a direct contributing factor to the FY05 Capability Review and Risk Assessment (CRRRA) "Tier 1" shortfall 1G "Survive and Operate in a CBRN environment".

10. If Congress were to provide additional funds for this item in FY 2006, what savings (in then year dollars) could be expected by starting (increasing) the project in FY 2006 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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation, or other savings expected if this proposal is implemented.

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 2004, FY 2005, and end of FY 2006 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The objective is to fully fund the sustainment of the HMSR AS so that needed equipment refresh, upgrading (changing out the non-FDA approved RAPIDS for the FDA approved JBAIDS), and training can occur across the total force. Equipment + Trained Personnel = Capability. Current inventory is now 3-5 years old and less rugged equipment such as Decon tents are in need of replacement. Personnel turnover and advances in equipment, doctrine and training require continued emphasis of perishable skills. The MeRET program (the follow-on to CODE SILVER) specifically address medical Exercise Evaluation Team training to include how to integrate the HMSR AS, tabletop exercise and functional training on HMSR AS equipment.

14. If Congress added FY 2005 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 2006?

No.

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

Non-Med: Additional funding was requested in the 06 POM. Request was only partially funded due to higher priority AF needs and overall budgetary constraints.

Medical: AFMC funded at 91% - \$10M, PACAF funded at 57% -\$1.2M. Eight remaining MAJCOMS placed program in TAB P or below cut line. Installation Support Panel

submitted as an “SPG Compliance Issue” in concert with IL non-medical WMD ER unfunded requirement so AF acted in “good faith” to minimally sustain the program in FY 06-10 – 27.5M. however, the need to fund other high priority programs prevented the procurement of additional pods.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #11 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: PE 11126F (B-1) 11113F (B-52)  
Potential Add: \$35M for B-1/B-52 Deployable Maintenance Kits

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

The B-1 was not originally procured with spare parts kits for long-term deployments. No phase capability at Forward Operating Locations (FOL) currently exists as equipment and facility requirements were based on home station operations. This funding improves B-1 capabilities within an expeditionary construct by improving their ability to deploy phase maintenance. Currently, aircraft must return home for phase, detracting from combat operations.

B-52s have been deployed continuously for 4 consecutive years. The additional flying hours require drive additional 300-hour phase inspections. Due to sheer distance, it is costly and inefficient to fly aircraft back to home station to perform phase inspections. These funds provide the parts and equipment necessary to set-up phase inspection operations for two forward operating locations (FOL).

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

B-1: Purchases deployable maintenance kits to support 2 FOLs.

B-52: Purchase 1 readiness spares package and 1 complete set of support and test equipment to support phase maintenance operations at 1 FOL.

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 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 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?

B-1: When forward deployed, \$1.8M/year is required for a contract field team to replace deployed active duty Air Force. B-1s require a full hangar to perform phase that may result in facility construction depending on FOB location. Costs vary from \$3M for a portable shelter to \$31M for a permanent facility.

B-52: Require a minimum "nose dock" to perform phase. Depending on FOL location, suitable facilities may have to be constructed with costs varying from \$3M for a portable shelter to \$31M for a permanent facility.

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. No additional funding 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.

COCOM OPLAN/CONPLANS detail bomber requirements at FOLs. Deploying bomber phase capability relieves bombers from making the 20+hour flight home when phase is due (every jet must ferry home for phase during deployments). Increases aircraft availability in theater and at home station.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

B-1: 2 each Readiness spares kits for phase: one each would be added to the table of allowances at Ellsworth AFB and Dyess AFB. There are currently no assets on-hand or projected.

B-52: Readiness spares kit and a complete set of support and test equipment for phase: one each would be added to the table of allowances at Barksdale AFB.

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?

B-1: \$25M. B-52: \$26M. Budget authority has not been extended yet to MAJCOM due to overall FY06 NDAA timeline.

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?

This cost of war requirement not addressed in any previous POM.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #12 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: RDT&E  
Budget Activity: 07  
Program Element: PE 33601F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-175  
Potential Add: \$30M B-2 Satellite Terminal Synchronization

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

The Air Force requests an additional \$30M of RDT&E to support acceleration of Extremely High Frequency (EHF) Extended Data Rate (XDR) capability on the Family of Advanced Beyond Line of Sight Terminals (FAB-T) to meet the integration schedule for the B-2. XDR capability was delayed 2 years due to a FAB-T replan because of cost overruns. If the Air Force cannot provide an XDR capable terminal to meet existing B-2 scheduled flight plan, they will incur an additional two-year delay until the next flight test and will incur additional cost of \$25M to incorporate the terminals into later flight tests.

Detailed Platform Impacts:

B-2 - The B-2 has a 2-year integration and test schedule that cannot be perturbed because of a single test a/c and ongoing classified programs. Moving the XDR availability date to Oct 2010 from Mar 2011 allow fielding of XDR in FY12 vice FY14. XDR is the critical capability to bring the B-2 into a Net Centric environment. It also is a key technology providing protected (Anti-Jam/Low Probability of Intercept/Low Probability of Detection) communications to allow the B-2 to keep in contact with planners, targeteers, threat warnings, etc even on deep strike missions requiring stealth. Without XDR, B-2 will not be able to perform future mission file transfers, offload of B-2 sensor data (threat ID/locations), receive ISR video, or receive GIG/SIRPNET connectivity. Future mission file transfers and sensor data far exceed LDR capability; XDR will be required to perform B-2 missions.

-- Needed to support Strategic Attack, Global Strike, Nuclear Response, Global Persistent Attack, Space and C4ISR, Joint Concept of Joint Integrating Concepts, CAS, potential reachback node for LO strike packages including F-22A and JSF.

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

The Air Force will spend these funds to start XDR systems engineering requirements flow down 3-6 months earlier.

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 Corporation is the Prime Contractor for the FAB-T terminal. Boeing along with Rockwell Collins as the primary sub contractor would develop this capability. Boeing's



performance to date has been poor on cost and schedule thus instituting a replan. However, with new management on board now and stronger relationships with the sub contractors, the Air Force has gained better confidence in Boeing.

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 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?

No additional funding required. No additional costs are budgeted in the FYDP. No plans to address in future 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?

\$346M invested through FY 2005. Testing begins in FY 2007 and continues through FY 2009. The next milestone is an LRIP decision in FY 2008.

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 in the Airborne Wideband Terminal ORD, Mar 04. Strategic platforms (B-2, B-52, etc) require protected EHF communication through MILSTAR and AEHF satellites. This mission today is provided via the UHF (unprotected) payload on MILSTAR. This new system (FAB-T XDR) will provide protected comm and higher data rates for fulfillment of additional comm requirements for strategic platforms such as air tasking orders, nuclear message traffic, presidential and COCOM/CC comm, etc.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented.

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

High military value...avoids 2-year delay of protected comm to our strategic airborne platforms.

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.

Inventory objective for FAB-T Inc 1 (LDR/MDR/XDR for AEHF/MILSTAR) is 260 airborne and ground. Procurement currently funded in FY08-11 (total 241 of the 260); remainder planned outside the FYDP.

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 2007?

No.

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

The FAB-T replan is ongoing and was not ready to be considered with the FY 2007 budget request.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #13 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 11127F  
Procurement Line Item: P-26  
Potential Add: \$5.9M for B-2 Engine Blade Repair

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

Procures new design, FOD-tolerant F118-GE-100 Engine Stage #1 Fan Blades. Ruggedization of the airfoil includes an increased leading edge blade thickness and outer span chord reduction along with the use of Laser Shock Peening (LSP) on the leading edge of the blade to reduce or eliminate FOD incidents.

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

Funding will buy Time Compliance Technical Order (TCTO) kits. Each kit includes a complete engine ship set of Stage # 1 blades (24). Technical Data and spares are also included in the modification program.

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 Electric Aircraft Engines (GEAE), Cincinnati, Ohio. 100% GEAE personnel in Ohio. Contractor performance to date 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?

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 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?

An additional \$ 8.07M is required in FY 2008 to complete TCTO Kit buys for the F118-GE-100 engine fleet. No funding has been budgeted at this time. The requirement for these funds will be introduced during the FY08 POM process.

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 Engine Component Improvement Program has invested \$5.5M in the development of the F118-GE-100 Fan Module redesign effort. The redesign effort includes all three stages of the fan module but only Stage # 1 has a safety issue. Stages 2 and 3 will be addressed at a later date in the Service Life Extension Program. Initial qualification testing at the General Electric facility in Cincinnati, OH was completed in Dec 2005. Additional qualification testing is scheduled at Arnold Engineering and Development Center (AEDC) in Feb 2006.

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 Stage # 1 fan blade was identified as a safety issue in Dec 05 by HQ ACC and subsequently validated by HQ AF Safety on 3 Jan 2006, assigning a Safety Modification designation to the Stage # 1 fan blade. Stage # 1 fan blade liberation has the potential to cause several hazardous events including engine loss, impact damage to surrounding aircraft structures, and fire.

Interim risk reduction action has been introduced to blend to zero any FOD damage at the organizational level for Stage #1 fan blades. Redesigned Stage #1 fan blade organizational FOD limits will allow some FOD damage during operations due to improved blade durability.

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.

Due to the late discovery, this is not included in the FY 2007 PB or the FYDP.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

The funding will purchase 50 (41%) of the required 120 kits in FY07. The remaining 70 kits will be an FY 2008 POM issue.

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?

No FY 2006 funding.

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 Stage # 1 fan blade was not identified as a safety issue until Dec 2005 when HQ ACC/ CC submitted the designation. HQ USAF/SE concurred in Jan 2006 assigning a Safety Modification designation to the Stage # 1 fan blade. Prior to this designation, the Stage #1 fan blade was below the cut line for funding.

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

Yes, this is the SECAF/CSAF #14 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 04  
Program Element: PE 41314F  
Procurement Line Item: P-22  
Potential Add: \$61M for one C-37B aircraft

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

The C-37B aircraft is a military version of the Gulfstream 550 business jet. The proposed purchase would add one C-37B aircraft to the current VIP Special Airlift (VIPSAM) fleet. 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.

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

Funds will be used for purchase of one C-37B 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?

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.

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 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?

CSAF's VIPSAM modernization/standardization plan includes replacing existing C-20Bs with C-37Bs. Approximately \$240M would be required for subsequent fiscal years to replace the four remaining C-20Bs. Operational and Support cost to be programmed through POM cycles.

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.

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 intransit 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.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented.

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.

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 NDAA provided additional funding for the purchase on one C-37B. Gulfstream no longer manufactures C-37As.

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?

Congress added \$45M in FY 2006 funds for this item. Funds have not yet been release. When so, we will obligate the funds.

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?

Other AF priorities took precedence for FY 20funding. Approving this request will enhance airlift support for our nation's senior civilian and military leaders.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #15 priority.



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Other Procurement & Operations and Maintenance (O&M)

Budget Activity: 03 for Other Procurement; 01 for O&M

Program Element: PE 27428F / 27604F

Procurement Line Item: P-52

Potential Add: \$20.5M (\$12.4M Other Procurement; \$8.1M O&M) for Range  
Infrastructure Improvements

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

Supports crucial range infrastructure improvements that support Joint Forces' ability to train as they fight.

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

Funds Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain (MOUT) training facility start-up (O&M tail covered in current FYDP funding) to provide realistic training for OIF. Improves range infrastructure through threat environment modernization. Funds Link 16, telemetry, radars, repeaters, receivers and encryption for ACC ranges. Funds Air Combat Maneuvering Instrumentation (ACMI) Pods for USAFE.

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?

NTTR (PE 27429F)

- The Joint Tactical Service Contract JTECH is performed by JT3, NV
- The Range Support Services Contract RSS is performed by CSC, NV
- Both contractors have an excellent rating on a Cost Plus Award Fee Contract.

UTTR (PE 27429F)

- JTECH, UT; exceeds contract performance

AETC (PE 27604F)

- The Environmental Company, AZ
- Statistical Research, Inc, AZ

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.

USAFE	3400	\$22.6M	+ \$1.0M
AETC	3400	\$18.6M	+ \$3.0M
NTTR/UTTR	3400	\$80.8M	+\$12.9M
NTTR/UTTR	3080	\$0	+ \$3.6M

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.

(\$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
O&M	73.3	81.7	83.5	87.4	84.2

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.

As per AF Form 1067:

The Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR), has continuing requirements for unmanned threat emitter systems to provide reconfigurable, representative threat coverage - especially around bombing complexes and other areas on the range that will be held 'at risk' during exercises. The current systems have performance and sustainability issues, which make these systems marginal as relevant threat trainers for aircrews. Additionally, current Unmanned Threat Emitters (UMTE) have the following key deficiencies:

- a) The current UMTEs do not provide user required data or bore site video feedback.
- b) They do not include the target acquisition waveforms, which makes each "threat" less realistic.
- c) Threat tracking and engagement modes are completely unresponsive to: terrain, tactics, jamming, etc.

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 start-up, acquisition, operation, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented. This provides a training capability that currently does not exist.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Current inventory of UMTEs is 33; these funds procure 2 modernization kits.

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?

\$8M. The funds have not yet been released. Once released, they will be obligated by May 2006.

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?

To remain within a constrained budget top-line, the Air Force had to judiciously allocate its resources.

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

Yes, it is the SECAF/CSAF #16 priority.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
 Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement, and RDT&E  
 Budget Activity: 04 (Aircraft Procurement); 07 (RDT&E)  
 Program Element: PE 35116F  
 RDT&E Line Item: R-185  
 Procurement Line Item: P-21  
 Potential Add: \$38.0M (\$36.0M for Aircraft Procurement; \$2.0M for RDT&E) for various Aerial Target Systems

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

Issue (by target priority)	Funding	Type	Description
RF-4C Supply Revitalization	\$15,000,000	3010	Last 4 years of QF-4 program will be made up of RF-4Cs. Is currently no parts repair/supply system in place to support them. OO-ALC projects major supportability issues if not addressed. Funds will be used to set up a capability at the depot. If not funded, our ability to field and sustain the final 3 years of QF-4s will be in jeopardy.
AST Risk Reduction	\$10,000,000	3600	Earliest start date for AST is FY08 per current POM planning activities. An FY08 start still leaves a potential gap of a year between QF-4 inventory exhaustion and AST first delivery. Providing a relatively small amount of funding in FY07 would allow us to accelerate our AST activities and cut 6-12 months off AST delivery time.
Subscale Aerial Target Munition Procurement	\$2,300,000	3010	Procures 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 late FY06/early FY07.

Subscale Aerial Target Procurement	\$11,200,000	3010	Procures 20 additional AF Subscale Aerial Target (AFSAT) aircraft. AFSAT IOC scheduled for Jul 06. However, current procurement budgets purchase fewer aircraft per year than projected kill losses. Additional 20 aircraft increases inventory to a level that enables more efficient operations by ACC.
Temporary Logistical Supply Point	\$2,000,000	3010	Temporary facility to store QF-4 parts at AMARC. Facility is currently running out of facility space to store parts. Without the space, the parts will be sent to DMRO and lost to the program permanently.
Subscale Aerial Target Alternate Launch Study	\$2,000,000	3600	Funds program to identify a viable replacement for the RATO bottles currently used to launch subscale aerial targets. Reduces annual operating costs by \$2-3M by eliminating future RATO procurements.
Full-Scale Aerial Target Procurement	\$15,000,000	3010	Procures 6 additional QF-4 aircraft
Electronic Attack Pod Procurement	\$1,500,000	3010	Procures 2 electronic attack pods for target aircraft. These pods are currently in very short supply.
AST Engine Study	\$500,000	3600	Study to identify and mitigate issues associated with using existing engines on AST.
QRF-4C ECP	\$4,000,000	3010	An Engineering Change Proposal to develop the droning process for the RF-4C aircraft which will make up the last three Lots of QF-4 Full-Scale Aerial Targets.

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

Procure additional BQM-167 subscale targets, additional EA pod, and additional subscale munitions due to a shortfall in munitions. Build temporary facility to store QF-4 parts. Fund capability (repair and supply) to support RF-4C drones, development of an Engineering Change Proposal for the QRF-4C Target, and a study for subscale alternate launch technique.

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?

- QF-4 efforts are completely accomplished by BAE in California, performance is good
- BQM-167 efforts are completely accomplished by CEi in California, performance is good
- BQM-167 RATO munitions are completely accomplished by ATK Tactical Systems in WV, performance is marginal
- Study efforts are completely accomplished by AAC/AAMWS/SASG/RT TEAS/TAMS support contractors in FL, performance is excellent
- Logistical supply effort are to be completely accomplished by OO-ALC in UT, performance is good
- Electronic Attack efforts are accomplished by NAWC Pt Mugu in CA, performance is 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?

Issue	Type	In FY07	Approp, value, how differs
RF-4C Supply Revitalization	3010	No	N/A
AST Risk Reduction	3600	No	N/A
Subscale Aerial Target Munition Procurement	3010	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP17 FY06 \$3.6M; FY07 \$3.7M; FY08 \$3.8M; FY09 \$3.9M; FY10 \$4.0M; FY11 \$4.1M
Subscale Aerial Target Procurement	3010	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP10 FY06 \$27.3M; FY07 \$27.7M; FY08 \$28.5M; FY09 \$29.6M; FY10 \$30.8M; FY11 \$30.7M
Temporary Logistical Supply Point	3010	No	N/A

Subscale Aerial Target Alternate Launch Study	3600	No	N/A
Full-Scale Aerial Target Procurement	3010	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP10 FY06 \$55.6M; FY07 \$53.6M; FY08 \$55.5M; FY09 \$59.4M; FY10 \$60.5M; FY11 \$61.5M
Electronic Attack Pod Procurement	3010	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP19 FY06 \$4.9M; FY07 \$5.3M; FY08 \$5.3M; FY09 \$4.9M; FY10 \$5.1M; FY11 \$5.3M
AST Engine Study	3600	No	N/A
QRF-4C ECP	3010	No	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.

Issue	Funding	Funding by FY
RF-4C Supply Revitalization	No	N/A
AST Risk Reduction	No	N/A
Subscale Aerial Target Munition Procurement	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP17 FY06 \$3.6M; FY07 \$3.7M; FY08 \$3.8M; FY09 \$3.9M; FY10 \$4.0M; FY11 \$4.1M
Subscale Aerial Target Procurement	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP10 FY06 \$27.3M; FY07 \$27.7M; FY08 \$28.5M; FY09 \$29.6M; FY10 \$30.8M; FY11 \$30.7M
Temporary Logistical Supply Point	No	N/A



Subscale Aerial Target Alternate Launch Study	No	N/A
Full-Scale Aerial Target Procurement	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP10 FY06 \$55.6M; FY07 \$53.6M; FY08 \$55.5M; FY09 \$59.4M; FY10 \$60.5M; FY11 \$61.5M
Electronic Attack Pod Procurement	Yes	3010 PE 35116 BP19 FY06 \$4.9M; FY07 \$5.3M; FY08 \$5.3M; FY09 \$4.9M; FY10 \$5.1M; FY11 \$5.3M
AST Engine Study	No	N/A
QRF-4C ECP	No	N/A

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?

No additional funding would be required to complete the project in subsequent fiscal years or the current FYDP. Yes, the AF 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?

- AST \$1.5 M of 3600 for an AoA

- BQM-167 ~\$90M of 3010 and ~\$9M of 3600; System currently accomplishing Flight Performance Demonstration; next major milestone will be to enter Full-Rate 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.

Yes. Title 10 U.S.C. for Live-Fire Testing, Oct 2005 DSB Report on Aerial Targets, COMACC Plan 85, Aerial Targets MNS, QF-4 ORD, AFSAT ORD, and AST ICD.

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.

These bills are all required. No savings will be realized but, losses (equivalent to amount requested) will be realized without additional funding. Exception is the procurement of BQM-167 and EA Pods. 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.

QF-4 – maintain a buffer inventory of ~20 assets on hand at end of year and expend ~20 assets per year (two year cycle to produce a QF-4)

BQM-167 – maintain a buffer inventory of ~20 assets on hand at end of year and expend ~40 assets per year (one year cycle to procure a BQM-167)

EA Pods – maintain a buffer inventory of ~6 assets on hand at end of year and expend ~12 assets per year (one year cycle to procure an EA Pod)

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 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, no Congressional adds were given.

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?

They have been but currently are not being met due to budgetary constraints.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations & Maintenance (Reserve), Operations & Maintenance (Guard)

Budget Activity: 01

Program Element: Support Equipment - 54119F; Vehicles – 52834F

Potential Add: \$14.0M for Support Equipment and Vehicles

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

Procures critical support equipment and vehicles for C-5, KC-135, and C-17 stand-up/new missions. Equipment is necessary to facilitate needed training, support daily operations, and maintain mission readiness. Procurement of this equipment in the near term addresses current critical shortfalls.

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

Procurement of critical, late to need SE/vehicles essential to enabling the continued safe and efficient operation of high-demand, low-density strategic assets.

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 Electric Aviation, Kern Steel Fabrication, Inc. and Howell Instruments Inc. are potential/past aircraft support equipment prime contractors.

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 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

No, funding has not been programmed in the FYDP.

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 budgeted. AF Reserve Command and Air National Guard will submit this requirement in its FY 2008 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, a validated requirement exists. For new mission stand-up bases, the command is using existing equipment moved from other bases (creating shortfalls at those units). This funding procures new equipment/vehicles for the new mission bases.

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?

This item is assessed as medium 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?

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, funding can be executed.

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

Stand-up/new mission.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Other Procurement and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) (Reserve)

Budget Activity: BA 03 for Other Procurement; BA01 for O&M (Reserve)

Procurement Line Item: P-74

Program Element: PE 53012F, 55395F

Potential Add: \$6.0M (\$4.0M Other Procurement; \$2.0M O&M) for AFR Critical Command and Control (C2)

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

The Air Force Reserve has a requirement to purchase and sustain parts, personnel mobility gear, fuel, oil, vehicle maintenance, and other equipment to meet critical theater deployable/combat communications requirements from combatant commanders. Secondly, to comply with First-Responder and Force Protection requirements, AFR must procure and sustain redundant voice and secure communications radios and consoles for its C2 facilities and security personnel.

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

Obligate \$1.1M O&M sustainment for theater deployable communications. Obligate \$1M O&M to sustain digital voice recorders and C2 consoles at AFR command posts, security forces units, fire departments, and base operations facilities. Spend \$3.8M to procure and sustain secure 56 HF and 56 UHF/VHF radios at AFR sites.

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

HF/UHF/VHF Radios: Harris Corporation, Rochester NY

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 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?

O&M sustainment costs remain an unfunded requirement and will 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.

Theater Deployable/Combat Communications: Requirement driven by Deployable Operational Capability (DOC) statement and Unit Type Code (UTC) taskings to provide combatant commanders with deployable warfighting communications. Mission was assigned to AFR without necessary O&M to sustain equipment. Supports AF I-CRRA priority 2A, Establish Expeditionary Operating Locations.

Minimal sustainment is being accomplished today. Non-funding degrades deployability and the support of AF Concepts of Operation (CONOPS). No repair, maintenance, or upgrade capability for deployable equipment. Limited capability for training on equipment. No funding to meet transportation contingencies.

C2 Console Sustainment: The requirement was driven by HQ USAF/XOOO Operational Requirements Document (ORD), Objective Wing Command Post (CP) Communications Requirements (25 Jul 01), Multi-Command Mission Need Statement, Combat AF-AMC 203-95, Standard Unit Command Post Communication Capability (12 Sep 94), AFI 10-207, and AFMS 135A, 1C3X1 Manpower Standard. 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 \$10M. Supports AF I-CRRA priority 2K, Tactical Response.



EOY funds have covered part of the requirement, however, the unreliable nature of this type of funding resulted in a two-month gap in coverage leaving a critical communications system unprotected. The result of this will magnify in the future as the system is expanded to fire department, security, and base operations facilities.

HF/UHF/VHF Radios: **HF:** AFI 10-207, paragraph 2.2.7. requires MAJCOMs to “maintain reliable/redundant voice connectivity with assigned command posts at all times.” AFR utilizes telephones as a primary method for voice connectivity but has no system available to meet the redundant requirement. The HF radio was chosen to accomplish this requirement after reviewing available options and determining that it was the least costly option to purchase and maintain over its life cycle. **UHF/VHF:** AFI 10-207, paragraph 2.2.4. states MAJCOMs will “identify requirements and program/secure the necessary funding for facility configurations, equipment, and communications for command posts to operate efficiently and reliably.” AFRCI 10-203, paragraph 2.3.4 requires AFR command posts to have a UHF radio capability and paragraph 2.6.1. requires the alternate command post to have access to the same capability as the primary. Supports AF I-CRRA priority 2K, Tactical Response.

Today, **HF:** Not available. AFR utilized tasked equipment residing in Communication Squadron and Tanker Airlift Control Element UTCs to meet past connectivity tests. The equipment is not installed or ready for immediate use. The equipment is subject to deployment and therefore is not available for this tasking. **UHF/VHF:** Available on a limited basis. AFR unit command posts utilize a variety of UHF/VHF radios to meet this requirement. Current equipment is non-standard increasing training and sustainment costs. Current equipment is often off-the-shelf civilian equipment is not capable of secure communications. The TRC-176 and similar generation radios are no longer logistically supported. AFR ability to maintain reliable/redundant voice and secure connectivity with assigned command posts/aircraft at all times is degraded. AFR risks losing command and control of assigned assets during critical points in tasked missions.

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.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Obtain two HF radios and two UHF/VHF radios for each of the 28 AFR unit command posts (total of 112 radios). No assets currently on hand.

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 2007?

No.

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

To remain within a constrained budget topline, the Air Force had to judiciously allocate its resources. The need to fund other high priority programs prevented the AFR Critical C2 program from being funded.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: BA 03  
Program Element: PE 27589F  
Procurement Line Item: P-51  
Potential Add: \$15M for AFSPC Security Upgrades

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

Funding provides for needed replacement of aging and inoperable electronic security systems protecting space platforms (priority level 1 assets) supporting in-theater war-fighting capability. (NOTE: The life-cycle of these systems is eight years, however, the current systems are between 10 and 17 years old.) Components for these systems include: perimeter and interior sensors, closed circuit television cameras, pedestrian control turnstiles, annunciators, and fiber optics for data transport. The replacement restores system effectiveness (ability to deter/detect an intruder) from current 3% to 90%. The effectiveness percentages come from a risk model, which includes modeling and simulation, designed by Sandia National Laboratories.

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

Continue the phased replacement of electronic security systems at Schriever AFB and start the project at Buckley AFB.

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 funding will be sent to Sandia National Laboratories. They work with the wings and local contractors in Colorado to perform all the tasks.

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?

There is no funding for these items in FY 2007.

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.

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
0M	6.6M	6.6M	5.5M	6.0M

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?

We will need an additional \$10M in FY 2008 to combine with the current funding line to finish the Schriever project and an additional \$6.4M to complete the Buckley project in FY 2008. Yes, we are pursuing additional funding in the 08 POM for these projects, as well as other space platform security projects.

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.

AFI 31-101 requires, for Protection Level 1 resources, a level of security to deter against hostile acts. The integrated security must include two lines of exterior detection, one at the boundary and one at the resource, interior detection, alarms and audible and visual displays at a monitoring station.

The systems are old and fail to provide the required detection. The interim measure to meet requirements is to take manpower out of hide and post at necessary locations. Replacement of the systems will improve the security reliability around the platforms providing warfighting capability. For Schriever, the wing will only have to maintain one system versus two.

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.

For Schriever, the wing is forced to operate and maintain two security systems. The savings will be realized in maintenance/sustainment of one system.

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

This is a high military value line item. These systems support missions in CRRA Tiers 1 & 2. Specific mission information can be provided in a classified format.

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.

These equipment items are commercial off-the-shelf, there is no inventory objective for these items.

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?

There was no FY06 add requested.

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

No, we can execute funding in FY07.

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

These funds are part of our FY08 POM request. We need this additional funding to get Schriever AFB to one security system and replace the Buckley AFB system before it totally fails.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: PE 35940F  
Potential Add: \$4.8M for Air Force Space Surveillance System (AFSSS)/Space Fence

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

AFSSS is the only uncued sensor in the Space Surveillance Network (SSN). It is comprised of nine fixed transmitting (3) and receiving (6) radar sites spread across the southern United States at 33° N latitude. The AFSSS provides metric observations on Near Earth and Deep Space objects in support of USSTRATCOM's Space Situation Awareness mission. The AFSSS was transferred from the Navy (formerly the Naval Space Surveillance System) to the Air Force in FY04.

This adjustment will add sustainment funding not received in the original transfer from the Navy to the Air Force. In the transfer, funds were not identified for civil engineering and environmental sustainment, computer/communications infrastructure and remote operations. The adjustment will allow continuation of AFSSS operations until its S-Band replacement becomes operational in FY14.

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

The required funds for FY 2007 will be used for civil engineering/environmental costs and operational costs not included in the transfer from the Navy to the Air Force. In addition, the funds will be used for Base Operating Support for the Air Force tenant unit at Dahlgren, VA (computer/communication infrastructure, Inter-Service Support Agreement (ISSA)). These costs were not identified in the original transfer from the NAVY.

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?

Chugach Telecommunications and Computers Inc., Anchorage, AK; personnel employed in TX, AZ, AL, CA, GA, MS, AR, NM. Contractor performance has met expectations to date.

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; O&M line item 13550, Other Space Operations, Space Situation Awareness Operations PE 35940F. This line item includes funding for all SSN assets, including

AFSSS (contracts, civilian personnel, depot maintenance, engineering, etc.). The proposed add includes necessary funding for items (as detailed above) that are not part of the current budget for AFSSS operations.

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.

PE	APPN	COST	PROG	OAC	WSC/BPAC	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FYDP
35940f	3400	59200	anw000	83	836790	27.11	27.27	27.76	27.760	27.760	137.660
35940f	3400	40900	anw000	83	836790	0.230	0.230	0.230	0.230	0.230	1.150
<b>Funding line totals</b>						<b>27.340</b>	<b>27.500</b>	<b>27.990</b>	<b>27.990</b>	<b>27.990</b>	<b>138.810</b>

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?

Funding will be adjusted in future budgets and likely won't require same level of support as AFSSS operations are normalized. AFSSS will cease operations the FY2014-2015 timeframe.

AFSSS is currently not budgeted in the FYDP and AF has no 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, AFSSS is the only uncued radar system in the SSN. The purpose of the SSN is to track, detect and find man-made objects in support of USSTRATCOM's SSA mission. The warfighter requirements are documented in USSTRATCOM's Capstone Requirement Document for Space Control.

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

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 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; Congress did not add money for AFSSS operations in FY 2006. In FY 2006, Congress added \$7M for AFSSS S-band development. Current AFSSS operations did not receive additional funds in the FY 2006 Budget.

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 AFSSS was transferred to the Air Force from the Navy. During FY04 and FY05, costs were identified that were not part of the transfer. These costs must be added to the AFSSS baseline to properly sustain and maintain the system.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 02  
Program Element: PE 41897F  
Potential Add: \$47.2M for Aircrew Training System Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) contract

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

Aircrew Training Systems (ATS) provides the Mobility Air Forces (MAF) aircrew member essential simulator and courseware training necessary to maintain their basic currency in the aircraft. The ATS trains all MAF C-5, C-17, C-130, C-130J, KC-10 and KC-135 aircrews.

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

Basic CLS contract in FY 2007 is unfunded \$47M. Would pay this "must-pay" 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?

The following are the ATS CLS contractors by weapon system and locations:

C-5: Flight Safety - California, Oklahoma, Texas, Delaware, Massachusetts, Ohio, Tennessee

C-17: Boeing - California, South Carolina, Hawaii, Alaska, Washington, Mississippi, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Delaware

C-130: Lockheed – Arkansas, Washington, Minnesota, Texas, Mississippi, Georgia, North Carolina

C-130J: Lockheed – Arkansas, Mississippi

KC-10: Boeing – California, New Jersey

KC-135: Flight Safety – Washington, Oklahoma, Kansas, Florida, North Dakota, California, Illinois, Mississippi, Georgia, Indiana, Wisconsin, New Hampshire. Overseas – Okinawa, Japan and England.

Contractor performance has been satisfactory.

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 - \$141.8M in Operations and Maintenance funds. This is only 75% of the contract cost.

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.

(\$ millions in Operation and Maintenance funds)

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
141.8	141.4	143.4	146.0	149.0

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 Operations and Maintenance funds required (over and above those in the funded baseline for the program) the following years:

(\$ millions in Operation and Maintenance funds)

FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12*	FY13*
63.7	74.5	81.1	91.6	92.9	96.1

\* Do not have information on FY12-13 in budget information provided – assumed funded baseline increased \$3M per year in FY12 and FY13.

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 Instruction 11-2C – XXX (Aircrew Training). Instructions list the required training by aircraft aircrew and frequency of training required. All simulator training requirements are contained in these instructions.

Most local aircrew training is accomplished in the C-5 and C-17 simulator. In the other MAF aircraft (C-130, C-130J, KC-10 and KC-135) some of the aircrew training is conducted in the simulator. With continuing simulator upgrades in these aircraft, more local training will be conducted in the simulators for these aircraft.

Cost savings are directly related to the cost per flying hour in various airframes. An average simulator hour cost is about \$600. Also, more training can be conducted in the simulator per hour than in the aircraft and many procedures that are critical to aircrew emergency procedure training cannot be conducted in the aircraft due to safety considerations.

Here are the latest Operations and Maintenance flying hour rates by aircraft:

C-5:	\$26,069
C-17:	\$11,513
C-130:	\$4,586
C-130J:	\$4,586
KC-10:	\$6,211
KC-135:	\$4,824

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.

Following savings are based on shutting down all C-17 aircrew training in the simulators due to the \$47.1M unfunded requirement:

C-17 flying hours required to conduct training that is currently conducted in the simulator - 17,169 hours at \$11,513 per C-17 flying hour equals a cost of \$198M to train our aircrews vs. the \$47M for the simulator contract.

This equates to a savings to the Air Force in FY07 of \$151M.

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 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?

\$133.6M. The funds have been released by the Air Force to us and sent to the various field organizations. About 80% has been obligated. Expect the other 20% to be obligated in 60 days.

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?

It is listed as the number 1 unfunded requirement in FY07 by U.S. Air Force Air Mobility command.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: RDT&E, Other Procurement

Budget Activity: 07 for RDT&E; 03 for Other Procurement

Program Element: PE 27412F

Procurement Line Item: P-42

RDT&E Line Item: R-145

Potential Add: \$38.2M Battle Control System – Mobile (\$8.2M RDT&E & \$30.0M Other Procurement)

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

Control and Reporting Center (CRC) is a Low Density/ High Demand (LD/HD) ground-based Tactical Command and Control (C2) element of the Theater Air Control System (TACS). The CRC is the Joint Force Air Component Commander's (JFACC's) ground-based C2 element executing theater battle management taskings to include surveillance, identification, theater air defense, tactical data link management, and Air Tasking Order execution. It is a critical link in the kill chain.

Proposed plus-up provides funds for an interim solution to replace the legacy CRC until the Battle Control System – Mobile (BCS-M) fields in FY09. This interim solution will be referred as the “BCS-M Bridge”. Operators involved in controlling high-speed Joint and Coalition aircraft experience poor communications, limited radar coverage, and continual system “crashes” at critical times during their management of air operations over Iraq and Afghanistan. This funding procures equipment that requires fewer personnel, while providing a wider tactical-level C2 for OIF and OEF. Web-based C2 tools and communications medium cannot be integrated into the legacy system; this makes it nearly impossible to effect the required communications between lateral C2 agencies and the HHQ CAOC. One element (Expeditionary Command and Control Center – EC3) consists of a “quick reaction” expeditionary High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV)-mounted communications switch, a new open-architecture mission computer, two operator workstations, a data link engine, and a radar tracker-correlator. The other element (Battle Control Center – BCC) has all of the capabilities of the EC3 plus 15 operator positions and a maintenance/equipment shelter for the communications gear, cryptographic equipment, and the C2 mission computer. Additionally, this funding will provide spares kits, tech data, and necessary test and training hardware assets. The combination of these elements replaces the legacy CRC and provides the Combined Force Air Component Commander the capability to address both current and emerging air defense and sovereignty requirements in Iraq and Afghanistan. Fielding this improved capability will have an immediate impact on coalition force protection – protection of theater high value assets, convoy security (air cover), combat search and rescue, and close air support of troops in contact.

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

The funding requested for the BCS-M Bridge provides for the acquisition of one BCC and two EC3s.

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 baseline BCS-M program is not on contract for this effort. Three contractors are being assessed for their ability to deliver a nearly off-the-shelf command and control capability; contractors are Thales-Raytheon Systems (CA), Raytheon-San Diego (CA), and Solipsys-Raytheon (MD). All three of these contractors develop major C2 systems and have performed up to standard.

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?

Funding for this item is not contained in the FY 2007 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 2007 for in-house or other costs not included in the amount under consideration?

No other funding is required in FY 2007.

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 a one-time fielding of essential C2 assets to OIF and OEF.

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 project is not an R&D item. The major RDT&E activity is test and certification.

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: Yes, an Air Force approved Battle Control System Operational Requirements Document (ORD) exists and there are additional CENTAF force protection requirements. The CRC is a low density/high demand Command and Control (C2) capability that provides the Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) the theater air track data required to maintain JFACC's real-time situational awareness of air activity within his Area of Operations. BCS-M Bridge provides a near-term replacement for the legacy system – the CRC. It significantly improves wide area surveillance and aircraft identification on the battlefield, implements a more robust Tactical Data Link (TDL) capability, and allows this theater-level asset to become fully interoperable with CAOC C2 systems and toolsets. The legacy CRC is unable to meet OIF and OEF required capabilities in a stand-alone mode. The requirements are to provide a tactical C2 node capable of integrating with other services' C2 elements to ensure an efficient and effective kill chain. In an effort to operate in today's net-centric environment, stand-alone systems have been fielded that significantly "clutter" operator workspace and have not improved the efficiency of the system.

Mission Today: The legacy C2 equipment of the CRC, a Low Density/High Demand (LD/HD) system, is currently employed in OIF and OEF today. Theater C2 operators will continue to be task saturated as they attempt to utilize the disparate stand-alone systems that have been laid on top of the legacy CRC. Operators involved in controlling high speed Joint and Coalition aircraft experience poor communications, limited radar coverage, and continual system "crashes" at critical times during their management of air operations over Iraq and Afghanistan. Web-based C2 tools and communications medium cannot be integrated into the legacy system; this makes it nearly impossible to effect the required communications between lateral C2 agencies and the Higher Headquarters CAOC. Force protection and prevention of fratricide are the overriding issues in this request. Equipment limitations will require the warfighter to use work-around solutions to accomplish the mission and, even with these, will not address serious capability gaps. As other systems in the kill chain have upgraded and improved their ability to detect and kill the enemy, the CRC has become a bottleneck resulting in missed opportunities to destroy the enemy and lengthening the kill chain timeline. The system has reached a technical saturation point and is now unable to fully integrate with joint and coalition C2 assets.

Warfighting Improvements: The "BCS-M Bridge" will provide improved communications, greater radar coverage, and fewer or no system "crashes" during critical air traffic management periods over Iraq and Afghanistan. This funding procures equipment that allows fewer personnel to provide a wider tactical-level C2 for OIF and OEF. The new system will enable integration of web-based C2 tools and communications, allowing required information and data to flow between lateral C2 agencies and the HHQ CAOC. Additionally, this funding will provide spares kits, tech data, and necessary test and training hardware assets. The combination of these elements replaces the legacy CRC and provides the Combined Force Air Component Commander with a capability to address both current and emerging air defense and sovereignty requirements. Fielding this improved capability will have an immediate impact on coalition force protection – protection of theater high value assets, convoy security (air cover), combat search and rescue, and close air support of troops in contact.

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.

Increase in FY 2007: Limited acquisition savings would occur due to bulk purchase of long-lead end-items as well as a concentration of contractor productivity.

Operational Savings: The operational 'footprint' would decrease, reducing the number of airmen in harm's way. Force protection assets would have the ability to be moved to other areas to accomplish other missions and increase the security for the entire theater. More missions could be simultaneously satisfied without increasing personnel because the system would not be as manpower intensive. Finally, because of an increased air surveillance capability, system reliability, and improved communications the likelihood of a fratricide incident or flight safety incident will decrease.

Additional Savings: Sustainment costs should decrease due to reduced operational demand on the currently deployed 30-year old CRC.

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, it does not interfere with the program execution..

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.

- FY 2005: 0 assets
- FY 2006: 0 assets
- FY 2007: 1 Battle Control Center  
2 Expeditionary Command and Control Center

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?

Congress has not added FY 2006 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 2007?

There is no reason the program could not execute the additional funds.

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

The funds were not in the budget request because the warfighter had not articulated the operational requirement. Coalition and other service force changes occurred, creating a force protection capability gap. The warfighter raised the issue after the FY07 APOM process had passed beyond the point where it could be influenced.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance (Reserves)  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: PE 54324F  
Potential Add: \$57.6M for Scott C-9C/C-40C Sustainment

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

Funds reserve manpower/sustainment for C-9C/C-40C; supports CLS for C-40C/C-9C.

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

Funds would pay for the manpower and O&M to operate 3 C-9Cs and 2 C-40Cs at Scott AFB. Third C-40C scheduled for FY 2008 delivery.

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-40C acquisition prime/CLS Boeing Derivative Airplane Programs, Seattle WA - 80%  
Interiors: Green Point Technologies, Everett WA - 20%  
Boeing Team has achieved great success fielding 3 C-40Cs in the ANG, 201<sup>st</sup> AS  
Andrews AFB, MA. Historic mission capability rates at 98%.

C-9C CLS: Engines Aerothrust, Miami, FL - 100%  
Combs Parts Supplies: L3 Vertex Meridian MS - 100%

Depot Contract: Lockheed Martin, Greenville SC - 100%

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 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?

No funds are currently budgeted in the FYDP. The Air Force intends to program funding in the FY08 POM.

	(\$M) FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	TOTAL
C-9/C-40 Funding	57.6					57.6

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 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.

ANG ORD 002-02, Global Airlift and Mission Support, dated 13 Feb 04, documents the requirements necessary to fulfill the OSA shortfall and comply with the congressional mark in FY05 Defense Appropriations Bill. This ORD defines the requirement to provide worldwide air transportation for the Executive Branch, Congressional Members/Delegations (CODEL), Department of Defense (DoD) officials, high-ranking U.S. and foreign dignitaries, and United States Air Force (USAF) inspection team travel. At any given time, world events may require the nation's military or civilian leaders to be dispatched to anywhere in the world on matters of national security. Mission requirements could dictate operation into civil as well as military airfields both during peace and war. High levels of physical and communications security are required to protect national interests. The Department of Defense (DoD) requires a fleet of intercontinental range jet aircraft to accomplish this mission.

This mission is currently being accomplished with C-32s, C-40Cs, C-37As, C-20Bs and C-38s stationed at Andrews AFB, MD. The addition of three C-40Cs will provide increased world-wide airlift support for CODELs and other senior ranking civilian and military leaders in peacetime and wartime.

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.

Since the costs in question 7 are for O&M and MILPERS, no changes would occur as a result of Congressional funding. No inflation, acquisition, or operational savings would be realized.

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 2004, FY 2005, and end of FY 2006 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is 3 C-40Cs and 3 C-9Cs for the 932 AW, Scott AFB IL. Assets on hand at the end of FY05 (3 C-9Cs), FY06 (3 C-9Cs), FY07 (3 C-9Cs/2 C-40Cs) total 83% of objective.

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?

The FY2006 Defense Bill included a Congressional Mark that funded the C-9C 932 AW operations and training/AW technicians (\$16.0M), wing personnel (\$4.7M). The funds have been released to HQ AFRC and the MILPERS and O&M sent to the 932 AW for execution.

15. Do you know of any reason that you could not or would not execute additional funds for this item in FY 2006?

No

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

AF retired all C-9A aircraft in FY04 PB. IL Delegation provided funding for sustainment of 3 C-9A/C for 932 AW at Scott AFB in FY04/05/06. AF/CV directed transfer of C-9Cs to AFRC in FY05 to allow C-9A retirements and bolster OSA support. Additional funds required to continue operations until FY08 POM. AF committed to funding operations in FY08 and out.

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

DATE: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 35895F  
Procurement Line Item: P-74  
Potential Add: \$6.9M for Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Land Mobile Radios (LMR) for 2008  
Narrowband (NTIA) Mandate

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

These funds will be used to purchase Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Land Mobile Radios (LMRs) to meet National Telecommunications & Information Administration (NTIA) nationwide mandate to convert to narrowband usage by 2008. NTIA mandated conversion of LMR communications from wideband (25 kHz channel spacing) to narrowband (12.5 kHz channel spacing) according to the following schedule:

- 162-174 MHz, January 1, 2005
- 138-150.8 MHz, January 1, 2008
- 406.1-420 MHz, January 1, 2008

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

Replace obsolete mission critical LMRs and LMR equipment. Funding supports CAP LMR requirements for Homeland Defense/Security requirements. CAP supports operations in all 50 states, Puerto Rico and District of Columbia (64,000 members) with 52 wings and 1,700 CAP units. LMRs will be used to support CAP's missions to include 95% of nation's inland search and rescue, aerial reconnaissance for homeland security, disaster-relief and damage assessment, transport for time-sensitive medical materials and counterdrug missions. CAP supports an average of 3,200 search and rescue missions, 2,700 sorties and 6,100 flying hours resulting in an annual saving of 50-100 lives each year. Counterdrug missions average 12,000 sorties and 16,000 flying hours.

Without requested funds to support LMR migration to narrowband, CAP operations will be significantly impacted. CAP depends on LMRs to command and control search and rescue operations to include deconfliction of airspace, dissemination of weather advisories to search teams, and coordination of other critical mission 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?

There are three primary acquisition sources for AF LMR procurement (Motorola, E.F. Johnson, and M/A Com). All contractors were selected based on their past

performance and ability to provide quality, cost-effective solutions in a competitively-bid process resulting in a ten year contract for DoD and federal agencies.

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. FY 2007 program funds have been identified.

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 funding is provided in any baseline for CAP LMR migration requirements.

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 additional funds are required to meet the NTIA CY08 mandate if successful in securing the full amount 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?

No additional funding in excess of the requested \$6.9M would be required to complete the requirements for CAP. The baseline funding identified in the FYDP is still needed for other AF LMR requirements. No additional funding for CAP LMR requirements would be pursued in the FY 2008 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. LMRs are commercial products and do not require R&D funding.

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. AF has documented requirements in the LMR Migration Plan. In addition, DEPSECDEF Memorandum, Subj: Policy on Land Mobile Radio (LMR) Systems, 1 August 2001 directed DoD Combatant Commanders, Services, and Agencies to comply with NTIA 2008 mandate. Our implementation strategy is structured to procure only spectrum efficient LMR systems meeting NTIA-narrowband standards and established migration priorities. Execution strategy includes using available government-screened vendors already in place to reduce cost and meet transition timeline.

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.

Cost savings are not a driver of this requirement. Existing equipment may not be used after NTIA-mandated migration dates leaving CAP without equipment necessary to execute their Search and Rescue and Homeland Defense/Security missions.

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. Competitive procurement vehicles are already in-place.

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.

This program migrates CAP LMR requirements to narrowband equipment and frequencies. It is not an "end-item" based procurement like a weapon system, aircraft engines, or X-Ray equipment.

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?

Partial CAP LMR infrastructure requirements were funded in FY 2004 for \$5.8M and FY 2005 for \$1.5M. All funds have been obligated by the responsible field activity.

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?

Insufficient Top Line in FY 2004/2005.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: PE 27431F  
Potential Add: \$1.1M for PACAF & USAFE Geospatial Information & Services (GI&S)

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

There are 13 Geospatial Product Library (GPL) servers in PACAF and 11 in USAFE. GPLs provide softcopy maps/charts, geographic data (e.g. elevation/terrain, magnetic anomalies, vertical obstructions, etc.), and data to support precise geo-coordinate derivation. At the flying squadron level, this information is used in mission planning for virtually every sortie flown by the Air Force. At the Theater level, this data is critical to the targeting process and development of the Air Tasking Order in the Air Operations Center.

Currently, there is no way to provide timely updates to these GPLs, nor any way to maintain visibility into their overall operational status. There is no sustainment funding to provide technical refresh or spares for these GPLs. The GPLs are the result of a National Geospatial Agency (NGA) directed standard format, which resulted in rapid fielding of these systems without long-term sustainment.

An addition of \$1,109K provides an enterprise solution for storing, accessing and disseminating digital geospatial/targeting data required by commanders, mission planners and aircrews in PACAF and USAFE to conduct aerospace operations; leveraging the latest in database, web and data visualization technology.

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

Specifically, funding will be used to fund hardware/software maintenance/systems administration and for GI&S systems throughout PACAF & USAFE. It will also fund travel, supplies, software licenses, and equipment purchases, to ensure warfighters receive geospatial data and information in near real-time.

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?

PACAF would utilize Ventura Technologies of Honolulu, HI for 50-100% of its requirements; USAFE would use General Dynamics, Chantilly, VA for the Hardware/Software Maintenance and System Administration support. Contractor performance is expected to be in keeping with requirements.

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 funding for this item is contained in the FY 2007 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 funding for this item is contained in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP.

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 additional funding would be 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?

Both PACAF and USAFE plan to include this requirement in the FY 2008-2013 POM submission. The additional cost is projected to remain at approximately the same level, with some increase for inflation, and will include funds to provide technical refresh/system replacement for 1/3 of the systems each year.

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 requirement is identified in the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) Transition Plan & Update (Aug 01/May 04), NGA Services Demarcation Transition Plan Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) (Nov 02), and the Air Force Transformation Plan (April 02). NOTE: Air Force Annual Planning and Programming Guidance (APPG) is the supporting directive for the MAJCOMs. The FY 2008 APPG will direct the Air Force Major Commands to program for this requirement under "Geospatial Transformation Plan" in the upcoming POM.

Today, dissemination of geospatial data is accomplished by mailing hard-drives containing worldwide updates to the GPL locations on a monthly basis. Once the units receive their hard-drives, they download the data to their GPL servers and then mail the hard-drives back. There is no current technical refresh or spares for these GPLs, nor is

there any way to maintain oversight and/or visibility of the operational “health” of these systems. The proposed program would provide automatic geospatial data updates to the GPLs in PACAF & USAFE. Technical refresh and spares would be provided on an annual basis. Additionally, the overall “health” of the systems could be ascertained and system administration provided via remote access.

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 should be cost savings to the USAF as shipping costs of hardcopy maps and disk drives would no longer apply. The gain to the USAF is a quantum improvement in timeliness of map updates because this process is done in near real time. This has critical safety of flight and important targeting implications. There are no other savings expected if this proposal is implemented.

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

This requirement is of high military value since maps and charts have critical safety-of-flight, force protection, and targeting implications.

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.

FY 2005: 24 alpha GPLs; no spares – 0%

FY 2006: 24 alpha GPLs; no spares – 0%

FY 2007: 8 bravo GPLs; 16 alpha GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 33%

FY 2007: 16 bravo GPLs; 8 alpha GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 66%

FY 2008: 24 bravo GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

FY 2009: 8 charlie GPLs; 16 bravo GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

FY 2010: 16 charlie GPLs; 8 bravo GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

FY 2011: 24 charlie GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

FY 2012: 8 delta GPLs; 16 charlie GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

FY 2013: 16 delta GPLs; 8 charlie GPLs + spares for all 24 systems – 100%

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?

\$842K for USAFE and \$0 for PACAF was appropriated in FY 2006. OSD released the funds, however USAFE had not received funding as 17 Jan 06 from HQ USAF. USAFE plans to obligate for GI&S equipment NLT 1 Jun 06. Hardware/software maintenance/system administration will be obligated NLT 15 Mar 06.

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 received NGA-directed standards for geospatial data without prior programming. The relatively sudden implementation prohibited smooth implementation: PACAF & USAFE received GPLs without sustainment funds or an update dissemination program in place. In the future, the sustainment portion will be programmed in the POM process, but it is unfunded in the current year.

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

DATE: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 04  
Program Element: 35114F  
Procurement Line Item: New  
Potential Add: \$30.0M for Combat Flight Inspection Aircraft

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

The Combat Flight Inspection (CFIN) aircraft support combat and peacetime navigational aid (NAVAID) flight inspection. Flight inspection ensures that NAVAIDs provide safe guidance for instrument flight, especially at night or adverse weather. CFIN aircraft are used extensively in Iraq and Afghanistan to certify NAVAIDS as safe. Six aircraft are required to support operational warplan tasking. Per a joint Air Force/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), the FAA owns and maintains CFIN aircraft and Air Force provides flight crews. The current CFIN aircraft is the C-29 Hawker which does not have the range and capacity to support worldwide deployments. This is a limiting factor in Air Force's ability to provide rapid and flexible support to mission tasking. Because of these operational limitations, the Air Force and FAA have initiated a program to replace the C-29 with the Bombardier Challenger aircraft. Per the joint Air Force/FAA MOA, the FAA will provide 5 new aircraft and the Air Force will provide one. The proposed plus-up is critical to successful transition to the new CFIN aircraft by 2007.

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

Additional funds will be used to procure one Bombardier Challenger aircraft. Funds would transfer to the FAA for exercise of a firm fixed price option on existing contract with Bombardier Aerospace Corporation, dated December 30, 2003.

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 will be Bombardier Inc. The FAA has already procured 4 Bombardier Challenger aircraft. Performance to date has been excellent in terms of product quality, cost, and schedule. Approximately 81% of all Challenger components are purchased in the United States (includes 32 states).

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 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?

None. Per FAA/Air Force MOA dated January 26, 2005, operation and maintenance (O&M) of the CFIN aircraft is responsibility of FAA and will be funded from the existing FAA CFIN line.

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 USAF/FAA requirements are contained in the Management Study of the Aircraft Fleet Replacement Strategy for Aviation System Standards, Appendix 11: Meeting the Requirements of the Combat/Contingency Flight Inspection Mission, dated February 15, 2002. The requirement exists for the Combat Flight Inspection aircraft to be able to deploy rapidly to any location in the world and be able to carry all of the required wartime fighting equipment.

Currently, the C-29 aircraft is capable of deploying to any location in the world. However, its lack of range requires numerous fuel stops, it is not capable of taking all the required wartime support equipment, and the aircraft loiter time can be limited based on usable operational bases.

The new aircraft is more flexible and can provide a more rapid response because it increases the range by over 1500 nautical miles, provides the required payload capability, and increases loiter time regardless of the operational bases used.

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.

As there are no funds to date for this in the FYDP. The FAA estimate is that complete transition from the C-29 to the Challenger aircraft will result in a FAA \$257.8M cost avoidance by the year 2025 and a breakeven by 2017 (FAA Business Case July 6, 2005).

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

Military value is assessed to be high because every aspect of a DoD operation will be affected without the capability of aircraft to operate to or from an airfield anytime, night or day, and in all weather conditions.

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

No. This will be a Single Source procurement to Bombardier Inc (reference approved FAA Single Source Rationale dated November 22, 2002).

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.

The inventory objective is a total of 6 replacement aircraft. The FAA has already procured 4 aircraft and plans to procure 1 additional aircraft in FY07. FY05 (67%), FY06 (67%), and FY07 (100%)\*.

\* - Assumes Air Force procures one aircraft in FY07 with additional funds and FAA procures last aircraft in FY07. Without additional funds, Air Force will continue to pursue funds in the FYDP.

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?

Congress did not add funds in FY06; however, the Senate Appropriations Committee provided language that noted the Air Force commitment in the AF/FAA Memorandum of Agreement to fund one Challenger aircraft and stated "The committee encourages the Department to fulfill its obligations regarding the Challenger 604 aircraft".

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

No. Funds can be obligated on existing FAA contract within 30 days of receipt.

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

While a high priority requirement, funding within the current FYDP was not possible when ranked against the funded higher priority programs.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: RDT&E

Budget Activity: 04

Program Element: PE 63854F

RDT&E Line Item: R-52

Potential Add: \$8.7M for System Integration and Test of new Wideband Gapfiller Satellite (WGS) and Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellites into Command and Control System – Consolidated (CCS-C).

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

CCS-C will provide standardized Telemetry, Tracking and Commanding (TT&C) operations for all AF MILSATCOM programs. These MILSATCOM systems deliver worldwide around-the-clock communication for all DoD tactical and strategic users. Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS) and Milstar have transitioned to CCS-C. AEHF and WGS mission unique software is under development.

\$8.7M funds system integration of new AEHF and WGS satellites into CCS-C. CCS-C is needed to launch AEHF #1. If CCS-C is not ready (integration not complete), AEHF #1 cannot launch, delaying critical communications capability to the warfighter. The AF will incur a bill of at least \$1M per day until it does launch. WGS will need CCS-C to transition WGS #1 from Boeing to Air Force operations after Boeing launch and checkout. Failure to take control of the satellite when Boeing is finished with checkout results in a \$1M per month cost to the AF.

Initial assumptions at time of CCS-C contract were that the complexity of AEHF and WGS integration would be comparable to that of DSCS and Milstar. The reality is these new systems are drastically more complex than anticipated. Systems development and integration costs have risen as a result.

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

The money will be used to complete the development and integration of the satellite control system with the new satellites (AEHF & WGS) to ensure the warfighter receives the increased communications capabilities without delay.

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 contractor segment is managed via Integral Systems Inc., (ISI) based in Lanham, Maryland with a Colorado Springs, CO office. Key subcontractors include SAIC (Maryland), CSC (Colorado), and SI International (Colorado). Personnel distribution is approximately 60% in Colorado Springs, CO and 40% Maryland. To date the contractor's performance has been excellent resulting in an Award Fee of 99% for the

most recent period. In addition the contract is performing under cost (CPI = 1.01) and on schedule (SPI = 1.00).

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?

CCS-C funding was included in the FY 2007 budget as an RDT&E line item, R-52, for the amount of \$6.659M. However, the program encountered unexpected satellite system complexity causing the amount of effort to increase significantly, driving an unfunded requirement of \$8.7M.

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.

(\$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Satellite Launch Support and Systems Engineering/Integration	6.659	5.186	5.728	5.809	6.286

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?

Subsequent satellite integration cost adjustments will be addressed in FY 2008 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?

To date, \$100.1M has been invested. DSCS and Milstar satellites have been fully integrated and are operational. WGS #1 is in development with a test completion schedule of May 07. AEHF #1 is in development with test completion date of Feb 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.

Documented communication requirements are in Joint Requirements Oversight Council approved AEHF and WGS requirements documents. The satellite platform C2 is required to launch AEHF, and operate both AEHF and WGS. Both systems provide 10-

100 times more communication capability to the warfighter than legacy DSCS and Milstar systems.

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.

If Congress funds this FY 2007 request, the program will avoid a slip of the AEHF #1 launch at a minimum cost of \$1M per day, and avoids a \$1M per month Boeing contract for WGS operations.

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 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. The request is for RDT&E funds.

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. No added funds from Congress above approved President's Budget.

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?

Higher priority AF programs and budget constraints

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: Air Force  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01, 02, 03, & 04  
Program Element: Multiple, all Contractor Logistic Support (CLS) PEs  
Potential Add: \$214.9M for Total Force Contractor Logistics Support

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

CLS is contractor logistics support for depot maintenance, sustaining engineering and spares support, design definition, operations, maintenance, and logistics requirements applicable to entire life cycle of the supported weapon system. The additional \$214.9M will minimize the risk associated with possible aircraft groundings and ensure the availability of contract field teams and spare parts (overhaul/repair).

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

CLS requires \$214.9 in additional funding to manage risk in the C-40, VC-25, C-21, KC-10 and C-130J sustainment programs.

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?

Due to the number of contractors involved across a variety of platforms and systems, this data is not readily available.

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?

	<b>FY07</b>
Active	\$3467.1M
ANG	\$302.8M
AFRC	\$44.6M
Total	\$3814.5M

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.

	<b>FY07</b>	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
Active	\$3467.1M	\$3841.0M	\$3771.8M	\$3938.8M	\$4019.6M
ANG	\$302.08M	\$263.9M	\$285.6M	\$298.3M	\$302.3M
AFRC	\$44.6M	\$51.2M	\$53.5M	\$65.2M	\$36.4M
Total	\$3814.5M	\$4156.1	\$4110.9M	\$4302.3M	\$4358.3M

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 additional funds would be 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?

CLS 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 execute CLS contracts 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 CLS requirements are reviewed and validated during the Logistics Support Review (LSR) process, covering all aspects of depot maintenance, 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 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. CLS underfunding impacts contract execution and affects mission readiness.

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?

The CLS program was appropriated at \$ 3338.9M. Funds have been released from OSD to SAF/FM and distributed to the MAJCOMs for obligation. As of 19 Jan 06, the Air Force is on track and has obligated \$1267M (38%) of the program. Funds will continue to be obligated as specified in the individual CLS contracts.

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

No. A significant portion of CLS funding assures that the fixed costs contracts are funded to ensure sustainment of the weapon systems.

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

The Air Force elected to accept some risk within CLS in FY07 with the intent to address any shortfall during execution.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance (O&M), Other Procurement, and Procurement of Ammunition

Budget Activity: 01 for O&M, 04 for Other Procurement, 02 for Procurement of Ammunition

Program Element: PE 27412F (O&M), 72833F (Other Procurement), & 27588F (Procurement of Ammunition)

Procurement Line Item: P-80 (Other Procurement) & P-16 (Procurement of Ammunition)

Potential Add: \$4.7M (\$.4M Procurement of Ammunition; \$.3M Other Procurement; \$4.0M O&M) Control & Reporting Center (CRC) Essential Equipment

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

Control and Reporting Center (CRC) is a ground-based Command and Control (C2) element of the Theater Air Control System (TACS). CRC is the Joint Force Air Component Commander's (JFACC's) ground-based C2 element conducting theater battle management taskings to include surveillance, identification, theater air defense, and Air Tasking Order execution. The Battle Control System – Mobile (BCS-M), is replacing CRC.

Proposed plus-up addresses shortfalls in the CRC O&M baseline. Shortfalls prevent CRC personnel from obtaining adequate equipment essential for combat operations.

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

Requested funding provides CRC personnel with wartime support items (M-4 & M-203s, NVGs, chemical warfare, life support, & security forces communication equipment, 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?

The material required is varied and will be obtained from the GSA schedule or through the normal USAF supply system.

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?

Funding for these items is not contained in the FY 2007 budget for O&M. Other Procurement for NVGs is \$19.3M in P-80. Munitions Procurement for M-4/M-203s is \$.11M in P-16.

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.

Funding for these items is not contained within the FY 2007 PB.

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 additional funding would be required in FY 2007.

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 funding request stems from a baseline disconnect for each active duty Control and Reporting Center (CRC) – 5 units. If wartime equipment shortfalls continue, we will POM for critical shortfalls such as these in the FY 2008 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 – No RDT&E funding is involved.

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.

These items are all contained on the various units’ list of approved equipment. The shortfall exists due to USAF force structure actions that eliminated a number of small radar units and consolidated their operations and personnel in larger Control and Reporting Centers. The CRCs assuming the increased manpower but did not have their baseline O&M funding adjusted accordingly. Units funded to maintain a wartime capability with 255 personnel, saw their ranks expand to well over 350 with no associated increase in baseline funding. Go-to-war equipment and supplies, therefore, remained underfunded. Initially this was not an issue as excess supplies from the closed units created a surplus but units are now experiencing extreme shortfalls. As CRCs are deeply involved in OIF, OEF, missions, the O&M shortfalls are now being exacerbated by wartime losses, high OPS Tempo. The CRCs, a low density/high demand (LD/HD) system, have been at MAX SURGE since 9/11.

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 start-up, acquisition, inflation or other savings are expected if proposal is implemented. The savings would be operational as it would properly equip and prepare personnel in a combat environment.

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, it does not interfere with the program execution.

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.

This request is for O&M and OPAF funding to provide a variety of combat support items and training. Specific end-item requirements vary based on unit and their place in the AEF rotation and employment down-range.

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?

Congress did not add FY 2006 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 2007?

There is no reason the program could not execute the additional funds.

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

Estimates were obtained by polling units for their wartime shortfalls and were not received until after the POM process had passed a point where they could influence it with this request.

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

Yes.

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Missile Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 35911F  
Procurement Line Item: P-23  
Potential Add: \$21M for Defense Support Program Launch Operations

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

The Defense Support Program (DSP) is a system of satellites in geostationary orbits, fixed and mobile ground processing stations, and a ground communications network. DSP's mission is to provide strategic and tactical missile warning of ballistic missile attack. The final satellite to launch, DSP-23, was planned for August 2005 on the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV). However the DSP-23 launch slipped from the second quarter of FY 2006 to no earlier than (NET) September 2006, and required additional funds in FY 2006 to continue the contractor support needed to launch DSP 23. This plus up in FY 2007 will fund an additional quarter of support to complete launch of DSP-23, early orbit testing and two months of contract close-out.

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

This plus-up will fund an additional quarter of support to complete launch of DSP-23, early orbit testing and two months of close-out costs required under the 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?

Northrop Grumman acquired the DSP sensor contractor (Aerojet), located in Azusa, CA in CY2001 and the DSP spacecraft contractor (TRW), located in Redondo Beach, CA in CY2002. Both divisions of Northrop Grumman are separate business sectors. FY 2005 was to be the last year for launch and operations services. However, this continuing launch slip has pushed their launch and operations services into FY 2006 and FY 2007. Both contractors 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?

\$38M, Other Procurement, P-23, is currently contained in FY 2007 for day-to-day DSP operations. The proposed add in FY 2007 will fund an additional quarter of support to complete launch of DSP-23, early orbit testing and two months of contract close-out.

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.

Funding for DSP is included in the FY 2007 PB as shown below:

DSP	PE #	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
3020	35911	138.207	105.418	42.147	38.391	33.822	34.779	36.122	36.983

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?

TBD. Current situation with AF-wide launch issues makes predicting any further funding requirements with any confidence nearly impossible.

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 over the programmed amount if DSP 23 launches during the last quarter of FY 2006. If DSP launch slips into FY 2007, additional funding would 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.

The Defense Support Program Operational Requirements Document was approved in November 1994. The Defense Support Program (DSP) is a system of satellites in geostationary orbits, fixed and mobile ground processing stations, and a ground communications network. DSP's mission is to provide strategic and tactical missile warning of ballistic missile attack. DSP-23 is the final satellite set to launch. The follow-on program to DSP is the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS).

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are anticipated. This is a fact-of-life additional expense due to the DSP-23 launch slip.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

DSP-23 is the final satellite set to launch. The follow-on program to DSP is the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High. Earliest launch date for SBIRS GEO 1 is FY 2009.

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?

Congress did not add funds to DSP over the President's Budget request.

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 continuing situation with the launch vehicle fleet did not cause this slip until after the AF had submitted the budget to OSD and OSD had approved the top-line.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

\$5M for Defense Support Program Optical Data Modernization

**Classified input provided under separate cover.**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF

Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance

Budget Activity: 01, 02, 03, 04

Program Element: Multiple; all Depot Purchase Equipment Maintenance (DPEM) PEs

Potential Add: \$220.4M for Total Force Depot Purchased Equipment Maintenance

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-Programmed Depot Maintenance (PDM) aircraft, engines, missiles, mission software, non-MSD exchangeables, other major end items, storage, and area base support and local manufacturing. MAJCOM's are funded by three separate O&M appropriations (Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, and Active Air Force).

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

The additional \$220.4M eliminates 20 aircraft deferrals and 28 engine deferrals across various platforms for FY06, maintaining deferred maintenance in other DPEM funded categories at a manageable level. Additionally, we would purchase depot maintenance for ICBMs and depot maintenance support for software.

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 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?

	<b>FY07</b>
Active	\$2315.4M
AFRC	\$373.3M
ANG	\$602.6M
Total	\$3291.3M

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.

	<b>FY07</b>	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
Active	\$2315.4M	\$2527.6M	\$2808.7M	\$3017.2M	\$3013.0M
AFRC	\$373.3M	\$395.6M	\$408.9M	\$384.8M	\$355.5M
ANG	\$602.6M	\$703.0M	\$855.2M	\$822.0M	\$880.5M
Total	\$3291.3M	\$3626.2M	\$4072.8M	\$4224.0M	\$4249.0M

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 additional in-house or other costs are 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?

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?

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.

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 AMARC). The additional \$220.4M 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 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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if proposal is implemented.

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 20 and 28 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 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?

The DPEM program was appropriated at \$3319.4M in FY 2006. Funds have been released from OSD to SAF/FM and distributed to the MAJCOMS for obligation. As of 17 Jan 06, the Air Force is on track and has obligated \$742M (~22%) of the program. Funds will continue to be obligated as assets are inducted into the depot repair facility.

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

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 FY 2006, 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 maintained DPEM funding at ~78% in order to contribute to GWOT and rising fuel bills. The Air Force elected to accept some risk within DPEM and will address any backlog issues during the FY 2008 POM.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: 27277F  
Potential Add: \$2.7M for CSAF Innovation Program Eagle Vision

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

Eagle Vision is a family of systems that provide commercial imagery to operational commanders/Homeland Defense for mission planning /rehearsal/ visualization and intelligence gathering purposes. The Eagle Vision concept emerged from Desert Storm's combat commander's operational demands for digital imagery to support air and carrier based missions.

The CSAF Innovation Program Eagle Vision is the only commercial satellite receive, processing, and exploitation capability in the DoD capable of deploying and supporting a wide range (broad area, multispectral, hyperspectral) of imagery intelligence requirements (IMINT) for an operational commander.

Proposed funds will be used to provide operating funds for South Carolina, Nevada, and Hawaii ANG Eagle Vision systems.

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

The three ANG units never received original O&M funding, and have been supported out-of-hide. O&M funds deployments, commercial imagery licensing fees, imagery costs, and maintenance contracts. Eagle Vision's 2005 deployments included Uganda, Thailand, Philippines, Hurricane Katrina support, and support to the Asian Tsunami relief effort. Imagery costs alone in FY05 were \$7.2M.

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?

Contractors include:

- EADS & Information, France. Prime contractor for collection segment of Eagle Vision
- General Dynamics, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Prime contractor for processing segment
- Space Imaging, Colorado. Vendor providing Satellite access
- ORBIMAGE, Virginia. Satellite access
- SPOT U.S., Virginia. Satellite access
- RADARSAT, Canada. Satellite access
- L3 COMM, Massachusetts. Antenna systems and maintenance

- Dynamics Research Corporation, Washington D.C. Contractor support to program office
- Mitre Corporation, Massachusetts. R&D
- Secure Information, San Antonio, TX

EADS Systems has a formal offset agreement with Northrop Grumman (New York, Florida) for purchase of the E-2C Hawkeye aircraft.

Contractors have provided high quality products that meet or exceed requirements within cost and schedule constraints.

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, however the AF intends to submit this as part of their FY 2008 program request to regularize support for these units

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?

No additional funding is 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?

This request does not drive a bill in future years, although the Air Force would like to maintain the same level of support.

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.

Combat Air Force (CAF) requirements for wide-area imagery are identified in CAF ORD 304-96-III-A, 23 Jul 1998, and US Air Forces Europe CONOPS, 22 Mar 99. Eagle Vision operates in accordance with the Joint Services Imagery Processing System

Program Management Directive 2379(1), 10 Apr 95, the ACC/IN Eagle Vision CONOPS, 13 Sep 2002, and an MOA between NGA and the USAF, 5 Jan 05.

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 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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are anticipated if the proposal is implemented.

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

Medium value. As commercial satellite imagery systems gain better resolution, Eagle Vision will become even more valuable for operational support.

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 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 2007?

No

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

Although an operating shortfall existed for the last couple of years, the programmed funding has been strained by the increased usage during Hurricanes Katrina/Rita relief operations and the Pakistan earthquake, both of which happened after the AF budget cycle was largely complete.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: BA 04  
Program Element: PE 31025F  
Potential Add: \$2.5M Geospatial Mapping Capability

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

The GeoBase program builds a net centric geospatial mapping capability into deliberate and contingency planning, force beddown and installation support processes. It gives planners and commanders unprecedented situational awareness and improves decision accuracy by smart mapping critical infrastructure, force protection, anti-terrorism, safety, and other mission information sets onto a single authoritative AF Portal accessible platform. Geographic Information System (GIS) software is the key technology enabler for this capability. This cutting edge software is refined and upgraded many times each year. Capability extensions are fielded, and 24/7 expert technical support enhances warfighter's ability to maximize this tool's effectiveness.

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

To centrally purchase annual software maintenance, which includes version upgrades, extension sets and 24/7 technical support for all AF users of the standard GIS software suite through an existing Blanket Purchase Agreement with Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI).

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?

Funding purchases software upgrades and technical support from a single vendor. Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) of Redlands, California holds 100% of the contract. ESRI currently employs 2900 skilled professionals. Contractor exceeds all government performance requirements.

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?

This item is not funded in the FY 2007 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.

The GeoBase program, which this item enables, is funded through the FYDP.

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
4.9M	5.5M	5.6M	5.7M	5.8M

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 additional funding would be required for this particular item.

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?

Software maintenance is an annual recurring O&M program cost. It would require \$2.5M per year through the FYDP. No funding for this particular item is budgeted in the current FYDP. HAF/ILEI will submit an initiative in the FY08 POM to fund this 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?

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.

From Expeditionary Site Mapping CONOPS, 1 Apr 2004, "...maps required by functional activities will be consolidated, areas for emergency use will be portrayed, and one installation map will be shared by all functional activities. In support of these Command and Control (C2) requirements, ESM provides: (1) a capability for maintaining global awareness of site capabilities to support mobility operations; and (2) an integrated planning capability to collect/update spatial data on airfield facilities from sites at necessary intervals prior to crisis development, fusing Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) with Agile Combat Support (ACS) in a horizontal and vertical integration strategy to provide rapid situational awareness".

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation, or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented.

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

High military value. Shortens force deployment planning time, improves operational effectiveness of force beddown, and integrates into current and future Command and Control & Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C2ISR) systems.

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 inventory objective. Not a procurement item.

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?

Congress did not add funds in FY 2006.

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

The current software license portfolio determines the annual maintenance costs. Additional funds above the requested upward adjustment cannot be applied to this particular item but could be used for other unfunded GeoBase program requirements.

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

Were not successful in getting this particular requirement into the FY 2006 POM. Funded prior year requirements with Congressional plus-ups. HAF/ILEI is pursuing FY 2006 O&M dollars through various channels to fund the FY 2006 requirement.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: 33141F  
Potential Add: \$22M Global Combat Support System (GCSS) AF

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

The primary responsibility of GCSS-AF is to provide a secure flow of timely, accurate and trusted combat support information, with the appropriate level of security, to any authorized process or user. GCSS-AF is our enterprise solution to meet the Combatant Commanders Asset Visibility requirements, and integrate the combat support information for the warfighter.

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

Additional funds will allow GCSS-AF to provide the required capacity, services and support for hosting the data warehouse, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERPs), and Enterprise Information Management (EIM). This includes new service development, enterprise architecture support, contractor operations and support personnel, COTS software maintenance, DISA hosting costs, and dedicated server support to forces overseas.

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 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. There are multiple subcontractors on the program in multiple locations. The list of locations and numbers of personnel are provided below.

<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

The GCSS-AF hardware is hosted in Montgomery, AL and Dayton, OH.

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?

Funding contained in the FY2007 budget is designated for the originally specified requirements. The proposed add addresses the additional requirements specified above.

Appropriation	Budget Line	\$M
Operations and Maintenance	SAG 12C	\$26.446
Requested Addition		\$22.000
Budget and Additional Funding		\$48.446

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.

Program	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FYDP
OPAF	11.8	12.3	10.6	10.8	11.0	56.5
RDT&E	19.9	20.8	20.9	21.2	21.1	103.9
O&M	26.5	28.3	31.3	32.3	32.7	151.1
FY07 PB	58.2	61.5	62.8	64.4	64.8	311.7

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?

The requested FY 2007 funding addresses the entire unfunded amount.

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?

FY 2008 and beyond unfunded requirements will be addressed during the POM 08 deliberations.

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 requested shortfall amount is in O&M but there is RDT&E budgeted for the program. From 2002 through 2006, the Air Force will have invested \$113M RDT&E and \$44M of OPAF into GCSS-AF. GCSS-AF is past IOC and with this additional funding will reach FOC by FY08. There is continual developmental testing of all new releases and OT&E is being planned in support of FOC determination.

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 COCOM 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 Family 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 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 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 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.

GCSS-AF has an AF Cost Analysis Agency-approved Economic Analysis with a calculated ROI of 650%. An average application will achieve a cost-avoidance of \$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 have a cost-avoidance over \$150M per year by migrating web content to the GCSS-AF Portal. There are also manpower reallocations made possible by eliminating IT infrastructure at dedicated system facilities. 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. Without GCSS-AF there is no means to provide timely, accurate, and trusted combat support information. In addition, GCSS-AF is the enabling infrastructure for the Operational Support Modernization Program and the AF's Enterprise Transition Plan.

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.

As a major IT hosting program, main equipment items are storage and processing servers. GCSS-AF & Defense Information Systems Agency are continually refining the number needed based on refreshment rates & capabilities of new commercial servers.

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?

Congress added \$1.7M of O&M funds in SAG 12C for "Enhanced Situational Awareness and Analysis for Geospatial Enterprise Infrastructure." GCSS-AF is the infrastructure for the AF Geobase program that provides installation mapping and visualization services for the entire AF. Funds have not yet been distributed due to the late approval of the FY06 Appropriations Bill.

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

No. Contracts are already in place.

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

Both FY06 and FY07 PB were constrained in rate of growth we could support in the overall Information Technology Budget. This requirement, although highly important, did not compete ahead of several major C2 & AF-wide network improvement initiatives.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Program: 02  
Program Element: PE 41214F  
Procurement Line Item: P-26  
Potential Add: \$8.2M for 9 Halvorsen loaders

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

The Halvorsen loader (formerly known as the Next Generation Small Loader (NGSL)) is a force enabler, loading/unloading aircraft and moving cargo to/from staging areas. It accommodates three pallets and handles loads up to 25,000 pounds. The Halvorsen handles all configurations of air cargo and interfaces with all military and commercial cargo aircraft. Unlike legacy 25K loaders, the Halvorsen has "high-reach" capability, allowing it to service wide-body aircraft (747, 767, KC-10, etc.). The Halvorsen is also C-130 transportable, enhancing the Air Force's ability to support rapid deployment to austere operating locations.

The potential add would procure an additional 9 Halvorsen loaders and associated program support.

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

Funds will be used to procure a total of 9 additional in FY 2007.

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?

FMC Airport Systems, a division of FMC Technologies, Inc., is the prime contractor for the Halvorsen Loader. FMC's performance on the program has been excellent. The Air Force considers the Halvorsen program a model acquisition program, with loader deliveries on schedule within program budget. Estimated Halvorsen contract value for 373 Loaders, FY00 through FY06, is \$217.3M. Major sub-contractor and additional personnel and contract information are listed below:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Associated Personnel</u>	<u>Percent of Contract</u>
FMC Airport Systems (Prime)	Orlando, FL	73	75%
Johnstown Welding and Fab	Johnstown, PA	32	10%
Static Engineering	Elizabeth, Australia	17	4%
Clover Hydraulics	Deerbrook, WI	7	3%
Diversified Machining Service	Perry, GA	9	3%
FMC Material Handling Sys	Tupelo, MS	24	2%
Florida Detroit Diesel-Allison	Tampa, FL	6	2%
Dana Corporation	Plymouth, IN	26	1%

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, program funding is currently in the FY 2007 budget under Other Procurement Air Force (OPAF), Vehicular Equipment, P-26 for \$8.2M. This potential add of \$8.2M would procure 9 additional loaders in FY 2007.

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.

Halvorsen procurement funding through the FYDP (\$M):

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12
8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

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?

Approximately \$103M will be needed across the FYDP to complete acquisition of the required Halvorsen loaders. Currently \$8.2M of this is budgeted in FY 2007. The Air Force plans to request additional funding to support Halvorsen procurement in the FY 2008 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 Halvorsen Operational Requirements Document (ORD) sets the initial number of Halvorsens needed by the Air Force at 264 loaders. The ORD also states that a subsequent buy of 248 would be required to replace additional 1960's vintage 25K loaders; this brings the total Halvorsen loader requirement to 512 loaders needed to meet global requirements. AMC is currently working with AF/XORD to increase the recognized quantity to 538. AMC also recognizes the Halvorsen will need to compete

favorably with other high priority AMC and Air Force programs to secure additional funding.

Additional new, reliable, high-reach capable Halvorsens would replace worn-out, limited-capability legacy loaders. Additionally, legacy 25Ks lack the “high-reach” capability needed to interface directly with wide-body aircraft (747, 767, KC-10, etc.).

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.

If Congress provides an additional \$8.2M in FY 2007, total acquisition savings would be approximately \$4.4M across the FYDP. No operational savings expected; however, there would be a savings with the larger quantity buy and an additional savings because of future year inflation avoidance.

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

The Halvorsen loader has high military value due to its versatility and ease of deployment. It serves as a critical link in the air transportation system, expediting cargo movement during wartime and peacetime operations. Halvorsen loaders continue to play a key role at austere locations round the world.

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.

Halvorsen inventory objective is 512 loaders, however, only 385 loaders are programmed to date. Adding 35 loaders in FY 2007 will bring the total to 408 loaders.

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Assets	348	373	408	443	478	512
%	68	73	79	87	93	100

Note – AMC is working with AF/XORD to increase the requirement from 512 to 538

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?

Proposed FY 2006 appropriation includes \$22.3M for the Halvorsen program.

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?

In the Air Force Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) process, the requirement for additional Halvorsens was out-prioritized by other high priority Air Mobility Command (AMC) and Air Force systems requirements.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 33133F  
Procurement Line Item: P-71  
Potential Add: \$5M in FY 2007 for High Frequency Ground Control Stations (HFGCS) Antennas

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 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 only continue to impact current operations but it also hinders the program's efforts to digitize HF for its more effective use. The program, in coordination with the Systems Program Office (SPO), is now trying to do a complete antenna replacement within the FY08-13 POM, but assistance in FY07 reduces the increasing risk of mission failure.

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

The HFGCS would spend the money to purchase 20 antennas in FY 2007. 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?

Leader Communications Inc is the prime contractor. Sub contracting effort is performed by US Tower. Antenna work will be performed on the most critical antennas in HFGCS first. The 14 stations exist in Alaska, California, Hawaii, Guam, Nebraska, Maryland, Puerto Rico, Japan, Diego Garcia, United Kingdom, Portugal, Ascension Islands, Iceland, and Italy. What has been the contractor(s) performance on this item to date, in terms of quality of product and cost/schedule? The program office is satisfied to date with contractor's performance.

4. Is funding for this item already contained in the FY 2007 budget?

Partly. The SPO has approximately \$1.25M for funding antennas in FY 2007. That will buy nominally four antennas in that year, depending on type of antenna and location needed.

5. Is funding for this project contained anywhere in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP?

Partly. The SPO has approximately \$1 M per year for funding antennas in FY 2008-2011. That will buy nominally three antennas each year, depending on type of antenna and location needed.

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?

An additional \$30.9M through FY 2008-2013 would be required to support all 14 stations. No additional funding is currently budgeted in the FYDP. Yes, AMC is consolidating all the antenna requirements and submitting them in the FY 2008-2013 POM.

8. If an R&D item, how much has been invested in this program to date?

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.

AMC ORD 002-86 II/III dated Mar 1996. "To meet its communications needs, the DoD must have radio systems capable of providing continuous, reliable communications services. These radio systems must support broad communications services ranging from single channel, simplex, nonsecure voice to multi-channel, nonsecure/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...."

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 HFGCS program provides the current HF capability through 14 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 nonsecure 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 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.

Additional funding would allow acceleration of the current funding plan. In addition, procurement of new antennas would reduce life cycle repair costs, day-to-day maintenance, and replacement of obsolete parts/components. Exact support costs are hard to estimate at this time. Due to many of the systems being past their lifecycles, many parts must be manufactured meaning greatly increased costs.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is to procure 20 HF antennas in FY 2007. 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 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?

No FY 2006 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 2007?

\$5M for 20 antennas can be executed in FY 2007, but the SPO feels this amount cannot be exceeded due to contract limitations.

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

Previously, antennas were base or MAJCOM responsibilities and did not compete well against other priorities. The current HFGCS program is not funded to overhaul the entire antenna inventory.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: RDT&E  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 64735F  
RDT&E Line Item: R-88  
Potential Add: \$7M for Joint Threat Emitter

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

The next generation Joint Threat Emitter (JTE) simulates enemy surface-to-air threat systems to provide realistic training for combat aircraft. It is a mobile system with remote emitter units. The additional funds accelerate the RDT&E effort for the advanced (double-digit) threats that the Air Force currently lacks capability to train against.

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

Funds will continue development of the advanced JTE which is in high demand by Joint users.

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: Modern Technologies Corporation, Ohio, Utah, and Georgia  
Sub to Prime: Northrop Grumman Amherst Systems, Buffalo New York (98% of development). The first development, a single-digit JTE, is scheduled for acceptance testing in May 2006. The overall program has slipped due to initial vendor inability to meet specifications on one key component of Threat Emitter Unit and several minor specifications unmet. This caused an increased development cost and delayed the production decision.

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?

\$2.2M RDT&E is funded in the FY 2007 PB; R-1, Line #88. Proposed \$7.0M RDT&E add fully funds the FY 2007 RDT&E effort.

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.

(\$M)	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
PE 64735F - Combat Training Range Equipment	2.2	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

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?

No additional funding is required. \$2.9M, which is already programmed in FY08, will complete this 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?

A total of \$21.95M R&D funds have been invested through FY06. JTE Kit 1 is scheduled for Site Acceptance Testing in May 06. The Milestone C decision is scheduled for April 06.

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.

ORD CAF 330-88-II-B JTE, 18 Jul 02

PMD 0111(35), 22 Aug 05

CAF MNS 330-88 Improved Combat Training Space, 22 Sep 99

From JTE ORD: Current systems are increasingly unsupportable and lack sufficient fidelity for proper training. JTE is required to be supportable, maintainable, transportable, and have correct fidelity to support all legacy and incoming aircraft and EW equipment. Spiral development will be used to meet future training needs.

Currently, no Air Force training threat emitter provides double-digit SAM threat representation at high fidelity, full power, with actual radar tracking capabilities. Aircrews train against low fidelity double-digit emitters that do not accurately replicate the actual threats. JTE development enables advanced aircraft (F-22A, JSF) to train against the most lethal threats known today.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented. This fills a training capability that currently does not exist.

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 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; RDT&E.

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?

Congress appropriated \$1M for Other Procurement for the JTE Townsend Range Complex. The funds have not yet been released.

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?

To remain within a constrained budget top-line, the Air Force had to judiciously allocate its resources.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 07  
Program Element: PE 27581  
Procurement Line Item: New  
Potential Add: \$16.9M for E-8 Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) Trainer

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

The ANG Wing has only one block 20 configured simulator. The second simulator was never funded for upgrade to block 20 during the retrofit of the E-8 JSTARS fleet to a block 20 configuration. Two simulators are required for IQT (Initial Qualification Training), MQT (Mission Qualification Training) and deployment spin-up training. Proposed plus-up upgrades the remaining E-8C mission crew trainer to a block 20 configuration.

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

Requested funding procures a second E-8C Block 20 configured mission crew trainer. The lack of the second trainer also highlights a single point failure in the training system. There is no organic additional/alternate simulator training capability available in the event the current mission trainer is down for extended periods of time. Additionally, with a single trainer, the Joint STARS wing is unable to conduct simultaneous Distributed Mission Operations (DMO) training and qualification training. These issues impact training and combat readiness.

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 is the Joint STARS system integrator. It is not known which company will build the second trainer, since the competitive bid process has not been initiated based on current funding.

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 funding has been identified for this project.



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 funding is identified in the FY 2007 PB or through the FYDP.

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 other funding would be required in FY 2007; however, sustainment funding would have to be identified by the ANG as part of their O&M bill.

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 procurement funding would be required for completion of the training system.

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. The initial mission crew trainer was provided as part of a Block upgrade to the aircraft. The second trainer will be a duplicate of the prior built training device.

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 2<sup>nd</sup> Mission Crew Trainer is a JROC approved Operational Requirements Document (ORD) Threshold requirement (28 Dec 2004). The ORD merely states. "two mission crew trainers (T) are required."

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 is no start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are being realized by funding this item. The impact of not having a second training device on which to train crews is operational, not a funding impact.

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.

The Joint STARS Wing has one operational mission crew trainer. The inventory objective is to have two trainers.

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?

No funds have been added for this program.

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

Any funding received to initiate this program could be executed.

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

This item has not previously been funded.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: Air Force  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 04  
Program Element: PE 78012F  
Potential Add: \$30.2 M for Logistics Information Technology (IT) Systems

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

This funding represents sustainment for IT systems that operate the core base level AF supply, maintenance, and logistics functions. They provide the only AF capability to plan, organize, track, deploy, sustain, re-supply, and reconstitute AF assets. These systems are essential for maintenance and transport of equipment, spares, fuels, cargo and munitions.

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

Funds will be used to keep current Logistics IT Systems operational until they are replaced by the Enterprise solution, Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS). Functional mapping has been completed to chart migration process and determine shutoff timeline for each system. Systems kept running by additional funding will include the Cargo Movement Operating System (CMOS), Fuels Automated Management System (FAMS), Weapons System Management Information System (WSMIS), Air Force Equipment Management System (AFEMS), Integrated Logistics Supply System (ILS-S), Online Vehicle Interactive Management System (OLVIMS), Combat Ammunition System (CAS), and Integrated Maintenance Data System (IMDS), among others.

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 majority of funding is sent through OSSG/FMA located at Gunter Annex to Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama. Considerable funding is also sent to DFSG/FMA at Wright Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio. Job losses in these areas will be considerable if systems are shut down, including reductions of civilian employees. Additional IT systems contractors come from many states and various districts.

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?

FY 2007 budgeted funds in the amount of \$49.7M in Operations and Maintenance funds is in OBAN 158F, RCCC ILIX26, PE 78012, EEIC 755.

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.

The funding levels through the FYDP decrease as systems are migrated to the ECSS. Migration begins in FY 2007, the first year the budget was to decrease substantially. System funding continues to decrease through the FYDP, as more systems are migrated to ECSS. In addition to impacts on warfighter support, lack of funding will jeopardize the migration schedule, adding cost to the AF.

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?

There is an additional unfunded requirement of \$13.6M the AF will source internally.

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?

Funds are provided for IT Systems and ECSS through the FYDP so no further requests will be made.

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 current requirement was validated as a budget item in the 2006 POM.

The Logistics IT Systems currently run from various servers, each with manpower, maintenance, and licenses paid on an individual, decentralized basis. ECSS will be run out of one centralized server located at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. It will use a Commercial-Off-The-Shelf Product, resulting in an overall decrease in manpower, licensing, maintenance and usage fees. Delay of migration will decrease and delay materiel savings.

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.

Operational savings of \$347M for ECSS when fielded are estimated for FY 2010 and FY 2011. Given sustainment shortfalls for existing systems migrating to ECSS, these savings will be delayed or fail to materialize. No other savings are expected.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Not a procurement item; no inventory objective.

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, contracts are fully executable.

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

Higher priority AF bills resulted in funding shortfalls for logistics IT systems.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 44011F  
Procurement Line Item: New  
Potential Add: \$9.8M for MC-130H and AC-130U Flight Data Recorders

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

MC-130H and AC-130U Flight Data Recorders provide a crash survivable solid state cockpit flight data recorder capability for recovery of flight and aircraft parameters during mishaps.

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

AFSOC MC-130H and AC-130U aircraft do not have mandated flight data recorders (FDR) installed, only voice recorders. All other AFSOC C-130 aircraft have been equipped. Funds would be used to procure and install FDR's to answer mishap prevention council and CDRUSSOCOM findings and concerns about the lack of mishap information.

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 contractor currently on contract. Installations accomplished by platform SPO's

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 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FDR is not a stand alone line item but incorporated as part of C-130 AMP. AMP is to provide an Integrated Cockpit Voice and Data Recorder (ICVDR) when fielded however AMP is not scheduled for completion until FY17.

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. Support personnel and equipment are already in place for existing similar FDRs.

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 or in the current FYDP. The AF has no 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.

C-130 AMP ORD, 26 Mar 99; AFSOC 1067; AFPD 63-14, AFI 63-1401, AFH 63-1402, PBD 705. No flight data recording is accomplished on MC-130H and AC-130U. Addition of the mandated recorders would allow for the dissemination of mishaps findings to crews to update tactics, training, and procedures to prevent future loss of life.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented.

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

High. Potential savings of life or limited equipment must be considered a 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.

Expect procurement of 37 FDRs for FY 2007.

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 2007?

No.

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

FDR's were originally part of C-130 AMP. AMP is projected to slip and final installations are not expected until FY17 which is too late to support mandates and safety concerns.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: PE 35940F  
Potential Add: \$6.9M for MSX/SBV Operations

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

Midcourse Space Experiment/Space-Based Visible (MSX/SVB) is the only sensor on the Space Surveillance Network that is not affected by weather, day/night or moon restrictions providing daily geostationary orbit collections on space objects of interest. It is also the only sensor that collects metric and space object identification (SOI) at the same time. MSX/SBV is known as the SOI workhorse, collecting 4361 tracks per month – supporting STRATCOM Joint Intelligence Center's mission and has been credited for discovering/recovering over 480 objects since its launch. Additional funding will continue operations in FY 2007.

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

Replacement system for MSX/SBV, Spaced Based Space Surveillance (SBSS), was initially scheduled for launch in FY 2006. MSX/SBV was to close out at that time. SBSS slipped to an FY 2009 launch creating a capability gap in STRATCOM's space situation awareness mission. Funding in FY 2007 will enable AFSPC to continue operating the only space-based space surveillance sensor in the inventory and ensure Massachusetts Institute of Technology/Lincoln Lab (MIT/LL) & John's Hopkins/Applied Physics Lab (JHU/APL) continue to support the Space-based Visible sensor and spacecraft until Space-Based Surveillance System (SBSS) pathfinder launch.

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?

John's Hopkins/Applied Physics Lab (JHU/APL), Baltimore, MD – Performs state of health on the MSX satellite platform  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology/Lincoln Lab (MIT/LL) Lexington, MASS – Maintains the Space Based Visible sensor mounted on MSX

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 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

FY 2006 - \$6.55M funded in FY06 only. No funding programmed FY 2007 through FYDP.

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?

When MSX/SBV completes operations, AF will need \$3M in FY 2008 to close out the program. No additional costs are budgeted in the current FYDP. The AF 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

MSX/SBV is the only space-based sensor on the Space Surveillance Network (SSN). The purpose of the SSN is to track, detect and find man-made objects in support of STRATCOM's SSA mission. The warfighter requirements are in STRATCOM's Capstone Requirement Document for Space Control.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if this proposal is implemented.

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. Replacement system for MSX/SBV, Spaced Based Space Surveillance (SBSS), was initially scheduled for launch in FY 2006. MSX/SBV was to close out at that time. SBSS slipped to an FY 2009 launch creating a capability gap in STRATCOM's space situation awareness mission.

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?

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?

Replacement system for MSX/SBV, Spaced Based Space Surveillance (SBSS), initially scheduled for launch in FY 2006. MSX/SBV was to close out at that time. SBSS slipped to a FY 2009 launch and left MSX/SBV with no funding to continue operations.

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: \$1,505M

MAJCOM	Base	State	Project	PA (\$000)	Cumulative
PACAF	Eielson	AK	Youth Center	\$10,100	\$10,100
PACAF	Eielson	AK	Consolidated Comm Facility	\$27,500	\$37,600
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Rpr Arctic Utilities and Infrastr, Ph 1/10	\$9,900	\$47,500
PACAF	Elmendorf	AK	Joint AF& Army PME Center	\$25,000	\$72,500
PACAF	Oliktok	AK	Construct New Access Roadway	\$2,500	\$75,000
AETC	Maxwell	AL	ADAL Air University Library	\$13,100	\$88,100
AFMC	Davis-Monthan	AZ	Consolidated Mission Support Center	\$7,200	\$95,300
ACC	Beale	CA	Repair Aircraft Maintenance Unit Facility	\$11,290	\$106,590
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Fitness Center	\$18,453	\$125,043
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Main Base Runway, Ph 3	\$35,000	\$160,043
AFMC	Edwards	CA	Distributed Network Telecommunications Facility	\$7,307	\$167,350
ANG	Fresno-Yosemite	CA	Replace Vehicle Maintenance Comple	\$5,000	\$172,350
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	AT/FP Consolidated Parking Area	\$14,140	\$186,490
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	Fitness Center Addition	\$5,486	\$191,976
AFSPC	Los Angeles	CA	Logistics Operations Resource Center	\$12,800	\$204,776
AMC	Travis	CA	Repair Electric & Runway 03R/21L	\$38,000	\$242,776
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	Replace 13th Street Bridge	\$18,500	\$261,276
AFSPC	Vandenberg	CA	30th Space Wing HQ Facility	\$19,200	\$280,476
AFSPC	Buckley	CO	Logistic Readiness Center	\$5,500	\$285,976
USAFA	USAFA	CO	Upgrade Academic Facility Ph IV B	\$6,379	\$292,355
11WG	Bolling	DC	Force Protection South Gate	\$4,349	\$296,704
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Security Forces Complex	\$7,100	\$303,804
AFMC	Eglin	FL	Fitness Center	\$18,100	\$321,904
AFSOC	Hurlburt Field	FL	Add to Visiting Quarters	\$2,633	\$324,537
AFSOC	Hurlburt Field	FL	ADAL USAF SOS Facility	\$2,800	\$327,337
AFSPC	Patrick	FL	Firing Range	\$9,800	\$337,137
AFMC	Santa Rosa Island	FL	Road Repairs (Hurricane Dennis)	\$61,360	\$398,497
AFMC	Santa Rosa Island	FL	Island Restoration (Hurricane Dennis)	\$54,860	\$453,357
AFMC	Santa Rosa Island	FL	Seawall Construction (Hurricane Dennis)	25155	\$478,512
AETC	Tyndall	FL	Repair Airfield Phase I	\$10,628	\$489,140
ACC	Robins	GA	54th Combat Communications Squadron Operations	\$8,400	\$497,540
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Construct Joint Mobility Processing Center	\$23,900	\$521,440
USAFE	Ramstein	GE	Const Aerospace Ground Equipment Maintenance Complex	\$9,900	\$531,340
PACAF	Andersen	GU	ISR/STF Realign Arc Light Boulevard	\$4,800	\$536,140
PACAF	Andersen	GU	Upgrd NW Field Infrastructure, Ph 2 of 2	\$9,600	\$545,740
PACAF	Hickam	HI	ADAL Fitness Center	\$22,000	\$567,740
PACAF	Hickam	HI	C-17 General Maintenance Hangar	\$33,000	\$600,740
PACAF	Hickam	HI	C-17 Aircraft Parking Pads	\$13,600	\$614,340
ANG	Fort Dodge ANG	IA	Vehicle Maintenance and Communications Training	5,500	\$619,840
ACC	Mt Home	ID	Visiting Quarters	\$17,200	\$637,040
AMC	Scott	IL	Security Forces Operations	\$10,400	\$647,440
USAFE	Aviano	IT	Expand North Ramp Ph I	\$2,000	\$649,440
PACAF	Kadena	JA	Upgrd Fire Protection Sys (Fighter Facilities)	\$14,600	\$664,040
ANG	Forbes MAP	KS	Replace Squadron Operations	9,500	\$673,540
ANG	Selfridge	MI	Fighter Alert Complex	\$22,000	\$695,540

AETC	Keesler	MS	Fire Crash Rescue Station	\$13,400	\$708,940
AFSPC	Malmstrom	MT	Upgrade Weapons Storage Area (Phase 1)	\$8,500	\$717,440
AFSOC	Pope	NC	Special Operations Facility	\$3,800	\$721,240
ACC	Seymour Johnson	NC	Consolidated Base Support Center	\$18,976	\$740,216
ACC	Minot	ND	Dormitory (144 RM)	\$15,300	\$755,516
ACC	Minot	ND	Air Traffic Control Complex	\$14,800	\$770,316
AFSPC	Minot	ND	Security Forces Operations Facility	\$12,200	\$782,516
ACC	Offutt	NE	Replace Dormitory (144 PN)	\$16,400	\$798,916
ACC	Offutt	NE	Consolidated Training Complex	\$21,000	\$819,916
AETC	McGuire	NJ	NCO PME Center	\$10,200	\$830,116
ANG	McGuire	NJ	Replace Base Civil Engineer Complex	7,400	\$837,516
AMC	McGuire	NJ	Munitions Storage Area	\$10,000	\$847,516
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Reconstruct/Widen Wyoming Road, Ph I	\$11,600	\$859,116
AFMC	Kirtland	NM	Space Vehicles Component Development Lab	\$14,600	\$873,716
ANG	Gabreski Airport	NY	Replace Pararescue Training Facility	13,400	\$887,116
AFMC	Wright Patterson	OH	Conversion for Advanced Power Research Laboratory	\$18,500	\$905,616
AETC	Altus	OK	BCE Complex Phase 3	\$4,000	\$909,616
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Upgrade Building 3001 Infrastructure, Ph 3	\$20,000	\$929,616
ACC	Tinker	OK	32nd Combat Communications Squadron Complex	\$8,200	\$937,816
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Substation 6 / Alter Distribution Lines	\$8,000	\$945,816
AFMC	Tinker	OK	Consolidated Software Support Facility	\$15,000	\$960,816
ANG	Klamath Falls IAP	OR	Replace Security Forces Facility	3,700	\$964,516
ANG	Portland IAP	OR	Upgrade Alert Crew Quarters	1500	\$966,016
ANG	Fort Indiantown Gap	PA	Replace RED HORSE Training Facility	6,000	\$972,016
AFRC	Pittsburgh	PA	Joint Services Lodging Facility	\$8,400	\$980,416
USAFE	Lajes Field	PO	Construct Satellite Fire Crash Station	\$4,000	\$984,416
USAFE	Lajes Field	PO	Repair Maintenance Hangar	\$16,800	\$1,001,216
AMC	Charleston	SC	Base Civil Engineer/Contracting Complex	\$19,600	\$1,020,816
ANG	McEntire ANGB	SC	Replace Operations and Training Complex	11,200	\$1,032,016
ACC	Shaw	SC	Replace Dormitory (144 PN)	\$15,600	\$1,047,616
AFMC	Arnold	TN	Consolidated Laboratory Complex	\$14,000	\$1,061,616
AFMC	Arnold	TN	Facility Maintenance Complex	\$18,500	\$1,080,116
ANG	Memphis IAP	TN	C-5 Final Infrastructure Support	6,175	\$1,086,291
USAFE	Incirlik	TU	Upgrade Base Main Road	\$3,408	\$1,089,699
USAFE	Incirlik	TU	Construct Consolidated Community Center	\$7,616	\$1,097,315
ACC	Dyess	TX	Consolidated Base Support Center	\$18,000	\$1,115,315
AETC	Goodfellow	TX	Fitness Center (ADAL)	\$10,800	\$1,126,115
AETC	Lackland	TX	Security Forces Operations Facility	\$16,000	\$1,142,115
AETC	Lackland	TX	Basic Exp Airman Skills Training (BEAST)	\$26,000	\$1,168,115
AETC	Randolph	TX	Fire Station	\$8,400	\$1,176,515
AETC	Sheppard	TX	Student Dormitory (300 RM)	\$30,000	\$1,206,515
AETC	Sheppard	TX	Student Dormitory (300 RM)	\$34,000	\$1,240,515
USAFE	RAF Lakenheath	UK	F-15C Squad Ops/AMU (493 FS)	\$14,285	\$1,254,800
USAFE	RAF Mildenhall	UK	Construct Mobility Processing Center	\$6,800	\$1,261,600
AFMC	Hill	UT	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	\$9,100	\$1,270,700
ACC	Langley	VA	ADAL Bethel Manor Chapel Facility	\$5,200	\$1,275,900
ILE	Various	VL	P&D	\$124,209	\$1,400,109
AETC	Fairchild	WA	Mission Support Complex	\$18,869	\$1,418,978
AMC	Fairchild	WA	Civil Engineer Complex	\$30,000	\$1,448,978
ANG	Martinsburg MAP	WV	C-5 Site Prep and Utilities	4,450	\$1,453,428

ANG	Martinsburg MAP	WV	C-5 Avionics and Shops Space	4,500	\$1,457,928
ANG	Martinsburg MAP	WV	C-5 Squadron Operations Facility	7300	\$1,465,228
AFSPC	FE Warren	WY	ADAL Missile Services Complex	\$6,600	\$1,471,828
AFSPC	FE Warren	WY	Renovate Historic Dormitory 236	\$7,800	\$1,479,628
AFSPC	FE Warren	WY	Upgrade Storm Drainage	\$10,000	\$1,489,628
CENTCOM	Al Udeid	QT	C-130 Maintenance Hangar	\$15,000	\$1,504,628

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Missile Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 11213F  
Procurement Line Item: P-11  
Potential Add: \$8.5M for Minuteman REACT Operator Input Devices Modernization

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

Intercontinental Ballistics Missile (ICBM) Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Console Operator Input Devices (OIDs) provide operations crews the means to rapidly retarget and/or rapidly execute Minuteman III (MMIII) missiles when directed by the President. OIDs currently consist of hardened trackballs, keyboards, and associated circuit cards. Original manufacturer no longer provides current system; keyboard failure rate is at 30/yr, and trackball failure rate is at 35/yr.

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

Funds procure modified commercial off the shelf OIDs and modifies the REACT Console at all Launch Control Centers (LCCs), Missile Procedures Trainers (MPTs) and test facilities to maintain warfighter capability. Mitigates failure rate impacts at test & training facilities in Aug 2006 and operational degrades starting in Apr 2009. FY 2007 funding supports 24-month lead-time for delivery and 12-month installation lead-time for maintenance personnel.

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: Northrop Grumman Mission Systems (30%)

Sub to Northrop Grumman: Lockheed Martin (70%)

As the ICBM Prime Contractor, Northrop Grumman has successfully procured developmental as well as COTS items for modification to meet the strict nuclear hardness standards required for ICBM materiel. This acquisition should be considered very low risk.

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?

The FY 2007 budget does not contain funds for this effort.

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?

No funds are currently budgeted 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.

The current requirement is documented in the Mission Need Statement (MNS) for Minuteman Life Extension, 30 Jan 96.

Current OIDs are aging and becoming irreparable. This effort will replace these items with modern OIDs having higher reliability and lower mean time to repair.

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.

A small amount of savings in maintenance costs will be realized, as the oldest and/or least reliable OIDs will be replaced first. No inflation, acquisition, or operational savings would be realized.

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 2004, FY 2005, and end of FY 2006 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Objective is 231 OID deliveries and will be purchased with the FY07 funding. Production requires a 24-month lead-time to deliver; no assets will be on-hand at the end of FY 2006.

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 has not added 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 2007?

No.

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

Higher priority AF programs.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 27589F  
Procurement Line Item: P-51  
Potential Add: \$14M for Missile Defense Security Upgrades

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

Intrusion detection technology is a wide-area coverage system (cameras, sensors, alarms) that will help detect and delay aggressors attempting to gain access to the Ground-based Midcourse Defense resources at Vandenberg AFB, as well as to purchase four armored vehicles. The upgrade meets Strategic Command Directive 538-2 and Air Force Instruction 31-101 requirement to provide specific security postings and protect Protection Level 1 assets to a specified level. Currently, there is no delay or early detection within the missile launch area.

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

The requested funding enables procurement and installation of delayed access and early detection technology for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense resources at Vandenberg AFB. These systems increase the effectiveness of the security response to alarms and removes requirement for additional security manpower.

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?

Commercial off the shelf equipment is available.

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 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?

None. The funding request is for the entire project.

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 requirement exists in Strategic Command Directive 538-2 to deter an attack and prevent damage, sabotage or destruction of Ground-based Midcourse Defense components through an integrated and robust physical security system.

The security requirement is not being met today and is currently under a waiver until the technology can be procured, installed and become operational. The cost savings comes as a cost avoidance in manpower. If the technology is not procured then additional manpower is required.

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.

The cost savings is a cost avoidance in additional manpower.

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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

These equipment items are commercial of the shelf; there is no inventory for these items.

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 2007?

No

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

Air Force waiver is in place pending viable alternative to remove additional manpower requirement from Vandenberg AFB.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: BA 02  
Program Element: PE 41300  
Potential Add: \$2.1M for Mobility Air Intelligence System (MAIS)

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

MAIS provides the backbone for Air Mobility Command's (AMC) Intelligence force supporting 115 Active, Reserve, and Air National Guard units. Based on increased requirements for operational support in FY05, this proposed plus-up of \$2.1M funds refresh maintenance and sustainment of AMC Intelligence Information System and intelligence databases which tie together support for the Global Mobility Air Operations Center, all CONUS bases, and 21 deployed locations worldwide. In FY05, 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. The MAIS enables 24/7 intelligence support for the Threat Working Group, mobility aircrew, deployed commanders, and the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC).

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

The additional money adds sustainment for wear and tear on AMC fielded intelligence systems supporting 9,000 air missions a month. Key to this is integrating the 60% of Guard and Reserve AMC units insure they operate with same intelligence information, equipment, and level of support as Active forces. Specifically, this funds deployable classified work stations/communication equipment and connectivity to AMC's centralized intelligence server. 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?

None.

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?

The existing PE funding in appropriation 30 is \$2.2M (as reflected in the FY 2007 budget) only covers half of the sustainment costs. AMC mission growth in FY 2005 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. The requested add in FY 2007 will bridge the gap that has developed. While this unfunded request does not cause a sustainment tail, AMC intends to include plus-ups in the FY 2008-2013 program build to be able to sustain this higher level of intelligence support for the increased operational requirements.

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.

The figures below show the total current program of record for a total of 11.6M across the FYDP. Funding is sufficient to cover approximately half of the newly increased requirements.

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
2.2M	2.3M	2.3M	2.4M	2.4M

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 additional resources in FY 2007 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 2008-2013 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 “validated” written requirements for AMC intelligence support are reflected in the AF Master Capabilities List, Global Mobility Concept of Operations, and Air Operations

Center Program Management Directive. The MAIS program funds AMC intelligence manpower, operations, and equipment, to include AMC's Intelligence Information Systems and intelligence databases.

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 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?

This request has high military value. This intelligence support is being provided directly to mobility aircrews and expeditionary forces flying daily into high-risk areas around the world; approximately 9000 missions a month.

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.

Inventory objective is to support 159 deployment increments with all functioning equipment and no system degradation. Current inventory maintenance & sustainment includes 1,850+ desktop and/or laptop computers, 118 Iridium phones, 440 secure telephones, 505 printers, 374 digital projectors, 216 digital cameras, 24 INMARSAT comms, a centralized server, and networking/data storage equipment.

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?

AMC's standard program line of \$1.9M in FY 2006 was approved without change. No additive Congressional marks were made. The funds are being obligated on schedule through the fiscal year with no lags.

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

For the past six years, MAIS has fully executed 100% of its programmed funds, and would be able to execute additional monies in FY 2007 without a problem due to the increased mission requirements that crystallized during FY 2005. Additional funds above the request would begin funding increased intelligence integration into the Tanker Airlift Control Center and support AMC's Integrated Flight Management improvements to provide more detailed flight following and threat assessments to enroute aircraft.

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

Equipment expenditures are based on life-cycle replacement rates of every three years. The toll that the current opstempo was taking on the intelligence infrastructure was not fully recognized until after the larger FY 2007 budget formulation process was largely complete.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 33140F  
Procurement Line Item: P-36  
Potential Add: \$25.2M in FY 2007 for Netcentric Communication Security (COMSEC)  
Buys

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

Air and Ground COMSEC directly supports the Air Force's global strike and defense in depth strategies. Support encompasses all critical functions related to component commodities that support the DOD's and AF's Need for Information Superiority and Agile Combat Support. Air and Ground COMSEC provides for critical mission warfighter secure voice and data communications in space, tactical, strategic and network applications for globally deployed cryptologic assets supporting the AF and DOD missions.

The equipment to be procured is In Line Network Encryptors (INE) and Link Encryptor Family (LEF). These items are used to protect classified and sensitive information for the warfighter. Both of these equipments are an AF Type 1 Crypto item.

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

The money would be spent to comply with NSA migration letters for the INE and LEF equipment. Reason for the migration is classified.

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?

INE – General Dynamics, Needham Heights, MA  
LEF – Mykotronx, Columbia, MD

Previous performance by these contractors on other types of equipment has been satisfactory on both quality and schedule.

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, funding for this migration had not been previously submitted.

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.

We have programmed significant funding for IA COMSEC Equipment Buys from FY08-11. Specific allocations between equipment types and requiring systems/platforms are still being determined.

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 additional costs for in house or other cost are 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?

Program	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FYDP
FY07 PB	11.9	11.9	14.5	13.5	13.6	65.4
Adjustment	25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Adjusted Program	37.1	11.9	14.5	13.5	13.6	90.6

COMSEC group will be submitting for additional funding in the FY08 POM. The funding levels above would still require an additional \$30-\$40M in FY14-15 to complete the acquisition.

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, NSA Migration Letter for INE and LEF replacement. In addition, requirement for INE’s is being driven by IPv6 compliancy.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented. Both of these items have long term contracts in place with set prices.

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

High military value – provides the warfighter mission critical secure voice and data communications in space, tactical, strategic and network applications for globally deployed cryptologic assets supporting AF and DoD 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 2005, FY 2006, and end of FY 2007 PB through the FYDP and the resultant percentage of inventory objective achieved by those times.

Inventory objective is addressed in question 7 answers. There is an adjustment quantity line. By the end of the FYDP there should be a 90% replacement of INEs and LEFs.

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?

No funds added

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 AF has made a significant investment in IA protection, training, and equipment upgrades for expansive variety of systems and platforms. However there is not sufficient TOA to meet all needs.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
 Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
 Budget Activity: 01  
 Program Element: 27697F  
 Potential Add: \$2.9M for AOC inputs in PACAF Exercises

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

Plus up is for computer simulation and supporting military-exercise operations services. These simulation services produce telephonic and text messages, and computer signal displays on communication, command-and-control, and intelligence systems in theater command posts, safely and economically mimicking a realistic wartime operating environment.

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

Organizational and system readiness of Air & Space Operations Centers (AOC) in Korea and Hawaii, in one exercise for each AOC for a total participation of two Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) exercises (UFL & TF). PACAF Warfighting Headquarters (WFHQ) will train, practice, and refine tactics, techniques and procedures of directing air operations in US Pacific Command's (USPACOM's) two principal OPLANs. These two annual OPLAN rehearsals are the main (and only) opportunities to test and verify that all the software in the AOC Weapon Systems (AN/USQ-163) is configured optimally.

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?

ULCHI FOCUS LENS (UFL) EXERCISE

Contractor Name	State	#Emp	%	Contract Performance
SAIC	HI	5	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
Booz-Allen Hamilton	VA	03	<1%	good, on cost & schedule
Northrop Grumman Info Tech	FL	27	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
Northrop Grumman Mission Sys	FL	03	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
Gestalt LLC	PA	01	<3%	good, on cost & schedule
Cubic Defense Applications	WA	02	<1%	good, on cost & schedule
CollaborX	CO	01	100	good, on cost & schedule
Alion Science & Tech (Titan)	VA	01	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
SAIC	AL	02	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
WESTAR Aerospace	AL	01	<3%	good, on cost & schedule
SDI	AL	03	<5%	good, on cost & schedule

TERMINAL FURY (TF) EXERCISE

Contractor Name	State	#Emp	%	Contract Performance
SAIC	AL	02	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
WESTAR Aerospace	AL	04	<3%	good, on cost & schedule
Systems Dynamics International	AL	01	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
Northrop Grumman Info Tech	FL	37	<5%	good, on cost & schedule
Northrop Grumman Mission Sys	FL	23	<5%	good, on cost & schedule

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?

This item is only partially funded at 0.9M in O&M in the FY 2007 budget. The proposed add is the minimum necessary to complete creation of the simulated exercise environment. The current FY 2007 budget is insufficient to produce simulated wartime environments for either of the two exercises. The amount funded in the FYDP is only sufficient to permit exercising to a level of fidelity and training capability marginally suitable for Gulf War #1.

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.

This project is partially funded in FY 2007 through the FYDP.

Budgeted in the current FYDP:

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
0.6M	0.9M	0.8M	0.7M	0.7M

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 additional funds are necessary for in-house performance nor are there other costs not included in the amount under consideration in order to provide the services described.

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 were to provide this requested additional \$2.9M in FY 2007, the additional required in subsequent fiscal years (08-11) is \$9.735M.

Additional funding required through the FYDP if Congress funds issue:

FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
2.9M	2.3M	2.4M	2.5M	2.5M

Yes, PACAF plans to pursue additional funding of this item in the FY08-13 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?

Not applicable because 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.

General Leon LaPorte, Commander, US Forces Korea and Commander, Republic Of Korea-United States Combined Forces Command (CFC) stated thr requirement for the UFL exercise simulation environment in testimony given to the House Armed Services Committee, 31 March 2004. "ULCHI FOCUS LENS (UFL) is a simulation-driven command post exercise focused on joint and combined effects-based operations, and sustaining command and control, logistics, and dominant maneuver skill sets. These exercises, supplemented by subordinate command training programs, ensure that the Combined Forces Command remains ready to fight tonight and win decisively."

Commander, US Pacific Command, in his annual written Command Training Plan, ranks the requirement for the TERMINAL FURY (TF) exercise simulation environment the number-one priority exercise.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are anticipated. This item is annually recurring to maintain and improve readiness.

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

High military value: Readiness by rehearsal and validation of two military OPLANS.

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

N/A. Not equipment.

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. No inventory involved.

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?

Congress did not add FY 2006 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 2007?

No.

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

Funding was diverted to higher AF priorities.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 04  
Program Element: 78012F  
Potential Add: \$1.7M for enterprise data collection environment, Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) hardware, installation and training

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

The proposed funding will provide the development of an enterprise data collection (EDC) environment for managing the RFID hardware, acquisition and installation of passive RFID hardware, and training. This funding would allow the Air Force to begin the OSD directed implementation.

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

The proposed funding will provide the prototyping of an enterprise data collection (EDC) environment for managing the RFID hardware, acquisition and installation of passive RFID hardware, and training to support operation at a pilot location. The implementation of RFID to collect data in the supply chain will enable hands free data collection as items pass through selected portals during transportation and supply operations. This hands free collection of data will enable more accurate data capture, decrease data verification and maintenance, and reduce the data collection/maintenance workload on the workforce (warfighter).

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 to prove the EDC concept is due to be awarded in February 2006. A contract to begin pilot implementation could be awarded within 3 months of funding the pilot effort.

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?

Funding is not included for this passive RFID in the FY 2007 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.

Funding is not included for this passive RFID in the FY 2007 PB through the FYDP.  
Funding is being included in the FY 2008 POM.



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 additional funding would be required to support the pilot implementation

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?

\$66.1M would be required. None of this requirement is in the current FYDP. The \$66.1M requirement is being pursued in the FY 2008 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 R&D effort. However, \$525K is being invested in the EDC proof of concept demonstration.

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.

Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition Technology and Logistics) ADUSD(AT&L), Mr Michael Wynn, issued "Radio Frequency Identification Policy" directing a phased implementation of passive RFID in the DoD supply chain. The implementation of RFID to collect data in the supply chain will enable hands free data collection as items pass through selected portals during transportation and supply operations. This hands free collection of data will enable more accurate data capture, decrease data verification and maintenance, and reduce the data collection/maintenance workload on the workforce (warfighter).

Data on supply chain transactions is currently collected by hand scribing data, typing the information into computer terminals or utilizing barcode scanners.

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.

Commercial industry and other service components have shown a positive Return On Investment (ROI) through the implementation of RFID in their supply chain business processes. This funding represents the initial proof-of-concept. No other savings are expected is the proposal is implemented.

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 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?

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?

New OSD requirement. This requirement is being addressed in FY 2008 POM

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 and Technology - \$40.0M

Title of Effort	PE	BPAC	FY07 UPL Amount \$M
Hypersonics	61102F	2307	3.0
Integrated Cyber/Info Warfare	61102F	2311	3.0
Bio-X	62102F	4348	1.1
Innovative Thermal Protection Systems for Vehicles	62102F	4347	1.6
Laser Shock Peening	62201F	2404	3.0
Tissue Regeneration and Restorative Bio-Engineering	62202F	7757	2.5
Adaptive Cycle Engine	62203F	3066	2.5
Persistent Staring All-Wx, Multi-Band RF Sensor (Gotcha)	62204F	6095	2.8
On-Board Image Processing	62601F	8809	0.5
TacSat Data Dissemination	62601F	8809	0.5
Polarization Data Collect	62601F	4846	0.3
MAX POWER	62605F	4867	1.9
In-Flight Aero-Optic High Bandwidth Wavefront Sensor Experiment and TIRU	62605F	4866	0.7
Network Management and Awareness	62702F	4519	0.8
Quantum Communication Technology	62702F	4519	1.0
Validate Life Management Tools Using Fielded Components	63112F	3153	1.2
Persistent Staring All-Wx, Multi-Band RF Sensor (Gotcha)	63203F	69DF	1.3
Adaptive Cycle Engine	63216F	4921	2.1
Non-Traditional Hydrocarbon Based Jet Fuels	63216F	2480	2.3
Bio-Assessment for Radio Frequency Weaponry	63231F	5020	0.5
Affordable Laser IRCM Survivability System (ALISS)	63270F	691X	0.6
Miniature RF Transmitter/Signal Processor	63401F	2181	0.5
Active Defense	63401F	4400	0.5
Long Wave Infrared Radiometer and Visible Wavelength Charge Coupled Device Photometer optimized for the 1.2m	63444F	4868	0.2
Survivable Thermostable Robust Intelligent Fuze (STRIFE)	63601F	670A	2.4
Integrated High Energy Laser Testbed Thermal Control System	63605F	3647	1.0
DETCM ATD Extension	63605F	3151	0.2
FASTER	63789F	4072	1.1
RAPTOR	63789F	4072	0.9

**TOTAL: 40.0**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
INFORMATION PAPER

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Operations and Maintenance  
Budget Activity: 01  
Program Element: 35158F  
Potential Add: \$4.6M for Joint Tactical Terminals (JTT)

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

JTT provides airborne assets access (both receive and transmit capability) to Integrated Broadcast Service (IBS) battlefield threat and Blue Force disposition data. Funding would allow the Air Force to upgrade 103 JTTs with upgraded digital COMSEC capability, enabling AF intelligence sensor platforms to disseminate critical battlefield intelligence data via IBS near-real-time to forces engaged in the fight

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

The proposed funding is to upgrade 103 JTTs with upgraded digital COMSEC capability. JTT must be modernized by FY 2009 deadline to conform to DoD INFOSEC Authority's IBS crypto algorithm upgrade.

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 (St. Petersburg, FL) is the contractor of record for 100% of this effort. Raytheon's warranty performance on the 103 JTTs in the AF inventory has been acceptable.

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, funding is not already contained in the FY 2007 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, funding for this project is not contained in the FY 2007 program through the FYDP.

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. This upgrade effort drives no additional bills.

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 is not required in subsequent fiscal 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.

JTT requirements are codified in the JTT ORD, March 2005. JTT provides capability for Air Force ISR weapon systems (RC-130, RC-135, AF DCGS) to inject critical battlefield threat and Blue Force data directly into the Integrated Broadcast Service (IBS) for dissemination to a variety of airborne and ground combat operations, mission planners, and decision makers. Without JTT terminal upgrades, AF IBS data producers will not have compatible crypto standards, and will be unable to disseminate critical battlefield intelligence to combat warfighters.

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 start-up, acquisition, operational, inflation or other savings are expected if the proposal is implemented.

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

High military value. JTT upgrade meets DoD INFOSEC Authority's IBS crypto algorithm upgrade requirement.

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.

This effort upgrades/modernizes the current inventory of 103 joint tactical terminals in accordance with DoD standards. Currently, none of the inventory has been upgraded/modernized.

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. FY2006 funds were not added, as the new DoD standard was not promulgated after the AF budget build.

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?

JTT upgrade was not required until the DoD INFOSEC Authority mandated IBS crypto algorithm modernization due to security concerns in 2005.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Other Procurement  
Budget Activity: 03  
Program Element: PE 35909F & 35912F  
Procurement Line Item: P-67  
Potential Add: \$55.8M for Upgraded Early Warning Radar (UEWR) System  
Programming Agency (SPA)

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

Our current Early Warning Radar (EWR) systems are supported by a SPA consisting of multiple strings of computers and peripherals to emulate each unique radar operating system. The UEWR SPA will provide a suite of equipment utilized to maintain, modify, and test software and hardware prior to integration on the operational systems to reduce operational risk, dramatically reduce the downtime required of operational systems to test uncertified software and hardware, provides a total test environment for new hardware and software, and support configuration control of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) hardware.

Configuration control of COTS hardware raises concern over maintaining the Integrated Tactical Warning and Attack Assessment (ITW&AA) certified baseline for the UEWR system since the UEWR modernization is established with 80% COTS equipment. COTS equipment can receive what vendors consider a form, fit and function upgrade without any notification to the purchaser that a change was made to the COTS equipment (i.e. vendors can no longer buy 386 processors so they begin installing 486 processors). Lack of configuration control can produce undesired results for the UEWR mission. The Air Force, utilizing the SPA, will be required to conduct a function test on all COTS equipment prior to distribution to the operational sites to validate and maintain ITW&AA equipment certification.

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

Funding will be used to create a UEWR SPA (as exists today to support EWR) for hardware and software development, analysis, testing, and configuration control. New equipment will emulate the UEWR radar, establish required licenses, and integrate the equipment into a fully functioning development and test capability.

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 Industries provides radar support services for our System Program Office (SPO), and manages and operates the SPA facility. However, the actual equipment purchase will be accomplished by our government acquisition agency, with integration and operations falling to ITT Industries.

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 2007 PB through the FYDP? If so, provide a breakdown of the funding contained in the FYDP.

\$10.9M was programmed for SPA development in FY 2008.

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?

\$10.9M would be required in FY 2008 and is currently programmed for SPA development in FY 2008; no additional funding is 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. Funds the creation of a UEWR SPA (as exists today supporting PAVE PAWS and BMEWS) for hardware and software development, analysis, testing, and configuration control.



Our current PAVE PAWS and BMEWS Early Warning Radar (EWR) systems are supported by a SPA consisting of multiple strings of computers and peripherals to emulate each unique operating system. The UEWR SPA will provide a suite of equipment utilized to maintain, modify, and test software and hardware prior to integration on the operational systems to reduce operational risk, and dramatically reduce the downtime required of operational systems to test uncertified software and hardware. The SPA will provide a total test environment for new hardware and software, and support configuration control of COTS hardware.

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.

UEWR established a second hardware and software baseline for the PAVE PAWS and BMEWS radars, which drive unfunded sustainment requirements. The Beale UEWR will transition from contractor to AFSPC for sustainment in FY09. Missile Defense Agency (MDA) will not deliver a SPA to sustain the UEWR hardware and software, as exists for the legacy EWR systems.

Significant cost increases for UEWR software and hardware sustainment are projected without a SPA. Performing software and hardware sustainment at each geographically dispersed operating location will cause a significant increase of overtime and TDY costs. In addition, sustainment personnel will have to wait for approved downtime to the operational equipment, approval of which is dependent on operational requirements and ITW&AA system availability. In addition, increased downtime for operational equipment used to develop new software and hardware will reduce overall operational availability for ITW+AA systems.

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

Very high military value.

Unacceptable Missile Defense, Missile Warning, and Space Surveillance mission downtime will result from no SPA to support UEWR hardware and software development, analysis, testing, and configuration control. Based on past experience with the Perimeter Acquisition Radar Characterization System (PARCS) radar, approximately 500 additional hours annually, or 60% of all downtime, will be required for systems operating without SPA support. Without a SPA, each site will have to validate COTS functionality on the operational system. By using the operational system for equipment checkout, you directly increase the operational risk of downtime.

Increased mission risk associated with loading unbonded, developmental, software and hardware on operational missile defense and ITW&AA systems. Past experience has proven that loading developmental hardware and software on an operational system can result in the generation of false missile warning reports.

The lack of SPA will delay in implementing emergency hardware and software repair actions to ITW&AA and missile defense radars. Emergency repairs are required to be accomplished within 24 hours of identification. Currently, a SPA supported by a cadre of technical experts support emergency repair actions. Without a SPA it would likely take 24 hours just to get our technical experts to the geographically separated operating locations.

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.

The UEWR SPA will provide a suite of equipment utilized to emulate the operational UEWRs to maintain, modify, and test software and hardware prior to integration on the operational systems to reduce operational risk, dramatically reduce the downtime required of operational systems to test uncertified software and hardware, provides a total test environment for new hardware and software, and support configuration control of COTS hardware.

FY05: Zero

FY06: Zero

FY07-11: \$10.9M was received in FY08 for SPA development. This will be used to establish a rudimentary anomaly resolution capability without additional funding.

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 2007?

No.

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

MDA will not deliver a System Programming Agency (SPA) to sustain the UEWR hardware and software, as exists for the legacy PAVE PAWS and BMEWS systems today.

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

Date: 23 FEB 06

Service/Agency: USAF  
Appropriation: Aircraft Procurement  
Budget Activity: 05  
Program Element: PE 41314F  
Procurement Line Item: P-51  
Potential Add: \$14.4M for VC-25 Lower Lobe Cooling Modification

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

In the post-9/11 environment, the President has been and will continue to be required to travel on short notice to worldwide destinations to meet with other Heads of State and to encourage our troops wherever they are deployed. All mission essential equipment must be operational to support these missions. Heat problems in the Forward Lower Lobe have caused critical systems to shut down during flight. These system shut downs place the President at risk. Solution to this problem is to add a cooling system that will duct ambient air to critical racks at the same time it is removing hot air from the racks and exhausting it overboard.

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

Place Boeing on contract to engineer and install lower lobe cooling 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?

The Boeing Corporation based in Wichita, KS would be the prime contractor for engineering and installation of the modification. Boeing is currently prime contractor for all heavy maintenance on the VC-25. Boeing has delivered outstanding quality products to date at an acceptable cost/schedule performance.

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, this item is not in the FY 2007 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, this item is not contained in the FYDP.

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 additional funding would be 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?

Initial funding would support engineering and kit buys with additional funding required in the out years for installation.

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, the AMC Configuration Review Board (CRB) through an AFTO Form 1067 aircraft modification request, AMC 02-147 Lower Lobe Cooling, validated the requirement.

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.

The sooner this effort starts the better. Excessive heat in the lower lobe is causing equipment shutdowns and failures. Component life expectancy is shortened due to the excessive heat and constant cycling.

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

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

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

No impact.

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.

Inventory objective is to have sufficient spares available for this new system.

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?

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 2007?

Funding would be executed in FY 2007.

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

Item has been an unfunded requirement since FY 2002, but there was no solution until FY 2005.

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

Yes.