

***UNITED STATES
AIR FORCE
WORKING CAPITAL
FUND***



U.S. AIR FORCE

***Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget
Estimates
February 2002
UNCLASSIFIED***

**AIR FORCE WORKING CAPITAL FUND
TABLE OF CONTENTS
U.S. AIR FORCE OVERVIEW
OPERATING/CAPITAL BUDGET**

AFWCF SUMMARY.....	1
OPERATING BUDGET.....	9
SUPPLY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY GROUP	10
DEPOT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY	29
INFORMATION SERVICES ACTIVITY GROUP.....	40
TRANSPORTATION WORKING CAPITAL FUND.....	49
CAPITAL BUDGET	69

DISTRIBUTION LIST

House Appropriation Committee	4
Senate Appropriation Committee	4
House Armed Services Committee	10
Senate Armed Services Committee	5
Congressional Budget Office	3
Library of Congress	1
General Accounting Office	3
Office of Management and Budget	2

***UNITED STATES
AIR FORCE
WORKING CAPITAL
FUND***



U.S. AIR FORCE

***FY 2003
Summary Budget***

Air Force Working Capital Fund FY 2003 Budget Estimates

The FY 2003 Air Force Working Capital Funds (AFWCF) Budget Estimate submission reflects current execution plans and a number of Air Force initiatives to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our activities while continuing to meet the needs of the warfighting forces. Successful WCF operations are essential to the Air Force's Global Engagement mission and our transition to an Air Expeditionary Force. To this end, we have incorporated changes in business management practices and some known impacts of base closures into the submission.

Activity Group Overview:

The AFWCF conducts business in three primary areas: the Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG), the Depot Maintenance Activity Group (DMAG) and the Information Services Activity Group (ISAG). The Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF), for which the Air Force assumed cash management responsibility in FY 1998, is part of this submission, although the Air Force does not have day-to-day management responsibility for TWCF operations.

Air Force Core Competencies:

The AFWCF activities support all the Air Force core competencies: *Air and Space Superiority, Global Attack, Precision Engagement, Rapid Global Mobility, Information Superiority and Agile Combat Support*. These core competencies are fundamental to the "Pathway to the 21st Century Air Force." The working capital funds provide key maintenance, transportation and support services and weapon system spare parts and supplies. The working capital funds are essential to the readiness and sustainability of our air and space assets and our ability to deploy forces around the globe and across any theater in support of the National Military Strategy. Maintenance depots provide the equipment, skills and repair services necessary to keep forces operational worldwide. Supply management activities procure and manage inventories of consumable and repairable spare parts maintaining all elements of the force structure mission ready. Transportation provides the worldwide mobility element of the global engagement vision. Activities that provide information services make it possible to operate and improve data collection and management systems essential to warfighting and support activities. Directly or indirectly, working capital fund activities provide warfighters the key services needed to meet mission capability standards.

Air Force Initiatives:

The Air Force has taken significant steps to fix spare parts shortages. Spare parts funding problems in the 1990s were a major contributor to the readiness decline over the past several years. Fiscal Year (FY) 2003, like FYs 2000 through 2002, fully funds "depot level repairable" validated requirements used by operating units to "buy" spare parts from DoD and Air Force sources. Congress, DoD and Air Force supported spare parts by providing additional funding for selected problems from excessive engine wear to post-contingency reconstitutions (e.g. Kosovo). Where underfunding was the issue in the late 90's, the issue for the new millenium is the effect of aging on our weapon systems and their components. As the demands placed on our aging airframes continue at peak levels, the need to more frequently replace components grows, as does the scope of work to continue to repair assets beyond their intended useful life. In support of both the FY2002 and FY2003 budgets, the Air Force made great strides in analyzing the 'cost of aging' on spare parts support and increased funding to allow the Air Force to maintain readiness while accommodating these increased costs. We are also continuing our efforts to bring the Direct Support Objective (DSO) related to our fighter readiness spares packages from 63% to 83%. This will enhance the capability of the RSPs to keep deployed squadrons flying at higher readiness rates until the stateside supply system can begin resupply efforts. Airlift RSPs are being enhanced during FY02 and FY03 as well in consideration of the diverse missions our airlifters support and the myriad of locations from which they can operate. All of these initiatives are expected to increase peacetime and contingency customer support.

In Depot Maintenance, the Air Force initiated a Depot Maintenance Review Team in FY2001 to evaluate all aspects of the depot maintenance enterprise, identify problem areas, isolate root causes, develop solutions and prepare implementation plans to rectify those problems. The team maintains members from the Headquarters, Secretariat, Major Command and Air Logistics Centers and has the full, uncompromised support of both the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The team has proposed recommendations for the improved efficiency and cost effectiveness of the depots in each of the seven areas evaluated: workload management, financial management, material support, information technology, infrastructure, organization structure and workforce planning. Implementation is scheduled to begin during FY2002 and will ramp up significantly through FY03 and FY04.

Base Closure & Depot Public-Private Competition

Efforts to realign San Antonio ALC (SA-ALC) and close Sacramento ALC (SM-ALC), as directed by the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, were completed in FY2001. These two bases constitute the largest installations ever to be realigned/closed by the Department of Defense, and the maintenance facilities represent the largest depots closed by the BRAC process.

Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG):

FY 2001 Air Force Supply Management Activity Group wholesale performance metrics improved in most areas. Thanks to previous spares plus-ups for inventories the Total Not Mission Capable due to Supply (TNMCS) rates have improved from a high of 14.3% in FY00 to 13.5% in FY01. The 1st quarter FY02 TNMCS rate has further improved to 11.8%, the best rate since FY97. Although the actual Issue and Stockage Effectiveness rates were two percentage points below the fiscal year goals of 63% and 72%, respectively, overall Logistics Response Times met the FY01 goal of 36 days.

Depot Maintenance Activity Group (DMAG)

FY 2001 Air Force Depot Maintenance Activity Group organic production hours, while ending the year below estimates, show an encouraging trend. Total production hours improved from 93% of the target in FY 2000 to 97% of the target in FY 2001. Production rebounded during August and September, particularly for the aircraft commodity, which finished FY 2001 296K production hours above target. While BRAC impacts are beginning to lessen, we expect to continue to feel the ripple effects of BRAC through FY 2003.

Information Services Activity group (ISAG)

The Air Force Information Services Activity Group continues to improve their business processes. Earned Value Management is being applied now and soon should show some useful data. Also, a new accounting system came on line in FY 2002. Defense Working Capital Fund Accounting System (DWAS) was modified and tested during FY 2001. This system promises true funds control and will be Chief Finance Officer (CFO) Act compliant. Defense Finance and Accounting Services and the ISAG have worked together throughout this FY to assure the success of implementing DWAS.

Transportation Working Capital Funds (TWCF):

USTRANSCOM, as the single manager of the Defense Transportation System (DTS), exercises combatant command and peacetime management over all common user aspects of the global mobility system. One of DoD's highest priority goals is to maintain a robust and responsive national DTS as a critical element of America's national security strategy of rapid power projection of a CONUS-based force. USTRANSCOM's ability to move sufficient numbers of U.S. forces and equipment enables us to defend vital national interests anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. A strong defense transportation capability gives credence to our alliance commitments by delivering economic and security assistance and when needed--military forces. The DTS--a partnership of military and commercial assets--enables us to accomplish these actions.

To meet these objectives, over 80 percent of USTRANSCOM's cost base is directly associated with the contracts and materials required. From FY 1994 to FY 2003, USTRANSCOM productivity /cost avoidance initiatives and organizational streamlining efforts generate savings of over \$1.1 billion. These productivity and streamlining initiatives are designed to optimize efficiency, effectiveness and customer support without degrading USTRANSCOM's core competencies and readiness posture.

Cash Management:

Our cash on hand for end of fiscal year 2001 was \$918.5 million. Our Air Logistic Centers collected \$500M in September 2001 through an advance billing action to shore up our cash position, in order to avoid an Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) violation. As shown in the table below, the estimated cash balance for end of fiscal years 2002 and 2003 is \$810.0 million and \$1,040.3 million, respectively. We do not anticipate a requirement to advance bill in either FY2002 or FY2003. We expect to meet the cash management goal of 7-10 days of operating cash on hand (\$697 - \$955 million) by the end of FY 2002.

**Air Force Working Capital Fund Cash
Including USTRANSCOM
(Dollars in Millions)**

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
BOP Cash Balance	\$ 542.6	\$ 918.5	\$ 810.0
Disbursements	\$ (19,668.1)	\$ (20,338.9)	\$ (20,263.0)
Collections	\$ 19,994.9	\$ 20,230.4	\$ 20,493.3
Transfers	\$ 49.1	\$ 0	\$ 0
EOP Cash Balance	\$ 918.5	\$ 810.0	\$ 1,040.3

In conclusion, to improve the accounting for and make the cost of government programs more visible to the American people, the Administration is proposing to align the full annual budgetary costs of resources used by programs with the budget accounts that fund the programs. To that end, the budget includes a request for a direct appropriation of \$122,365.0 million for the Working Capital Fund, \$47,902.0 million to fund the full accruing cost of the Civil Service Retirement System and \$74,463.0 million for the retiree health benefits for civilian employees in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. Beginning with the FY 2004 Budget, these costs will be built-into the rates charged to Working Capital Fund customers. This proposal does not increase the total costs to the Federal government, since these costs were previously funded from a central account.

Revenues and Expenses
Air Force Working Capital Fund

FUND14
(Dollars in Millions)

Consolidation

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001 AC	2002 AP	2003 R
Revenue:			
Gross Sales	21,517.340	22,708.781	23,590.943
Operations	20,985.627	22,088.478	23,210.252
Capital Surcharge	13.500	0.000	0.000
Depreciation exc Maj Const	188.200	200.900	210.100
Major Construction Dep	16.171	17.043	17.037
Cash Surcharge	47.600	50.000	25.000
Other Income	684.646	759.058	360.875
Refunds/Discounts	2,395.476	2,643.307	3,416.874
Total Income:	19,540.268	20,472.172	20,435.590
Expenses:			
Cost of Materiel Sold from Inv	8,095.803	7,945.207	7,603.086
Mobilization	29.224	29.786	30.356
Full Cost Recovery	0.000	0.000	0.000
Lean Logistics	0.000	0.000	0.000
Inventory Gains/Losses	(49.095)	(14.103)	(3.693)
Inventory Maintenance	0.101	0.048	0.049
Salaries and Wages:			
Military Personnel Compensation & Benefits	107.327	98.213	100.453
Civilian Personnel Compensation & Benefits	1,714.973	1,793.528	1,968.782
Travel & Transportation of Personnel	107.213	115.162	116.362
Materials & Supplies (For internal Operations)	2,842.137	3,269.258	3,398.165
Equipment	37.224	48.556	41.055
Other Purchases from Revolving Funds	1,105.927	1,401.267	1,413.800
Transportation of Things	133.729	96.846	91.376
Depreciation - Capital	349.250	368.791	384.054
Printing and Reproduction	4.370	8.433	8.380
Advisory and Assistance Services	68.718	71.500	70.723
Rent, Communication, Utilities, & Misc. Charges	73.007	78.596	82.752
Other Purchased Services	4,607.793	4,847.872	4,986.419
Other Expenses	(1.300)	8.642	0.090
Total Expenses	19,226.401	20,167.602	20,292.209
Change in Work in Process	(140.543)	(34.619)	17.798
Operating Result	173.324	269.951	161.179
Less Capital Surcharge Reservation	13.500	0.000	0.000
Plus Passthroughs or Other Approps (NOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Adjustments (NOR)	26.831	38.973	(25.653)
Mobilization	29.224	29.786	30.356
Other Changes	(2.393)	9.187	(56.009)
Net Operating Result (Calculation)	186.655	308.924	135.526
Net Operating Result (1307 Report)	299.615	308.924	135.526
Prior Year Adjustments	(3.532)	0.000	0.000
Other Changes (AOR)	0.000	0.338	(5.276)
Prior Year AOR	(123.926)	(170.190)	48.178
Accumulated Operating Result	172.157	139.072	178.428
Non-Recoverable Adjustment (AOR)	350.830	90.894	125.000
Accumulated Operating Result for Bdgt Purposes	(178.673)	48.178	53.428

AFWCF Total Summary - Financial Highlights**Air Force Working Capital Fund****AFWCF Total Summary
(Dollars in Millions)****Consolidation****Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

	2001 AC	2002 AP	2003 R
Cost of Goods Sold	18,516.2	19,148.0	19,193.0
Net Operating Results	186.7	308.9	135.5
Accumulated Operating Results	(178.7)	48.2	53.4
Civilian End Strength	28,672	27,460	28,262
Military End Strength	15,304	15,659	15,751
Civilian Workyears	27,969	28,750	28,805
Military Workyears	15,137	14,856	14,802
Capital Budget Program Authority	374.0	413.8	387.5

***UNITED STATES
AIR FORCE
WORKING CAPITAL
FUND***



U.S. AIR FORCE
FY 2003
Operating Budget

**Air Force Working Capital Fund
FY 2003 Budget Estimates
Supply Management Activity Group**

Activity Group Overview

The Air Force Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG), formerly the Supply Management Business Area (SMBA), was incorporated into the Air Force Working Capital Fund effective 11 Dec 1996. During Fiscal Year 2001, the Supply Management Activity Group consisted of five diverse wholesale and retail divisions: Material Support, General Support, Medical-Dental, Fuels, and United States Air Force Academy. Effective with the Beginning of Fiscal Year 2002, the Fuels Division transferred to the Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) as directed by DoD.

The Supply Management Activity Group manages over 1.7 million inventory items including weapon system spare parts, medical-dental supplies and equipment, and other supply items used in non-weapon system applications. The Air Force Supply Management Activity Group is an equal partner in the support of combat readiness for all customers by procuring critical material and making repair parts available for sale to authorized customers.

The Air Force Supply Management Activity Group generates revenue from sales of various supplies to a variety of customers. The primary customers are Air Force Operations and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, Foreign Military Sales, Army, Navy and other non-DoD activities, as well as other working capital funds, such as Depot Maintenance.

Division Overviews

Wholesale Activities

The Material Support Division (MSD) manages over 132,000 depot level reparable (DLR) and consumable items for which the Air Force is the Inventory Control Point (ICP). The Air Force Materiel Command procures the inventory items and all inventory items are generally weapon system related. The Supply Management Activity Group provides cost visibility related to wholesale inventory control point operations (including cataloging and standardization) in support of the MSD. MSD accumulates the costs for civilian and military labor, travel, supplies, expendable equipment, and contractual services. Additionally, this division recovers capital asset depreciation for funding future capital investments. Also, MSD accumulates the expenses for reimbursable services provided by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Defense Logistics Information Services (DLIS), Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), Defense Reutilization and Marketing

Service (DRMS), Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), and AF Operation and Maintenance - Base Operating Support.

Increased deployments since 1990, aging aircraft, problems in funding spares through most of the 1990s, and low retention of maintenance technicians in recent years have combined and caused a drop in Air Force mission capable (MC) rates from 79.4% in FY 1994 to 73.5% in FY2001. Recent improved funding and depot surge activity has provided increase aircraft support. The FY 2002 first quarter aggregate mission capable rate has improved to 76.4%. While MC rates have suffered, Congressional, DoD and Air Force efforts related to spare parts have resulted in the non-mission capable rates relating to supply (NMCS) to begin showing improvement. These efforts were primarily funding based, including the FY99 Bowwave funding which allowed the Air Force to purchase much needed engine components, Kosovo reconstitution funding and the decision to allow the Air Force cost per flying hour program to be funded unconstrained.

In addition to these funding based initiatives, the MSD has made two significant business process changes, which will help improve readiness as well. The first required an in-depth look at the cause behind a systemic cash drain within the Division. The Air Force realized MSD financial statements did not sufficiently reflect repair costs, thus causing overstated operating results and less than adequate budget year price changes. In addition to the cash loss this imposed on the Division whereby sales revenue collected was inadequate to recover full costs, this also caused an inordinate amount of cost authority to be subsumed in the repair process. The Division was unable to fully support the buy program and even had to scale back the repair program to stay within available resources. In FY02 and FY03, MSD prices included more accurate repair expenses estimates, thus contributing to the 10.6% price change in FY02 and an increase of 10.3% in FY03. This will allow the Division to fully recover costs and will stop the cash drain that has plagued the Fund since FY98.

The second process change centers on distancing the relationship between sales revenue and cost authority required to support the spares program. Particularly in light of the effects of aging on aircraft component part reliability, the supply system is recognizing that the frequency of demands is increasing and the need to order replacement parts and step up repair activity is increasing as well. Given that the time between ordering and delivering parts is 12-24 months on average, the supply system may need cost authority in excess of that which could be 'earned' through sales transactions. This cause and effect relationship between sales and cost authority that was maintained in the past has been updated to allow the supply system to take a more proactive position in terms of repairing and ordering parts in anticipation of future needs rather than based on past events. With these changes, we hope to continue to make improvements in stockage effectiveness and backorder reduction.

Retail Activities

The **General Support Division** (GSD) finances the Air Force retail inventory and issue requirements for all non-Air Force managed items other than those pertaining to medical requirements. The GSD customers use the majority of items to support field and depot maintenance of aircraft, ground and airborne communication and electronic systems, as well as other sophisticated systems and equipment. The General Support Division also manages many items related to installation, maintenance, and administrative functions. For fiscal year 2002, the number of different items managed by General Support Division is over 1,680,000.

The Surgeon General of the Air Force is responsible for the overall management of the **Medical-Dental Division**. The AF assigned the central financial and material management functions to the Air Force Medical Logistics Office at Frederick, Maryland. The division manages 3,362 different items through 91 outlets, of which 69 are in the CONUS. The Medical-Dental Division has a War Reserve Material requirement for prepositioned medical supplies and equipment vital to support forces in combat pending resupply. It reduces the demand for high priority transportation and ensures a rapid go-to-war capability.

The **Fuels Division** managed aviation fuel and ground fuel requirements for Air Force components and missile fuel requirements for all Department of Defense activities. Air Force Fuels Division transferred operations to Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) effective 1 October 2001 as directed by DoD. The Air Force obtained aviation and ground fuel products from the Defense Logistics Agency, which procures these products from vendors. The Directorate of Aerospace Fuels Management directly procured missile fuel products from vendors. Like the Material Support Division, Fuels also provided cost visibility related to its retail operations.

The **Air Force Academy Division** finances the purchase of uniforms and uniform accessories for sale to cadets in accordance with regulations of the Air Force Academy and related statutes. The customer base consists of **over 4,000 cadets** who receive distinctive uniforms procured from various manufacturing contractors located coast to coast.

Revenue, Expenses and Items Managed

The table below provides revenue and expenses for the total Supply Management Activity Group.

In conclusion, to improve the accounting for and make the cost of government programs more visible to the American people, the Administration is proposing to align the full annual budgetary costs of resources used by programs with the budget accounts that fund the programs. To that end, the budget includes a request for a direct appropriation of \$.344

million for the Working Capital Fund- Supply Management Activity Group, \$.094 million to fund the full accruing cost of the Civil Service Retirement System and \$.250 million for the retiree health benefits for civilian employees in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. Beginning with the FY 2004 Budget, these costs will be built-into the rates charged to Working Capital Fund customers. This proposal does not increase the total costs to the Federal government, since these costs were previously funded from a central account.

(\$ Millions)	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Revenue	\$ 9,123.4	\$ 9,061.7	\$ 8,758.1
Expenses	8,946.5	8,999.4	8,684.5
Operating Result	176.8	62.3	73.7
Net Operating Results	319.0	91.3	100.0
Accumulated Operating Results	\$ 375.2	\$ 169.2	\$ 178.3
Number of Items Managed	1,821,743	1,765,215	1,792,438

Military and Civilian End Strength

Civilian and Military End Strength, Full Time Equivalents and Workyears are only applicable to the Material Support and Fuels Divisions.

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Civilian End Strength	1,948	2,225	2,188
Civilian Full Time Equivalents	1,887	2,175	2,191
Military End Strength	49	60	60
Military Workyears	50	55	60

Customer Price Change (%)

Division	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Material Support	+6.4	+10.6	+10.3
General Support	-1.12	+5.44	+5.51
Fuels	-0.02	N/A	N/A
Medical-Dental	+0.78	+1.23	+5.55
Academy	+1.45	+0.41	+8.05

Stockage Effectiveness

Stockage Effectiveness measures how often the supply system has available for immediate sale those items it intends to maintain at base and depot level supply locations. Stockage Effectiveness is only measured for the Material Support and General Support Divisions.

Division	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Material Support	69%	71%	72%
General Support	87%	87%	87%
Medical-Dental	93%	95%	95%
Academy	9%	99%	99%
Fuels	100%	N/A	N/A

Material Cost Summary
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

SM1
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

2001 AC DIVISION	PEACETIME INVENTORY	NET CUSTOMER ORDERS	NET SALES	COST TARGETS				COMMITMENT TARGET	TARGET TOTAL
				OPERATING	MOBILIZATION	OTHER	TOTAL		
Supply Management Activity Group									
ICP Retail Summary									
Fuels	114.519	1,917.001	1,917.001	2,044.881	0.000	0.691	2,045.572	0.000	2,045.572
GSD	1,402.071	1,755.594	1,760.397	1,834.366	0.000	0.000	1,834.366	23.497	1,857.863
Med/Dent	17.071	688.493	697.720	715.923	29.224	0.000	745.147	14.000	759.147
Academy	4.325	4.768	4.768	5.300	0.000	0.000	5.300	5.300	10.600
Subtotal	1,537.986	4,365.856	4,379.886	4,600.470	29.224	0.691	4,630.385	42.797	4,673.182
ICP Wholesale Summary									
MSD	21,220.000	4,504.281	4,325.064	4,683.211	0.000	179.183	4,862.394	4.183	4,866.577
Subtotal	21,220.000	4,504.281	4,325.064	4,683.211	0.000	179.183	4,862.394	4.183	4,866.577
Component Total	22,757.986	8,870.137	8,704.950	9,283.681	29.224	179.874	9,492.779	46.980	9,539.759

Material Cost Summary
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

SM1
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

2002 AP DIVISION	PEACETIME INVENTORY	NET CUSTOMER ORDERS	NET SALES	COST TARGETS				COMMITMENT TARGET	TARGET TOTAL
				OPERATING	MOBILIZATION	OTHER	TOTAL		
Supply Management Activity Group									
ICP Retail Summary									
Fuels	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
GSD	1,270.404	1,929.181	1,938.196	1,938.196	0.000	0.000	1,938.196	25.386	1,963.582
Med/Dent	16.792	914.521	893.678	893.678	29.786	0.000	923.464	14.000	937.464
Academy	4.325	5.300	5.300	5.300	0.000	0.000	5.300	5.300	10.600
Subtotal	1,291.521	2,849.002	2,837.174	2,837.174	29.786	0.000	2,866.960	44.686	2,911.646
 ICP Wholesale Summary									
MSD	22,193.000	5,916.121	5,817.820	5,369.617	0.000	387.463	5,757.080	4.246	5,761.326
Subtotal	22,193.000	5,916.121	5,817.820	5,369.617	0.000	387.463	5,757.080	4.246	5,761.326
 Component Total	 23,484.521	 8,765.123	 8,654.994	 8,206.791	 29.786	 387.463	 8,624.040	 48.932	 8,672.972

Material Cost Summary
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

SM1
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

2003 R DIVISION	PEACETIME INVENTORY	NET CUSTOMER ORDERS	NET SALES	COST TARGETS			TOTAL	COMMITMENT TARGET	TARGET TOTAL
				OPERATING	MOBILIZATION	OTHER			
Supply Management Activity Group									
ICP Retail Summary									
Fuels	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
GSD	1,136.535	1,476.111	1,486.182	1,486.182	0.000	0.000	1,486.182	25.967	1,512.149
Med/Dent	18.181	973.339	932.957	932.957	30.356	0.000	963.313	14.000	977.313
Academy	4.335	5.472	5.472	5.200	0.000	0.000	5.200	5.200	10.400
Subtotal	1,159.051	2,454.922	2,424.611	2,424.339	30.356	0.000	2,454.695	45.167	2,499.862
ICP Wholesale Summary									
MSD	23,321.001	6,192.960	6,094.697	5,553.358	0.000	344.474	5,897.832	4.309	5,902.141
Subtotal	23,321.001	6,192.960	6,094.697	5,553.358	0.000	344.474	5,897.832	4.309	5,902.141
Component Total	24,480.052	8,647.882	8,519.308	7,977.697	30.356	344.474	8,352.527	49.476	8,402.003

**Weapon System Funding
Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group
Material Support Division**

**SM-3B
(Dollars in Millions)**

**Fiscal Year (FY) 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

2001 ACTUALS	Rep Buy	Con Buy	Total Buy	Initial Spares	Repair	Total
A-10	14.514	4.489	19.003	0.646	85.019	104.667
B-1B	72.601	10.192	82.794	6.396	161.535	250.725
B-2	5.892	19.628	25.520	3.853	19.350	48.724
B-52	21.471	7.690	29.161	1.590	50.883	81.634
C-5	93.016	4.477	97.493	0.031	140.369	237.893
C-130	27.311	3.257	30.567	7.132	131.171	168.871
C-135	52.449	13.098	65.548	18.292	111.654	195.494
C-141	1.007	0.698	1.705	0.000	32.441	34.145
E-3	33.181	6.981	40.162	8.655	43.941	92.757
E-4	0.018	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.180	0.198
E-8	0.179	0.021	0.201	3.622	7.290	11.113
F-4	1.485	0.649	2.134	0.000	8.497	10.631
F-15	53.974	44.530	98.504	9.895	254.011	362.410
F-16	40.696	15.376	56.071	40.464	178.769	275.305
F100 ENG	205.581	85.358	290.939	0.000	705.066	996.005
F110 ENG	159.443	29.685	189.128	0.000	150.842	339.970
F-22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
F-111	0.117	0.015	0.132	0.000	0.336	0.468
F-117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
H-1	1.187	0.039	1.226	0.000	4.871	6.097
H-53	0.967	0.314	1.281	0.000	19.633	20.914
H-60	0.294	0.068	0.361	0.000	3.214	3.575
TRAINERS	16.517	15.996	32.513	0.000	30.992	63.504
OTHER A/C	3.498	1.626	5.124	0.000	13.485	18.609
SOF	1.411	0.814	2.225	2.312	16.746	21.283
COMMON	35.142	7.754	42.896	2.271	199.772	244.939
COMMON EW	34.915	0.746	35.661	0.000	49.353	85.014
MISSILES	6.618	6.153	12.771	0.603	19.105	32.479
OTHER	27.838	14.994	42.833	7.180	86.566	136.579
NIMSC5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	117.963	117.963
TOTAL	911.323	294.646	1,205.969	112.942	2,643.054	3,961.965

**Weapon System Funding
Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group
Material Support Division**

**SM-3B
(Dollars in Millions)**

**Fiscal Year (FY) 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

2002	Rep Buy	Con Buy	Total Buy	Initial Spares	Repair	Total
A-10	21.177	8.706	29.883	0.303	102.081	132.267
B-1B	67.898	13.067	80.965	9.976	154.600	245.541
B-2	22.018	30.709	52.727	6.803	23.748	83.278
B-52	35.360	8.907	44.268	1.878	53.971	100.117
C-5	177.472	11.865	189.337	0.000	182.679	372.016
C-130	67.081	6.301	73.382	9.254	138.215	220.851
C-135	75.425	13.244	88.670	26.504	107.141	222.314
C-141	1.570	0.318	1.889	0.000	24.482	26.370
E-3	28.023	10.087	38.110	6.662	41.949	86.721
E-4	0.093	0.000	0.093	0.000	0.036	0.129
E-8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.270	0.270
F-4	1.875	0.717	2.592	0.000	5.198	7.790
F-15	75.643	79.428	155.072	7.711	301.296	464.079
F-16	38.154	63.185	101.338	52.826	218.766	372.931
F100 ENG	287.443	137.317	424.760	0.000	650.792	1,075.552
F110 ENG	184.298	42.057	226.356	0.000	147.692	374.047
F-22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
F-111	0.648	0.009	0.657	0.000	0.322	0.979
F-117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
H-1	0.543	0.005	0.548	0.000	5.934	6.482
H-53	1.140	0.405	1.545	0.000	20.729	22.275
H-60	0.167	0.221	0.387	0.000	1.673	2.060
TRAINERS	26.207	18.490	44.697	0.000	31.314	76.010
OTHER A/C	0.327	0.160	0.487	0.000	9.439	9.926
SOF	7.585	1.350	8.935	4.310	16.607	29.852
COMMON	81.538	23.023	104.561	0.254	211.468	316.283
COMMON EW	26.895	1.526	28.421	0.000	39.343	67.764
MISSILES	4.387	5.494	9.881	0.816	17.091	27.788
OTHER	28.919	13.968	42.887	14.602	51.748	109.237
NIMSC5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	124.072	124.072
TOTAL	1,261.889	490.560	1,752.449	141.899	2,682.654	4,577.002

**Material Support Division
FY 2003 Amended President's Budget**

**SM-3B
(Dollars in Millions)**

**FY 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

2003	Rep Buy	Con Buy	Total Buy	Initial Spares	Repair	Total
A-10	15.780	7.306	23.085	0.519	144.002	167.607
B-1B	55.747	11.656	67.403	8.028	205.546	280.977
B-2	22.800	24.938	47.738	4.803	34.182	86.722
B-52	26.982	7.289	34.271	0.000	67.241	101.512
C-5	123.295	23.407	146.701	0.450	245.214	392.365
C-130	58.461	2.880	61.341	2.255	194.409	258.006
C-135	73.940	13.095	87.035	21.324	137.540	245.899
C-141	0.412	0.357	0.770	0.000	21.372	22.142
E-3	12.162	6.912	19.074	6.570	60.642	86.286
E-4	0.082	0.000	0.082	0.000	0.167	0.249
E-8	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.330	0.330
F-4	0.873	0.656	1.529	0.000	5.568	7.097
F-15	48.515	73.866	122.382	28.571	315.342	466.294
F-16	24.191	32.772	56.963	28.567	253.345	338.874
F100 ENGINES	264.522	121.785	386.307	0.000	663.906	1,050.212
F110 ENGINES	135.842	38.582	174.424	0.000	155.171	329.595
F-22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
F-111	0.052	0.000	0.052	0.000	0.285	0.337
F-117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
H-1	0.314	0.004	0.318	0.000	7.002	7.320
H-53	5.793	0.410	6.204	0.000	24.675	30.879
H-60	0.025	0.162	0.187	0.000	2.781	2.969
TRAINERS	20.535	14.687	35.222	0.000	37.908	73.130
OTHER A/C	0.420	0.128	0.548	0.000	14.734	15.282
SOF	5.060	1.121	6.180	4.110	17.730	28.020
COMMON	67.989	9.473	77.462	0.823	269.528	347.814
COMMON EW	18.552	1.146	19.699	0.000	46.459	66.157
MISSILES	1.953	5.557	7.510	1.671	24.522	33.703
OTHER	24.420	7.018	31.438	14.602	75.759	121.799
NIMSC5	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	145.377	145.377
TOTAL	1,008.717	405.207	1,413.924	122.293	3,170.738	4,706.955

Inventory Status
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

SM4
(Dollars in Millions)

2001 AC	Total	Mobil	Peacetime Operating	Peacetime Other
1. Inventory BOP	22,504.587	1,222.079	17,299.082	3,983.426
2. BOP Inventory Adjustments				
a. Reclassification Change (Memo)	(11.662)	0.000	(11.662)	0.000
b. Price Change Amount	(11.704)	0.798	(4.834)	(7.668)
c. Inventory Reclassified and Repriced	22,481.221	1,222.877	17,282.586	3,975.758
3. Receipts at Standard	6,720.427	24.283	6,199.233	496.911
4. Gross Sales w/ Surcharge	11,069.361	0.000	11,069.361	0.000
5. Inventory Adjustments				
a. Capitalizations + or (-)	110.911	60.048	34.863	16.000
b. Returns from Customers for Credit +	2,383.276	0.000	2,383.276	0.000
c. Returns from Customers w/o Credit	2,158.950	0.244	2.383	2,156.323
d. Returns to Suppliers (-)	(182.340)	(0.080)	(79.861)	(102.399)
e. Transfers to Property Disposal (-)	(1,017.658)	(9.570)	(0.623)	(1,007.465)
f. Issues/Receipts w/o Reimbursement	299.520	6.837	452.042	(159.359)
g. Other Adjustments				
1. Destruct, Shrink, Deteriorations, etc.	(25.252)	(3.476)	(15.313)	(6.463)
2. Discounts on Returns	(23.169)	0.000	3.141	(26.310)
3. Trade-ins	(13.473)	(6.063)	(2.021)	(5.389)
4. Loss from Disaster	(0.131)	(0.004)	(0.103)	(0.024)
5. Assembly/Disassembly	33.038	1.262	26.040	5.736
6. Physical Inventory Adj	(147.906)	3.287	(130.086)	(21.107)
7. Accounting Adjustments	2,523.394	128.945	1,930.764	463.685
8. Shipment Discrepancies	(46.721)	1.002	(92.905)	45.182
9. Other Gains/Losses	(842.214)	(86.916)	(615.875)	(139.423)
10. Strata Transfers	10.828	(73.631)	73.828	10.631
11. Strata Transfers in Transit	11.718	0.000	11.718	0.000
12. Other Adjustments - Total	1,480.112	(35.594)	1,189.188	326.518
h. Total Inventory Adjustments	5,232.771	21.885	3,981.268	1,229.618
6. Inventory EOP	23,365.058	1,269.045	16,393.726	5,702.287
7. Inventory EOP, Revalued (LAC, Discounted)	23,365.058	1,269.045	16,393.726	5,702.287
a. Economic Retention (Memo)	4,328.549	0.000	0.000	4,328.549
b. Contingency Retention (Memo)	964.066	0.000	0.000	964.066
c. Potential DOD Reutilization (Memo)	424.994	18.000	0.200	406.794
8. Inventory on Order at Cost EOP (Memo)	3,412.568	16.511	2,833.103	562.954

Inventory Status
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

SM4
(Dollars in Millions)

February 2002

2002 AP	Total	Mobil	Peacetime Operating	Peacetime Other
1. Inventory BOP	23,250.539	1,269.045	16,279.207	5,702.287
2. BOP Inventory Adjustments				
a. Reclassification Change (Memo)	(0.059)	0.000	(0.059)	0.000
b. Price Change Amount	523.438	44.936	379.326	99.176
c. Inventory Reclassified and Repriced	23,773.918	1,313.981	16,658.474	5,801.463
3. Receipts at Standard	5,737.929	25.148	5,042.793	669.988
4. Gross Sales w/ Surcharge	11,288.684	0.000	11,288.684	0.000
5. Inventory Adjustments				
a. Capitalizations + or (-)	(25.688)	(13.682)	(3.128)	(8.878)
b. Returns from Customers for Credit +	2,643.307	0.000	2,643.307	0.000
c. Returns from Customers w/o Credit	2,557.674	0.000	0.000	2,557.674
d. Returns to Suppliers (-)	(201.766)	(4.500)	(1.000)	(196.266)
e. Transfers to Property Disposal (-)	(986.409)	(16.000)	(0.645)	(969.764)
f. Issues/Receipts w/o Reimbursement	391.564	0.000	526.066	(134.502)
g. Other Adjustments				
1. Destruct, Shrink, Deteriorations, etc.	(10.617)	(7.108)	(2.835)	(0.674)
2. Discounts on Returns	(32.654)	0.000	(6.154)	(26.500)
3. Trade-ins	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4. Loss from Disaster	(0.395)	(0.005)	(0.125)	(0.265)
5. Assembly/Disassembly	33.528	1.068	26.588	5.872
6. Physical Inventory Adj	(234.734)	(9.564)	(183.334)	(41.836)
7. Accounting Adjustments	2,129.354	54.190	1,706.850	368.314
8. Shipment Discrepancies	18.039	0.000	(55.589)	73.628
9. Other Gains/Losses	(418.571)	(20.396)	(320.961)	(77.214)
10. Strata Transfers	(0.040)	0.000	(0.040)	0.000
11. Strata Transfers in Transit	0.009	0.000	0.009	0.000
12. Other Adjustments - Total	1,483.919	18.185	1,164.409	301.325
h. Total Inventory Adjustments	5,862.601	(15.997)	4,329.009	1,549.589
6. Inventory EOP	24,085.764	1,323.132	14,741.592	8,021.040
7. Inventory EOP, Revalued (LAC, Discounted)	24,085.764	1,323.132	14,741.592	8,021.040
a. Economic Retention (Memo)	6,175.875	0.000	0.000	6,175.875
b. Contingency Retention (Memo)	1,385.653	0.000	0.000	1,385.653
c. Potential DOD Reutilization (Memo)	452.795	0.000	0.000	452.795
8. Inventory on Order at Cost EOP (Memo)	4,120.720	21.149	3,413.620	685.951

Inventory Status
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

SM4 Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
(Dollars in Millions) February 2002

2003 R	Total	Mobil	Peacetime Operating	Peacetime Other
1. Inventory BOP	24,085.764	1,323.132	14,741.592	8,021.040
2. BOP Inventory Adjustments				
a. Reclassification Change (Memo)	(0.060)	0.000	(0.060)	0.000
b. Price Change Amount	499.474	37.818	370.520	91.136
c. Inventory Reclassified and Repriced	24,585.178	1,360.950	15,112.052	8,112.176
3. Receipts at Standard	5,372.412	30.071	4,699.779	642.562
4. Gross Sales w/ Surcharge	11,924.576	0.000	11,924.576	0.000
5. Inventory Adjustments				
a. Capitalizations + or (-)	(3.949)	(10.820)	11.262	(4.391)
b. Returns from Customers for Credit +	3,416.874	0.000	3,416.874	0.000
c. Returns from Customers w/o Credit	2,489.625	0.000	0.000	2,489.625
d. Returns to Suppliers (-)	(171.627)	(2.150)	3.000	(172.477)
e. Transfers to Property Disposal (-)	(874.878)	(10.000)	(0.087)	(864.791)
f. Issues/Receipts w/o Reimbursement	392.230	0.000	510.085	(117.855)
g. Other Adjustments				
1. Destruct, Shrink, Deteriorations, etc.	(5.164)	(1.610)	(2.883)	(0.671)
2. Discounts on Returns	(26.341)	0.000	(6.259)	(20.082)
3. Trade-ins	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4. Loss from Disaster	(0.337)	(0.005)	(0.127)	(0.205)
5. Assembly/Disassembly	34.008	1.073	26.981	5.954
6. Physical Inventory Adj	(226.784)	(7.697)	(178.962)	(40.125)
7. Accounting Adjustments	2,489.221	66.837	1,990.684	431.700
8. Shipment Discrepancies	13.053	0.000	(42.078)	55.131
9. Other Gains/Losses	(452.313)	(7.703)	(366.753)	(77.857)
10. Strata Transfers	(0.048)	0.000	(0.048)	0.000
11. Strata Transfers in Transit	0.010	0.000	0.010	0.000
12. Other Adjustments - Total	1,825.305	50.895	1,420.565	353.845
h. Total Inventory Adjustments	7,073.580	27.925	5,361.699	1,683.956
6. Inventory EOP	25,106.594	1,418.946	13,248.954	10,438.694
7. Inventory EOP, Revalued (LAC, Discounted)	25,106.594	1,418.946	13,248.954	10,438.694
a. Economic Retention (Memo)	8,100.851	0.000	0.000	8,100.851
b. Contingency Retention (Memo)	1,826.795	0.000	0.000	1,826.795
c. Potential DOD Reutilization (Memo)	503.776	0.000	0.000	503.776
8. Inventory on Order at Cost EOP (Memo)	4,690.246	21.434	3,895.841	772.971

**FY 2002 War Reserve Material (WRM) Stockpile
Air Force Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG)**

(\$ in millions)

Exhibit SM-6

FY 2003 Budget Estimates

STOCKPILE STATUS			
	Total	WRM Protected	WRM Other
1. Inventory BOP @ Std	1,269.045	607.072	661.973
2. Price Change	44.936	34.016	10.920
3. Reclassification	1,313.981	641.088	672.893
4. Inventory Changes			
a. Receipts @ Std	25.148	25.148	0.000
(1). Purchases	25.148	25.148	0.000
(2). Returns from customers	0.000	0.000	0.000
b. Issues @ Std	-20.500	-20.500	0.000
(1). Sales	0.000	0.000	0.000
(2). Returns to suppliers	-4.500	-4.500	0.000
(3.) Disposals	-16.000	-16.000	0.000
c. Adjustments @ Std	4.503	-44.493	48.996
(1). Capitalizations	-13.682	-15.362	1.680
(2). Gains and losses	-12.795	-7.047	-5.748
(3). Other	30.980	-22.084	53.064
5. Inventory EOP	1,323.132	601.243	721.889
STOCKPILE COSTS			
1. Storage		Air Force WRM is intermixed with existing supply inventories under the spare-is-a-spare concept or to prevent spoilage of perishable items. As such, seperately identifiable WRM stockpile costs are not available.	
2. Management			
3. Maintenance/Other			
Total Cost			
WRM BUDGET REQUEST			
1. Obligations @ Cost	29.786	29.786	0.000
a. Additional WRM	0.000	0.000	0.000
b. Replen WRM	29.786	29.786	0.000
c. Repair WRM	0.000	0.000	0.000
d. Assemble/Disassemble	0.000	0.000	0.000
e. Other	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Request	29.786	29.786	0.000

**FY 2003 War Reserve Material (WRM) Stockpile
Air Force Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG)**

(\$ in millions)

Exhibit SM-6

FY 2003 Budget Estimates

STOCKPILE STATUS			
	Total	WRM Protected	WRM Other
1. Inventory BOP @ Std	1,323.132	601.243	721.889
2. Price Change	37.818	26.397	11.421
3. Reclassification	1,360.950	627.640	733.310
4. Inventory Changes			
a. Receipts @ Std	30.071	30.071	0.000
(1). Purchases	30.071	30.071	0.000
(2). Returns from customers	0.000	0.000	0.000
b. Issues @ Std	-12.150	-12.150	0.000
(1). Sales	0.000	0.000	0.000
(2). Returns to suppliers	-2.150	-2.150	0.000
(3.) Disposals	-10.000	-10.000	0.000
c. Adjustments @ Std	40.075	-19.018	59.093
(1). Capitalizations	-10.820	-12.529	1.709
(2). Gains and losses	0.027	5.873	-5.846
(3). Other	50.868	-12.362	63.230
5. Inventory EOP	1,418.946	626.543	792.403
STOCKPILE COSTS			
1. Storage		Air Force WRM is intermixed with existing supply inventories under the spare-is-a-spare concept or to prevent spoilage of perishable items. As such, seperately identifiable WRM stockpile costs are not available.	
2. Management			
3. Maintenance/Other			
Total Cost			
WRM BUDGET REQUEST			
1. Obligations @ Cost	30.356	30.356	0.000
a. Additional WRM	0.000	0.000	0.000
b. Replen WRM	30.356	30.356	0.000
c. Repair WRM	0.000	0.000	0.000
d. Assemble/Disassemble	0.000	0.000	0.000
e. Other	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Request	30.356	30.356	0.000

Sources of Revenue
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

FUND11
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001 AC	2002 AP	2003 R
1. New Orders (Gross)			
a. Orders From DOD Components:			
(1) Air Force			
(a) Aircraft Procurement	46.461	31.706	24.911
(b) Missile Procurement	18.632	1.680	2.564
(c) Other Procurement	0.900	5.052	3.100
(d) Military Construction - AF	0.001	(0.001)	0.000
(e) Operations & Maintenance - AF	4,933.988	5,246.770	5,341.264
(f) Military Personnel - AF	58.955	33.708	37.589
(g) Research and Development - AF	128.412	110.738	126.477
(h) Reserve Personnel - AF	3.595	4.223	4.551
(i) Operations & Maintenance - AFRES	377.666	310.833	376.143
(j) Operations & Maintenance - ANG	1,388.310	1,368.136	1,504.289
(k) Guard Personnel - ANG	11.736	9.177	10.420
(l) Family Housing	6.764	6.893	9.868
(m) Special Trust Funds	4.873	5.291	5.556
(n) Other Air Force	0.001	1.774	1.156
Total Air Force	6,980.294	7,135.980	7,447.888
(2) Army	37.277	20.781	14.550
(3) Navy	153.663	92.695	84.020
(4) MAP/Grant Aid	0.010	0.094	0.084
(5) Other DOD	983.527	1,265.761	1,383.635
Total DOD excluding WCF	8,154.771	8,515.311	8,930.177
b. Orders From Other Fund Activity Groups			
(1) Oth AF Supply Management Activity Group	21.535	19.946	17.826
(2) Transportation Activity Group - TRANSCC	736.190	482.870	478.779
(3) Depot Maintenance Activity Group	1,890.763	2,114.194	2,411.979
(4) Other WCF Activity Groups	0.009	0.008	0.008
(5) Commissary, Sur. Coll.	0.003	0.000	0.000
Total Other Fund Activity Groups	2,648.500	2,617.018	2,908.592
c. Total DOD	10,803.271	11,132.329	11,838.769
d. Other Orders:			
(1) Other Federal Agencies	33.560	15.290	12.902
(2) Non Federal Agencies	128.021	21.783	23.698
(3) FMS	288.561	239.028	189.387
Total	450.142	276.101	225.987
Total New Gross Orders	11,253.413	11,408.430	12,064.756
2. Carry-In Orders	919.386	1,084.573	1,194.702
3. Total Gross Orders (New + Carry-in Orders)	12,172.799	12,493.003	13,259.458
4. Change to Backlog	165.187	110.129	128.574
5. Total Gross Sales	11,088.226	11,298.301	11,936.182
6. Less Credit Returns	2,383.276	2,643.307	3,416.874
7. Total Net Sales	8,704.950	8,654.994	8,519.308

Revenues and Expenses
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group

FUND14
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001 AC	2002 AP	2003 R
Revenue:			
Gross Sales	11,088.226	11,298.301	11,936.182
Operations	11,088.226	11,298.301	11,936.182
Capital Surcharge	0.000	0.000	0.000
Depreciation exc Maj Const	0.000	0.000	0.000
Major Construction Dep	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Income	418.404	406.698	238.822
Refunds/Discounts/Credit Returns (-)	2,383.276	2,643.307	3,416.874
Total Income:	9,123.354	9,061.692	8,758.130
Expenses:			
Cost of Materiel Sold from Inv	8,095.803	7,945.207	7,603.086
STD Cost of Materiel	5,883.830	4,843.811	4,434.836
Exchg Cost of Materiel	2,211.973	3,101.396	3,168.250
Condemnations @ Carcass	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mobilization	29.224	29.786	30.356
Full Cost Recovery	0.000	0.000	0.000
Lean Logistics	0.000	0.000	0.000
Inventory Gains/Losses	(49.095)	(14.103)	(3.693)
Inventory Maintenance	0.101	0.048	0.049
Salaries and Wages:			
Military Personnel Compensation & Benefits	3.081	3.959	4.216
Civilian Personnel Compensation & Benefits	114.537	141.727	145.598
Travel & Transportation of Personnel	3.581	5.981	6.042
Materials & Supplies (For internal Operations)	10.632	7.059	7.523
Equipment	(0.002)	0.000	0.000
Other Purchases from Revolving Funds	555.230	748.352	771.042
Transportation of Things	119.821	78.025	72.249
Depreciation - Capital	56.282	38.842	41.941
Printing and Reproduction	3.270	5.259	5.354
Advisory and Assistance Services	0.000	0.000	0.000
Rent, Communication, Utilities, & Misc. Charge	3.287	0.244	0.246
Other Purchased Services	2.090	0.360	0.365
Other Expenses	(1.300)	8.642	0.090
Total Expenses	8,946.542	8,999.388	8,684.464
Operating Result	176.812	62.304	73.666
Less Capital Surcharge Reservation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Plus Passthroughs or Other Approps (NOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Adjustments (NOR)	29.224	28.960	26.334
Mobilization	29.224	29.786	30.356
Other Changes	0.000	(0.826)	(4.022)
Net Operating Result (Calculation)	206.036	91.264	100.000
Net Operating Result (1307 Report)	318.997	91.264	100.000
Other Changes (AOR)	0.000	0.338	0.000
Prior Year AOR	56.243	77.603	78.311
Accumulated Operating Result	375.240	169.205	178.311
Non-Recoverable Adjustment (AOR)	306.120	90.894	100.000
Accumulated Operating Result for Bdqt Purpo:	69.120	78.311	78.311

Fuel Procurement
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group
Fuels Division

FUND15
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

2001	PROCURED FROM DESC			PROCURED BY SERVICE			
	BARRELS (MIL BBLS)	COST PER BARREL (\$)	EXTENDED PRICE (\$ MIL)	BARRELS (MIL BBLS)	COST PER BARREL (\$)	EXTENDED PRICE (\$ MIL)	STABIL PRICE (\$)
JP-4	0.00000	50.82	0.000	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
JA-1	0.23265	42.00	9.771	1.90829	63.00	120.222	0.00
JP-5	1.19167	43.26	51.552	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
JP-8	38.57497	42.42	1,636.350	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
AVGAS	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
INTO-PLANE	0.98858	53.34	52.731	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
MOGAS,UNL	0.13506	45.78	6.183	0.26453	45.78	12.110	0.00
MOGAS,LD	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
DISTILLATE	0.45066	41.16	18.549	1.11914	41.16	46.064	0.00
RESIDUALS	0.00000	27.30	0.000	0.11090	27.30	3.028	0.00
LIQ PROP	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
PPV ADJ	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00000	0.00	0.000	0.00
MISSILE	0.00000	0.00	0.000	73.79800	1.00	73.798	0.00
TOTAL	41.57359	42.70	1,775.136	77.20086	3.31	255.222	

**AIR FORCE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2003 BUDGET ESTIMATES
DEPOT MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY GROUP (DMAG)**

DMAG Mission Statement

The Depot Maintenance Activity Group repairs systems and spare parts that ensure readiness in peacetime and provide sustainment to combat forces in wartime. In peacetime, we enhance readiness by efficiently and economically repairing, overhauling and modifying aircraft, engines, missiles, components and software to meet customer demands. The depots have unique skills and equipment required to support and overhaul both new, complex components as well as aging weapon systems. During wartime or contingencies, we surge repair operations and realign capacity to support the war fighter's immediate needs. This is an extremely important facet of the depots.

Repair and overhaul are accomplished by both Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) depots and contract operations. Depot Maintenance operates on the funds received from its customers through sales of its services.

DMAG Customers, Products and Services

Depot Maintenance provides support to a variety of customers. Our single largest customer is the Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG), which generates approximately 44 percent of our revenue. The Major Commands, including the Air Force Materiel Command, Air Mobility Command, Air Combat Command, Air National Guard and Air Force Reserves, generate approximately another 41 percent of our revenue. The balance of our work comes from other services, other government agencies and foreign countries.

We provide scheduled overhaul for airframes and engines based on a planned timetable or number of cycles for each weapon system. We also repair individual components routed from the field. Missiles and ground electronic systems are repaired through scheduled and unscheduled depot maintenance. AFMC depots provide an extensive software capability to develop or modify software used to operate weapon systems, as well as software designed for diagnostic purposes. Our depots manufacture critical components that are not otherwise obtainable from commercial sources in a timely or cost effective manner. Finally, we provide storage, regeneration and disposal of excess equipment for all the services at the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona.

DMAG Objectives

There are two primary objectives of the DMAG. The first is to provide organic and contract depot repair capability for fielded and emerging weapon systems. Several objectives toward meeting this goal are listed below.

Meet end item delivery commitments 90% of the time by the end of FY05, commensurate with the adjusted Aircraft Maintenance Repair (AMREP) date.

Meet depot level reparable due date performance commitments 90% of the time by the end of FY05 commensurate with the published shop flow days provided to the customer.

Ensure technically compliant operations across all product lines.

Ensure new and existing weapon systems/technologies are considered during the biennial core assessment and facility improvements are included in the Program Objective Memorandum to support a viable organic core capability in the future.

Leverage the core competencies of government and private industry through pursuit of partnerships based on ability to meet performance requirements at the best value to the Air Force.

Manage depot operations each year to ensure Net Operating Result (NOR) goals are met or exceeded.

Drive accepted quality defect rates to .03 per exchangeable item and according to individually established Model Design (MD) and Type Model (TM) defect rates.

The second primary objective of the DMAG is to ensure the ability to rapidly respond to user requirements driven by contingency operations. To accomplish this we will develop short term and long strategies to implement the depot maintenance strategic plan; strategies that provide the workload capacity and capability to meet depot maintenance: a) peacetime support; b) surge; and c) core requirements by the end of FY05.

Outlook

As the Expeditionary Aerospace Force evolves, Depot Maintenance will remain a fundamental element of both readiness and sustainability by providing a cost effective rapid repair capability. We will continue to provide a core Air Force depot capability to retain an in-house source of technical competence. We will seek new methods for efficient use of our resources such as partnering, government owned/contractor operated facilities, and contractor field teams augmenting in-house operations. Competitions and outsourcing for workloads unnecessary to support core capabilities will be pursued to the maximum extent allowable by law. We will continue to invest prudently to find innovative ways to decrease flow days for systems and components, increase parts availability to the repair line and control material costs through process reviews, adoption of commercial practices and engineered standards.

DMAG Mission Description

Depot Maintenance provides the capability, organic and contract, that guarantees mission support of workload for combat forces. Our organic Depot Maintenance ensures support of mission essential workload and support of workload that commercial sources cannot or will not perform. Our contract Depot Maintenance supports non-mission essential workloads and mission essential workloads where the risk of non-support is low. This can include military workloads that have commercial derivatives, where there are multiple contract sources to perform the work, and where these sources have experienced few production disruptions.

Organic Depot Maintenance services include repair, overhaul and modification of aircraft, missiles, engines, engine modules and associated component items, exchangeable spare parts and other major end items. Other services include local manufacture, software maintenance, aircraft storage and reclamation, and support to base tenants. Current organic depot maintenance sites include:

Ogden Air Logistics Center (OO-ALC), Ogden, UT
 Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center (OC-ALC), Oklahoma City, OK
 Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WR-ALC), Warner Robins, GA
 Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center, Tucson, AZ

DMAG Mission Organization

The Depot Maintenance Activity Group (DMAG) is managed under a Chief Executive Officer structure. The AFMC Commander (AFMC/CC) is the Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The AFMC Director of Logistics (HQ AFMC/LG) serves as the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and the AFMC Director of Financial Management (HQ AFMC/FM) is the Chief Financial Officer (CFO).

At the center level, the Center Commander (CC) has the responsibility (both operational and financial) for Depot Maintenance at that center. The Center Chief Operating Officer (COO) responsibility is exercised by the Director of Logistics (LG at OC-ALC, OO-ALC and WR-ALC) or the Center Executive Director (CD) at AMARC. Day-to-day management of the financial portion of the DMAG is managed by the center Chief Financial Officer (CF) while the depot maintenance managers (DMMs) manage the production.

Financial Highlights

Customer Orders: (\$M)

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Organic	3,242.5	3,947.6	4,118.3
Contract	<u>2,608.9</u>	<u>2,211.5</u>	<u>2,469.2</u>
Total	5,851.4	6,159.1	6,587.5

Revenue and Expenses (\$M)

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Revenue	5,633.2	6,214.9	6,628.7
- Cost of Goods Sold/Other*	<u>5,661.4</u>	<u>6,005.0</u>	<u>6,603.7</u>
= Net Operating Results	(28.2)	209.9	25.0
Prior Year AOR	(176.0)	(253.2)	(43.3)
+Prior Year Gains/Losses	<u>(4.3)</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
= Revised Prior Year AOR	(180.3)	(253.2)	(43.3)
+ Net Operating Results	<u>(28.2)</u>	<u>209.9</u>	<u>25.0</u>
= End of Year (AOR)	(208.5)	(43.3)	(18.3)
- Non-Recoverable Amounts	<u>44.7</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>25.0</u>
= End of Year AOR (Budget Purposes)	(253.2)	(43.3)	(43.3)

Material inflation, usage, and workload increases are driving higher material expenses in FY03. Contractor charges also increased in FY03 due to increased workload as well as an attempt to work off some of the transitioning carry-in from the two closing Air Logistic Centers. Additional factors include increased equipment and facility maintenance costs as well as the Administration's proposed change in legislation to charge agencies the full Government share of the accruing retirement costs of current Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) employees and the accruing health care costs of all future Federal retirees.

*Other includes the book value of equipment written off and extraordinary items (to be consistent with 1307 report – NOR - line 13)

Stabilized Sales Rates and Prices

	FY01	FY02	FY03
Organic Composite Sales Rate	12.5%	16.9%	13.75%
Rate Change			
Contract Customer Price Change	0.0%	2.0%	4.54%

The following list depicts the estimated changes from the FY02 organic composite rate to the FY03 composite rate.

FY02 Stabilized Rate	157.73
Price Growth	8.54
Direct Labor	.48
Direct Material	7.63
Direct Other	.09
Overhead Labor	.39
Overhead Material	-.17
Overhead Other	1.39
Carry-In Loss	4.40
Remove Cash Surcharge	<u>-1.06</u>
Subtotal	21.69
FY03 Proposed Stabilized Rate	179.42
FY03 Composite Rate Change	13.75%

Other

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Manpower Resources:			
Civilian Endstrength	21,410	19,908	20,876
Civilian Workyears (w/o OT)	20,685	21,213	21,401
Military Endstrength	197	226	226
Military Workyears	462	318	317
Direct Production Standard Hours	21,723	22,256	22,866
Direct Labor Hours	21,686	22,244	22,881
(Hours in Millions)			
Unit Cost	\$149.71	\$161.63	\$175.85

The increase in the FY03 unit cost is being driven by higher material prices from suppliers and increased workload/program costs. Additional factors include increased equipment and facility maintenance costs as well as the Administration's proposal to charge agencies the full cost of retiree health and civil service retirement benefits.

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Direct Appropriation: (\$M)			
Organic	0.0	3.1	99.4

The direct appropriation in FY02 was a result of Congressional action to assist the Services with unanticipated utility costs. The budget also includes a request for \$99.4 million to fund the full costs of retiree health and civil service retirement benefits.

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Capital Budget Program Authority: (\$M)			
Equipment	60.5	55.2	45.0
ADPE & Telecom	9.5	12.0	11.0
Software Development	52.1	64.9	49.9
Minor Construction	3.9	2.3	1.3
Adjustment for prior year cost increases	<u>2.6</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	128.6	139.8	107.2

The decrease from FY02 to FY03 is attributed to a decrease in Capital depreciation revenue that is used to finance the capital program. Although the Capital depreciation is listed as \$124.2M in the backup exhibits, after adjusting for the Improvements Made to Land, the actual depreciation available for future financing is only \$107.2M. Depreciation is low due to items not being depreciated until fully implemented, such as DMAPS.

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Cash: (\$M)			
Collections	5,863.4	5,659.8	6,494.6
Disbursements	<u>5,681.9</u>	<u>5,878.9</u>	<u>6,469.7</u>
Net Outlays	(181.5)	219.1	(24.9)

The anticipated outlays for FY02 are a result of advance billing performed at the end of FY01. DMAG cash is expected to decline during FY02, as work completed against these outstanding FY01 orders will generate disbursements, but no additional collections. It is anticipated that all advance billing will be worked off by the end of FY02, leaving FY03 clear to earn the projected \$25M.

	<u>Goal</u>	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Performance Indicators:				
Net Operating Result (\$M)	0	(28)	210	25
Due Date Performance	71%	75%	75%	75%
Quality Defect Rate	0.24	0.19	0.19	0.19

Other Highlights

REDUCTIONS IN INFRASTRUCTURE, WORKFORCE, AND OVERHEAD. In this year's budget, we have continued to defer investments in facilities, equipment and our workforce. These deferrals have been part of a larger effort on the Air Force's part to direct scarce resources to the most critical high priority needs of the war fighter. As we begin to make gains in readiness and modernization, we will again turn our attention to facilitating the depots to ensure their continued viability. We have developed a Long Term Depot Strategy that will lay the groundwork for FY04 and subsequent budget requests in this area.

CLOSURE OF SA-ALC AND SM-ALC. We have completed the closure of SA-ALC and SM-ALC and have transferred management and source of repair responsibilities to the remaining ALCs or contract sources. All financial records from SA-ALC and SM-ALC have been closed or transferred to the gaining centers.

DEPOT MAINTENANCE REVIEW TEAM. Depot Maintenance Review Teams (DMRTs) were established in FY01 to assess the depot maintenance mission area and prepare plans to improve both financial performance and support to the MAJCOMs. The group has recommended improvements to current processes and is building implementation plans for the future path of the mission area. In order to accomplish this tasking seven individual focus teams, workload management, financial management, workforce, material support, information technology, organization structure and infrastructure were formed to address the specifics from their respective team's perspective. The groups identified issues, determined root causes for each issue, recommended solutions to issues, and are now providing implementation schedules and necessary follow-up actions to ensure efforts remain focused and on track.

Current Issues:

1. MATERIAL EXPENSES. With the use of realistic pricing factors, we see increased organic material costs in FY02 and FY03 due to price increases, workload and usage/consumption increases. Also included in our material expenses beginning in FY02 are costs for DLA charges that were previously funded by our Supply Management Activity Group (SMAG). Though some usage increases are hard to quantify, we know occurrence factors have increased for engine rotors, chine plate replacements, bulkhead end fittings, infrared shields, and boron cell repair. We also know that our aging aircraft fleets are requiring more repairs. Finally, we see new and/or increased workload for such programs as the F-16 Foreign Military Sales and Common Configuration Implementation Program, the B-1 stabilizer, the B-2 & F-16 valves & actuators, the E-3 COWLS, the KC-135 cowl & struts, and the C130/C141 autopilot. To assist with material cost analysis, HQ AFMC has formed a Depot Maintenance material IPT to research and identify material variances by the following three drivers: price changes, production volume, and usage.

2. IMPACT OF WORKLOAD TRANSFERS. We are still feeling the effects of the Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC). Approximately 40% of depot workload have moved to new sources of repair. As a result, our productivity has suffered due to loss of experienced personnel, hiring difficulties, increased training, facility modifications, and additional repairs needed for transferred equipment. While we have begun to see some improvements in productivity, we expect that we will continue to feel the ripple effects of BRAC through FY02 and FY03.

3. UNION GRIEVANCE OVER ENVIRONMENT DIFFERENTIAL PAY. The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) Local 1627 is grieving the Air Force's failure and/or refusal to pay environmental differential pay to the union's bargaining unit employees as a result of asbestos exposure at Kelly AFB since March 1975. On 11 Feb 00, an arbitrator issued a decision limiting the amount of differential pay to six years under the Back Pay Act. Potential timing and cost of any settlement is difficult to estimate or predict and, as such, is not included in this budget. The estimates for the potential settlement could, if the union's grievance prevails, reach approximately \$100M.

4. CASH BALANCES. The effect of increasing material usage and cost, declining productivity due in part to the realignment of work from San Antonio and Sacramento Air Logistic Centers to the three remaining depots, and an aging fleet, has been an overall decline in the depot maintenance cash balance. In conjunction with this decline, an already tenuous cash position within the total AFWCF reached a critical point during FY01. At the end of FY01, the AFWCF processed an advance billing of \$500M against outstanding depot maintenance orders to bolster cash. As a result of the advance, DMAG cash will decline during FY02, as work completed against unfilled FY01 orders will generate disbursements, but no additional collections. As with previous advance billing actions, we will maintain a status of those orders for which billings has already occurred. The DMRT is in the process of identifying specific problems that have negatively impacted production and created a cash drain and is working towards developing solutions.

5. BUDGETING AND MANAGING FOR RESULTS: Full Funding of Retiree Costs. To improve the accounting for and make the cost of government programs more visible, the Administration is proposing to align the full annual budgetary costs of resources used by programs with the budget accounts that fund the programs. To that end, the budget includes a request for a direct appropriation of \$99.4 million, \$39.4 million to fund the full cost of the Civil Service Retirement System and \$60.0 million to fund retiree health benefits for civilian employees in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. Beginning with the FY 2004 Budget, these costs will be built into the rates charged to Air Force Depot Maintenance Working Capital Fund customers. This proposal does not increase the total costs to the Federal government, since these costs were previously funded from a central account.

Changes in Cost of Operations
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Depot Maintenance Activity Group

FUND2
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

FY01 TO FY02 FY02 TO FY03

Cost of Operations		
Organic	3,252.156	3,597.314
Contract	2,266.362	2,371.080
TOTAL	5,518.518	5,968.394
ANNUALIZATION		
Annualization of Civilian Pay	12.086	16.811
Annualization of Military Pay	0.093	0.111
TOTAL ANNUALIZATION	12.179	16.922
PRICE CHANGES		
Organic Civilian Pay Raises	41.552	122.855
Organic Military Pay Raises	0.446	0.254
Material Price Growth	144.347	194.079
Contractor Cost Growth	27.233	23.584
Contract Interservice Growth	5.342	2.314
Other Growth	6.334	5.213
TOTAL PRICE CHANGES	225.254	348.299
PRODUCTIVITY SAVINGS		
Organic Labor Savings	0.000	0.000
Material Savings	0.000	0.000
Organic Other Savings	0.000	0.000
Contract Savings	0.000	0.000
TOTAL PRODUCTIVITY SAVINGS	0.000	0.000
PROGRAM CHANGES		
Organic Labor Workload	(23.471)	7.215
Material Workload	100.827	103.965
BOS	(12.241)	1.690
Contractor Changes	90.396	171.076
TOTAL PROGRAM CHANGES	155.511	283.946
OTHER CHANGES		
Travel & Transportation	1.383	0.006
Organic Depreciation	23.733	1.992
Organic Facility Maintenance	17.167	8.796
Organic Utilities	0.238	0.112
Data Systems Development	1.913	0.610
Organic Other ADP	20.082	2.312
Organic Equip/Vehicle Rep & Maintenance	0.496	5.716
Miscellaneous	(5.842)	(17.977)
TOTAL OTHER CHANGES	59.170	1.567
TOTAL CHANGES	452.114	650.734
Cost of Operations		
Organic	3,597.314	4,021.009
Contract	2,371.080	2,598.463
TOTAL	5,968.394	6,619.472

Sources of Revenue
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Depot Maintenance Activity Group

FUND11
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001	2002	2003
1. DOD COMPONENTS			
Aircraft Procurement	193.217	145.023	178.002
Missile Procurement	1.008	0.313	0.307
Other Procurement	0.000	0.000	0.000
MAJCOM O&M	1,898.826	1,745.567	1,781.809
ANG O&M	268.598	498.062	565.224
AFRES O&M	174.190	318.501	337.113
RDTE	24.289	18.579	8.348
AF Supply Mgmt Act Group	2,628.812	2,594.471	3,066.641
Other AF Customers	40.433	56.490	52.129
Other	261.518	369.403	116.391
TOTAL	5,490.891	5,746.409	6,105.964
2. ORDERS FROM OTHER FUND			
Army	1.415	2.705	2.859
Navy	126.553	122.179	177.024
Marine Corps	0.578	0.000	0.000
TRANSCOM	134.440	187.753	193.284
Other DOD Customers	33.460	19.320	22.138
TOTAL	296.446	331.957	395.305
3. TOTAL DOD ORDERS	5,787.337	6,078.366	6,501.269
4. OTHER ORDERS			
Other Federal Funds	9.858	11.793	20.109
Trust Funds (Non-Federal)	0.000	0.000	0.000
FMS (Non-Federal)	51.799	68.773	65.903
Other Non-Federal Funds	2.397	0.202	0.200
TOTAL	64.054	80.768	86.212
5. TOTAL NEW ORDERS	5,851.391	6,159.134	6,587.481
6. CARRY IN ORDERS	2,847.843	3,065.996	3,010.262
7. TOTAL GROSS ORDERS	8,699.234	9,225.130	9,597.743
8. TOTAL GROSS SALES	5,633.238	6,214.868	6,628.661
9. EOY WIP	1,102.725	1,068.106	1,085.904
10. NON-DOD, BRAC, FMS & TWCF ORDERS&CONTR LI/	198.494	268.521	279.496
11. FUNDED CARRYOVER	1,764.777	1,673.635	1,603.682
12. MONTHS OF CARRYOVER	3.759	3.232	2.903

Revenues and Expenses
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Depot Maintenance Activity Group

FUND14
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001	2002	2003
Revenue:			
Gross Sales	5,633.238	6,214.868	6,628.661
Operations	5,303.225	5,845.465	6,487.270
Capital Surcharge	0.000	0.000	0.000
Depreciation excl Maj Const	0.000	0.000	0.000
Major Construction Dep	16.171	17.043	17.037
Cash Surcharge	47.600	0.000	25.000
Other Income	266.242	352.360	99.354
Refunds/Discounts (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Income:	5,633.238	6,214.868	6,628.661
Expenses:			
Cost of Materiel Sold from Inv	0.000	0.000	0.000
Salaries and Wages:			
Military Personnel Compensation & Benefits	12.233	12.102	12.399
Civilian Personnel Compensation & Benefits	1,263.518	1,294.139	1,441.088
Voluntary Separation Prog. Incentive	0.000	0.200	0.200
Reduction in Force	0.000	0.000	0.000
Retirement Fund Offset - 15%	0.000	0.016	0.016
Retirement Fund Offset - \$80	0.000	0.000	0.000
Travel & Transportation of Personnel	15.224	17.123	17.244
Materials & Supplies (For Internal Operations)	1,931.264	2,176.660	2,475.034
Equipment	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Purchases from Revolving Funds	195.475	213.715	209.958
Transportation of Things	0.000	0.000	0.000
Depreciation - Capital	96.611	122.220	124.220
Printing and Reproduction	0.000	1.858	1.710
Advisory and Assistance Services	0.000	0.000	0.000
Rent, Communication, Utilities, & Misc Charges	41.521	42.424	43.880
Other Purchased Services	1,962.672	2,087.937	2,293.723
Total Expenses	5,518.518	5,968.394	6,619.472
Work in Process, Beginning of Year	1,243.268	1,102.725	1,068.106
Work in Process, End of Year	1,102.725	1,068.106	1,085.904
Work in Process, Change	(140.543)	(34.619)	17.798
Operating Result	(25.823)	211.855	26.987
Less Capital Surchg Reservation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Plus Passthroughs or Other Approps (NOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Adjustments (NOR)	(2.393)	(1.987)	(1.987)
Net Operating Result (Calculation)	(28.216)	209.868	25.000
Net Operating Result (1307 Report)	(28.217)	209.868	25.000
Prior Year Adjustments	(4.320)	0.000	0.000
Other Changes (AOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Prior Year AOR	(175.904)	(253.151)	(43.283)
Accumulated Operating Result	(208.441)	(43.283)	(18.283)
Non-Recoverable Adjustment (AOR)	44.710	0.000	25.000
Accumulated Operating Result for Bdgt Purposes	(253.151)	(43.283)	(43.283)

Material Inventory Data
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Depot Maintenance Activity Group

FUND16
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

	2001	2002	2003
1. Material Inventory BOP	344.072	435.416	437.939
2. A. BOP Reclassification Changes	0.000	0.000	0.000
B. Adjust To Standard Price	0.000	0.000	0.000
3. A. Price Changes	0.000	0.000	0.000
B. Inventory Reclass & Repriced	344.072	435.416	437.939
4. Receipts From Commercial Sources	467.619	354.987	323.373
5. Negotiated Purchases From Customers	0.000	0.000	0.000
6. Gross Sales	377.975	352.464	395.820
7. Inventory Adjustments			
A. Capitalizations (Net)(+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
B. Returns To suppliers (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
C. Transfer To Prop Disposal (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
D. Issues/Receipts W/O Reimbrsmnt (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
E. Customer Returns W/O Credit(+)	0.000	0.000	0.000
F. DLR Retrograde (+)	0.000	0.000	0.000
G. Other Inventory Adjustments			
1. Other-Destructions (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
2. Other-Discounts on Returns	0.000	0.000	0.000
3. Other-Trade Ins (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
4. Other-Loss From Disaster (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
5. Other-Assembly/Disassembly (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
6. Other-Physical Inventory Adj (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
7. Other-Accounting Adjustments (+/-)	1.700	0.000	0.000
8. Other-Shipment Discrepancies (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
9. Other-Other Gains/Losses (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
10. Other-Strata Transfers (+/-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
11. Other-Strata Transers in Transit	0.000	0.000	0.000
12. Other-Total	1.700	0.000	0.000
H. Adjustments to Revised Valuation	0.000	0.000	0.000
I. Total Adjustments	1.700	0.000	0.000
8. Inventory-End of Period	435.416	437.939	365.492
A. Economic Retention (Memo)	0.000	0.000	0.000
B. Policy Retention (Memo)	0.000	0.000	0.000
C. Potential Excess (Memo)	0.000	0.000	0.000
D. Other (Memo)	0.000	0.000	0.000
9. Inventory On Order (EOP)	0.000	0.000	0.000

**Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group (ISAG)
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates**

The Information Services Activity Group was established, effective 1 October 1995 (FY96), under the authority of Section 2208 of Title 10, United States Code. Operations of the group are conducted in accordance with applicable Department of Defense (DoD) policies and regulations.

Functional Description:

There are two Air Force activities acting as one Central Design Activity (CDA) under the command of the HQ Air Force Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFB), Ohio through Electronic Systems Command (ESC) at Hanscom AFB, MA. The two activities are the Materiel Systems Group (MSG) located at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH and the Standard Systems Group (SSG) located at Maxwell AFB – Gunter Annex, AL.

The ISAG is authorized and provides, through the CDAs, the following information services activities: (1) Development and operational sustainment of automated information and communications systems on existing hardware and software platforms for Air Force Materiel Command level logistics support systems and Air Force base level standard support systems. This includes a 24-hour by 7-day field user help desk for field users to call for hardware and software systems support; (2) Automated information and communications systems requirements analysis, system design, development, testing, integration, implementation support, and documentation services on mainframe, mid-tier and personal computer hardware/software platforms for Air Force and DoD customers using the Software Engineering Institute Capability Maturity Model processes; (3) And other authorized information system services or products through the acquisition and operation of the Commercial Information Technology Product Area Directorate (CIT-PAD) commodity contracts for the Department of the Air Force and other agencies of the DoD. The CIT-PAD portion of the ISAG is operated through the collection of a surcharge on the orders submitted by the users of the contracts or blanket purchase authority. This service provides the customers with the opportunity to stay abreast of the latest information technology for personal computers and network hardware and services. While our primary mission of providing CDA services is based on service level agreements (SLAs) with known customers and on the sale of direct billable hours, the CIT-PAD business area provides goods and services (e.g., personal computers, local area network hardware and services including installations worldwide) to many thousands of individual customers across the Air Force and DOD. The nature of this business cannot be supported by SLAs and the recovery of costs through the sale of direct billable hours. Instead, the surcharge rate is established by dividing total CIT-PAD program office expenses (the cost of managing the programs and administering the contracts) by anticipated sales off the

contracts. Prior year profits and losses are also incorporated as adjustments to the surcharge rate to obtain the ISAG goal of zero AOR.

The Group may furnish these products or services to agencies of other departments or instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and to private parties and other agencies, as authorized by law. The services are authorized to be provided by organic or contract sources.

HQ Management:

HQ management costs in FY01 and out provides for employees who directly support the ISAG management and their associated travel and supplies. It also includes the Air Force Materiel Command Enterprise Intranet, Oracle software licenses and ABACUS database expenses.

Performance Indicators:

The ISAG manages to both financial and non-financial performance indicators. The financial indicators are revenue, cost of goods sold, net operating result, collections, disbursements, and change in cash. The Industrial Fund Accounting Systems (IFAS) has been the source of the monthly data points collected for each indicator/measurement. However, IFAS was replaced by the Defense Working Capital Fund Accounting System (DWAS) in FY02. The actual data is compared to the annual operating budget plan. An explanation of the variances (plus/minus) and a get-well date is provided on a monthly basis to the ISAG Chief Operating Officer (COO) (HQ AFMC/DR) and the ISAG Chief Financial Officer (CFO) (HQ AFMC/FM). The financial performance indicators are reported to SAF/FM and AF/SC/IL on a quarterly basis. The non-financial indicators are the number of releases scheduled/made, the number of category one and two deficiency reports open/closed, earned value measurement of programs/projects.

Productivity:

Earned Value Management is a SAF/AQ initiative. It is a management technique that relates resource planning to schedule, technical cost, and scheduled requirements. All work is planned, budgeted, and scheduled in time-phased "planned value" increments constituting a cost and schedule measurement baseline. Once established, CDA management and ISAG customers will have visibility of cost variances, the difference between the planned and actual costs for a given task performed; and the schedule variances, a dollarized representation of schedule status. This will indicate whether budgeted work is being accomplished as planned. This visibility allows managers to focus their attention where corrective actions are required.

Financial:

This budget is structured to separate rate-based expenses (organic exhibits) from the cost reimbursable and CIT-PAD expenses (contract exhibits) so that an accurate rate is developed per direct labor hour. Cost reimbursable expenses include direct contract costs and extraordinary mission unique expenses (e.g., travel, supplies, equipment) that are charged dollar for dollar to the customer. The CITPAD expenses are recovered based on a percent of the sale price.

Financial Highlights

Customer Orders:

(\$ in Millions)

	FY01	FY02	FY03
Organic	\$136.1	\$142.3	\$167.3
Contract	<u>483.8</u>	<u>320.8</u>	<u>428.5</u>
Total	\$619.9	\$463.1	\$595.8

Revenue and Expenses:

(\$ in Millions)

	FY01	FY02	FY03
Revenue	\$554.2	\$600.5	\$603.5
Cost of Goods Sold	561.1	604.0	595.1
Net Operating Results	(6.9)	(3.5)	8.4
Total Other Adjust	0.8	0.0	-5.3
Accumulated Operating Result	0.4	(3.1)	0.0

Stabilized Sales Rates and Prices:

	FY01	FY02	FY03
Organic Composite Sales Rate	\$60.90	\$64.78	\$70.94
Rate Change	5.9%	6.4%	9.5%
CITPAD Surcharge	1.54%	1.54%	1.54%

The following list depicts the changes from the FY02 organic composite rate to the FY03 composite rate.

FY02 Composite Sales Rate **\$64.78**

- FY01/02 NOR/AOR Adj 2.77
- Standard Inflation 2.12
- Workyear changes 2.21
- Depreciation/other - 0.58
- Direct labor hour increases - 0.36

FY03 Composite Sales Rate **\$70.94**

Other Highlights

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>
Direct Labor Hours (Hours in Millions)	2.163	2.324	2.376
Manpower Resources			
Civilian Endstrength	1,111	1,064	1,056
Civilian Workyears (w/o OT)	1,067	1,067	1,072
Military Endstrength	850	1,151	1,138

Capital Budget \$9.5M* \$10.3M \$10.4M

* approved budget total \$11.0M; \$1.5M carryover in FY02

Changes from Previous Submission

Revenue

Revenue is up \$16.1M in FY01 actuals when compared to the FY01 PB due to additional reimbursable expense, predominantly purchased equipment for customers. The current FY02 increase, \$0.6M in revenue from the FY02 PB is minimal. In FY03 the revenue increase \$3.0M due to various programs increasing their estimated extraordinary requirements.

Expenses

The increase, \$23.8M in FY01, is due to the increase extraordinary requirements, mission unique expenses, for various customers. The ISAG also started paying it's own share of the Defense Finance & Accounting Service (DFAS) which was previously centrally paid by another WCF activity group. FY02 increases \$2.4M is also attributed to customer increased unique expenses.

FY01 - FY02

Civ Pers: Civilian personnel costs increase with the planned movement of identified positions that are performing CDA functions and were not capitalized into ISAG. These

costs were included "Other Costs" prior to this submission. We are also increasing our projected fill rate from 92% to 97%.

Travel: The increase is due to new efforts such as Air Force Portal and increased extraordinary travel for existing programs (e.g., Air Force Intranet Control Center, Defense Messaging System-Air Force, Defense Security Enterprise).

Materials and Supplies; Equipment: Increases are due to a variety of programs increasing their estimated extraordinary requirements (e.g., Combat Ammunition System, Defense Messaging System-Air Force). FY01 expenses were artificially kept down as funds were diverted to contracts. Expenses are back to a normal rate in FY02 and FY03. Expense are also higher due to reclassification of overhead office automation/local area network software expenses from "Other Costs" to this category which is more in line with the Defense Working Capital Fund Accounting System (DWAS) object classes.

Transportation of Things: Increase is due to Defense Messaging System-Air Force transportation requirements.

FY02 - FY03

Civ Pers: Increase due to using a higher projected fill rate at HQ Standard Systems Group (SSG), from 92% to 99%. Additionally, a \$1.9M increase is included for the Administration's proposed change in legislation to charge agencies the full Government share of the accruing retirement costs of current Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) employees and the accruing health care costs of all future Federal retirees.

Materials & Supplies: Increase is due to continuing additional estimated extraordinary requirements for customer programs.

Transportation of Things: Increase is due to Defense Messaging System-Air Force transportation requirements.

Depreciation: This category will continue to grow until old items become fully depreciated and offset new items that are operational.

Rent, Communications, etc: The Enterprise Data Warehouse personnel are going to have to temporarily relocate into the DISA facilities located on Wright-Pat AFB. This increase is paying for their costs while tenants in that space.

In conclusion, to improve the accounting for and make the cost of government programs more visible to the American people, the Administration is proposing to align the full annual budgetary costs of resources used by programs with the budget accounts that fund the programs. To that end, the budget includes a request for a direct appropriation of \$1,899.0 million for the AFISAG, \$703.0 million to fund the full accruing cost of the Civil Service Retirement System and \$1,196.0 million for the retiree health benefits for civilian

employees in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. Beginning with the FY 2004 Budget, these costs will be built-into the rates charged to our customers. This proposal does not increase the total costs to the Federal government, since these costs were previously funded from a central account.

Changes in Cost of Operations
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Information Services Activity Group

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

FUND2
(Dollars in Millions)

	FY01 TO FY02	FY02 TO FY03
COST OF OPERATIONS	561.041	604.020
PRICE CHANGES		
Military Pay	2.257	1.739
Civilian Pay	3.590	2.727
Supply Price Growth	0.597	0.587
Contractor Cost	6.490	5.285
Other	0.423	0.365
TOTAL PRICE CHANGES	13.357	10.703
PRODUCTIVITY CHANGES		
Civilian Labor	0.000	0.000
Military Labor	0.000	0.000
Supply Savings	0.000	0.000
Travel Cost Savings	0.000	0.000
Contract Cost Savings	0.000	0.000
Other	0.000	0.000
TOTAL PRODUCTIVITY CHANGES	0.000	0.000
PROGRAM CHANGES		
BOS	2.032	(0.220)
Other	27.590	(19.430)
TOTAL PROGRAM CHANGES	29.622	(19.650)
OTHER CHANGES	0.000	0.000
COST OF OPERATIONS	604.020	595.073

Sources of Revenue

Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Information Services Activity GroupFiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

FUND11 (Dollars in Millions)	2001	2002	2003
1. DOD COMPONENTS			
Aircraft Procurement	0.000	0.000	0.000
Missile Procurement	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Procurement	47.886	14.431	33.635
MAJCOM O&M	204.601	202.928	220.463
ANG O&M	0.015	0.000	0.000
AFRES O&M	0.000	0.000	0.000
RDTE	76.078	46.836	74.938
AMC	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other AF Customers	53.658	32.488	62.370
TOTAL	382.238	296.683	391.406
2. ORDERS FROM OTHER FUND			
AF Supply Mgmt Act Group	102.021	93.792	110.821
AF Depot Maint Act Group	50.712	41.458	41.115
Army	0.663	0.000	0.474
Navy	0.229	0.076	0.187
Marine Corps	0.674	0.899	0.949
TRANSCOM	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other DOD Customers	83.304	30.233	50.879
TOTAL	237.603	166.458	204.425
3. TOTAL DOD ORDERS	619.841	463.141	595.831
4. OTHER ORDERS			
Other Federal Funds	0.000	0.000	0.000
Trust Funds (Non-Federal)	0.000	0.000	0.000
FMS (Non-Federal)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Non-Federal Funds	0.000	0.000	0.000
TOTAL	0.000	0.000	0.000
5. TOTAL NEW ORDERS	619.841	463.141	595.831
6. CARRY IN ORDERS	147.228	212.893	75.522
7. TOTAL GROSS ORDERS	767.069	676.034	671.353
8. FUNDED CARRYOVER	212.893	75.522	69.753
9. TOTAL GROSS SALES	554.176	600.512	601.600

Revenues and Expenses
Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Information Services Activity Group

FUND14
(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

TOTAL	2001	2002	2003
Revenue:			
Gross Sales	554.176	600.512	601.600
Operations	554.176	600.512	601.600
Capital Surcharge	0.000	0.000	0.000
Depreciation exc Maj Const	0.000	0.000	0.000
Major Construction Dep	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Income	0.000	0.000	1.899
Refunds/Discounts (-)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total Income:	554.176	600.512	603.499
Expenses:			
Cost of Materiel Sold from Inv	0.000	0.000	0.000
Salaries and Wages:			
Military Personnel Compensation & Benefits	37.013	36.252	36.938
Civilian Personnel Compensation & Benefits	82.218	87.946	93.380
Travel & Transportation of Personnel	4.608	7.258	8.876
Materials & Supplies (For internal Operations)	5.441	6.739	12.108
Equipment	29.626	38.456	30.755
Other Purchases from Revolving Funds	2.322	2.000	2.000
Transportation of Things	0.008	0.021	0.027
Depreciation - Capital	8.157	6.829	7.793
Printing and Reproduction	0.000	0.016	0.016
Advisory and Assistance Services	54.818	55.800	55.423
Rent, Communication, Utilities, & Misc. Charge:	(0.001)	0.228	0.326
Other Purchased Services	336.831	362.475	347.431
Total Expenses	561.041	604.020	595.073
Work in Process, Beginning of Year	0.000	0.000	0.000
Work in Process, End of Year	0.000	0.000	0.000
Work in Process, Change	0.000	0.000	0.000
Operating Result	(6.865)	(3.508)	8.426
Less Capital Surcharge Reservation	0.000	0.000	0.000
Plus Passthroughs or Other Approps (NOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Adjustments (NOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Net Operating Result (Calculation)	(6.865)	(3.508)	8.426
Net Operating Result (1307 Report)	(6.865)	(3.508)	8.426
Prior Year Adjustments	0.788	0.000	0.000
Other Changes (AOR)	0.000	0.000	(5.276)
Prior Year AOR	6.435	0.358	(3.150)
Accumulated Operating Result	0.358	(3.150)	0.000
Non-Recoverable Adjustment (AOR)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Accumulated Operating Result for Bdgt Purpose	0.358	(3.150)	0.000

UNITED STATES TRANSPORTATION COMMAND
TRANSPORTATION WORKING CAPITAL FUND
BUDGET NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

This Budget Estimate provides justification for the United States Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF) budget. Common-user transportation assets are under the combatant command (command authority) of USCINCTRANS, excluding Service-unique or theater-assigned assets. USTRANSCOM is the single Department of Defense (DOD) manager for the Defense Transportation System (DTS) in peace and war. USTRANSCOM submits the TWCF budget as a discrete subset of the Air Force Working Capital Fund budget submission. This budget reflects the expense authority needed to meet peacetime operations and the surge/readiness requirements to support the National Military Strategy. Requested capital funding supports the Department's In-Transit Visibility and Command and Control needs and facilitates continuous process improvement, and modernization.

COMPOSITION OF COMPONENT BUSINESS AREA

The mission of USTRANSCOM is to provide air, land, and sea transportation for the DOD, both in time of peace and war. USTRANSCOM is a joint team of transportation components, which operate intermodally to provide a seamless peace-to-war transition. As a unified command, USTRANSCOM exercises combatant command and peacetime management over the common-user aspects of the global mobility network, and executes this responsibility via its Transportation Component Commands (TCCs)--the Air Mobility Command (AMC), the Military Sealift Command (MSC), and the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC). USTRANSCOM ensures this network is capable of rapidly transitioning from peacetime to contingency and wartime operations as required by the National Command Authority. USTRANSCOM forces operate worldwide in direct support of United States humanitarian and military operations which demonstrates DTS readiness on a daily basis. The following describes the TCCs' roles:

AMC operates the nation's airlift services and maintains the worldwide airlift system in a constant state of readiness. Accomplishment of this mission directly affects the readiness and sustainability of our forces throughout the world as well as the nation's ability to deploy CONUS based forces quickly. Airlift capacity generated by the military airlift readiness training program, as well as augmentation from the commercial Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers, is used to satisfy sustainment requirements. AMC also manages service-unique airlift assets for the Department of the Air Force.

Defense Courier Service (DCS) is a joint agency assigned to USTRANSCOM's airlift component. DCS maintains a global network of courier stations. DCS is the DOD agent for secure custody/rapid transfer of highly classified/sensitive national security materials.

Military Sealift Command (MSC) provides sealift support for the Department for both emergent and peacetime requirements. MSC supports four of the Command's major programs—Chartered Cargo, Petroleum Tankerships (POL), Strategic Surge (Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) vessels and Fast Sealift Ships (FSS)), and the Non-Navy Afloat Prepositioning Force (APF-T). MSC obtains the majority of its sealift capability through MSC controlled contracted vessels and operating contracts. MSC also manages Service-unique sealift assets for the Department of the Navy.

Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) provides services as the single defense manager for traffic management, land transportation, common-user ocean terminals, and intermodal container management during peacetime and war. As common-user transportation manager, MTMC manages freight movement, personal property shipment, and passenger traffic worldwide. As a transportation operator, MTMC operates and manages common-user water terminals throughout the world and monitors movements through all terminals. MTMC also has responsibility for intermodal surface transportation referred to in this budget as Liner Ocean Transportation. In addition, MTMC manages Service-unique assets for the Department of the Army.

United States Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) centralized headquarters and three components promote our ability to support the warfighting Commanders in Chief (CINC). The Transportation Component Commands (TCC) provides lines of communication to the Services, ensuring assets are available when needed for a seamless transition from peace to war. Our ability to execute our responsibilities under the National Military Strategy resides in the core competencies of our components. Our successes result from the synergy of military and commercial lift (air, land, and sea), air refueling, port operations, and afloat prepositioning--all involving our TCCs. The TCCs also provide the critical link to the Services' core competencies in organizing, training, and equipping forces. We are inextricably linked to Service training, operations tempo (OPTEMPO), personnel tempo (PERSTEMPO), maintenance, acquisition, logistics, and support policies and procedures--all key enablers in providing ready forces and capabilities.

USTRANSCOM's goal is to effectively and efficiently direct the mix of the above transportation functions in order to meet defense transportation requirements. The establishment of the Joint Mobility Control Group (JMCG) at USTRANSCOM enables us to centralize visibility of all transportation requirements within the DTS. The JMCG exercises command and control over the entire DTS and ensures efficient use of all assets allowing us to make optimum use of training opportunities while meeting customer requirements.

BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

One of the Department of Defense's (DOD) highest priority goals is to maintain a robust and responsive Defense Transportation System (DTS) as a critical element of America's national security strategy for rapid power projection of a CONUS-based force. United States Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) ability to move sufficient numbers of United States forces and equipment enables us to defend vital national interests anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. A strong defense transportation capability gives credence to our alliance commitments by delivering economic and security assistance, and when needed--military forces. The DTS--a partnership of military and commercial assets--enables us to accomplish these actions. The following budget highlights discuss our various initiatives and budget changes.

ECONOMIES AND EFFICIENCIES:

To date, USTRANSCOM productivity and cost avoidance initiatives and organizational streamlining efforts have resulted in savings of over \$1 billion. In cooperation with the Services, USTRANSCOM has made significant progress in streamlining the components. As a Unified Command, USTRANSCOM does not have the authority to direct organizational change within the components--that is a Service authority granted under Title 10. However, over the past decade, the Services have downsized the Transportation Component Commands (TCC) commensurate with overall Department of Defense (DOD) plans. Our streamlining effort is an important step toward achieving a leaner, more efficient DTS, while preserving our war fighting capability. The following outlines our FY94 - FY03 productivity and cost avoidance initiatives and organizational streamlining savings.

PRODUCTIVITY AND COST AVOIDANCE INITIATIVES: Since our inception as a revolving fund activity in FY94, we have produced over \$935 million in savings because of productivity and cost avoidance initiatives. Some of these are:

- Initiating cost reduction initiatives at Military Traffic Management Command
- Renegotiating ship contracts
- Reducing ship testing periods
- Devising fuel savings techniques for our ship charters
- Operating aircraft channels and utilizing aircraft more efficiently
- Scrubbing asset maintenance requirements to ensure only the minimum required expenditures
- Implementing Strategic Distribution Management Initiative (SDMI)
- Revising flying hour models

USTRANSCOM has significantly reduced costs, yet maintained required DTS wartime readiness levels.

STREAMLINING-SAVINGS INITIATIVES: From FY97 to FY03, our budget has reflected over \$206 million in savings as a result of streamlining initiatives. We have undertaken initiatives designed to improve customer service, reduce costs, and operate more efficiently. Since our designation as the single manager for defense transportation, we have aggressively pursued numerous reengineering initiatives. These actions have resulted in a more efficient organization to support our peacetime responsibilities, while preserving go-to-war readiness capability and effectiveness. These initiatives include:

- Reengineering strategic airlift
- Eliminating redundancies between components
- Implementing Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) actions
- Reducing port infrastructure
- Consolidating command headquarters
- Streamlining organizational structures
- Renegotiating contracts
- Implementing cost savings initiatives

COST

COST (\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY01	FY02	FY03
Air Mobility Command (AMC)	\$2,609	\$3,055	\$2,820
Military Sealift Command (MSC)	\$650	\$647	\$682
Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC)	\$922	\$873	\$871
Defense Courier Service (DCS)	\$19	\$21	\$20
Total	\$4,200	\$4,596	\$4,393

Cost Changes: FY02 – FY03

AMC: Cost decreased in FY03 by \$235 million

Major cost changes

- +\$29 million - Inflation
- \$10 million - General & administrative costs
- (\$221) million - Flying hour costs and commercial cargo charters reduced, mainly due to Operation Enduring Freedom workload reflected in FY02 but not in FY03
- (\$49) million - Depot maintenance
- (\$10) million - DLRs due to reduction in C-5 thrust reverser overhauls
- (\$4) million - Other

Military Sealift Command (MSC): Cost increased in FY03 by \$35 million

Major cost changes

- +\$12 million - Inflation
- +\$18 million - Prepo Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) contract operation
- +\$12 million - Two additional Petroleum Tankerships (POL) overhauls in FY03 and more voyage charters
- +\$6 million - Operating costs and ship maintenance for additional Surge LMSRs
- (\$13) million - Fuel consumption and prices

Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC): Cost decreased in FY03 by \$2 million

Major cost changes

- +\$15 million - Inflation (Liner, Global Privately Owned Vehicle (POV), and stevedore contract price changes)
- +\$3 million - Miscellaneous cost increases
- (\$20) million - Direct Booking Initiative
- (\$9) million - Consolidation of MTMC Headquarters

Defense Courier Service (DCS): Cost decreased in FY03 by \$1 million due to organizational structure reducing civilian authorizations

REVENUE

REVENUE (\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY01	FY02	FY03
Air Mobility Command (AMC)	\$2,604	\$3,005	\$2,856
Military Sealift Command (MSC)	\$614	\$681	\$775
Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC)	\$991	\$892	\$793
Defense Courier Service (DCS)	\$20	\$17	\$21
Total	\$4,229	\$4,595	\$4,445

REVENUE: We adjust billing rates each year for MTMC, MSC, DCS and part of AMC to generate enough revenue to cover our costs. Revenue is a function of cost changes plus Accumulated Operating Result (AOR) factors required from last year's budget and this submission. The Air Force subsidizes AMC rates with the Airlift Readiness Account (ARA). The ARA covers the difference between revenue from customer rates and the total required revenue to break even. We compute the ARA by determining the revenue required less the revenue received from customers. Narrative following table contains discussion of financial results.

To improve the accounting for and make the cost of government programs more visible, the Administration is proposing to align the full annual budgetary costs of resources used by programs with the budget accounts that fund the programs. To that end, the budget

includes a request for a direct appropriation of \$20.8 million to fund the full accruing cost of the Civil Service Retirement System and retiree health benefits for civilian employees in the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. Beginning with the FY 2004 Budget, these costs will be built-into the rates charged to Transportation Working Capital Fund customers. This proposal does not increase the total costs to the Federal government, since these costs were previously funded from a central account.

NET OPERATING RESULT/ACCUMULATED OPERATING RESULT (NOR/AOR)

NOR/AOR (\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY01	FY02	FY03
Beginning AOR	-\$11	\$5	\$16
Operating Result	\$29	-\$1	\$52
Other Adjustments	-\$13	\$12	-\$50
NOR	\$16	\$11	\$2
Ending AOR	\$5	\$16	\$18

FY01 OPERATING RESULT: We estimated FY01 operating result at a negative \$24 million in the FY02 Budget Estimates. Our actual FY01 operating result is a positive \$29 million, an increase of \$53 million.

FY02 OPERATING RESULT: We estimated FY02 operating result at a positive \$78 million in the FY02 Budget Estimates. Our current FY02 estimate is a negative \$1 million, a decrease of \$79 million.

FY03 OPERATING RESULT: FY03 operating result brings United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) to zero accumulated operating result (AOR) by FY03 in accordance with Working Capital Fund policy with the exception of the MTMC. The budget includes AOR recovery for the Cargo Operations Business Area over FY04 and FY05.

DISBURSEMENTS, COLLECTIONS, AND NET OUTLAYS

(\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY01	FY02	FY03
Disbursements	\$4,357	\$4,873	\$4,623
Collections	\$4,416	\$4,895	\$4,688
Net Outlays	(\$59)	(\$22)	(\$65)

Net Outlay Changes: FY02 – FY03

- Disbursements decreased in FY03 by \$250 million
 - Costs decreased by \$203 million
 - Accounts payable decreased by \$42 million

- Collections decreased in FY03 by \$207 million
- Revenue decreased by \$150 million
 - Accounts receivable increased by \$23 million

UNIT COST

AIR MOBILITY COMMAND (AMC) UNIT COST	FY01	FY02	FY03
Channel Passenger (Million Passenger Miles)	\$219,860	\$224,200	\$214,243
Channel Cargo (Million Ton miles)	\$1,714,252	\$1,979,642	\$1,902,814
SAAM/JCS (Million Ton Miles)	\$774,559	\$690,413	\$727,182
Training – Cost per Flying Hour			
--- C-5	\$18,375	\$19,657	\$21,421
--- C-17	\$7,673	\$8,516	\$8,563
--- C-141	\$7,834	\$8,829	\$13,229

MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND (MSC) UNIT COST	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Chartered Cargo Point-to-Point Measurement Ton Miles	43,845	57,650	59,016
Petroleum Tankership Ship Days	51,563	47,586	49,820
Surge Full Operating Status (FOS) Ship Days	32,701	60,000	56,889
Surge Reduced Operating Status (ROS) Ship Days	21,289	20,829	17,999
Army Afloat Prepo Ship Days	38,310	36,385	39,160
Air Force Afloat Prepo Ship Days	30,952	33,624	32,740
Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Afloat Prepo Ship Days	26,758	36,164	36,530
Chartered Cargo Ship Days	25,933	35,138	34,138

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND (MTMC) UNIT COST	FY01	FY02	FY03
Cargo Operations (MTON)	\$27.71	\$26.19	\$25.43
Global Privately Owned Vehicle (POV)	\$2,893.00	\$2,886.00	\$2,924.00
Liner Ocean Transportation (MTON)	\$87.37	\$92.54	\$88.98

DEFENSE COURIER SERVICE (DCS) UNIT COST	FY01	FY02	FY03
Cost per 1,000 pounds delivered	\$5,770	\$5,750	\$5,722

WORKLOAD ASSUMPTIONS

Workload at United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) means three things:

- (1) Readiness – training of airlift crews and maintaining the Nation's mobilization infrastructure for the purpose of adequate wartime surge capacity
- (2) Contingency Operations – emergent humanitarian, peacekeeping, and other operations ordered by the National Command Authority that require transportation services
- (3) Recurring peacetime workload – the routine movement via air, land, and sea of our Department of Defense (DOD) and non-DOD customers' cargo and passengers

Readiness: The Bottom Up Review Update (BURU) established the transportation force structure and infrastructure to achieve readiness requirements. The Mobility Requirements Study (MRS) 05 validated the Strategic Mobility Requirements (SMR) in the BURU and identified shortfalls in our current surge capability. We are currently 10 million ton miles per day (MTM/D) below this requirement and are experiencing difficulty with low mission capable rates for the C-5 fleet and reduced number of tails with retiring C-141s as we replace 270 C-141s with 137 C-17s. The solution is to meet the MRS-05 strategic airlift minimum moderate risk requirement of 54.5 MTM/D and sustain our day-to-day commitment to our customers (National Command Authority, Services, CINCs, and taxpayers). We plan to do this with the Reliability Enhancement and Re-engineing Program (RERP) for C-5Bs, buying 180 C-17s, evaluating the feasibility of commercial C-17s, and nurturing the total force partnerships we have with the Air Reserve Component and Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). Our Surge sealift investment programs have proven to be sufficient and will be at full capacity by FY02. However, over the past several years' enhancements to the support forces and reserve units, which have significantly improved warfighting capabilities have also increased overall lift demands. To achieve the desired force closures for the major theater wars, we will require commercial augmentation to surface and sealift movement assets and improvements to DOD infrastructure at key U.S. and overseas installations.

Contingency Operations: The National Security Strategy for a New Century (May 1997) specifies the need to remain actively engaged throughout the world to minimize security risks to the United States. Specifically, the strategy cites peacekeeping operations, counter proliferation of weapons, humanitarian missions, and drug trafficking interdiction as the means to mitigate recurring security risks. All of these operations require USTRANSCOM services; therefore, we expect high OPTEMPO to continue into the future. In most cases, contingency workload substitutes for normal workload in that units being transported are not conducting normal training but are engaged in a contingency. Based on current guidance, we generally do not reflect any assumptions for unplanned contingency workload, cost, or revenue in the budget years (FY02-03). However, we

included a Noble Eagle/Enduring Freedom workload assumption in FY02, improving net operating results by \$137M. Additionally, we do budget for ongoing planned workload such as SOUTHERN WATCH and JOINT FORGE.

Recurring Peacetime Workload: We establish our peacetime workload estimates based on current customer transportation projections. Customers provide the projections to United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) via workload conferences, other correspondence, and historical trends, combined with analysis of future force structure.

AIR MOBILITY COMMAND AMC WORKLOAD	FY01	FY02	FY03
Training Flying Hours C-5	7,385	7,333	10,015
Training Flying Hours C-17	24,239	24,505	36,434
Training Flying Hours C-141	11,486	5,054	545
Channel Passenger Miles	1,238.1	1,244.7	1,314.0
Channel Cargo Ton Miles	530.1	550.9	542.3
Special Assignment Airlift Mission (SAAM)/JCS Ton Miles	1,312.6	1,865.4	1,337.3

C-5 flying hours

FY03 increases as we transferred 2,682 hours from channel to training

C-17 flying hours

FY03 increases with C-17 fleet size and transfer of 7,318 hours from channel to training

C-141 flying hours

FY03 decreases primarily due to retirement of the C-141 fleet

Channel passenger workload

FY03 increases due to stronger enforcement of Patriot Express for Permanent Change of Station (PCS) riders

Channel cargo workload

FY03 decreases due to a slightly lower customer forecast

SAAM/JCS workload

FY03 decrease due to the absence of Enduring Freedom workload

MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND (MSC) WORKLOAD	FY01	FY02	FY03
Chartered Cargo Point to Point	593	732	732
Petroleum Tankership (POL) Ship Days	3,008	2,444	2,503
Surge Full Operating Status (FOS) Ship Days	211	225	225
Surge Reduced Operating Status (ROS) Ship Days	5,308	5,958	6,845
Army Afloat Prepo Ship Days	5,017	5,472	5,475
Air Force Afloat Prepo Ship Days	1,092	1,032	1,460
Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Afloat Prepo Ship Days	1,095	1,095	1,095
Chartered Cargo Ship Days	2,734	1,699	1,699

Chartered Cargo point to point million measurement ton miles (MMTM)
FY03 stays relatively constant

POL Tankership days
FY03 increases due to two T-5 tanker overhauls

Surge FOS days
FY03 stays relatively constant

Surge ROS days
FY03 increases due to the delivery of additional Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) vessels

Army Afloat Prepo days
FY03 increases due to LMSR related ship mix changes

Air Force Afloat Prepo days
FY03 increases due to addition of fourth ship

Chartered Cargo days
FY03 stays relatively constant

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND (MTMC) WORKLOAD	FY01	FY02	FY03
Cargo Operations Measurement Tons (MTONS)	3,673,373	3,700,000	3,700,000
Global Privately Owned Vehicle (POV) Vehicles	76,005	74,000	74,000
Liner Ocean Transportation (MTONS)	5,100,216	4,600,000	4,600,000

Cargo Operations
FY03 stays relatively constant

Global POV
FY03 stays relatively constant

Liner Ocean Transportation
 FY03 stays relatively constant

DEFENSE COURIER SERVICE (DCS) WORKLOAD	FY01	FY02	FY03
Pounds Delivered (thousands)	3,344	3,600	3,600

Pounds Delivered
 FY03 stays relatively constant

CUSTOMER RATE CHANGES

AIR MOBILITY COMMAND (AMC) RATE CHANGES	FY01	FY02	FY03
Channel Passengers	7.5%	6.0%	10.7%
Channel Cargo	7.5%	7.2%	11.0%
Special Assignment Airlift Mission (SAAM)/Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Exercises	13.7%	-3.8%	0.4%
Training	11.2%	9.6%	-1.9%

Channel Passengers
 FY03 channel passenger rate increase offset a suppressed FY02 rate increase

Channel Cargo
 FY03 channel cargo rate increase due to a recent commercial benchmarking initiative

SAAM /JCS Exercises
 FY03 SAAM rates remain stable, as lower fuel prices offset standard inflation

Training
 FY03 training rate decrease primarily due to lower fuel prices

MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND (MSC) RATE CHANGES	FY01	FY02	FY03
Chartered Cargo	16.3%	-4.4%	37.4%
Petroleum Tankerships (POL)	-9.3%	14.4%	13.4%
Surge	-2.7%	45.6%	-8.7%
Afloat Prepositioning (APF-T)	-.7%	14.5%	11.7%

Chartered Cargo
 FY03 Chartered Cargo rate increase due to recoupment of FY01 and FY02 losses caused by an unbudgeted loss of workload

POL

FY03 POL rate increase reflects recoument of FY01 losses caused by increased ship maintenance and repair (M&R), increased spot charters, and two more overhauls in FY03 than in FY02

Surge

FY03 Surge rate decrease due to elimination of additional Sea Trials approved in the FY02 rate and return of prior year profit

APF-T

FY03 APF-T rate increase due to reduced M&R, overhauls, and no new Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) deliveries in the Army program offset by the addition of one Air Force Prepo ship in FY03

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND (MTMC) RATE CHANGES	FY01	FY02	FY03
Cargo Operations	-27.0%	-40.0%	-38.3%
Global Privately Owned Vehicle (POV)	-7.5%	-7.0%	-14.7%
Liner Ocean Transportation	15.1%	-1.4%	-8.4%

Cargo Operations:

FY03 Cargo Operations rate decrease due to FY01 cost recovery over FY02 and FY03. The budget includes a cost recovery for the Cargo Operations business area over FY04 and FY05. Fifty percent of the FY03 Cargo Operations recoverable amount is budgeted for FY04 and fifty percent is budgeted for FY05.

Global POV

FY03 Global POV rate decrease is a result of a return of profits from FY02

Liner Ocean Transportation

FY03 Liner Ocean Transportation rate decrease is a result of a return of profits from FY02

DEFENSE COURIER SERVICE (DCS) RATE	FY01	FY02	FY03
Pounds Delivered	1.7%	-22.0%	-4.4%

Pounds Delivered

FY03 rate decrease due to return of prior year profits

CAPITAL PURCHASE PROGRAM

United States Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) major systems under development and modernization are interim migratory systems. This budget enables the continued upgrade to allow us to move into the 21st century. Our Capital Purchase Program (CPP) includes investment in Automated Data Processing Equipment (ADPE) and telecommunications equipment, software development, minor construction, and equipment (other than ADPE and telecommunications). Global Transportation Network (GTN) is one of our major systems efforts. The budget contains capital funding for its replacement—GTN 21. GTN 21 development begins in FY02.

CAPITAL (\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY01	FY02	FY03
Equipment	\$1.4	\$7.5	\$7.6
ADPE and Telecom Equip	\$49.7	\$57.7	\$52.2
Software Development	\$136.0	\$124.6	\$129.6
Minor Construction	\$9.8	\$10.4	\$12.3
Total CPP	\$196.9	\$200.2	\$201.7

FY03 Increase:

Command and Control Information Processing System (C2IPS) migrates into Global Decision Support System (GDSS)

MANPOWER TRENDS

United States Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) funded staffing is approximately 78 percent military and 22 percent civilian. Maintaining a ready airlift capability consumes 84 percent of our workforce. Military Sealift Command (MSC) meets the majority of its requirements through commercial charter and port contracts; therefore, it is not manpower intensive. Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) budget reflects manpower reductions due to organizational streamlining. The efficient use of manpower by our components is integral to the national mobilization and strategic lift capability.

MILITARY END STRENGTH AND WORKYEARS

	FY01	FY02	FY03
Army	243	273	248
Navy	202	206	206
Marine Corps	18	17	17
Air Force	13,745	13,726	13,856
Total Military End Strength	14,208	14,222	14,327
Total Military Workyears	13,736	13,628	13,609

FY02 - FY03 Military End Strength Force Changes:

- Air Force end strength increases to support growth in C-17 crew requirements and recomputation of manpower requirements based on weapon system needs
- Decrease in MTMC due to organizational streamlining and transfer to operation & maintenance (O&M) activities

Military Workyears: We computed workyear levels using a three-year rolling average in accordance with budget guidance

CIVILIAN END STRENGTH

	FY01	FY02	FY03
United States Direct Hire	3,532	3,608	3,493
Foreign National Direct Hire	226	202	196
Foreign National Indirect Hire	445	453	453
Total Civilian	4,203	4,263	4,142

CIVILIAN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS (FTE)

	FY01	FY02	FY03
United States Direct Hire	3,643	3,640	3,492
Foreign National Direct Hire	229	202	196
Foreign National Indirect Hire	458	453	453
Total Civilian	4,330	4,295	4,141

FY02 - FY03 Civilian FTE Change: Changes commensurate with reduced workload requirements

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Air Mobility Command (AMC):

- Number of Pallets - Percentage of pallet positions offered versus used on Continental United States (CONUS) outbound channel cargo missions
GOAL: 92%
- On-Time Commercial Mission - Percentage of time channel passenger commercial missions are within 20 minutes of scheduled departure
GOAL: 94%
- Flight Crew Readiness - Percentage of assigned crews qualified to fly primary missions
GOAL: 90%

Military Sealift Command (MSC):

- On-Time Pickup or Delivery - Percentage of shipments that meet required lift dates or delivery dates based on predetermined agreed upon lift and delivery requirements as established by the customer
GOAL: 95%
- Ship Availability - Days against plan that ships are actually available to perform their intended function
GOAL: 95%

Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC):

- Response to Customer Requirements (Passenger) - Time it takes MTMC from receipt of the customer movement requirement to confirmation of surface transportation
GOAL: 100%
- Response to Customer Requirements (Freight) - Percentage of solicitation awards that meet agreed upon start-up dates
GOAL: 97%
- Containers "Lifted" - Movement of cargo by land inside MTMC cargo system. Measure containers "lifted" (placed on a ship) to published booking schedules in accordance with Movement Standard Movement Procedures
GOAL: 91%
- Completeness of Ocean Cargo Manifests – Percentage of cargo not included on the original manifest
GOAL: 85%
- Timeliness of Ocean Cargo Manifests - Percentage of time MTMC does not produce a manifest in accordance with Movement Standard Movement Procedures
GOAL: 80%

- Timeliness of Advance Transportation Control Movement Documents (ATCMD) -
Percentage of time the ATCMD was not provided to the port
GOAL: 68%
- Accuracy of ATCMDs - Percentage of accurate ATCMDs provided to the port
GOAL: 90%
- Water Port Hold Time Uniform Material Movement and Issue Priority System (UMMIPS)
- Percentage of manifested cargo not meeting UMMIPS standards
GOAL: 96%
- Transit Time Performance for Customer Service Contracts - Time standards as
prescribed by various contracts (i.e., Defense Commissary Agency (DECA) to Europe)
GOAL: 97%

Changes in the Costs of Operation
Component: United States Transportation Command/Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(Dollars in Millions)

	Expenses
FY 2001 Est Actual:	\$4,200.3
FY 2002 Estimate in President's Budget:	\$4,527.2
Estimated Impact in FY 2002 of Actual FY 2001 Experience:	
Pricing Adjustments:	(\$7.0)
a. FY 2002 Pay Raise	\$1.8
(1) Civilian Personnel	\$1.8
(2) Military Personnel	\$0.0
b. Annualization of Prior Year Pay Raises	\$0.1
(1) Civilian Personnel	\$0.0
(2) Military Personnel	\$0.1
c. Liner Ocean Transportation Contract Price Decrease	(\$11.6)
d. Global POV Contract Price Decrease	(\$3.2)
e. Stevedore Contract Price Increase	\$2.0
f. General Purchase Inflation	\$3.9
Productivity Initiatives & Other Efficiencies:	(\$52.8)
a. Strategic Distribution Management Initiative (SDMI)	(\$11.2)
b. Flying Hour Model Revisions	(\$32.6)
c. Organizational Streamlining	(\$9.0)
d. Non-Add: SDMI Revenue Enhancement = \$14.6M	\$0.0
e. Non-Add: Portion of Flying Hour Model Revisions in PB = \$35.3M	\$0.0
Program Changes:	\$128.4
a. Airlift Workload and Other Changes	\$151.5
b. Aircraft Maintenance	\$18.2
c. Travel	\$10.9
d. Increased Depot Maintenance Costs	\$28.2
e. ADPE Maintenance and Operations	\$11.8
f. Sealift Workload Changes	(\$60.5)
g. Liner Ocean Transportation Fuel Surcharge	(\$8.0)
h. Contractual Changes	\$12.1
I. Underestimation of Average Workyear Cost	\$7.4
j. Liner Ocean Transportation Program Estimate Adjustment	(\$29.6)
k. Direct Booking Initiative	(\$25.0)
l. Depreciation	\$3.4
m. Other	\$8.0
FY2002 Current Estimate:	\$4,595.8

Changes in the Costs of Operation
Component: United States Transportation Command/Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(Dollars in Millions)

	Expenses
FY2002 Current Estimate:	\$4,595.8
Pricing Adjustments:	\$65.9
a. FY 2003 Pay Raise	\$6.3
(1) Civilian Personnel	\$5.1
(2) Military Personnel	\$1.2
b. Annualization of Prior Year Pay Raises	\$4.0
(1) Civilian Personnel	\$3.7
(2) Military Personnel	\$0.3
c. Fuel	(\$77.8)
d. Supplies	\$35.6
e. Military Augmentation Rate Increase	\$2.0
f. Depot Maintenance	\$36.4
g. Global POV Contract Price Increase	\$2.9
h. Liner Ocean Transportation Contract Price Increase	\$3.5
i. CSRS/FEHB Benefits	\$20.8
j. Stevedore Contract Price Increase	\$1.7
k. Chartered Sealift Contract Price Increase	\$3.6
l. General Purchase Inflation	\$31.9
m Other	(\$5.0)
Productivity Initiatives & Other Efficiencies:	(\$14.9)
a. Organizational Streamlining	(\$13.0)
b. Flying Hour Model Revisions (Organic)	(\$1.6)
c. Mobility 2000	(\$0.3)
Program Changes:	(\$253.6)
a. Airlift Workload and Other Changes	(\$219.0)
b. Aircraft Maintenance	(\$10.2)
c. Decrease in Depot Maintenance Costs	(\$49.4)
d. Base Support (G&A) Costs	\$9.8
e. Sealift Workload Changes	\$40.2
f. Fuel Requirements Change	(\$4.7)
g. Information Technology Costs	(\$6.1)
h. Direct Booking Initiative	(\$19.7)
i. ADPE Maintenance and Operations	(\$2.2)
j. Depreciation	\$9.2
k. Other	(\$1.5)
FY 2003 Estimate:	\$4,393.2

Activity Group Analysis
Component/Activity Group: United States Transportation Command
SOURCE OF NEW ORDERS AND REVENUE
(Dollars in Millions)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
1. New Orders			
a. Orders from DOD Components	3,617.0	4,016.6	3,883.3
Air Force	1,638.5	1,700.7	1,705.0
Military Personnel	170.2	169.8	172.7
Other Procurement	16.9	20.6	17.4
Operations and Maintenance	1,289.4	1,337.8	1,350.5
ANG, O&M	7.7	9.7	6.9
AFRES, O&M	147.1	153.8	151.4
RDT&E	5.0	7.1	4.6
Other	2.2	1.9	1.5
Army:	982.7	1,140.0	1,033.5
Military Personnel	192.5	211.8	202.9
Other Procurement	3.8	2.5	1.7
AAFES	97.9	110.3	101.7
Operations and Maintenance	659.3	794.5	708.6
NG, O&M	12.6	7.1	5.1
RDT&E	10.2	7.8	7.0
Other	6.4	6.0	6.5
Navy:	447.0	548.0	529.0
Military Personnel	113.4	131.6	102.7
NEXCOM	28.2	31.4	29.2
Operations and Maintenance	201.3	376.9	394.7
NG, O&M	0.7	1.7	1.8
Other	103.4	6.4	0.6
Marines:	108.0	109.4	94.0
Military Personnel	50.2	51.9	46.8
MCEX	2.0	0.5	0.5
Operations and Maintenance	52.6	56.8	46.6
Other	3.2	0.2	0.1
OSD:	440.8	518.5	521.8
Operations & Maintenance:	313.0	335.5	354.9
JCS	273.8	310.0	316.7
Health Affairs	27.8	20.9	24.1
NSA	4.1	3.1	3.1
DIA	0.1	0.7	0.1
Other	7.2	0.8	10.9
Other	127.8	183.0	166.9
b. Orders from other Fund Activity groups	551.0	503.4	497.2
DECA	83.6	72.5	65.0
DLA	379.8	339.4	339.4
Other	87.6	91.5	92.8
c. Total DoD	4,168.0	4,520.0	4,380.5
d. Other Orders:	61.5	75.1	64.8
Other Federal Agencies	26.9	36.5	29.9
Trust Fund	7.5	10.8	8.9
Non Federal Agencies	16.2	22.1	21.1
Foreign Military Sales	10.9	5.7	4.9
Total New Orders	4,229.5	4,595.1	4,445.3
2. Carry-In Orders	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Total Gross Orders	4,229.5	4,595.1	4,445.3
4. Funded Carry-over	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Total Gross Sales	4,229.5	4,595.1	4,445.3

Transportation Working Capital Fund
Component: United States Transportation Command/Activity Group: Transportation
Revenue and Expenses
(Dollars in Millions)

	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Revenue			
Gross Sales	\$4,241.7	\$4,595.1	\$4,424.5
Operations	\$4,040.0	\$4,344.2	\$4,185.2
Capital Surcharge	\$13.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
Cash Surcharge	\$0.0	\$50.0	\$50.0
Depreciation excluding Maj Const	\$188.2	\$200.9	\$210.1
Major Construction Depreciation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Other Income	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$20.8
Refunds/Discounts(-)	(\$12.2)	\$0.0	\$0.0
 Total Income:	 \$4,229.5	 \$4,595.1	 \$4,445.3
Expenses:			
Salaries and Wages:			
Military Personnel Compensation & Benefits	\$55.0	\$45.9	\$46.9
Civilian Personnel Compensation & Benefits	\$254.7	\$269.5	\$288.5
Travel and Transportation of Personnel	\$83.8	\$84.8	\$84.2
Materials and Supplies (For internal operations)	\$894.8	\$1,078.8	\$903.5
Equipment	\$7.6	\$10.1	\$10.3
Other Purchases from Revolving Funds	\$352.9	\$437.2	\$430.8
Transportation of Things	\$13.9	\$18.8	\$19.1
Depreciation - Capital	\$188.2	\$200.9	\$210.1
Printing and Reproduction	\$1.1	\$1.3	\$1.3
Advisory and Assistance Services	\$13.9	\$15.7	\$15.3
Rent, Communications, Utilities, and Misc Charges	\$28.2	\$35.7	\$38.3
Other Purchased Services	\$2,306.2	\$2,397.1	\$2,344.9
 Total Expenses	 \$4,200.3	 \$4,595.8	 \$4,393.2
Operating Result	\$29.2	(\$0.7)	\$52.1
Less Capital Surcharge Reservation	\$13.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
Plus Passthroughs of Other Appropriations affecting NOR/AOR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Other Changes Affecting NOR	\$0.0	\$12.0	(\$50.0)
Net Operating Result	\$15.7	\$11.3	\$2.1
Beginning AOR	(\$10.7)	\$5.0	\$16.3
Prior Year Adjustments	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Other Changes Affecting AOR (Specify)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Accumulated Operating Result	\$5.0	\$16.3	\$18.4
Non-Recoverable Adjustment Impacting AOR (Specify)	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Accumulated Operating Results for Budget Purposes	\$5.0	\$16.3	\$18.4

***UNITED STATES
AIR FORCE
WORKING CAPITAL
FUND***



***U.S. AIR FORCE
FY 2003
Capital Budget***

Capital Budget Summary

**Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Supply Management Activity Group**

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

FUND9A
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Description	FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
EQUIPMENT	4	0.691	0	0.000	0	0.000
Replacement	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000
ELEC. MICROSCOPE	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000
HUB COMPUTER	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000
Productivity	4	0.691	0	0.000	0	0.000
Microscope (VAFB)	2	0.390	0	0.000	0	0.000
Spect. Microscope	1	0.122	0	0.000	0	0.000
SPECTROMETER MASS	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000
Spectrophotometer	1	0.179	0	0.000	0	0.000
ADPE & TELECOM	2	4.500	4	7.320	4	8.480
EDW H/W	0	0.000	1	2.310	1	3.465
Inventory Val hw	0	0.000	1	0.410	1	0.200
KeystoneHW	1	0.450	1	0.100	1	0.165
MMSHW	1	4.050	1	4.500	1	4.650
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT	10	33.868	12	56.244	12	59.701
Externally Developed	10	33.868	12	56.244	12	59.701
ABACUSSW	1	1.432	1	1.957	1	1.969
CARLOS Enhancement	1	0.500	0	0.000	0	0.000
EDW	0	0.000	1	5.100	1	7.690
EXPRESS (D0878X)	1	0.425	1	0.425	1	1.125
FIABSSW	0	0.000	1	6.155	1	1.000
Inventory Val	0	0.000	1	3.200	1	1.580
KeystoneSW	1	0.691	1	1.440	1	3.571
MP&E	1	3.225	1	8.612	1	4.800
PCMS	1	0.000	1	6.625	1	7.575
PRPS (D203)	1	0.625	1	3.275	1	2.275
RMS	1	5.155	1	6.665	1	7.436
RSSP	1	3.825	1	3.425	1	1.880
SCS	1	17.990	1	9.365	1	18.800
Total	16	39.059	16	63.564	16	68.181

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: EDW HW
Item Description: HQAF00013
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	2.310	2.310	1	3.465	3.465

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW)

Description and Purpose:

The Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) Program is a cross-functional Program that encompasses the 23 combat support functions of the Global Combat Support System (GCSS-AF). It will provide the data sharing and functional integration of data required by GCSS-AF in support of the AF Warfighter. Through the use of modern query and data mining tools the EDW cross-functional data will be transformed into the information required by the war fighters and combat support personnel, accessible via the AF Portal. Gathering and storing enterprise wide data in a secure, reliable and consistent manner, through web accessible portals, the EDW will enable modern decision support tools to quickly provide clear and accurate decision support information. The Material Support Division (MSD) is the primary functional area with the largest requirement for EDW and has the largest volume of data that will reside in EDW. Other functional areas like Maintenance (AF/ILM) have identified their peculiar functional requirements and have provided funding for those EDW requirements. To gain the maximum benefit from an EDW, cross-functional data needs to be loaded into EDW. Currently, only REMIS historical aircraft maintenance data is loaded. By January 2002, comm-electronics, engine, and airlift data will also be loaded. The next group of functions to be loaded will be supply chain management, asset visibility, cataloging, mission capable parts, requirements determination, and item management data. The aircraft Mission Design Series (MDS) phase (Increment III) will take two years for the initial loading of data and developing the initial capability. This endeavor will significantly enhance the Air Force's ability to improve weapon system availability, asset visibility, operational readiness, contingency planning and combat operations. Supply data from selected Materiel Support Division (MSD) supply systems like REMIS, SCS, D043, D165 (MICAP data), WSMIS, and D200 will be folded into EDW by the end of FY03 followed by other logistics and decision support data in FY04/05. The entire combat support enterprise will be covered by the close of FY07.

The Enterprise Data Warehouse establishes an open, flexible, shared data environment for the Air Force's combat support community and opens up unprecedented lines of communications with the operations community. Enhanced access and analytical query capabilities will allow war fighters to look beyond what is in multiple Air Force combat support data bases, decision support systems and local "home grown" tools, to verifying suspected trends and analyze current data before they restrict combat capability. The EDW will drive an order of magnitude improvement in a commander's ability to make decisions and impact readiness. This will be GCSS-AF compliant. Hardware consists of upgrades for storage, processing and communications components.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

As EDW development progresses we must purchase additional storage capacity to accommodate planned data systems feeds. The current Teredata storage box is near capacity and additional capacity is urgently required to continue EDW development.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

Program Completion:

The entire combat support enterprise will be completed by the close of FY07.

Point Of Contact:

Tina Vasquez, MSG/MAE, DSN 787-5077 (X6299)

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Inventory Val hw

Item Description: MSD0001

Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	0.410	0.410	1	0.200	0.200

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Inventory Valuation Hardware

Description and Purpose:

The Chief Financial (CFO) Act of 1990 requires DoD to produce accurate, complete, timely, and consistent financial information for management. The requirement is to produce auditable financial statements with the ultimate goal of an unqualified audit opinion. Federal accounting standards require inventories to be valued based on historical costs. Valuation is of particular importance to capture the cost of operations in the DoD working capital funds, which in turn is critical to the profit and loss, and cash position as reported in AF Financial Statements.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

With the current system, senior AF financial managers have difficulty getting timely, credible information and meeting statutory requirements for producing CFO Act compliant and auditable financial statements. A major reason is that the Air Force Supply Management Business Area general ledger system, Financial Inventory Accounting and Billing System (FIABS), does not capture the information needed to report historical costs. Further, FIABS was designed using a collection of legacy data processing systems intended for logistical information not accounting data.

Impact:

This capital investment is required to purchase new servers to meet increased storage and processing demands.

Program Completion:

Projected completion is FY07.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

Point of Contact:

Pam Henson, HQ AFMC/FM PMO, DSN 787-4394

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: KeystoneHW
Item Description: HQAFMC0001
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.450	0.450	1	0.100	0.100	1	0.165	0.165

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Keystone (H303) Decision Support System (DSS)

Description and Purpose:

The Keystone (H303) Decision Support System has evolved from the Unit Cost Analysis and Resource Tracking System (UCARTS) requirement to provide unit cost ratio information for the Air Force Working Capital Fund Materiel Support Division (MSD). UCARTS was terminated in August 1997 because it did not meet program objectives. The Keystone (H303) DSS provides improved functionality previously identified for UCARTS, with additional capabilities for visibility into MSD sales and costs down to Product Directorate and weapon system level. Keystone also has ad hoc analysis capability, allowing improved comparisons of estimates and actual costs, facilitating MSD budgeting and reporting capabilities.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

Increased user demand and stricter security requirements will require expanded hardware requirements capacity and continuing security improvements to maintain system performance specifications. Hardware upgrades are anticipated to include processor and memory expansion/upgrades, plus system security protocol improvements.

Impact:

Approval of this request will allow us to purchase hardware upgrades to include processor and memory expansions, which will increase user accessibility, response time, and permit us to remain compliant with security requirements.

Economic Analysis:

A current approved economic analysis is on file.

Program Completion:

Hardware purchased with FY02 or FY03 funds will be delivered within eight weeks of purchase request initiation and generally will be within the FY.

Point of Contact:

Rick Iacobucci, HQ AFMC/FMRS, DSN 787- 4615

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: MMSHW
Item Description: JLSC001
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	4.050	4.050	1	4.500	4.500	1	4.650	4.650

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Material Management System

Description and Purpose:

These funds will be used to continue modernization efforts of the depot material management infrastructure for MSD. This work is necessary to support modern data systems architecture required by Defense Information Infrastructure/Common Operating Environment (DII/COE). Additionally, the work is required for the data systems to move into Global Combat Support Systems (GCSS) AF in compliance with USAF/IL direction. GCSS-AF and DII/COE will bring all the systems into a common operating environment. This, with the combination of on-line, real-time capability, will allow users from the entire Air Force to share data for analysis as well as automated and interactive file maintenance actions, suspense tracking, and determine order status. The number of interfaces will be reduced and the systems will provide more timely and accurate information to decision makers.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current infrastructure does not support the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment, we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction.

Impact:

The MSD hardware capital funding requirements cover hardware replacement, hardware installation, infrastructure upgrades, new server requirements, server upgrades and replacements. All purchases are necessary to accommodate GCSS-AF migration and are planned to meet existing DII/COE technical specifications. The majority of existing MSD computers are antiquated and are not capable of the processing speed necessary to accommodate Windows NT/2000 deployment. To achieve DII/COE compliance, one third (660) of all MSD computers will be replaced in FY02 and FY03. This replacement cycle supports GCSS migration and HQ AFMC ADPE replacement policy, and the continued deployment of modernized MSD systems. Cost of each computer is estimated to be \$3K. The installation of new computers also drives additional costs for infrastructure upgrades. These costs include routers, hubs, switches and fiber wiring necessary to accommodate the Windows NT/2000 bandwidth during network connection. These costs are estimated to be \$750 per new computer installed. The remaining FY 02/03 SMAG hardware purchases are new servers supporting GCSS migration and DII COE architecture standards. Migration from mainframe computing to mid-tiers will temporarily require dual processing to avoid single point failure while transitioning to the new environment. Two types of new server purchases (HPV servers and NT servers) are planned in FY02 and FY03. Some of the existing servers can be economically modified with additional storage or memory capacity. Server upgrade funding is applied where it is technologically feasible to meet DII COE requirements and processing meets the server life cycle thus minimizing full replacement costs. New license and license upgrades are necessary for the latest server software technology to accommodate GCSS migration. Material/item managers need this hardware to reap full benefit of the newly deployed software. Without upgrades the system performance would be at unacceptable levels.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of ADPE using FY02 funds will be completed in FY02. Delivery of ADPE using FY03 funds will be completed in FY03

Point of Contact:

Carolyn Cunningham. HQ AFMC/LGNM. DSN 674-0131

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: ABACUSSW

Item Description: HQSAF0012

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	1.432	1.432	1	1.957	1.957	1	1.969	1.969

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System (ABACUS)

Description and Purpose:

This capital purchase request reflects the costs estimated for functional contractor support to effect analysis/documentation/validation of an enhanced budget system, plus an initial estimate for software development contractor support for an enhanced budget system. This enhanced budget system is intended to be more responsive to changing Air Force Working Capital Funds (AFWCF) business practices, automating current manual processes, and providing "what if" scenario capability. This enhanced budget system will be used by MSD personnel at the Pentagon, AFMC, and the ALCs to build budgets, and respond to ad hoc requests for information.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current ABACUS is used to create and assemble budgets in a uniform manner for approximately six months out of the year. The remaining time ABACUS is not used. Analysts currently work offline to develop budget data, and then key the information into ABACUS. There is no database to store historical data which could be used to analyze trends. Changes that occur at higher organizational levels during budget reviews cannot be distributed properly to lower levels. Changes to AFWCF procedures are not easily incorporated due to current system architecture and operating environment. There is no interface between ABACUS and other information systems currently in use. Budget submissions are sent by File Transfer Protocol, which is a tedious process. The proposed changes to ABACUS will fix all of these shortfalls. The resulting system will be a budget generation, reporting and execution tool that can be used throughout the year.

Impact:

An enhanced ABACUS will allow more time for analysis, because historical data and interface information will be available within ABACUS. Time will be saved by allowing budgets to be developed in ABACUS. Files can be transferred easily from lower to higher levels.

Estimated Completion Date:

FY05

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

POC: Denette Marshall, HQ AFMC/FMRS, DSN 787-4626

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: EDW

Item Description: HQAF00012

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	5.100	5.100	1	7.690	7.690

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) Software

Description and Purpose:

The Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) program will bring together the full spectrum of Air Force combat support data to include maintenance, supply, transportation, finance, contracting and planning. Through the use of modern query and data mining tools the EDW cross-functional data will be transformed into the information required by the war fighters. Gathering and storing enterprise wide data in a secure, reliable and consistent manner, through web accessible portals, the Enterprise Data Warehouse will enable modern decision support tools to quickly provide clear and accurate decision support information. This endeavor will significantly enhance the Air Force's ability to improve weapon system availability, asset visibility, operational readiness, contingency planning and combat operations. The Enterprise Data Warehouse will continuously gather key data elements from selected Air Force systems, organize them, provide enhanced access and analytical query capabilities, and produce user tailored reports. Two other key characteristics will be user single point of entry and significantly reduced response times. Starting in the last quarter of FY00, the initial segment, the Air Force's fleet wide historical maintenance data provided by REMIS, was entered into the EDW by the end of March 2001. The next segment drew pertinent data from all other aircraft and communications-electronics related maintenance systems by the end of FY01. Supply data from selected Materiel Support Division (MSD) supply systems like REMIS, SCS, D043, D165 (MICAP data), PTAMS, and D200 will be folded into the enterprise warehouse by the end of FY03 followed by other logistics and decision support data in FY04/05. The entire combat support enterprise will be covered by the close of FY07. Targeted data is currently planned for the following domains; maintenance, supply, ammunition, medical, transportation, civil engineering, finance, accounting, cost management, logistics plans, contracting, requirements determination, sustaining engineering, decision support, PPBS, communications, services, and security.

The Enterprise Data Warehouse establishes an open, flexible, shared data environment for the Air Force's combat support community and opens up unprecedented lines of communications with the operations community. Enhanced access and analytical query capabilities will allow war fighters to look beyond what is in multiple Air Force combat support data bases to verifying suspected trends and seeking out the unknown ones before they restrict combat capability. The Enterprise Data Warehouse will drive an order of magnitude improvement in a commander's ability to make decisions and impact readiness. It will be GCSS-AF compliant. Software to include COTS, as well as design and code development.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

Currently, the MSD community is using several systems with data mart capabilities throughout AFMC and the AF. However, existing data mart capabilities require the data be transferred multiple times and stored in many places, resulting in outdated and inaccurate data. By building EDW, the MSD community will get a single decision support capability that will provide data from a single reliable and accurate source. This single data source will allow access faster and increase the accuracy of available information.

Impact:

Failure to fund the Enterprise Data Warehouse will continue the practice of relying on closed, rigid, compartmentalized and non-integrated combat support data to underpin key decisions. Timeliness of data will continue to lag the needs of commanders, accuracy will remain suspect and the relationships between such activities as supply, transportation, maintenance, and operations will remain clouded. The Air Force's ability to make combat support decisions will trail best proven business practices, not meet the intent of Joint Vision 2010/2020, and could place people and equipment at unnecessary risk.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis in on file.

Program Completion:

The entire combat support enterprise will be covered by the close of FY07.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: EXPRESS (DO878X)

Item Description: JLSC02E

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.425	0.425	1	0.425	0.425	1	1.125	1.125

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Execution and Prioritization of Repairs Support Systems (EXPRESS) DO87X

Description and Purpose:

EXPRESS is an automated tool to support the Depot Repair Enhancement Program (DREP), which performs the following functions: a. Prioritization of Aircraft Repairables (PARs) b. Repair prioritization via the EXPRESS Prioritization Processor (EPP) c. Assessment of repair resources via the Supportability Module. EXPRESS provides a single integrated priority list of all repair requirements at an ALC, determines the ability of existing resources to support repair actions, and provides the data and the mechanism to move items into repair. The source of repair/supply uses a mathematical model in PARs to prioritize repair and distribution of assets to the users from the source of the consolidated serviceable inventory (CS). PARs takes into account base flying activity, asset position, and the corporately established aircraft availability goals. EPP sets priorities for the repair of items which are not addressed in PARs and combines all priorities into a single integrated list for each repair shop. Assets which do not have aircraft availability goals are prioritized using a "deepest hole" logic to try to fill the most critical need. EPP also provides the prioritized list to the Distribution Module, which identifies prepositioning actions for serviceable parts as they come out of repair. The Supportability Module takes the prioritized repair list from the EPP and determines whether the required items can be repaired based on four evaluation criteria: a. Carcass availability b. Repair parts availability c. Repair funds availability d. Repair resources availability. Items which meet all of these criteria are identified to workload managers who resolve supportability constraints.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current systems performing this process do not meet the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment, we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction. Additionally, current systems do not allow for on-time, real-time capability.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to move into a modern DII/COE architecture nor will the system be GCSS-AF compliant. The system must be modernized to provide the best support to the field.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

Program Completion:

Delivery of software using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03. Delivery of software using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04.

Point of Contact:

Mr. Jon Fox, HQ AFMC/LGNM, DSN 787-8129

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: FIABSSW
Item Description: HQAFMC00013
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	6.155	6.155	1	1.000	1.000

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Financial Inventory Accounting and Billing System (FIABS) Technical Refresh

Description and Purpose:

FIABS is used by wholesale and retail item managers, loan control officers, Air Logistics Centers, various logistics organizations such as procurement, and accounting and finance. It also provides data interface files to other systems that are users. The capital investment for software addressed in this project entails the technical refresh of the existing FIABS.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current FIABS is inflexible, hosts rigid applications, is expensive and slow to incorporate changes. It has reached the point where poor data quality and the lack of standardization inhibit the ability to share reliable data. The technical refresh will comply with DOD and Air Force directives to provide commanders with near real-time information. The modernization will be accompanied by better documentation which is important to understanding/validating data. Simplified accounting will clean up the existing process, making data review less cumbersome. In July 01, OSD mandated the use of Moving Average Cost (MAC) for historical inventory valuation. This will be incorporated into the modernization effort. Improving the data inputs will be an eventual step in the process to achieve CFO compliance for financial systems. It will also comply with design requirements of the Defense Information Infrastructure-Common Operating Environment (DII-COE), and shared database (SHADE) initiatives.

Impact:

The major benefits of technical refresh are upgrades to the current antiquated legacy system, reduced operations and maintenance costs and improved business area management. The new system will incorporate the valuation of inventory using Moving Average Cost as directed in the Jul 01 OSD policy. The system will contain work flow management software that will allow all processes to be presented to the user in a graphical format that will completely document each step of a process and require users to complete each step before going on to the next. Also, the modernized system will reduce the number of transactions passed between systems, eliminate data redundancy, streamline accounting procedures and processes, and move edits to upfront shared processes. This will allow errors to be caught as the transactions process through the logistic systems so they are rejected at the source of entry. Management visibility will be increased by the use of statistical modeling and analytical sampling such as metrics. Audit trails will exist that document the entire processing of each transaction. This will include all updates to user maintainable tables as well as including program and process tracing capabilities to meet CFO requirements. Original transactions will not be altered and the original transaction will be marked as audited and new transactions will take their place. Other benefits include the evolution of the current business systems baseline to an integrated functional and interoperable technical environment maximizing the use of standardized data and data repositories to support all logistics business functions, management and operating levels.

Program Completion:

Projected completion is FY03.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

Point of Contact:

Denette Marshal, HQ AFMC/FMRS, DSN 787-5352

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Inventory Val
Item Description: MSD0001A
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	3.200	3.200	1	1.580	1.580

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Inventory Valuation Software

Description and Purpose:

The Chief Financial (CFO) Act of 1990 requires DoD to produce accurate, complete, timely, and consistent financial information for management. The requirement is to produce auditable financial statements with the ultimate goal of an unqualified audit opinion. Federal accounting standards require inventories to be valued based on historical costs. Valuation is of particular importance to capture the cost of operations in the DoD working capital funds, which in turn is critical to the profit and loss, and cash position as reported in AF Financial Statements.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

With the current system, senior AF financial managers have difficulty getting timely, credible information and meeting statutory requirements for producing CFO Act compliant and auditable financial statements. A major reason is the Air Force Supply Management Business Area general ledger system, Financial Inventory Accounting and Billing System (FIABS), does not capture the information needed to report historical costs. Further, FIABS was designed using a collection of legacy data processing systems intended for logistical information, not accounting data. This capital investment for software for Inventory Valuation will be incorporated into the technically refreshed FIABS. COTS was originally proposed as a solution but was dismissed because it could not meet the 1 Oct 2003 deadline. Massive tailoring of the COTS would be required to resolve non-compatibility issues with the current inventory system.

Impact:

This inventory valuation software will allow for recording transactions that will meet the standards required by the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), be simpler, and provide much needed financial information for senior financial managers. Recording financial transactions that adhere to GAAP standards will facilitate attaining an unqualified audit opinion of financial statements to meet the requirements of the CFO Act.

Program Completion:

Projected completion is FY07.

Economic Analysis:

An approved economic analysis is on file.

Point of Contact:

Pam Henson, HQ AFMC/FM PMO, DSN 787-4394

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: KeystoneSW
Item Description: HQAFMC0011
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.691	0.691	1	1.440	1.440	1	3.571	3.571

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Keystone (H303) Decision Support System (DSS)

Description and Purpose:

The Keystone (H303) Decision Support System has evolved from the Unit Cost Analysis and Resource Tracking System (UCARTS) requirement to provide unit cost ratio information for the Air Force Working Capital Fund Materiel Support Division (MSD). UCARTS was terminated in August 1997 because it did not meet program objectives. The Keystone (H303) DSS provides improved functionality previously identified for UCARTS, with additional capabilities for visibility into MSD sales and costs down to Product Directorate and weapon system level. Keystone also has ad hoc analysis capability, allowing improved comparisons of estimates and actual costs, facilitating MSD budgeting and reporting capabilities.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

This request is to support software upgrades for additional MSD analysis requirements, such as cash management forecasting, providing cost visibility down to Supply Chain Manager, full integration of the new United States Standard General Ledger Account (USSGLA) structure to allow analysis of financial business indicators between USSGLA and Air Force General Ledger Account structures and improving revenue data timeliness. Additional upgrades include the integration of repair data, appropriated funds data, trial balance data, improving the Central Procurement Accounting System feed, and providing sales data by MAJCOM, by weapon system (MSD).

Impact:

Disapproval of this request will limit Keystone's capability to meet identified user requirements in providing budget analysts, inventory managers and Supply Chain Management personnel an effective and efficient means for reviewing their program's MSD sales and cost data and allow them to manage their programs more effectively.

Economic Analysis:

A current approved economic analysis is on file.

Program Completion:

Enhancements initiated with FY02 or FY03 funding generally will be completed within six months of project initiation. We anticipate most of the projects initiated in FY02 or FY03 to be completed within that FY.

Point of Contact:

Rick Iacobucci, HQ AFMC/FMRS, DSN 787- 4615

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: MP&E

Item Description: JLSC02C

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	3.225	3.225	1	8.612	8.612	1	4.800	4.800

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Maintenance Planning and Execution (MP&E)

Description and Purpose:

MP&E provides Repair Program Managers with a standard system for performing the actions of planning for the maintenance of reparable items. The application provides a common system for controlling and tracking funds used for maintenance; negotiating maintenance costs and schedules; and providing management of maintenance programs.

The first phase of the MP&E was successfully deployed in FY00.

These funds will be used to continue the ongoing modernization efforts of the MP&E. This modernization effort includes developing and deploying capabilities to support web access, support shared data from a single logical data repository, and support the Global Command Support (GCSS) - AF Integration Framework (IF). This work will move the system towards a Defense Information Infrastructure/Common Operating Environment (DII/COE) compliant open systems architecture, and prepare the system for and move it into GCSS-AF in compliance with USAF/IL direction. GCSS-AF and DII/COE will bring all the systems into a common operating environment. This with the combination of on-line, real-time capability, will allow users from the entire Air Force to share data for analysis as well as conduct automated and interactive file maintenance actions, suspense tracking, and determine order status. The number of interfaces will be reduced and the systems will provide more timely and accurate information to decision makers.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The additional capabilities are a direct result of modernizing the system to meet USAF/IL direction related to DII/COE and GCSS-AF requirements. The system is deficient in that it does not currently meet those requirements, to include: supporting web access, supporting shared data, and supporting the GCSS-AF. Additionally, current systems do not allow for on-time, real time capability.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to move into a modern DII/COE architecture nor will the system be GCSS-AF compliant. This effort will allow the system to share data and information with other modernized systems, improve access and availability of the system, facilitate future maintenance efforts, and allow for on-time, real time capability.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of software using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03.

Delivery of software using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04.

Point of Contact:

Keith Ferguson, HQ AFMC/LGNM, DSN 674-0125

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: PCMS

Item Description: JLSC02B

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.000	0.000	1	6.625	6.625	1	7.575	7.575

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Provisioning and Management System (PCMS)

Description and Purpose:

This software development will modernize and automate AF provisioning functionality to be a standard AF system. The system will be used by Air Logistic Centers of the Air Force Materiel Command to evaluate initial support requirements of USAF aerospace equipment, it will provide for data storage and retrieval using common web-enabled baseline accessibility for all ALCs. Through the use of on-line, real-time capability, an ALC can conduct automated and interactive file maintenance actions, workloading, suspense tracking, data processing, procuring and contracting support actions.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current systems performing this process do not meet the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction. Additionally, current systems do not allow for on-time, real time capability.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to move into a modern DII/COE architecture nor will the system be GCSS-AF compliant. The system must be modernized to provide the best support to the field.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of software using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03.

Delivery of software using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04.

Point of Contact:

Carolyn Cunningham, HQ AFMC/LGNM, DSN 674-0131

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: PRPS (D203)
Item Description: JLSC02D
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.625	0.625	1	3.275	3.275	1	2.275	2.275

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Purchase Request Process System (PRPS)

Description and Purpose:

The PRPS automates the front end of the acquisition process and is used to bridge the requirement stage to the contracting stage. PRPS processing begins with the receipt of a validated buy requirement, and includes acquisition competition screening, automated purchase request and attachments, delivery order notices and transmission to the buying activity.

These funds will be used to continue the ongoing modernization efforts of the Purchase Request Process System (D203). The work will move the system into a Defense Information Infrastructure/Common Operating Environment (DII/COE) compliant open systems architecture. Additionally, the work will prepare the system for and move it into GCSS-AF in compliance with USAF/IL direction. GCSS-AF and DII/COE will bring all the systems into a common operating environment. This with the combination of on-line, real-time capability, will allow users from the entire Air Force to share data for analysis as well as conduct automated and interactive file maintenance actions, suspense tracking, and determine order status. The number of interfaces will be reduced and the systems will provide more timely and accurate information to decision makers.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current systems performing this process do not meet the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction. Additionally, current systems do not allow for on-time, real time capability and do not allow for paperless contracting.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to move into a modern DII/COE architecture as directed by higher HQ nor will it provide a paperless acquisition system. The system must be modernized to provide the best support to the field.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of software using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03.

Delivery of software using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04.

Point of Contact:

Donna Dow, HQ AFMC/LGNM, DSN 674-0132

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: RMS
Item Description: JLSC02A

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	5.155	5.155	1	6.665	6.665	1	7.436	7.436

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Requirements Management Systems (RMS)

Description and Purpose:

This system comprises a set of major logistics processes and models integrated by a large relational database. This system automates and integrates the Air Force materiel requirements determination processes which compute procurement, termination and repair requirements for spares, repair parts, and major equipment items. It uses a planning period of 38 quarters and recomputes quarterly. The relational database is the repository of detailed information showing the indentured application of every individual part of each particular aircraft type of end item. Within this structure the system holds the historical and planning data needed to support computation of quantities for buy, termination and repair. The data includes: past and projected weapon system operating programs, future readiness goals, maintenance and modification schedules, item failure rates, and condemnations. Dataquery, modeling, and management report generation are on-line.

These funds will be used to continue the ongoing modernization efforts of the Requirements Management System (RMS). Some System changes reflect improved requirements determination processes driven by establishment of the AF Spares Requirements Review Board (SRRB). The work will move the system into a DII/COE compliant open systems architecture. Additionally, the work will prepare the system for and move it into GCSS-AF in compliance with USAF/IL direction. GCSS-AF and DII/COE will bring all the systems into a common operating environment. This with the combination of on-line, real-time capability, will allow users from the entire Air Force to share data for analysis as well as conduct automated and interactive file maintenance actions, suspense tracking, and determine order status. The number of interfaces will be reduced and the systems will provide more timely and accurate information to decision makers.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current systems performing this process do not meet the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction. Additionally, current systems do not allow for on-time, real time capability.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to move into a modern DII/COE architecture nor will the system be GCSS-AF compliant. The system must be modernized to provide the best support to the field.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of Block 3 SRRB Changes using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03. Delivery of Block 4 SRRB changes using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04.

Point of Contact:

Margie Osterhus, HQ AFMC/LGNN, DSN 787-5485

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: RSSP
Item Description: SM99001

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	3.825	3.825	1	3.425	3.425	1	1.880	1.880

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Reformed Supply Support Program (RSSP)

Description and Purpose:

The RSSP (formerly known as the Reengineered Supply Support Program) is the process the Air Force will use to bring initial spares into the inventory and to form a partnership with industry to manage initial spares more efficiently. These project funds will develop and implement the RSSP Data Exchange for AF weapon systems to provide visibility of spares and usage of parts during the acquisition cycle and the interim supply support period. The Data Exchange will feed spares data from the contractor to the government systems (i.e., computation models, retail tracking systems and wholesale tracking systems) to enhance asset visibility, provide the data necessary for the government to make informed decisions when laying in initial and follow-on spares and Agile Logistics in an open systems architecture. This concept was approved by AFMC/DR/LG, and endorsed by SAF/AQ and AF/IL. A joint decision was made that funding for the RSSP project would be provided by both organizations.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The data that the RSSP Data Exchange will provide is not collected and tracked in any government systems today. The data is held in a myriad of contractor systems which do not link to government systems. This situation precludes informed decisions when laying in initial and follow-on spares.

Impact:

HQ AFMC, AF/IL and SAF/AQ have endorsed this process for immediate implementation. Without funding, the government will lose sight of sparing activities as contractors hold onto systems longer and longer. Also the government will be hampered in trying to buy the right spares, in the right amount, and the right time. MSD will benefit from this project because they will receive more accurate requirements positions and usable data when the programs transition from the contractor to organic support.

Program Completion:

Effort is planned for completion in three spirals: IOC in Dec 01, additional capability in Jun 02, and FOC in FY 03.

Economic Analysis:

An Economic Analysis along with a Cost Benefit Analysis was prepared and is on file.

Point of Contact:

Leeanne Stephenson, Jim Coe, SMC Det 11/CWSBM, DSN 834-2575 or
John Zawila, MSG/SLR, DSN 986-0505

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Supply Management Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
MSD - AFMC February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: SCS
Item Description: JLSC02F

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	17.990	17.990	1	9.365	9.365	1	18.800	18.800

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

Stock Control Systems (SCS)

Description and Purpose:

SCS is the core of asset management. SCS is used by both the Air Force and Marine Corps (AF as executive agent) to maintain visibility of wholesale supply assets (serviceable, unserviceable, reparable carcasses, intransit to repair, in work, intransit from repair); process requisitions and issue materiel; provide customer status; control allocation/release of assets, and provide Joint Total Asset Visibility (JTAV) capability for inter-service lateral redistribution and procurement offset transactions. Air Force uses SCS to maintain visibility of MSD assets at base/depot supply, to redistribute excess MSD assets from base/depot supply to fill backorders, to track assets intransit between bases and intransit to Air Logistics centers and to improve customer support through prepositioning of backorders for immediate shipment from the receiving line. SCS provides real-time MSD asset balances, requisition status and item management data to customers world-wide via SCS Web capability. As a key financial feeder system, SCS impacts the MSD general ledger accounts and achievement of Air Force Chief Financial Officer (CFO) compliance. SCS maintains aggregation accounts, controls/issues Government Furnished Materiel (GFM) to contractors, and processes shipments to disposal.

These funds will be used to continue the ongoing modernization efforts of the Stock Control System (SCS). The work will improve/re-engineer various business processes such as those impacting issue effectiveness and pipeline time, improve the visibility and management of MSD items, directly contribute to Air Force's achievement of CFO compliance, and move SCS into a DII/COE and GCSS-AF open systems configuration, thereby allowing more effective sharing of logistics information/improved functional integration within the AF and DoD. This effort will allow SCS to comply with direction given by HQ USAF/IL.

GCSS-AF and DII/COE will bring all the systems into a common operating environment. This with the combination of on-line, real-time capability, will allow users from the entire Air Force to share data for analysis as well as conduct automated and interactive file maintenance actions, suspense tracking, and determine order status. The number of interfaces will be reduced and the systems will provide more timely and accurate information to decision makers.

Current Deficiency and/or Problem:

The current systems performing this process are not fully CFO compliant and do not meet the DII/COE or GCSS-AF requirements. Without this investment we will not be able to meet USAF/IL direction.

Impact:

Without these funds this system will not be able to become fully CFO compliant, to move into a modern DII/COE architecture or to be GCSS-AF compliant. The system must be modernized to provide the most effective visibility/management of MSD assets and to provide superior support to the warfighter.

Economic Analysis:

An economic analysis has been completed for this project and is on file with HQ AFMC/FMRS.

Program Completion:

Delivery of software using FY02 funds will be completed in FY03

Delivery of software using FY03 funds will be completed in FY04

Point of Contact:

JoAnn Tudor, HQ AFMC/LGNM, DSN 674-0160

**Material Support Division
Capital Budget Execution**

**Fund 9D
(Dollars in Millions)**

**FY 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

<u>FY</u>	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Internal Transfers</u>	<u>Carryover</u>	<u>Approved Project Cost</u>	<u>Current Project Cost</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Equipment - Except ADPE and TELECOM						
	Microscope (VAFB)			0.390	0.390	
	Spect. Microscope			0.122	0.122	
	Spechtrphotometer			0.179	0.179	
Equipment - ADPE and TELECOM						
FY01	KEYSTONE		-0.123	0.450	0.327	Project executed under budget (0.123). Funds converted to software carried over to FY02 to be executed by KEYSTONE.
	MMS ADPE Equipment			4.050	4.050	
FY02	KEYSTONE			0.100	0.100	
	MMS ADPE Equipment			4.500	4.500	
	Inventory Valuation				0.410	New requirement
	EDW				2.310	New requirement
FY03	KEYSTONE			0.165	0.165	
	MMS ADPE Equipment			4.650	4.650	
	Inventory Valuation				0.200	FY02 New requirement
	EDW				3.465	FY02 New requirement

**Material Support Division
Capital Budget Execution**

**Fund 9D
(Dollars in Millions)**

**FY 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

<u>FY</u>	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Internal Transfers</u>	<u>Carryover</u>	<u>Approved Project Cost</u>	<u>Current Project Cost</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Software Development						
FY01	ABACUS		(\$1.432)	1.432	0.000	Funds carried over to FY02. The system functional description required refining before beginning development.
	KEYSTONE		(\$0.189)	0.691	0.502	The remaining approved costs were carried over to FY 02.
	RSSP			3.825	3.825	
	CARLOS			0.500	0.500	Project funding complete in FY 01 with delivery scheduled in FY03.
	Legacy Systems Modernization			27.420	27.420	
	SCS	3.125		14.865	17.990	\$3.125 transferred from Provisioning and Management System (PCMS).
	PRPS			0.625	0.625	
	EXPRESS			0.425	0.425	
	PCMS	-3.125		3.125	0.000	\$3.125 transferred to the Stock Control System (SCS).
	MP&E			3.225	3.225	
	RMS			5.155	5.155	

**Material Support Division
Capital Budget Execution**

**Fund 9D
(Dollars in Millions)**

**FY 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

PROJECT		Internal	Approved	Current	Explanation
FY	Approved Project	Transfers	Project Cost	Project Cost	
Software Development					
FY02	ABACUS		1.432	1.957	3.389 The carryover is necessary because we had to refine the functional description prior to beginning development.
	KEYSTONE		0.312	1.440	1.752 Funds transferred from FY01 were software (.189) Hardware (.123). Hardware approved for conversion to software and execution as software in FY02
	RSSP			3.425	3.425
	FIABS				6.155 New requirement
	EDW				5.100 New requirement
	Inventory Valuation				3.200 New requirement
	Legacy Systems Modernization		34.967	34.967	
	SCS		9.365	9.365	
	PRPS		3.275	3.275	
	EXPRESS		0.425	0.425	
	PCMS		6.625	6.625	
	MP&E		8.612	8.612	
	RMS		6.665	6.665	

**Material Support Division
Capital Budget Execution**

**Fund 9D
(Dollars in Millions)**

**FY 03 Budget Estimates
February 2002**

<u>FY</u>	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Internal Transfers</u>	<u>Carryover</u>	<u>Approved Project Cost</u>	<u>Current Project Cost</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
FY03	ABACUS			1.969	1.969	
	KEYSTONE			3.571	3.571	
	RSSP			1.880	1.880	
	FIABS				1.000	FY02 New requirement
	EDW				7.690	FY02 New requirement
	Inventory Valuation				1.580	FY02 New requirement
	Legacy Systems Modernization			42.011	42.011	
	SCS			18.800	18.800	
	PRPS			2.275	2.275	
	EXPRESS			1.125	1.125	
	PCMS			7.575	7.575	
	MP&E			4.800	4.800	
	RMS			7.436	7.436	

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force - Activity Group Capital Investment Summary for Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(\$ in Millions)

Line Number	Item Description	FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
		Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
	EQUIPMENT						
	* \$1,000,000 and over						
E9901	VXI Rehost <i>R</i>	1	4.2	1	0.8	0	0.0
E9902	F-16 Microwave Test Station Upgrade <i>R</i>	4	4.4	1	1.2	0	0.0
E9903	Intermediate Frequency/Video/Micro Test Station <i>R</i>	1	2.0	1	5.3	0	0.0
E0102	Plasma Spray Systems <i>R</i>	10	3.8	5	2.1	0	0.0
E0103	Benchtop R/A Tester <i>R</i>	1	3.5	1	1.4	0	0.0
E0104	IOE Corrosion Control <i>E</i>	1	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0105	IOE C-130 Corrosion Control <i>E</i>	1	10.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0106	Automatic Depot Test Station <i>R</i>	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0107	Multi Function Tester Rehost <i>R</i>	1	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0108	Nose Radome Electronic Test System <i>R</i>	2	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0109	High Speed Blade Tip Grinding Machine <i>R</i>	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0111	Reconfigurable Tooling System <i>P</i>	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0112	Drop Bottom Furnace <i>R</i>	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
E0201	Digital Test Stands <i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	1.1
E0202	Fire Control RADAR Antenna <i>R</i>	0	0.0	2	2.1	0	0.0
E0203	Automatic Shot Peening Systems <i>R</i>	0	0.0	3	1.4	0	0.0
E0206	Electro Optical Work Center (EOWC) <i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.7	1	1.5

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force - Activity Group Capital Investment Summary for Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(\$ in Millions)

Line Number	Item Description		FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
			Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
E0212	F110 Engine Run / Mount Kit	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
E0213	Fuel Control T/S Replacement	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0
E0214	5 Axis CNC Universal Mach Center	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
E0224	Nickle Tank Line (Pretreat)	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	2	1.2	0	0.0
E0236	BRAT Tester Software	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
E0238	CNC Universal Grinders	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	2	1.5	0	0.0
E0239	Benchtop Reconfigurable Auto Testers	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	3.5
E0240	Case FPI Line Restoration	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0
E0244	15 X 45 Autoclave	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0
E0246	C/KC-135 Circuit Analyzer	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0
E0249	6861 Test Station	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	1	2.8	0	0.0
E0301	IOE Depot Plating Shop MILCON	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7
E0302	IOE for Military Construction MCP	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.5
E0303	IOE Multi-System Paint Hanger	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.8
E0306	FACT Electrical Interconnecting	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.1
E0310	High Prec Mach Center Jig Borer	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0
E0313	BRAT Tester replace Gen Rad	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5
E0315	Test Set, Stores Management	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3
E0316	Paint Booth Insert	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force - Activity Group Capital Investment Summary for Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(\$ in Millions)

Line Number	Item Description		FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
			Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
E0327	Penetrate Line (Pretreat)	<i>R</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5
E0328	C-5 Tail Stands	<i>P</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
	Equipment Over \$1M Subtotal		13	51.5	20	44.9	13	40.2
E5000	* \$500,000 to \$999,999.99		4	3.2	6	4.4	5	3.8
E9999	* \$100,000 to \$499,99.99		16	5.7	17	5.9	4	1.0
	ADPE & Telecommunication Equipment							
A9601	DMAPS/Legacy System Modernization		1	9.5	1	12.0	1	11.0
	ADPE & Telecom Subtotal		1	9.5	1	12.0	1	11.0
	Software Development (Internally)							
S9601	Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System	<i>S</i>	1	0.7	1	2.0	1	2.0
S9701	Legacy System Technical Refresh	<i>S</i>	1	10.4	1	24.9	1	33.9
S9702	DMAPS Development/Implementation	<i>S</i>	1	41.0	1	38.0	1	14.0
	Software Development Subtotal		3	52.1	3	64.9	3	49.9
M0000	Minor Construction		11	3.9	6	2.3	3	1.3

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

**Department of the Air Force - Activity Group Capital Investment Summary
for Depot Maintenance**

February 2002

(\$ in Millions)

Line Number	Item Description	FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
		Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
P0000	Prior cost increases.		0.1				
	TOTAL	48	126.0	53	134.4	29	107.2
P0001	Adjustment for prior year cost increases		2.6		5.4		
	Adjusted Total	48	128.6	53	139.8	29	107.2

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E9901 VXI Rehost		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
VXI Rehost				1	4196	4196	1	760	760	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to re-host digital shop replaceable unit (SRU) test programs sets (TPS) onto previously purchased VXI testers, thereby replacing the obsolete test station used to repair cards from the depot automatic test station for avionics (DATSA). The FY1999 (\$4,383), FY2001, and FY2002 effort re-host digital circuit cards; the remaining effort will be to re-host analog/hybrid circuit cards in FY2004 (\$9.9M), completing this project. This project, when completed, will provide for the replacement of all obsolete DATSA in support of the B-1B, re-hosting software programs to more state-of-the-art equipment. The software (TPS) development and re-hosting of the TPS is identified as one system. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.0 for FY1999, 0.9 for FY2001, 4.78 for FY2002, and 1.52 for FY2004. The cost/benefit analysis shows replacement will yield the highest long-term value to the Air Force.

Impact if not provided: DATSA obsolescence factors worsen each year, leading to increasing breakdown rates, reduction in the availability of spare parts, increase in repair costs, and DATSA downtime per breakdown. If this obsolete system is not replaced, the eventual result will be loss of B-1B SRU repair capability which severely impacts mission readiness of the B-1 weapon system. Additionally, OC-ALC would experience degradation of shop efficiency, increasing resource control center (RCC) cost, while decreasing repair volume and quality of repair. Without the B-1B SRU repair capability, loss of the annual \$3.72M in B1 SRU avionics repair jeopardizes the \$5.43M in B1 line replaceable unit (LRU) avionics repair, and OC-ALC avionics repair capabilities and their financial role in the AFWCF in general.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E9902 F-16 Microwave Test Station Upgrade		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
F-16 Microwave Test Station Upgrade				4	1100	4400	1	1202	1202	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide replacement microwave depot test stations (MDTS) to test F-16 microwave shop replacement units (SRU) and avionics intermediate shop (AIS) tray replacement units (TRU). The proposed project will provide an upgraded capability to test, diagnose/troubleshoot, and retest to verify these units were correctly diagnosed and repaired. The microwave test stations have been a multi-year project since FY1999. Obsolescence/parts non-availability problems have been experienced with all MDTS configurations. The replacement cost in FY2001 was \$4.346K (rounded to \$4,400K in this document to report the correct summary total), the effort continues in FY2002, and to finish this project in FY2004 is estimated at \$610K. This MDTS effort upgrades previous configurations to one common, sustainable configuration to the CY2020, allowing retention of existing test program sets (TPS) while improving repair support capability because of improved station reliability/maintainability. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected saving to investment ratio of 4.6 for FY2001 and 1.5 for FY2002 this project. Costs for this project have fluctuated as program requirements were refined. The original cost covered technical data, blueprints and documentation. Future costs are strictly for test station production from that data. This project is expected to be completed September 2005, but it is already improving test/repair capability. Savings will increase as the project is accomplished.

Impact if not provided: The current test stations are down for repairs 50% of the time for long periods, due to the unavailability of replacement parts, and result in adverse mission capable and supportability impacts of critical components of F-16 and B-1B aircraft. Without the critical components serviced by these test stations, these aircraft become non-supportable. The test station replacement is critical to Air Force F-16 weapon system availability.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E9903 Replacement Intermediate Frequency/Video/Micro Test Station		Activity Identification WR-ALC								
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Intermediate Frequency/Video/Micro Test Station				1	1968	1968	1	5282	5282	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace original 1970's technology and equipment with state-of-the-art instrumentation that has greater reliability, capability, and flexibility. This project is currently budgeted for FY2000/2001/2002 to rehost new instrument consoles for these automatic test stations. The F-15 aircraft and the APG-63 multi-mode radar systems have been extensively modified and upgraded, but the depot support equipment was not simultaneously upgraded for sustainment. The automatic test equipment covered by this project is required for final testing of the multi-mode radar on the F-15 and F-16 aircraft to technical order (T.O.) specifications. This requirement was input for different dollar amounts each year because of the necessity for testing between some of the procurement stages. The requirement will upgrade equipment incrementally, funding the necessary testing to ensure the test station is performing all the correct functional requirements before proceeding to the next upgrade task. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by WR-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 15.4 for this project. The saving on this project will begin when this equipment is fully installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: Without funding to upgrade the station, the repair and testing capability of the multi-mode radar shop replaceable units will be lost and the F-15 fleet will face serious threats to its mission capability. It was estimated that for current stations parts availability affecting 80% of the instrumentation will no longer be supportable by CY2002. Potential grounding of F-15 aircraft could result if no action is taken. WR-ALC believes this project mitigates that threat, and the current schedule will meet their needs.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0102 Plasma Spray Systems		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Plasma Spray Systems				10	383	3830	5	423	2115	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this multi-year project is to replace fifteen (total) manual and semi-automated plasma spray systems. The phasing in of this equipment will minimize any impact to production flow. The project replaced ten units in FY2001 and will replace five units in FY2002. The existing system consists of several different models and series. The new systems will consist of a single model type that provides the needed configuration control to reduce process errors. The plasma spray process is used to apply coatings tailored to specific jet engine parts on every type of jet engine repaired at OC-ALC. The coatings provide dimensional restoration, thermal barrier coating protection and additional wear resistance. Configuration to a single model to eliminate multiple operator interfaces will eliminate errors identified to a Class A mishap. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE and reflects in FY2001 a projected savings to investment ratio of 4.4 and in FY2002 a projected SIR of 0.8 for this project. The FY2002 SIR decreased because the system improved with implementation of the first phase. Phase 1 of this project was installed and ready for production in July 2001. Phase 2 will become production ready in October 2002.

Impact if not provided: Continued risk associated with errors and process variations that affect the quality of the parts produced. These errors, if undetected, could result in a Class A mishap. This equipment is used on jet engine parts for the F-15, F-16, B-1B, KC-135R, E-6A, C-135, B-52, C-141 and E-3. All these systems are essential to the mission readiness of the Air Force.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0103 Benchtop R/A Tester		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Benchtop Reconfigurable Automatic Tester				1	3531	3531	1	1400	1400	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this multi-phase project is to purchase benchtop reconfigurable automatic testers (BRAT) and rehost the test program sets from the multifunction avionics test set (MADTS) to the BRAT tester. The MADTS is the automatic test and operational platform that enables repair of nearly fifty circuit cards, supplies power to shop repair units (SRU) which comprise the bulk of four line repairable units (LRU), and is critical to F-15 aircraft flight. The MADTS was designed in the early 1970s and the first tester was delivered to SM-ALC about 1975. There are only three MADTS testers. One tester is not operational and is used as a source of parts to keep the other two testers operating. Many of the component parts for these are not commercially available. The testers fail frequently and require extensive efforts to make repairs. The yearly direct labor cost to maintain the stands is \$93,048. At last estimate, there were 2025 hours of production backlogged and waiting because of test stand breakdowns. These three test stations are the only testers capable of testing this F-15 workload, and no contractual sources capable of doing this workload exist. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected saving to investment ratio of 2.3 for FY2001 and 9.8 for FY2002 for this project. The \$3M required the first year is to cover the cost of technical orders, blueprints, and documentation required for the tester. Once this cost is paid, subsequent costs are for the hardware and software required to make each tester functional. The two BRAT testers are scheduled to be installed and operational in August 2003.

Impact if not provided: The cost of operations will continue to increase until the test stands eventually fail and cannot be repaired. At that point non-mission capable incidents will stack up and the F-15 aircraft may be grounded.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0201 Digital Test Stands		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Digital Test Stands				0	0	0	1	8350	8350	1	1100	1100

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this multi-year project is to replace the existing digital automatic test equipment (ATE) and test program sets (TPS). The digital ATE are used to test digital voltages, patterns, sequences, and other peculiar test capabilities such as digital word simulation for the shop replacement units (SRU) that are removed from F-16, F-15, C141, F-4, and B-1B aircraft. The proposed project is a multi-year program (FY2002 ~ \$8.4M, FY2003 ~ \$1.1M, FY2004 ~ \$17.5M, FY2005 ~ \$5.2M, Total project ~ \$32.2M) that will provide 11 ATE units and TPS's. Current test stations (e.g. H3500, H2600, TI-960, HP-ATS-D01, HP-ATS-E56, DATSA, GENRAD, and PK-1000) supporting the digital workloads are obsolete and extremely difficult to support. The digital test stands are down for repairs frequently, and are becoming increasingly non-supportable because of existing hardware components and subsequent operational software impacts. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN: 777-1227) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.3 for the project. As the equipment is upgraded, a savings will result and will increase as the upgrade nears completion in November 2005.

Impact if not provided: The current digital test stand capability has become marginal due to increasing non-supportability of existing hardware components and subsequent operational software impacts. As the spares pipeline becomes exhausted, the SRU tested by the obsolete equipment will reflect higher non-mission capable incidents and eventually the F-16, F-15, C-141, F-4 and B-1 aircraft will become non-supportable.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0202 Fire Control RADAR Antenna		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Fire Control RADAR Antenna Test System (FCRATS)				0	0	0	2	1050	2100	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide a replacement capability for the fire control radar antenna test system (FCRATS), which tests and calibrates antennas as part of the repair process, through the projected program life expectancy of FY2020. Two phases will be necessary to replace or refurbish the FCRATS ranges, support automatic test equipment (ATE) and rehost test program sets (TPS) on the respective stations. Parts obsolescence and insufficient spares are resulting in cannibalization and reduced mean time between failures (MTBF) as the equipment ages. The present situation is one operable FCRATS. The repair facility has tried to continue satisfying demands by overtime and multiple shifts; however, the backlog of antennas requiring test is growing along with the number of non-mission capable incidents, awaiting parts for these end items. Each of the systems and the support ATE needs to be refurbished or replaced with the TPS rehosted, to provide the repair facility with the original capacity provided. Present shop's capacity cannot satisfy peacetime demand and there is no capability to meet a wartime surge. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared OO-ALC/FMC (DSN: 777-1227) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.8 for this project. This first phase of the project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in August 2003, and second phase in August 2004 with additional savings.

Impact if not provided: Antenna backlogs awaiting testing will grow, non-mission capable incidents will increase, and the repair facility will continue working overtime. The F-16 aircraft becomes non-supportable and non-mission capable by September 2003 when the remaining system is projected to fail, thus becoming insupportable to test antennas.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0203 Automatic Shot Peening Systems		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Automatic Shot Peening Systems				0	0	0	3	461	1383	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this multi-year project is to replace five (total) manual shot peening systems with automatic systems. The FY2002 project will replace three units at \$1.4M, and the FY2004 project will replace two units at \$.9M. This is a per unit cost or \$461K. Shot peening is used to induce compressive stresses via the impact of tiny steel shot on the metal surface. Lance peening is used to relieve the internal component stresses on the inner dovetail cavity on the F110 fan stage disks or to repair fretted surfaces in the dovetail slots. The manual equipment is not capable of meeting the technical order or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 9002 certification, which requires the use of computer-numerically-controlled (CNC) equipment. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The projected savings to investment ratio for this project is 0.3, however there is no other method of performing this function and the simulation model reflects a 50% reduction in flow-time. It also shows that this replacement will provide adequate capacity for increased workload. A vital mission memo was submitted by OC-ALC and is retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This equipment will become operational in July 2002 with the final phase installed and production ready in July 2003.

Impact if not provided: OC-ALC will be unable to comply with Aerospace Material Specification 2432, referenced by ISO 9002 requirements and the technical order 2J-F110-3-6. These directives and changes to process mandate the use of CNC equipment. Failure to acquire this equipment will impact OC-ALC's capability to perform the shot peening process in accordance with the weapon systems stress tolerances. Weapon systems supported are the B-1B, F-16A/B/C/D, KC-135, F-14D, B-52, and E-3. Delay in performing this process has potential for grounding aircraft.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0206 Replacement Electro Optical Work Center (EOWC)			Activity Identification WR-ALC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Electro Optical Work Center (EOWC)				0	0	0	1	1748	1748	1	1503	1503

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace the low altitude navigation and targeting infrared for night (LANTIRN) electro optical work center (EOWC) tester with a new generation electro optical test station. The Northrop Grumman electro optical module with the integrated family of test equipment are approved Department of Defense automatic test sets that are capable of performing LANTIRN tests. The LANTIRN EOWC is a tester designed and built specifically for depot level repair and testing of the LANTIRN roll assembly and nose section equipment support assembly (NSESAs). The EOWC is early 1980s technology and is controlled by two Lockheed Martin (LM) designed and built generic bus interface cards (GBIC). The GBIC are designed specifically for the EOWC and the three related laser testers in the LANTIRN area. The GBIC have suffered more frequent failures as their age has increased. LM is the only demonstrated source of repair for the GBIC. LM has indicated a limited supply of parts and an increased repair cost and duration for each required repair. In addition to the GBIC, the reliability and maintainability study performed by Diagnostic Manufacturing Engineering Corporation (DME) and ARINC Inc. cited fifty obsolete test replaceable units (TRU) in the EOWC. These items will also become increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by WR-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.1 for this project. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be July 2004.

Impact if not provided: Eventual loss of the EOWC tester in the LANTIRN depot would result in decreased mission capable rate for the using wings. The LANTIRN roll assembly and NSESAs are consistently in the top three avionics production division (WR-ALC/LYP) non-mission capable backorders. This is in direct support of the F15E, F16C, F16D and F14.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0212 F110 Engine Run / Mount Kit		Productivity			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
F110 Engine Run / Mount Kit				0	0	0	1	1218	1218	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide the equipment needed to conduct F110-GE-100 and F110-GE-129 engine-run tests in the building 33 engine test cell. The run kit consists of a fuel tank, support rails, a test cap, and cables. It enables the test cell control room to be configured with the instrumentation to be able to functionally test the GE110-100/129 engines. This equipment is essential to supporting OO-ALC's F-16 programmed depot maintenance engine workload requirements. The GE 110 run kit allows inspection of the engine outside the plane, which allows for testing of operational thrust as well as checking for leaks or other exterior defects. This process is required for improvement in the production of the engine workload and the safety of pilots and aircraft. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.0 for this project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by OO-ALC and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in September 2003.

Impact if not provided: The depot's ability to meet customer expectations for timely aircraft delivery will be hindered. Continuing with current practice of on-airframe engine operational checks on the flight line, which is the last F-16 aircraft depot-level repair milestone, provides inadequate time to correct defects prior to the aircraft/missile maintenance report (AMREP) delivery date. Without this production improvement, it will be impossible to install the engine in the test cell thrust bed to test the engines completely. The present workaround that has the user using a tenant-owned run kit causes non-mission capable incidents, because their workload goes into the test cell ahead of our workload. Approximately 142 out of 305 F-16s input at OO-ALC/LAO for maintenance possess F110-GE-100/129 engines.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0213 Fuel Control T/S Replacement		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Fuel Control Test Stand Replacement				0	0	0	1	5883	5883	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace all fuel control test stand system located in building 252. This test stand system is used for testing the fuel control units associated with the Auxiliary Power Gas Turbine Engines and jet fuel starters. Current test stands range in age from 15 years to 30 years of age. They are unable to support the required workload variety and quantity for test performance resulting in fuel control end item defects and premature field failures. In addition, test stand is incapable of testing multiple fuel controls due to test stand functional limitations and unique setup requirements, which prevent redundancy of test capability between test stands. Maintenance and repair actions at OO-ALC are limited by the absence of accurate and or complete test stand schematics and technical data. The economic analysis of this project demonstrates that \$3,238,943 would be saved direct labor repair costs and parts over a ten-year period. The investment will pay for itself in 5.5 years. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.0 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in April 2004.

Impact if not provided: The center will be unable to support the required workload variety and quantity for test performance resulting in fuel control end item defects and premature field failures.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0214 5 Axis CNC Universal Mach Center		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
5 Axis CNC Universal Mach Center				0	0	0	1	1700	1700	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide the capability to manufacture and repair weapon system component parts having complex geometries. The machine will accommodate relatively large parts and replace three obsolete numerically controlled, horizontal milling machines. The five-axis contouring spindle, tool and part-probing, and automatic tool-changing capabilities will reduce manufacturing cost. This machining center differs from the 5-Axis CNC Horizontal Machining Center, E0210, in that it has a larger parts envelope and does not have the rotary table needed to repair or manufacture round parts. This is better suited for repair of structural components such as structural ribs. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC (14 February 2000) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) that this EA meets the criteria as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.3 for this project. The equipment will be installed and production ready in December 2002.

Impact if not provided: Parts can no longer be purchased for the 28-year-old equipment to be replaced. This results in the inability to manufacture replacement component parts for the B-1B, KC135, and B-52 in a timely manner. Lack of parts always carries the potential for grounding aircraft.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0224 Nickle Tank Line (Pretreat)		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Nickle Tank Line (Pretreat)				0	0	0	2	600	1200	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to continue a work effort from the nickel tank & vent system funded in FY00 due to the flooring required and the tanks were not purchased. This project slipped from the FY2001, "under \$500K program" due to cost increases. This phase will replace two tank rows each which comprise the nickel plating line. The existing structure and equipment is 30 years old and has exceeded its useful life. The tanks are deteriorating, creating safety and environmental problems. The tank support structure is severely corroded to the point of failure. Replacing the nickel line will ensure continued service and minimize the risks to employees and the environment. The new plating line will recycle more rinse water, resulting in less waste going to the industrial waste treatment plant. Safety has placed a RAC C1 on this project which states that this project is hazardous to personnel, and requires replacement. The division chief is required to brief this project monthly, and has taken responsibility in writing to provide for a waiver from the RAC C1. The waiver ends FY2002. The new nickel line will employ the latest technologies and streamline the process reducing rework by reducing the time spent moving from one solution tank to the next, thereby minimizing part contamination. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.9 for this project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by OO-ALC and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in November 2003.

Impact if not provided: Failure of the support structure of the existing tanks may result in injury or death, and definitely will result in a hazardous environmental situation due to the chemicals that will be released.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0236 BRAT Tester Software		Productivity			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
BRAT Tester Software				0	0	0	1	1197	1197	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to repair circuit cards and power supplies for Shop Repair Units (SRU's). These SRU's comprise the bulk of four Line Repairable Units (LRU's) that are critical to F-15 ACFT flight. The multi-function avionics digital test set (MADTS) testers are 1970's vintage. Included in the three testers, one is not operational and is used as a source of parts to keep the other two testers operating. Many component parts are not available. The testers fail frequently and require extensive effort to make repairs. The yearly direct labor cost to maintain the stands per year is \$93,048. There are 2025 hours of production backlogged and waiting because of test stand breakdowns. These three test stations are the only testers capable of testing this F-15 workload. There aren't any contracting sources capable of doing this workload. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.0 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in March 2004.

IMPACT: The cost of operation will increase until the test stands eventually fail and can't be repaired and the mission incapable awaiting parts (MICAP) will stack up resulting in the F-15 aircraft being grounded. The customer is not receiving aircraft in a timely manner, causing delays in the customer's workload.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0238 CNC Universal Grinders		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Computerized Numeric Controlled Universal Grinders				0	0	0	2	736	1472	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

This project will provide replacement of two obsolete conventional universal grinders. The equipment is used to repair and grind parts for journals on disks, shafts, spacers, and hubs that are components of the aircraft gear box. The existing equipment will no longer meet the required specifications and tolerances required to repair these components. This equipment is capable of machining jet engine components to their original specification. The new equipment is expected to reduce production time by forty percent. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by OC-ALC/FMC (DSN 339-7377) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The project has a savings investment ratio of 1.8 and a payback period of 4.7 years. Estimated implementation date is September 2002.

Impact if not provided: These machines support the repair of jet engine components that are used on F-15, F-16, B-1B, F-16A/B/C/D, F-14D, KC-135, E-6A and B-2A weapon systems. The equipment to be replaced is approximately twenty-eight years old. Parts are no longer available for repair. The equipment cannot be restored to provide acceptable tolerances for the repair of critical engine components. It is vital to the mission of the Air Force that these engine components be repaired to an acceptable tolerance and replaced in the engines as quickly as possible.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0239 Replacement Benchtop Reconfigurable Auto Testers			Activity Identification WR-ALC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Benchtop Reconfigurable Auto Testers (BRAT)				0	0	0	1	1500	1500	1	3500	3500

Narrative Justification

The project objective is to replace the E-3 depot maintenance shop equipment that consists of nine antiquated, mostly unsupportable manual/semi-automatic testers with eight benchtop reconfigurable auto testers BRATs in FY2002/2003/2004 (\$4.2M) and is identified as one system. The E-3 AWACS maintenance program is undergoing a tremendous change in upgraded avionics. New improvement programs are in process with other programs on the horizon. To meet these challenges, the test equipment required to support these programs need to be upgraded to be compatible with these programs. New test software has been written and delivered to the E-3 depot maintenance shop, but in many cases cannot be utilized because of the lack of appropriate BRAT equipment. In addition, the present manual/semi-automatic testers are 18-20 years old and in many cases, unsupportable. The long-term benefits greatly out-weigh the short-term investment as shown in the economic analysis. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by WR-ALC/FMC (DSN 468-5485) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506, Economic Analysis. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.3 for this project. The saving on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: There are four types of problems dealing with the current testers within the E-3 shop: 1) The aging testers, 2) test program set (TPS) development, 3) current workload demands, and 4) overflow workload temporarily repaired by contractors. The above four problems will not go away without the procurement of the above replacement brat testers. Currently, flow times are increasing and significant overtime is being used just to maintain demand. If failure occurs that involves one of the unsupportable parts, and cannibalization is not possible from another tester, the result will be a catastrophic event that will shut down our capability to repair specific E-3 assets.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0240 Case FPI Line Restoration		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Case Fluorescent Penetrant Inspection (FPI) Line Restoration				0	0	0	1	1500	1500	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide restoration and partial replacement of the fluorescent penetrant inspection (FPI) line, which is the only capability to process large parts such as engine cases and ducts. The fluorescent penetrant line, procured in FY2000 provided for the replacement of a complete system in Building 3221. The proposed project will involve replacing the overhead chain, power and free trolleys, stop switches, track switches and anti-backups. Restoration is required because of safety concerns. OC-ALC has several fluorescent penetrant lines located in different buildings and supporting various workloads. The lines have different requirements for different workloads supported. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by OC-ALC/FMC (DSN 339-7377) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The economic analysis (EA) is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio (SIR) of 1.0 for the project at the original cost of \$789K. The increase in usage during the past year and the two shifts workloads has escalated deterioration and more hard breakdowns are experienced. The economic analysis is in review and we anticipate the SIR to remain above 1.0 due to the increase loadload. In the event the revised EA generates a SIR of less than 1.0, this project is supported by a vital mission request. This equipment will be installed and production ready in November 2002.

Impact if not provided: The overhead system has been determined to be worn out-of-limits and must be replaced. If the overhead chain should break, it will destroy the rest of the FPI line and could cause serious injury or loss of life to personnel working under the overhead chain and carriers. The inspections are performed on the E-3, C-135, B-52, F-14, B-1B, F-15, F-16, and B-2 weapon systems. All of these weapon systems play a vital role in the mission readiness of the Air Force.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0244 15 X 45 Autoclave		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
15 X 45 Autoclave				0	0	0	1	1130	1130	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace an existing 15 x 45 autoclave that is over 20 years old. The proposed project will replace a worn out capability that includes damaged cooling coils, faulty thermocouples and pressure transducers in the autoclave vessel (approximately 30% are operational). The existing heating and cooling coils are a composite of copper and stainless steel. Operating cooks above 450 degrees F, the expansion coefficients of the dissimilar metals allow glycol to leak into the atmosphere during the venting and cooling segments. The sheetmetal lining is damaged and the insulation has deteriorated to a point so that the exterior vessel temperature exceeds the OSHA maximum temperature of 140 degrees F. The blower motor resistance of the field coils is three times the rating plate on the motor. The modification will increase the temperature of the autoclave 200 degrees with the purchase of new stainless steel heating and cooling coils, and also change out the existing cooling system to an air/water vapor cooling method during the high cooks. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.9 for this project. Due to this low SIR, a vital mission memo has been submitted by OO-ALC and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in February 2003.

Impact if not provided: Due to increase of composite workload over the next five years, the existing 15 x 45 autoclave cannot handle the increase in workload or the future temperature requirements of the new advanced composites. This will impact the repair of weapons system component items and support of workloads where temperature and pressure characteristics are required for repair of those items. Without these repaired items, non-mission capable rates could increase on the F-4, F-5, F-16, C-5, C-130, KC-135, and projected F-117, F-22, B-2, and C-17 weapon system supported.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0246 C/KC-135 Circuit Analyzer		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Circuit Analyzer for C/KC-135 Weapon System				0	0	0	1	1010	1010	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to purchase circuit analyzers used to perform operational checks on all aircraft electrical systems and circuits added or disturbed during programmed depot maintenance (PDM) in accordance with FY1999 C/KC-135 aircraft work specifications. The project will provide the capability to perform thousands of multiple and sequential computed diagnostic tests simultaneously. They generate reports and graphics about the conditions, locations and the problems discovered. Benefits are an increase in efficiency, supports new technology, replacement parts are available, and it can be upgraded to meet future requirements. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.0 for the project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by OC-ALC and is retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. The equipment will be installed and production ready in November 2002.

Impact if not provided: Increased failure of test equipment, costly workarounds, risk of damaging very high cost internal aircraft systems, and delays in the C/KC-135 PDM schedule. Complete failure of this test equipment would require workers to perform hand checks providing less accurate results. Borrowing existing units from other weapon systems is not feasible, since are all in need of replacement. Sharing analyzers causes delays and work stoppages on multiple weapon systems due to workload increases.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0249 6861 Test Station		Productivity			Activity Identification WR-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
6861 Test Station				0	0	0	1	2754	2754	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The project objective is to replace the existing capability of the 6861 Test Station currently in use by the WR-ALC/LYPEE shop. The 6861 is 1960's technology and requires considerable maintenance thereby preventing the WR-ALC/LYPEE shop from meeting their production requirements. This project involves rehosting 24 Test Program Sets (TPSs) to a new WesTest-2000 Test Station. This project provides an economical solution to the existing problems of the 6861 Test Station. The 6861 Test Station supports the F-15 program, which should remain in service through the year 2020. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by WR-ALC/FMC (DSN 468-5485) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506, Economic Analysis. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.46 for this project. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: Currently, the WR-ALC/LYPEE shop has 24 different units, which are tested, on the 6861 Test Station in support of the F-15 program. During the last two years, the workload for the 6861 Test Station was 5965 hours, which equals \$792,331 (5965 hours x \$132.83/hour). The 6861 also has the capability to test 284 other units in support of the F-15 program, which could become part of the LYPEE workload in the future. Given the current condition of the 6861, it will be unsupported and inoperable by the end of the year 2002. If the 6861 Test Station capability is not replaced the current workload and any future workloads will be lost.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0301 IOE Depot Plating Shop MILCON		Productivity			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
IOE Depot Plating Shop MILCON				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7700	7700

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace plating equipment including process tanks, ventilation, environmental control equipment, electrical equipment, instrumentation and controls, lighting, pumps, piping, and corrosion resistant coatings for support structures. Deficiencies in the current plating shop processes will be corrected with modernization of the design concept, application of corrosion resistant materials, and installation of best available control technology. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC (22 Feb 99) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 6.6 with a payback of 4.1 years. This equipment will be installed and production ready in October 2005.

Impact if not provided: Accelerating deterioration of plating shop environment, systems malfunction, personnel safety and health risks, soil and ground water contamination occurrences, increasing cost for cleanup and remedial maintenance, interruption of the operation, and a delay in the delivery of parts. Regulatory action could result in the issuance of a Notice of Violation and fines assessed against the base. The failure to replace this equipment will impact the capability to perform borazon (nickel plating) and alodine (chrome plating) of large engine components for the B-1B, F-16, F-14, KC-135, E-6, B-2, U-2, F-111, C-135, B-52, C-141, E-3A, E-8 and E-15 weapon systems. This includes the F110-414 and TF33-414 jet engines.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0302 IOE for Military Construction MCP		Productivity			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
IOE for Military Construction MCP				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3550	3550

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to construct a new Hydraulics/pneudraulics repair facility as a two story addition to building 503. OO-ALC has been designated the Technical Repair Center for the Air Force for all hydraulic/pneudraulics workloads. This facility is required to consolidate and relocate the existing workload to the industrial area of the base and provide for the testing, repair, overhaul and maintenance of hydraulic components for all active Air Force aircraft systems, as well as Minuteman, ALCM, and Advance Cruise Missiles. The facility will include areas for shipping and receiving, assembly/disassembly, test setup and operation, support shops, clean rooms, training, administration and hazardous waste storage. This project will move the shops from the west area of the base into the industrial area. This will eliminate a seven mile one way route for all items which must be machined, ground or plated. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.5 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in August 2004.

Impact if not provided: The cost to the customer will not be able to be reduced, because the inefficiencies of the old spread out isolated, badly laid out buildings will still have to be contended with. The cost of rework will not be eliminated since the long routings between shops will still exist. The hydraulics shop affects every weapons system and having an unworkable situation can cause a domino effect in other areas. It is imperative that this situation is remedied or landing gears, gears and aircraft parts will cause aircraft to become non-mission capable in one area or another.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0303 IOE Multi-System Paint Hanger		Productivity			Activity Identification WR-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
IOE Multi-System Paint Hanger				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6831	6831

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to procure the Initial Outfitting Equipment (IOE) for the MILCON to construct a Paint Hangar suitable for painting all large aircraft, including C-5, C-130, C-141, that are worked at WR-ALC. The IOE is the equipment required to make the facility functional. At present, C-5 aircraft must be both painted and de-painted in building 54. The total capability of building 54 falls short of the requirement for C-5, starting in FY2003. C-130 and C-141 aircraft are de-painted in building 50 and painted in building 89. C-130's are already contracted out due to the shortfall in capacity. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by WR-ALC/FMC (DSN 468-5485) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506, Economic Analysis. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.30 for this project. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: Lack of the proposed IOE would prevent WR-ALC from completing the PDM paint workloads on the variety of aircraft worked and force aircraft to be contracted out. Having to contract out paint jobs would raise sales rates and throughput times, which in turn would inhibit gaining additional workload.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0306 FACT Electrical Interconnecting		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Flexible Automatic Circuit Tester (FACT) Electrical Cable-Interconnecting				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1050	2100

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace and upgrade the previous configurations of the flexible automatic circuit tester (FACT) II F4100 required to sustain a test/repair capability used to test and fault isolation chassis for multiple weapon systems as part of the repair process. This sustainment effort or upgrade will allow us to retain our existing test capability while improving our repair support capability because of improved station reliability/maintainability. The proposed project will replace the existing test stations with two test stations, updating the documentation and rehosting the present test program sets on the two replacement test stations. The FACT II F4100 stations are obsolete and extremely difficult to support. The hardware, including the Digital Equipment Corporation computer and serial printers, are 80-90% non-supportable, with resulting hardware and subsequent operational software impacts. The A-10, B-52, C-5A, C-141, F4 AND F-16 aircraft become non-supportable and non-mission capable by FY2003. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 4.7 for this project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in November 2002.

Impact if not provided: The A-10, B-52, C-5A, C-141, F-4 and F-16 aircraft become non-supportable and non-mission capable by CY2003, because of new configurations to the flexible automatic circuit boards.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0310 High Prec Mach Center Jig Borer		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
High Prec Mach Center Jig Borer				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2000	2000

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace one of four Jig-Boring Machines transitioned from SA-ALC to OO-ALC. This machine is required to repair and modify gearboxes and housings for all weapon systems and ground support equipment within DoD, Department of Defense. Three of four jig boring machines are very old and would not hold the tolerances required for machining many of the parts before being transitioned to Ogden ALC. The shop operates two shifts, five-day workweek and uses these machines. One of the machines was damaged during the move and had to be welded after it was in place at Hill Air Force Base. The capability of this machine is unknown at this time but it is presumed that it is not a reliable machine. The new machine will replace one of these old machines and will be capable of producing at a faster rate than the old machines. This will lead to savings on machine times throughputs. The bottom line is less equipment to maintain and better capability with less equipment. Currently the older machines, shop machine the parts and then have to send them for a quality verification inspection. With this new machine the tolerances of these parts could be maintained with more accuracy in less time. This new machine has a 3-D touch probe that alleviates dialing in each hold or bore which also saves time and is more cost efficient. In addition there are safety features on new equipment that protects the operator from flying objects and coolants reservoirs to contain chips and cutting fluids, front accessibility to perform ordinary maintenance. The equipment is equipped with power saving modes to conserve energy. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.7 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in April 2004.

IMPACT: Continue rework to bring part into tolerance and higher cost of operation.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0313 BRAT Tester replace Gen Rad		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
BRAT Tester replace Gen Rad				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1450	1450

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace current GenRad test stations that is antiquated/non-repairable and no longer supportable due to old technology. Repair parts are no longer being manufactured nor are they procurable. This tester supports the Shop Repairable Units (SRU) for A-10 Central Air Data Computer (CADC). GenRad test stands have antiquated test equipment and are no longer supported by the item manager. Many parts are no longer manufactured by any source. Additionally in trying to repair the test stations there is often a safety hazard (electric shock) due to some of the electric wires being frayed or bare. The frayed wires are due to the age of the equipment. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227) and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.0 for this project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in November 2003.

Impact: The ability to produce assets on the A-10 CADC contract workload will be jeopardized. Repair of the circuit cards within the A-10 in a timely manner could seriously affect the aircraft, to include grounding of the aircraft. MICAPS have already been experienced incident due to the equipment being down for repairs. Also the safety hazard due to electric shock by frayed or bare wires will increase as continual repairs are tried on the old equipment.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0315 Test Set, Stores Management		Replacement			Activity Identification WR-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Test Set, Stores Management				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1302	1302

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace test sets used for fault isolation and functional testing of weapons delivery system on all models of F-15 aircraft in Programmed Depot Maintenance (PDM). Existing test sets in at least three configurations are not all capable of testing all facets of F-15E aircraft. Some have exceeded their economic life. They are prone to failure, resulting in delay in completion of PDM and necessitating use of overtime to catch up. Since the functional checks are among the final operations in PDM, catching up is very hard to do. The condition will significantly worsen in FY 2003 as we begin PDM on F-15E Conformal Fuel Tanks (CFT). This work will extend the test time by 50% on all E models. In addition, repair costs are growing. Failure or faulty operation may result in severe hazard. If fire control system is not accurately set up, weapons may be fired inadvertently. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by WR-ALC/FMC (DSN 468-5485) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506, Economic Analysis. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.34 for this project. Due to the low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by WR-ALC and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: Possible unintentional F-15 firing of weapons after return to flying status. Cost of maintenance and lost time due to equipment malfunction will continue to increase.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0316 Paint Booth Insert		Productivity			Activity Identification WR-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Paint Booth Insert				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5551	5551

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to convert an existing aircraft hangar, in Building 49, into a paint hangar by installing a self-contained, slide-in paint booth module. With the current method of painting and de-painting in the same facility, quality of painting operations is compromised. The de-paint method uses bicarbonate of soda to blast away the old paint. This soda particulates as the water evaporates from the de-painting solution, causing contamination in the hangar. While the aircraft is washed after this operation, some residue always remains and compromises paint quality. With the increased workload scheduled over the next several years, it will be impossible to handle all paint/de-paint operations without this additional facility, thereby causing outsourcing of critical paint operations that could be accomplished in-house at lower cost. The paint quality and longevity is greatly affected due to contamination of paint from the de-paint process. The existing workload schedule is at its limits and the current process causes production problems in the paint/de-paint operations. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by WR-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 3.0 for this project. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be July 2005.

Impact if not provided: Current process and increased workload is causing production problems in paint and de-paint operation. Paint quality and longevity is negatively impacted due to contamination of paint from de-paint process in support of the C-130.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0327 Replacement Penetrate Line (Pretreat)		Activity Identification OO-ALC								
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Penetrate Line (Pretreat)				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1500	1500

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace existing 30 year old tanks and ventilation systems that are deteriorating, creating safety and environmental problems. The tank support structure is severely corroded to the point that failure is a very real and serious concern. Failure of the support structure may result in injury or death, and definitely will result in a hazardous environmental situation due to the chemicals that will be released. Replacing these process lines will ensure continued service and minimize the risks to our employees and the environment. The new lines will recycle more rinse water, resulting in less waste going to the Industrial Waste Treatment Plant (IWTP). This will save \$32,000 per year. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.3 for the project. Due to the low projected savings to investment ratio, a mission essential letter is on file. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in August 2004.

IMPACT: If the penetrant inspection, temper etch, and chrome strip lines are not replaced, expect frequent work stoppages due to equipment breakdowns. Employees and the environment will continue to be at risk due to catastrophic failure of a major component. The probability of a catastrophic event is high. In the event of a major failure, the plating shop could be closed permanently, be subject to fines or employees could be imprisoned.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E0328 C-5 Tail Stands		Productivity			Activity Identification WR-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
C-5 Tail Stands				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2060	2060

Narrative Justification

This project consists of a pair of portable tail stands whose main function will be to remove and install the horizontal stabilizer on the C-5 aircraft, per requirements of Programmed Depot Maintenance (PDM). Currently, an overhead hoist mounted within the mobile tail enclosure (MTE) is utilized. The tail stands will replace the use of the existing aerial lift platforms for access to the C-5 empennage, for the removal and installation of all stabilizers. Shoring/jacks mounted on the tail stand will support the stabilizer from underneath and enhance the safety of the operation. The stands will be portable to allow movement to the different dock locations and ramp area. The current method for removal of horizontal stabilizers is both labor-intensive and time consuming. It also exposes some operators to the hazard of working under the suspended load of the horizontal stabilizer, which is in violation of OSHA and AFOSH standards (RAC 2 IC). We are currently operating on a request for variance from HQ. With the required tail stands, the variance will no longer be needed. The tail stands will reduce the flow time for each removal and installation. The tail stands will also eliminate the exposure to the potential hazards of a suspended load by providing support shoring under the stabilizer. The tail stands also will increase the efficiency of personnel to access the empennage to perform PDM. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by WR-ALC/FMC (DSN 468-5485) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506, Economic Analysis. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.6 for this project. Due to the low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by WR-ALC and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. The savings on this project will begin the year this equipment is installed and functional, which is anticipated to be September 2003.

Impact if not provided: If the proposed tail stands are not provided, personnel will continue to be exposed to the risk of working beneath suspended loads, and we will continue to lose the potential savings. The purpose of this project is to upgrade the robotics.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5000 * \$500,000 to \$999,999.99			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
\$500,000 to \$999,999.99 Equipment See E5000 series of numbers				4		3230	6		4394	5		3835

Narrative Justification

See E5000 series of numbers for individual justification and cost.

Note:

- 1) FY2002 ATE Directional Test Station (\$650K) was moved to FY04 due to changes in workload and priority.
- 2) FY2002 Tube Bender 1/8"-1" Dual Radius (\$500K) was moved to FY04 due to changes in workload and priority.
- 3) FY2002 B-1B Wing Removal Stand Set project withdrawn due workload change.
- 4) FY2002 High Velocity Oxygen Fuel project (\$594K) was moved to FY04 in support of the \$5.4M adjustment (See P0001).

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5217 Replacement Safety Control Switch Test Console			Activity Identification OO-ALC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Safety Control Switch Test Console				0	0	0	1	696	696	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to functionally test and fault isolate the Safety Control switch and is a systems critical component of the Minuteman and peacekeeper Launch Facilities. The existing switch is 1960's vintage and is no longer supportable. Replacement parts are no longer procurable (80% obsolescence) and the internal wiring has become so brittle that attempts to perform maintenance has put the test set down for long periods of time. The switch will require depot support through the year 2020 due to the life extension of the Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM). An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.2 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in April 2004.

Impact if not provided: Failure to support the above project will impact the depot's capability to certify and test the Safety Control Switch. This condition would result in missiles going off alert. The present safety control switch test station recently quit and is out of commission. The Peacekeeper and Minuteman Missiles are a major source of protection for the United States. Without the safety Control Switch test console, the nation is without a major protection.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5229 Vertical Turret Lathe		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Vertical Turret Lathe				0	0	0	1	850	850	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace the old vertical turret lathe with a new computer-numerically-controlled (CNC) vertical turret lathe. The existing vertical turret lathe purchased in CY1987 is being used to remove corrosion from the bearing bores in the aircraft landing gears. The equipment is used to remove corrosion from bearing bores for all F-15, F-16, C-130, C-5 and KC-135 aircraft during depot overhaul. The machine was manufactured in Italy, and parts and service are not available from any known source. It currently has intermittent problems that require time and attention to service several undiagnosed problems and intermittent faults that have made the machine inoperable for long periods of time. The most serious problem is the gear train, which has damaged components and is rapidly degrading, affecting equipment and mission supportability. The machine operates 1600 hours per year. If the machine is lost, wheels can be repaired using a manual machine, but that will take about 2.5 times longer to repair. This will increase repair costs by 2400 hours at \$30 per hour or \$72,000 per year. The new machine can also do some secondary operations with no additional labor. That will save an additional 600 hours times \$30 per hour or \$18,000 per year. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.8 for this project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted and retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in May 2003.

Impact if not provided: When the current machine gear train components fail totally, the machine will be inoperable. Mission incapability will lead to increased labor costs, workload slippages and potential loss of aircraft and personnel due to inadequate parts being used on the aircraft. Aircraft affected are the F-15, F-16, B-1B, A-10, and C-130.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5234 Rotor Fluorescent Penetrant Line		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Rotor Fluorescent Penetrant Line Restoration				0	0	0	1	900	900	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

This project will restore the Rotor Fluorescent Penetrant Line for critical rotating engine parts such as disks, spacers, and air seals to like new condition. This the only system of its type that can process parts up to 1000 pounds. Inspection is required on all engine components to identify defects prior to performing repairs. Over ninety percent of all engine components utilize this inspection process. This project was planned for \$412K, however the lines are being used on two shifts and this has accelerated the rate of deterioration. Each break down incident causes more damage to already aged and worn components, thus driving an increase to the cost of restoration. The risk of line stoppage has also increased. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by OC-ALC/FMC (DSN 339-7377) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The present economic analysis reflects a savings to investment ration of 1.4 with a payback of 6.1 years. The EA is in review, but a change to the payback is not anticipated due to increased workload.

Impact if not provided: This equipment is used to inspect rotating engine components for the engines used in the E-3, C-135, C-141, B-52, F-14, B-1B, F-15, F-16 and B-2 weapon systems. It is vital to the mission of the Air Force that these engine components be inspected and repaired in a timely and efficient manner.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5243 Circuit Analyzer for E-3		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Circuit Analyzer for E-3				0	0	0	1	505	505	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to purchase circuit analyzer that is used to perform operational checks on all aircraft electrical systems and circuits added or disturbed during programmed depot maintenance (PDM) in accordance with E-3 aircraft work specifications. The project will provide the capability to perform thousands of multiple and sequential computed diagnostic tests simultaneously. They generate reports and graphics about the conditions, locations and the problems discovered. Benefits are an increase in efficiency, supports new technology, replacement parts are available, and it can be upgraded to meet future requirements. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.0 for the project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by OC-ALC and is retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project slipped from the FY2001 under \$500K program. The equipment will be installed and production ready in November 2002.

Impact if not provided: Increased failure of test equipment, costly workarounds, risk of damaging very high cost internal aircraft systems, and delays in the repair of E-3 electrical systems and related sub systems. Complete failure of this test equipment would require workers to perform hand checks providing less accurate results. Borrowing existing units from other weapon systems is not feasible, since are all in need of replacement. Sharing analyzers causes delays and work stoppages on multiple weapon systems due to workload increases.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5247 Replacement Circuit Analyzer for B-52		Activity Identification OC-ALC								
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Circuit Analyzer for B-52				0	0	0	1	505	505	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to purchase circuit analyzer that are used to perform operational checks on all aircraft electrical systems and circuits added or disturbed during programmed depot maintenance (PDM) in accordance with B-52 aircraft work specifications. The project will provide the capability to perform thousands of multiple and sequential computed diagnostic tests simultaneously. They generate reports and graphics about the conditions, locations and the problems discovered. Benefits are an increase in efficiency, supports new technology, replacement parts are available, and it can be upgraded to meet future requirements. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by OC-ALC and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 0.0 for the project. Due to this low ratio, a vital mission memo was submitted by OC-ALC and is retained on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE. This project slipped from the FY2001 under \$500K program. The equipment will be installed and production ready in November 2002.

Impact if not provided: Increased failure of test equipment, costly workarounds, risk of damaging very high cost internal aircraft systems, and delays in the B-52 PDM schedule. Complete failure of this test equipment would require workers to perform hand checks providing less accurate results. Borrowing existing units from other weapon systems is not feasible, since are all in need of replacement. Sharing analyzers causes delays and work stoppages on multiple weapon systems due to workload increases.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5253 Hydraulic System		Replacement			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Hydraulic System				0	0	0	1	937	937	0	0	0

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace six self contained hydraulic test stands system. It takes four hours per day to service six test stands. The test stands test and sample hydraulic fluid. Sampling will be reduced from six to one sample by using a common manifold. Currently this area is on a hearing conservation program and approximately 45 employees are affected due to the noise hazards involved. If the six old test stands are replaced by the six new test stands, the area will no longer be noisy and the area can be declassified for the hearing conservation program. The employees will no longer have to wear hearing protection. As of 11 Feb 00, three test stands are operational; the other three require extensive work in parts and man-hours. The shop produces 90 different control numbers a year and uses \$5,943 of direct labor per month to set the different control numbers to be repaired. The new test stands will require much less time because the stands are set to do many different end items. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC /FMC (DSN 777-1227) to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.3 for the project. This project is expected to be installed and savings to begin in November 2003.

Impact if not provided: The cost to replace hydraulic fluid, direct labor to filter and set up for different workloads will increase, and the test stands will break eventually becoming unrepairable. The cost of the hearing conservation program will continue. Savings of \$145,355 will be lost. The most critical impact is the slowdown caused in delivery of the aircraft to the customer. This will affect the full range of aircraft from F-15 to C-5.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5305 Replacement Hydraulic Test Stand Pump/Motor		Activity Identification OO-ALC								
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Hydraulic Test Stand Pump/Motor				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	750	750

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to purchase a replacement hydraulic tester to support the actuator workload. Two testers were provided from SM-ALC with only one operational. Approximately 80% of this shop workload requires a hydraulic test stand for diagnostic testing and final functional test. This test stand involves a continual running time of eight hours, on average, for each pump/motor tested. The present stand is experiencing failures and the design and operations are complex. At present the shop has no back-up test capability if the tester fails, which requires an outside contractor to keep the station operational. This added cost to the shop is required monthly and has increased recently to two or more times per month. The operating test station was modified at SM-ALC so that it could run automatically, but the automatic feature had to be by-passed because the station was producing erratic pressure readings. The station is now being operated in the manual mode, and the source code for the software makes it virtually impossible to determine whether the software is at fault or there is a hardware problem. The cost to have the contractor make repairs is \$40,000 per year. To reach the correct range of operation the test stand vibrates and the workers are worried about something breaking loose and injuring someone. The hydraulic tester supports actuator workload for multiple aircraft such as the F-15, F-16, F-106, F-4, C-141, C-130, KC-135, A-10, and C-5. An economic analysis (EA) was submitted and certified by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227) and is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.3 for the project. This project works with the F-15 hydraulic test stand, in that this test stand tests the actuator workload for the F-15 Aircraft. This project slipped from FY2002 to FY2003 and is expected to be installed with the savings to begin in November 2003.

Impact if not provided: The existing equipment carries a high risk potential for an extended work stoppage status on this operation. This will cause F-15 and other aircraft supported to go into non-mission capable status. Failure to resolve this problem and locate a reliable test station could shut down the ability to test, repair and overhaul all actuators for a number of weapon systems.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5311 Replacement Hydraulic F-15 STS Stabalator		Activity Identification OO-ALC								
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Hydraulic F-15 Standard Test Station Stabalator				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	929	929

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to replace pair of existing hydraulic test stands that are configured to test only one component. For example, the F-15 rudder control actuator provides the capability to test hydraulic components of weapon systems other than F-15, therefore allowing the Hydraulic Production Section to level high priority workloads in surge situations. The current workstands are in a state of unreliability. They require frequent repair and calibration. The proposed project will provide an upgraded test stand capability that will test all F-15 hydraulic flight control actuators. The new stand will be programmable, providing the capability to test hydraulic components of other weapon systems which will allow the hydraulic production shop to level high priority workloads in surge situations. Two test stands were obtained from SM-ALC during the hydraulic workload transition and were found to be unreliable. One station requires frequent repair and calibration, while the other has become totally unserviceable and cannibalized beyond the point of cost-effective refurbishment. Currently, they are working two shifts per day to meet the production schedule. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared and certified by OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227), to meet the criteria of a certifiable EA as outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 1.8 for the project. This project slipped from FY2001 to FY2003 and is expected to be installed and savings to begin in August 2004.

Impact if not provided: The failure to replace these test stands will result in the F-15 actuator workload becoming not fully supportable and may lead to a shutdown of the ability to test, repair and overhaul the F-15 actuator workload.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5314 GE Fan Rotor Axiam		Replacement			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
GE Fan Rotor Axiam				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	554	554

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to upgrade the axiam to assist in the production of fan rotor systems. The current method of building fan rotors is to place the aft shaft on the grease chunk and rotate the shaft until the run out is within limits. Then the second stage disk is installed and measured, if not within limits it is removed and re-indexed until the run out limits are met. This process is repeated on the first stage disk/shaft and the third disk. The rotor stacking gauge system will allow OC-ALC/LPP to reduce the production time, increase accuracy, and repeatability of rotor builds. The rotor stacking gauge system consists of a granite mounted air bearing rotary table, vertical and horizontal adjustable supports for the gauge heads, lever type gauge heads, and a computer to analyze the input from the gauge heads. The system will reduce Test Cell vibration, increase life in the engine components, improve the rotor assembly process, and reduce fuel consumption. An economic analysis (EA) has been prepared by OC-ALC (01 Feb 01) and has been certified by HQ AFMC/FMPS (DSN 787-3820) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 5-601, and AFMAN 5-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2501) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 2.6 for this project. The equipment will be production ready October 2003.

Impact if not provided: OC-ALC will not have the inherent capability to meet the future engine assembly techniques. The system will reduce production time and increase the accuracy of repair to the rotor assembly. The equipment will also reduce the recycle rate currently related to inability of existing equipment to produce quality parts. OC-ALC will be unable to compete with other engine repair centers without purchase of this system. The simulation model indicates an eighty five percent reduction in repair flow time.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5320 Aircraft De-paint Blast Sys KC135		Productivity			Activity Identification OC-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Aircraft De-paint Blasting System (ADBS) for C/KC-135 Aircraft				0	0	0	0	0	0	2	451	902

Narrative Justification

The purpose of this project is to provide two aircraft de-paint blast systems (ADBS) that will be used to strip exterior aircraft paint and primers from C-135 aircraft during programmed depot maintenance operations at OC-ALC. The proposed project will provide a capability to remove aircraft coatings using a plastic abrasive media that is more efficient and cost effective than the chemical de-paint process it replaces. Operators will manually sweep the spent blast media from the shop floor into a low profile media reclaim system for size reclassification and reuse. Media that is too small for reuse will be collected into media reclaim hoppers and shipped to the abrasive media vendor for recycling, thus eliminating any/all waste disposal issues. An economic analysis (EA) was certified by OC-ALC/FMC (DSN 339-7377) as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE (DSN 674-2051) and reflects a projected savings to investment ratio of 10.9 for this project. Moved from FY2002 to FY2003 due to change in workload. This equipment will be installed and production ready in January 2003.

Impact if not provided: OC-ALC will continue a process that is subject to future environmental regulatory limitations. In addition they will not realize the benefits of reduced labor cost and process flow time associated with the ADBS.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E5325 Waste Water Pretreatment		Environmental Compliance			Activity Identification OO-ALC					
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Waste Water Pretreatment				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	700	700

Narrative Justification

To procure a modularized compact industrial waste water pretreatment plant in building 505, to pretreat 100,000 gal per day plating wastewater. System will include pH adjustment and precipitation of Chrome and Nickel from the acid waste line and Cyanide destruction and Cadmium precipitation from the Cadmium lines. The existing equipment is 30 years old and has exceeded its useful life. The wastewater pretreatment lines are deteriorating and creating safety and environmental problems. Significant potential now exists for fines resulting from exceeding and/or termination of operation due to waste water pretreatment plant failure caused by slug loading. Potential for impact has been increased due to regulatory reduction of discharge standards. Both events may occur separately or concurrently. All costs would be incurred by DMAG. OO-ALC/FMC (DSN 777-1227) waived the requirement for a certified economic analysis (EA).

Impact if not provided: High potential for Notice of Violation and termination of support through compliance order issued by regulatory authority. The existing system is dangerous to the environment and the safety of the employees due to unsafe conditions. It is imperative to replace the waste water pretreatment equipment before it is placed on RAC C1 status. The current waiver will be discontinued after September 2002. If the Waste Water Pretreatment is not corrected by that date, the chemical shop will be closed by the state of Utah on a Title V Environmental and Safety and place the operation in work stoppage.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: E9999 * \$100,000 to \$499,99.99			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Equipment from \$100,000 to \$499,99.99				16		5700	17		5897	4		1000

Narrative Justification

This category includes a vast array of equipment required to support depot maintenance industrial processes. Equipment included is essential to the AFMC depot maintenance activities at OC-ALC, OO-ALC, WR-ALC, and AMARC for ongoing efforts to maintain and modernize their existing organic industrial base, save taxpayer dollars through increased productivity, and support customer requirements. Each piece of equipment will contribute to improving inherent industrial processes, such as testing, inspecting, cleaning, coating, bonding, grinding, forming or some other industrial operation. The equipment when replaced, upgraded, integrated, or combined into their industrial operation will improve efficiency and personnel safety, support hazardous waste minimization and pollution prevention efforts, enhance product quality and increase customer satisfaction in performing the depot maintenance mission. Examples include hydraulic test, grinding machines, boring machines, lathes, tube benders, grinders, heat treating equipment, parts cleaning equipment, non-destructive inspection equipment, avionics/electronic automatic test equipment, circuit card repair equipment, plating/cleaning equipment, coordinate measuring equipment, laboratory analysis equipment and other industrial plant equipment. Economic analyses (EA) for individual projects within this funding threshold are submitted, certified, and maintained on file locally.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: A9601 Hardware for Computer DMAPS/Legacy System Modernization			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
DMAPS/Legacy System Modernization				1	9542	9542	1	12000	12000	1	11000	11000

Narrative Justification

This project is to upgrade the infrastructure necessary to support depot maintenance accounting and production system (DMAPS) and the modernized depot maintenance legacy systems. The funds are linked to both programs, as they can not be separately identified. Both efforts will share the same infrastructure. All the fiber optics, computers, and equipment will be jointly used, making it impossible to allocate the cost separately to each project. This effort is to upgrade the fiber optics, routers, and infrastructure items running to buildings that will implement the NT (operating system) network. Additionally, these funds will be used for personal computer upgrades and operating software. The benefits of this project is that it meets the desired goals of the Department of Defense (DoD) driving specific modernization directed for DoD logistics information. This is according to the logistics strategic plan from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics). To accomplish these goals, further definition has been provided by the defense information infrastructure (DII) master plan, dated 23 April 1997, and the DII shared data environment (SHADE) capstone document. The current infrastructure at the air logistics centers will not support these applications. The infrastructure upgrades are being phased between FY2000 and FY2003. They are coordinated with release of software for DMAPS and the legacy modernization efforts. An economic analysis is not available for this work. A waiver is requested since this investment is necessary to support initiatives being directed by higher headquarters.

Impact if not provided: The Air Force would be unsuccessful in the implementation of DMAPS and the modernization of legacy systems that would impact the ability to support DoD logistic strategic plans. Without this improvement much needed infrastructure improvements will not be made. The modernized software must have the upgraded infrastructure in place to operate. This is a key investment to allow our depots to remain competitive.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: S9601 Software for Computer Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System (ABACUS)				1	650	650	1	2000	2000	1	2000	2000

Narrative Justification

The current Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System (ABACUS) is used to create and assemble budgets in a uniform manner for approximately six months out of the year. The remaining time ABACUS is not used. Analysts currently work offline to develop budget data, and then key the information into ABACUS. There is no database to store historical data which could be used to analyze trends. Changes that occur at higher levels cannot be distributed properly to lower levels. Changes to AFWCF procedures are not easily incorporated due to current system architect and operating environment. There is no interface between ABACUS and other information systems currently in use. Budgets submissions are sent by File Transfer Protocol, which is a tedious process. The proposed changes to ABACUS will fix these shortfalls. It will be a budget generation, reporting and execution tool that can be used throughout the year. This has all been documented in the low-level functional description. An economic analysis (EA) was prepared by HQ AFMC/FMRS and certified by HQ AFMC/FMPC as meeting criteria outlined in DoDI 7041.3, AFI 65-501 and AFMAN 65-506. The EA is on file in HQ AFMC/LGPE.

Impact if not provided: An Enhanced ABACUS will allow more time for analysis, because historical data and interface information will be available within ABACUS. Time will be saved by allowing budgets to be developed in ABACUS. Files can be transferred easily from lower to higher levels.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: S9701 Software for Computer Legacy System Technical Refresh			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Legacy System Technical Refresh				1	10449	10449	1	24900	24900	1	33900	33900

Narrative Justification

The Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) is in the process of modernizing/replacing their current depot maintenance legacy systems. The technical refresh of G004L, G005M, E046B, and G337 will separate data from the host application, standardize the data and place those data elements into a shared data environment (Data Depot/Warehouse) that is DII/COE compliant. This migration will place the data into one logical data base with unique applications designed to support the depot maintenance business processes accessing it. The deployments of the modernized systems began in June 2000 with the deployment of H117R. Deployments of legacy modernization work currently underway are projected to be complete in December 2003. The data separation, standardization, and data warehousing efforts of these legacy modernization efforts will have laid the groundwork for replacement by GOTS/COTS/DMAPS and MRPII. Modernization of additional depot maintenance legacy systems will continue through FY07. These systems include G402A, additional segments of PDMSS and implementation of MRP II. The funds in the POM, (\$25.5M in FY04, \$16.8M in FY05, \$15.0M in FY06, \$14.5M in FY07), will be used to ensure the modernization project is accomplished. AFMC awarded the first MRPII implementation planning task order this FY. The Navy Compass/ENTERPRISE MRPII/MRO suite of software has been selected as the next step in modernizing the AFMC depot maintenance system after successful implementation of DMAPS. This study effort compares Navy and AF depot maintenance processes and will recommend which of the Navy MRP II/MRO suite of MRP/MRO software is a best fit in our environment. First site implementation of MRPII/MRO will occur in September 2002, with the remainder of the sites fully implemented by FY06. The funding levels requested are higher in FY02 to fund the planning and first MRPII/MRO site implementation (as well as a continuance of legacy modernization). FY03 requested dollars reflect final legacy modernization plans and MRPII/MRO implementations at multiple sites. The savings to investment ratio is in excess of 1.2 for this entire effort. An economic analysis is on file.

Impact if not provided: AFMC systems will remain antiquated and unable to support the depot maintenance processes of the future.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: S9702 Software for Computer DMAPS Development/Implementation			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
DMAPS Development/Implementation				1	40995	40995	1	38000	38000	1	14000	14000

Narrative Justification

The purpose of the Depot Maintenance Accounting and Production System (DMAPS) program is to establish a standardized financial and reporting system that supports the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Act and Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) compliance for Air Force Maintenance Operations. The Program Authority is provided by a Memorandum of Understanding between Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), Navy, and Air Force for Conducting a Business Process Review (BPR) of Defense Industrial Financial Management System (DIFMS) to the Air Force Depots, dated 14 May 1997. As a result of the BPR, SAF/FM tasked HQ AFMC/LG to develop and deploy DMAPS. The Director of DFAS and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Financial Management and Comptroller (SAF/FM), gave approval for software design and development. Subsequently, in January 1998, SAF/FM approved the implementation of the DMAPS components to the three air logistics centers. DMAPS will be implemented in two phases. Phase I is currently being deployed to the three ALCs, with full operational capability planned for April 2002. Phase II is scheduled for full operational capability in March 2003. An economic analysis is not available for this work. A waiver has been approved since this investment is necessary to support direction from higher headquarters. The funding for DMAPS in the POM for FY04-07, (\$6.8M per year), will be used for continued system upgrades and improvements to make DMAPS more compatible with GCSS-AF.

Impact if not provided: If not provided AFMC will not increase the accuracy of cost accounting by utilizing actual labor hour accounting for product costing; will not increase the visibility of DMAG operations to improve financial, material and production management; will not achieve CFO and CAS compliance as directed; and will not support the DFAS initiative to consolidate and standardize financial systems

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates						
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: M0000 Minor Construction			Activity Identification AFMC					
Element of Cost		FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
		Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Minor Construction		11		3857	6		2345	3		1300

Narrative Justification

This category includes an array of minor construction projects that allows flexibility in adapting to new and changing workloads. Projects are small scale (costing between \$100,000 and \$500,000) and are designed, scheduled, and constructed in accordance with air logistics center (ALC) and AMARC established priorities. These projects support the depot maintenance mission requirements, correct safety and health problems, consolidate work areas as a result of downsizing efforts, and improve productivity through quality of life improvement projects and office/work space reorganizations. Typical projects could include modifications of load-bearing walls, changing work category codes within designated areas, or adding square footage to an existing work area to accommodate mission changes.

ACTIVITY GROUP CAPITAL INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION (\$ in Thousands)				Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates								
Department of the Air Force Depot Maintenance February 2002		Line Number: P0001 Adjustment for prior year cost increases			Activity Identification AFMC							
Element of Cost				FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2003		
				Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Qty	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Adjustment for prior year cost increases						2600			5400			

Narrative Justification

The \$5.4M decrease from the FY2002 program was required to meet prior year cost increases. We have cost increases for FY1998 ~ \$575K, FY1999 ~ \$55K, FY2000 ~ \$1,785K and FY2001 ~ \$3.0M for equipment projects. In FY1998, the Compact Radome Range increased \$575K. In FY1999, the Tube Benders Accessories increased \$55K. In FY2000, the B210 Replacement MILCON IOE increased \$1,500K and GE K400 manual test stands increased \$285K. In FY2001, the corrosion Control MILCON IOE increased \$2,795K, the F-15 Hydraulic Test Stand increased 60K, and Bead Blast Equipment increased \$160K.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force

Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project		Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficiency	Explanation
01	VXI Rehost	4.5	0.0	4.5	4.2	0.3	Program effort slip into the following year.
01	F-16 Microwave Test Station Upgrade	4.8	0.0	4.8	4.4	0.4	Required to pay for other projects cost increase.
01	Inter. Freq/Video/Micro Test Station	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	
01	Plasma Spray Systems	3.8	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0	
01	Benchtop Reconfigurable Automatic Tester	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.5	-0.5	Procurement cost was higher than estimated.
01	IOE Corrosion Control	11.4	0.0	11.4	12.2	-0.8	Procurement cost was higher than estimated.
01	IOE C-130 Corrosion Control	10.2	0.0	10.2	10.2	0.0	
01	Automatic Depot Test Station	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.7	0.3	Procurement cost was lower than estimated.
01	Multi Function Tester Rehost	3.5	0.0	3.5	3.5	0.0	
01	Nose Radome Electronic Test System	2.1	0.0	2.1	1.9	0.2	Procurement cost was lower than estimated.
01	High Speed Blade Tip Grinding Machine	2.6	-0.6	2.0	1.6	0.4	Good results from contract competitive bidding reduce procurement cost..
01	Reconfigurable Tooling System	1.3	0.0	1.3	1.4	-0.1	Procurement cost was higher than estimated.
01	Drop Bottom Furnace	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	0.0	
01	LFIC / RFIC Test Console	5.5	-5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	Slip to FY05.
01	C/KC-135 Circuit Analyzer	1.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	The project was delayed to FY02 due to funding constraints imposed by DMAPS.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force

Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project	Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficiency	Explanation		
01	TEWS Intermediate Support System	5.8	-5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	This project increased in price and was slipped to FY04.	
01	Equipment from \$500,000 to \$999,999.99	1.8	0.7	2.5	3.2	-0.7	The tube bender was moved to FY2002; vent system and computer-numerically-controlled (CNC) turning center was moved to equipment <=/ \$500K; and the HVAC paint booth upgrade was added to this line due to price increase.	
01	Equipment from \$100,000 to \$499,99.99	6.1	-0.3	5.8	5.7	0.1	Reprogrammed for projects requiring higher priority.	
01	DMAPS/Legacy System Modernization	9.5	-0.5	9.0	9.5	-0.5	New requirement.	
01	ADPE & Telecom \$100,000 to \$499,999.99	0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	Project was re-identified as equipment under \$500K and moved to FY2002.	
01	DMAG Budget and Price Development System	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.7	0.8	Scope of the project was reduce.	
01	Legacy System Technical Refresh	9.1	1.0	10.1	10.4	-0.3	Price adjustment	
01	DMAPS Development/Implementation	31.0	10.0	41.0	41.0	0.0	Increase driven by a slip to the schedule (fully operational by March 2002) and higher than expected DISA cost	
01	Minor Construction	4.7	-0.3	4.4	3.9	0.5	Increase in the procurement cost.	
01		0.0	Prior year cost increases	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.1	Prior year cost increases..
01		0.0	Adjusted prior year cost increases	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.0	AOB approved prior year cost increases.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Department of the Air Force

Depot Maintenance

February 2002

(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project	Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficiency	Explanation
	Grand Total		128.6	128.6	0.0	

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Air Force
Depot Maintenance
February 2002
(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project	Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficienc	Explanation	
02	VXI Rehost	0.0	VXI Rehost	0.0	0.8	-0.8	Part of this program effort slip from FY01 into this year.
02	F-16 Microwave Test Station Upgrade	1.2		1.2	1.2	0.0	
02	Intermediate Frequency/Video/Micro Test Station	5.3		5.3	5.3	0.0	
02		0.0	Plasma Spray Systems	0.0	2.1	-2.1	An additional requirement is needed in FY2002.
02	Benchtop Reconfigurable Automatic Tester	1.2		1.2	1.4	-0.2	Revised estimate.
02	Digital Test Stands	10.0		10.0	8.3	1.7	Revised estimate.
02	Fire Control RADAR Antenna	4.2		4.2	2.1	2.1	Split into a multi year project for FY2002 & FY2004.
02	Automatic Shot Peening Systems	1.4		1.4	1.4	0.0	
02	Electro Optical Work Center (EOWC)	3.3		3.3	1.7	1.6	This project was made a multi year project for FY2002-FY2003.
02	F110 Engine Run / Mount Kit	1.2		1.2	1.2	0.0	
02		0.0	Fuel Control T/S Replacement	0.0	5.9	-5.9	New requirement
02	5 Axis CNC Universal Mach Center	1.7		1.7	1.7	0.0	
02		0.0	Nickle Tank Line (Pretreat)	0.0	1.2	-1.2	Continue work from previous year that slipped due to cost increases..
02		0.0	BRAT Tester Software	0.0	1.2	-1.2	New requirement.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Air Force
Depot Maintenance
February 2002
(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project	Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficienc	Explanation
02		CNC Universal Grinders	0.0	1.5	-1.5	This a new requirement to support existing and projected workloads.
02		Benchtop Reconfigurable Auto Testers	0.0	1.5	-1.5	New requirement.
02		Case FPI Line Restoration	0.0	1.5	-1.5	This moved from the \$500K-\$999K category to the \$1M and over category due to cost increase.
02		15 X 45 Autoclave	0.0	1.1	-1.1	New requirement.
02		6861 Test Station	0.0	2.8	-2.8	New requirement.
02	LFIC / RFIC Test Console		18.3	0.0	18.3	Slip to FY06.
02	B-1B CASS Bldg 240		3.9	0.0	3.9	Delayed to FY2006 due to due to workload change.
02	Ramp CASS Bldg 2122		2.5	0.0	2.5	Deferred to FY2004 to support DMAPS.
02	Engine Nacelle Ground Trailer		1.5	0.0	1.5	Project cancelled due to work load change.
02	Bake, Fill & Evacuate Test Stand		1.2	0.0	1.2	This project was move to equipment under \$500K in FY2002 for one unit and plan for two more units in FY2004.
02		C/KC-135 Circuit Analyzer	0.0	1.0	-1.0	Move from FY01 to FY02 and revised estimate.
02	FACT Electrical Interconnecting		2.1	0.0	2.1	Slip to FY2003.
02	Paint Booth Insert		5.0	0.0	5.0	Slip to FY2003 due to higher priority requirements and price increased
02	Dry Media Blast De-painting System		1.0	0.0	1.0	Slip to FY2004 and updated estimate to \$1,450K.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Department of the Air Force
Depot Maintenance
February 2002
(Dollars in Millions)

Projects on the FY2002 Amended Budget Submission

FY	Approved Project	Reprogrammed	Approved Project Cost	Current Project Cost	Asset / Deficienc	Explanation	
02	7600 Ton Elastomer Pad Press	2.4	2.4	0.0	2.4	Delayed to FY2004 due to due to workload change.	
02	GG-1111 ATE Test Station	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	This project was moved to FY2004 due to changes in workload and requirements	
02	Equipment from \$500,000 to \$999,999.99	6.7	6.7	4.4	2.3	Added to this line is the F-15 hydraulic test stand as a new requirement; and moved the furnace and analyzer items to \$1M and over equipment line due to revised estimate.	
02	Equipment from \$100,000 to \$499,99.99	9.7	9.7	5.9	3.8	New requirements.	
02	DMAPS/Legacy System Modernization	10.4	10.4	12.0	-1.6	Additional infrastructure requiremests.	
02	DMAG Budget and Price Development System	2.0	Automated Budget Analysis/Centralized User System	2.0	2.0	0.0	Update of program name.
02	Legacy System Technical Refresh	24.9	24.9	24.9	0.0	Price adjustment.	
02	DMAPS Development/Implementation	9.3	9.3	38.0	-28.7	Increase for system integration testing/site acceptance testing (SIT/SAT), DISA, program management, and ALC program office support costs.	
02	Minor Construction	7.9	7.9	2.3	5.6	Adjusted to meet requirements.	
02		0.0	Adjusted prior year cost increases	0.0	5.4	-5.4	AOB approved prior year cost increases.
Grand Total			139.8	139.8	0.0		

Capital Budget Summary

**Air Force Working Capital Fund
AF Information Services Activity Group**

Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
February 2002

FUND9A
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Description	FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003	
	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
EQUIPMENT	3	0.663	2	1.620	3	1.854
Replacement	2	0.661	2	1.620	3	1.854
Infrastructure-MSG	0	0.000	0	0.000	1	0.350
LAN Upgrade Equip.	1	0.003	1	0.512	1	0.052
System Furniture	1	0.658	1	1.108	1	1.452
New Mission	1	0.002	0	0.000	0	0.000
Data/Video Sys Equ	1	0.002	0	0.000	0	0.000
ADPE & TELECOM	10	2.673	7	4.433	8	4.627
ADPE GCSS-AF Req	1	0.138	0	0.000	0	0.000
Bldg 856 Generator	0	0.000	0	0.000	1	0.343
Cust Supp Enhance	1	0.232	1	0.650	1	0.650
Data Warehouse	1	0.087	0	0.000	0	0.000
Data/Video System	1	0.107	0	0.000	0	0.000
Enter Inter Plat	1	0.160	1	0.230	1	0.265
ITAC	1	0.208	0	0.000	0	0.000
LAN Upgrade	1	0.858	1	1.018	1	0.902
MSG VCTN Switch	0	0.000	1	0.260	1	0.140
NetWork Servers	0	0.000	1	1.375	1	1.538
SAN	1	0.295	0	0.000	0	0.000
Test Env Upgrade	1	0.466	1	0.665	1	0.517
Virtual Office	1	0.122	1	0.235	1	0.272
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT	12	6.136	6	4.224	6	3.759
Internally Developed	1	0.520	0	0.000	0	0.000
Ent Intg Plat (SW)	1	0.520	0	0.000	0	0.000
Externally Developed	11	5.616	6	4.224	6	3.759
Customer Supp Enha	1	0.194	0	0.000	0	0.000
Data Warehouse-SW	1	0.052	0	0.000	0	0.000
DWAS	2	3.240	0	0.000	0	0.000
FM Toolkit	1	0.551	1	0.450	1	0.450
ITAC - SW	1	0.149	0	0.000	0	0.000
LAN Upgrade SW	1	0.515	1	0.769	1	0.879
Software Dev Tool	1	0.376	1	0.600	1	0.600
Spectrum	1	0.500	1	0.500	1	0.500
SW Developmt Tools	1	0.000	1	1.775	1	0.820
SW GCSS-AF Reqmnt	1	0.039	0	0.000	1	0.510
SWT Test Tools	0	0.000	1	0.130	0	0.000
MINOR CONSTRUCTION	0	0.000	0	0.000	1	0.156
Bldg 888 Addition	0	0.000	0	0.000	1	0.156
Total	25	9.472	15	10.277	18	10.396

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Infrastructure-MSG
Item Description: MSG Infrastructure Upgrade - Space Renov
Capital Category: Equipment (Replacement)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	0	0.000	0.000	1	0.350	0.350

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: MSG Infrastructure Upgrade - Space Renovation

In 1998, HQ MSG/CC was directed, by HQ ESC/CC, to physically relocate and consolidate the entire MSG organization onto Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. Historically, the Headquarters Materiel Systems Group has been located in numerous on and off-base facilities. All directorates, other than REMIS, have been moved onto the installation. During Phase I, MSG, with help from the 88th CEG, was able to relocate approximately 450 persons from off-base locations to numerous buildings on WPAFB. These moves included the RDB office relocation to Bldg 20, AFEMS relocation to Bldg 262, and SC&D and DMMIS relocation to Bldg 280. However, the MSG is still geographically separated, occupying seven different buildings throughout the installation. Phase II's initial goal was to consolidate the MSG into one existing facility on WPAFB. It is the intent of MSG/CC to comply with ESC/CC's directive and relocate REMIS to WPAFB. This move is currently scheduled during the first quarter of FY05.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

Currently, all MSG offices, except for the REMIS office, are located on WPAFB, occupying six different buildings. At this time, MSG's short-term goal is to consolidate into three buildings. To do this, new MSG office space renovation and systems furniture is required. As the MSG endeavors to comply with HQ ESC/CC's direction, MSG must continue to burden the cost to purchase and relocate systems furniture. Funding this effort to consolidate the MSG will result in a savings of man-hours; those being exhausted in transit from one location to another.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Infrastructure Upgrade Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired:

If the MSG cannot fund these moves, we will not be in compliance with HQ ESC/CC's direction. And, will continue to be a split organization, operating seven different locations. This method of operation results in a sub-optimal, less efficient organization for WPAFB, HQ ESC, HQ AFMC, and our Air Force Working Capital Fund customers.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA. The economic analysis Savings Investment Ratio is 9.554.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: LAN Upgrade Equip.

Item Description: LAN Upgrade

Capital Category: Equipment (Replacement)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.003	0.003	1	0.512	0.512	1	0.052	0.052

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: LAN UPGRADE Category: Non-ADPE Equipment. SSG has programmed and is anticipating execution of a MILCON project to construct the Integrated Operational Support Facility in FY 02. The occupants of this new facility, including the Field assistance Branch and the AF Network Operations Center, require Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) back-up for mission accomplishment. The LAN upgrade project requires approximately \$7K for various rack systems to organize and house ADPE.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: The designated occupying organizations are presently in Building 857 and are provided UPS support to allow successful mission completion. The existing UPS supports the entire facility and cannot be relocated. Solution: HQ Standard Systems Group should purchase and have installed a 400 KVA Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) for the Integrated Operational Support Facility (\$500K).

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired: This alternative provides no means of immediate back-up power to the Integrated Operational Support Facility in the event of a power outage. During the time needed for the back-up generators to start-up and synchronize, systems will crash and data will be corrupted. A massive recovery effort would then be required. This would eventually lead to substantial costs and degradation of the mission. The UPS equipment is a companion project for a MILCON insert in FY02. If the MILCON does not get approved, then the UPS equipment will not be needed.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: System Furniture
Item Description: System Furniture
Capital Category: Equipment (Replacement)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.658	0.658	1	1.108	1.108	1	1.452	1.452

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: SYSTEM FURNITURE

Category: Non-ADPE. The Civil Engineering Branch continually replaces all Systems Furniture, within SSG facilities, that is 12 years old or older. HQ SSG is in the final year of a furniture replace plan. The existing furniture is 15 years old and has reached the end of its useful life.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: HQ SSG is in the process of programming a new facility. The facility would house communications programs such as customer service functions for all AF standard software systems, AF Network Operations Center, AF Defense Messaging System, and the AF E-Mail Portal initiative. By FY03, the furniture in Building 856, Phase II will be 14 years old and will have reached the end of its useful life. Solution: Purchase furniture.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Three Year Furniture Lease
- B. Five Year Furniture Lease
- C. Furniture Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired: Furniture is worn and becomes easily broken after it's useful life. This will result in reduced productivity and quality of work environment. This could also result in injury to personnel and other government property. If furniture is not in place in the new mission facility, the facility would not be useable for mission requirements and result in mission stoppage of these critical AF programs. FY02 requirement is a companion project to a pending MILCON insert. If the MILCON project is not approved, then the systems furniture is not needed.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Bldg 856 Generator
Item Description: Building 856 Generator
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	0	0.000	0.000	1	0.343	0.343

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: BUILDING 856 GENERATOR

Category: Minor Construction. SSG requires back-up power for Phase III of Bldg 856.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: The SSG Certification Network Test Center, which supports the Air Force Network Test Center, is located in building 856, Phase III. If power is lost to this facility, SSG is not able to perform the Network Risk Assessments required or issue certificates of net worthiness for new systems. This prevents the systems from being placed in operation. The SSG also loses the capability of distributing software to its customers. Additionally, Phase III houses Software Engineering, Configuration Management, Release Control and the Contracting SPO. There are over 350 personnel in Phase III who would be at a complete work stoppage if power is lost. Solution: SSG should purchase and permanently install a 750 KW generator for Phase III, Bldg 856. Upon loss of power, work will continue in Phase III of Bldg. 856 after a short 10-second interruption of service.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Lease Generator
- C. Purchase Generator

4. Impact if not acquired:

Lost Productivity: The lack of available back-up power will lead to lost productivity in the event of a power outage.

Work Environment: The environment in the office is a primary Quality of Life element. Loss of power, which in turn creates a loss in HVAC, will negatively impact the work environment.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Cust Supp Enhance
Item Description: Customer Support Enhancement
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.232	0.232	1	0.650	0.650	1	0.650	0.650

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: CUSTOMER SUPPORT ENHANCEMENT

Category: ADPE. Provides for the replacement and upgrade of hardware for the Customer Support Division (CSD).

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: The CSD provides "help desk" services for virutally all SSG programs servicing thousands of users worldwide. To accomplish this, they maintain trouble call databases, REMEDY problem management software, Enterprise Interactive Center (EIC) phone systems. The current hardware/software suite is old and technologically limited. The EIC phone system has maxed out all circuits which means no new business can be adopted. Additionally, the reporting and data sharing capability is extremely limited making it difficult to satisfy tracking, reporting and analysis. Solution: Upgrade CSD harware/software with current technology.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Retain the status quo, which is to continue to use current equipment.
- B. Purchase new
- C. Provide a partial upgrade of hardware/software
- D. Lease equipment

4. Impact if not acquired: If not acquired, the CSD would not be able to take on new business because their EIC call system is maxed out with no new circuits available. Reporting and analysis capabilities will continue to be limited impairing the ability to support management and higher headquarters reporting requirements. Reports will have to be generated from divergent databases and provided in hardcopy. Spatial mapping of system status will not be accomplished hampering the management of the AF network. Customer satisfaction will decline due to the limited expansion capability and longer wait times. Customers will have to satifice themselves with the current reporting capabilities. Additionally, the new Air Force Portal project, with a potential user base of 1.2 million users who may hit the web-based Portal multiple times a day, poses a potentially huge call volume into the Field Assistance Building (FAB) as the system is implemented

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Enter Inter Plat
Item Description: MSG Enterprise Integration Platform
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.160	0.160	1	0.230	0.230	1	0.265	0.265

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: MSG Enterprise Integration Platform

The MSG Enterprise Integration Platform is designed to establish an enterprise wide repository for MSG Information/Data/Documents. The Enterprise Platform manages documentation, official files, and all records created no matter what their native form. This project involves the building blocks for an engineering change for the MSG Network. The platform will allow the MSG network to run the next generation software. It will also provide better support to our customers by giving them continuous access to Software Process Improvement (SPI) standard tools. The platform will allow management of licensed software and will save money by buying fewer licensed copies and managing the copies we do have better.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

Currently, MSG expends numerous man-hours and dollars manually managing a host of software and assembling information/data. The MSG Infrastructure Plan provides the MSG with a "common" product work environment. This means that everyone accesses the same information and uses the same software. Efficiency and productivity is increased. This eliminates the need to maintain several copies of the same information in several locations. It also eliminates trying to keep all the data current and accurate at all times.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Enterprise Intergration Platform Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired:

If not funded, the MSG will lack a solid information infrastructure. Failure to implement this plan will result in continuing to exhaust precious man-hours and significant cost accumulation attempting to manage software packages/licenses and project future standardized software purchases. Funding this will provide efficiencies in reduced numbers of licensed software and having current generation software tools. With this repository, the MSG will be a much more efficient, productive, and better-informed Central Design Activity (CDA).

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA. The economic analysis Savings Investment Ration (SIT) is 1.18.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: LAN Upgrade
Item Description: LAN Upgrade
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.858	0.858	1	1.018	1.018	1	0.902	0.902

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: LAN UPGRADE. Category: ADPE & Telecomm. The Standard Systems Group is responsible for implementing and maintaining Classified and Unclassified Local Area Network Communications. HQ SSG has requirements for fast resolution of network addresses for internal and external customers, and high-speed throughput of messages and data into and out of the HQ SSG network customer information repositories.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: HQ Standard Systems Group has identified the following areas requiring implementation, replacement and/or upgrade: Communications Infrastructure, Electronic Document Management System, Super Servers, and Network Security Hardware. Solution: HQ Standard Systems Group should procure, implement, replace and/or upgrade the following areas: Communications Infrastructure, FY 02 and FY 03, EDMS, FY02 and FY 03, Super Servers/V-LAN/VPN, FY 02, and Network Security Hardware, FY 02 and FY 03.

C. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Leasing
- C. Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired: If additional funding is not approved for this effort, the capabilities offered by the Local Area Network will not be deliverable to the customer, or, capabilities may be available at a degraded rate. This degraded performance will lessen Standard System Group's ability to provide mission essential support to our customer base. Additionally, HQ SSG would fail to be in compliance with DoD, AF and AFMC directives concerning network management/security, software license control, records management, operationalizing and professionalizing the network. Not upgrading and maintaining technological parity would hinder internal and external communications as well as reduce efficiency. Because of the SSG's mission, technological parity is an essential component of daily business operations.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA. This program combines separate previous line item submissions under one project and one EA. Previous line items included are: Storage Area Networks, Super Servers/V-LAN/VPN, Network Security HW, and Communications Infrastructure,

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: MSG VCTN Switch
Item Description: MSG VCTN, Hub, Switch, Network Upgrades
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	0.260	0.260	1	0.140	0.140

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: MSG VCTN, Hub, Switch, Network Upgrade

The objective of the Information Systems Activity Group (ISAG) is to maximize application re-use across all systems and directly support the Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE). The MSG Infrastructure Plan provides server relocation and consolidation, required network hubs, switches, racks, and modules required for interoperability with the 88th Communications Group established equipment standards. Global Combat Support System-Air Force (GCSS-AF) compliant servers are required to implement GCSS-AF mandated software and tools for compatibility. The ISAG five-year re-use strategy/objective is to accomplish the following: 1) migrate CDA Legacy Systems to a common GUI interface; 2) use Enterprise wide solutions; 3) standardize the Client/Server architecture; 4) standardize the data; 5) consolidate operational databases; and 6) use the Data Depot/Warehouse as the single "clean" source of information.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

Currently, the MSG does not meet the 88th Communications Group network "throughput" data transmission standards. The MSG Infrastructure Plan, based on GCSS-AF direction, is to build program code libraries to be used throughout the Central Design Activity. Implementation of this plan is based on a three-tier structure. The three tiers are: 1) Client, supporting the presentation of the data only; 2) Applications Server, which supports data manipulation and storage; and 3) data security. The network and servers provide the development environment necessary to implement software re-use across three development activities.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo
 Network Upgrade Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired:

The infrastructure must be consolidated and updated to provide for the dynamic needs of the CDA development activity. Increased networking traffic has caused major delays and system congestion. Not funding this effort will continue to cause sub-standard performance and system delays. In addition, the CDA network will not meet the 88th Communications Group network "throughput" data transmission standards if the required network switches and hub upgrades are not completed.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: NetWork Servers
Item Description: MSG Application Developmt Network Servrs
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	1.375	1.375	1	1.538	1.538

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: Development Network Servers

The MSG IT Infrastructure Plan includes application development network servers; Information Technology Application Center (ITAC) Lab Storage Area Network Server which will prove new technology prior to application to all MSG data systems.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

The MSG IT plan will solve several interoperability server problems by purchasing a Centralized Storage Area Network for email servers, a NT Server for MSG Data Warehouse Development and Decision Support System, a Quad Micro NT Server for each MSG development activity to provide a core development environment, and a Big Iron Router & Uplink which will connect the MSG development environment for the dynamic exchange of lessons learned and the use of exportable modules. The 3-Tier architecture separates the presentation portion of the application from the storage and manipulation of data. These tiers are: Client, supporting the presentation of data only; Applications Server, which supports data manipulation, storage; and data security.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Development Network Server Purchas

4. Impact if not acquired:

Failure to fund will result in the MSG not reducing future development cycles, thus increasing development costs and decreasing productivity and competitiveness with industry.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Test Env Upgrade
Item Description: Test Environment Upgrade
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.466	0.466	1	0.665	0.665	1	0.517	0.517

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: TEST ENVIRONMENT UPGRADE (Communications Environment Test Laboratory (CETL), Server & Micro Labs, GCSS AF Framework)Category: ADPE. The Test and Evaluation Division is responsible for testing all Automated Information Systems (AIS) acquired, developed, and maintained by HQ SSG. This project provides for the upgrade of the test environment. Cutting edge technology is required so that testing of new programs both commercial and AF developed can be conducted. It is also critical that emerging technologies be incorporated into the test environment so they can be evaluated for inclusion in and compatibility with the AF standards.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

Current Server lab equipment used to evaluate HP systems is quickly becoming insufficient to meet current requirements. 25 percent of HP systems evaluated by SWT are evaluated in an unisolated, unsanitized, and undedicated environment. Over 50 percent of the PCs in the Micro lab are four years old or older which is well beyond the three-year life cycle for PCs. Currently, the test facility, CETL, is behind in communication technology fielded throughout DoD. The CETL does not have the ability to test emerging enterprise technology prior to fielding. This would prevent the completion of the primary objective, to prevent the detection of AIS/network infrastructure problems before being introduced to the field.

Solution: Purchase new equipment to upgrade the Server lab, Micro lab and CETL providing a controlled, configurable, and observable test environment.

3. Alternatives considered:

A. Status Quo

B. Purchase the Server lab, Micro lab and CETL equipment.

4. Impact if not acquired: Existing resources are quickly becoming insufficient to support current and known future requirements. SWT will be unable to support testing of additional server or Micro client systems. These hardware and software upgrades will keep the lab current with the technology fielded throughout the Air Force, ensure AIS's are tested in an environment, which emulates the operational environment, and identify any possible implementation problems before negative impacts to operational bases worldwide. Additionally, SSG will be unable to meet the following goals, as stated in the SSG CONOPS:

(1) Maintain a development cycle time of 12 mths or less for new starts and major modifications.

(2) Provide complete life cycle support to include systems integration.

If the CETL lab does not receive upgrades to keep pace with technology, HQ SSG will be unable to maintain a development cycle time of 12 months or less for new starts and major modifications

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Virtual Office
Item Description: Virtual Office
Capital Category: ADPE & Telecomm

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.122	0.122	1	0.235	0.235	1	0.272	0.272

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: Virtual Office

Virtual Office is an MSG Workforce Reshaping Initiative. Virtual Office will enable the MSG employees to work anywhere at anytime. Virtual Office provides the client with Video Teleconference (VTC) capability at the desktop.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

Currently, file sharing is non-existent unless attached to emails; creating large, cumbersome, files that use excessive amounts of computer/server memory and bandwidth. Desktop VTC capability is non-existent; creating difficulties when trying to solve complex problem via telephone/teleconferences. Individuals unable to access email while on convalescence. Virtual Office provides the capability to share files across the entire MSG. It provides the client with VTC capability at the desktop. It also provides the capability to send emails with "Virtual" attachments, saving space and bandwidth. It allows for management to provide offsite virtual office capability of an employee "work at home" project when valuable office space is not available or during an employee's convalescence.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Purchase Virtual Office Capabilit

4. Impact if not acquired:

Email will not be efficient and clients will not be able to communicate with other DoD components that have VTC desktop capability. Files that are not shared virtually will be sent via email further congesting email traffic. The capability of allowing employees, under certain circumstances, to continue their daily workload at an alternative site, would cut back on time lost to employees staying home with sick family members, being unavailable because of TDY, and other absences from the workplace. Government industry partners are currently conducting this type of program; lack of funding will prevent accessing our partners using this very efficient mode of communication.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: FM Toolkit
Item Description: JLIMS/RCDB Development
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.551	0.551	1	0.450	0.450	1	0.450	0.450

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: Joint Labor Interface Management System (JLIMS)/Resource Control Database (RCDB) and FM Toolkit.

Category: Software. The purpose is to develop JLIMS into a stand-alone system with multi-ability interface capabilities. JLIMS will provide users a labor tracking and personnel data system with user friendly front-end edits. JLIMS also supports interface requirements to DFAS accounting system, RCDB and the DCPS system. RCDB tracks plans, expenses, revenues, labor creating an enterprise platform standardizing financial data and report generation. RCDB must be modified to interface into DWAS and enhanced over time adding modules and capabilities.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: JLIMS does not have adequate reporting and interfacing capabilities to support the HQ SSG organization and financial structure. Under the current system, all adjustments must be accomplished manually and does not provide adequate reports for upper management oversight into labor costs. RCDB cannot interface with DWAS accounting system. JLIMS/DWAS/RCDB form the FM Toolkit and must be developed/enhanced over time to meet organizational goals. Solution: Enhanced versions of JLIMS would provide the capability for labor hour adjustments to interface automatically into IFAS and DWAS. JLIMS report capability would also be enhanced to provide management with a point and click type of reporting. RCDB must interface with DWAS. The FM Toolkit requirement allows for programming of future enhancements, especially DWAS, to maximize efficiency and keep pace with continued development of AF systems.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Enhance JLIMS/RCDB, Develop/Purchase Financial Tools

4. Impact if not acquired: Without the JLIMS enhancement and development/purchase of financial software tools, adequate reporting capabilities to support the HQ SSG organization and financial structures will not exist. Performance problems would continue to persist at HQ SSG. Labor reporting would continue to be based on data retrieved from IFAS. Since the IFAS system is being phased out and the capabilities of the DFAS DWAS system are not yet complete, our ability to create labor reports in is in jeopardy. By not removing JOCAS as the backbone of JLIMS, we will continue to have the liability and overhead of using JOCAS and its associated connection to Oracle 7.2, which creates performance and security problems.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act 1990.

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA. This program combines separate line item submissions under one project and one EA. Previous submissions were: DWAS, JLIMS, RCDB

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: LAN Upgrade SW

Item Description: LAN Upgrade

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.515	0.515	1	0.769	0.769	1	0.879	0.879

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: LAN UPGRADE, Category: Software. The Standard Systems Group is responsible for implementing and maintaining Classified and Unclassified Local Area Network Communications. HQ SSG has requirements for fast resolution of network addresses for internal and external customers, high-speed throughput of messages and data into and out of the HQ SSG network customer information repositories, standardized desktop software technology, document management, and enterprise management.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: HQ Standard Systems Group has identified the following areas requiring implementation, replacement and/or upgrade: Communications Infrastructure, Network Security Software, EDMS, Corporate Enterprise PC Software, and Standard Server Software. Solution: HQ Standard Systems Group should procure, implement, replace and/or upgrade the following areas: FY 02, Network Security Software, FY 02 AND FY 03, EDMS, FY 02 AND FY 03, FY01, Corporate Enterprise PC Software, FY 01, FY02 AND FY 03 and Standard/Super Server Software FY 01 and FY02.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Leasing
- C. Purchase

4. Impact if not acquired: Without the supporting software, this portion of the Network upgrade will be inoperable and the capabilities offered by the Local Area Network will not be deliverable to the customer or, capabilities may be available at a degraded rate. This degraded performance will lessen Standard System Group's ability to provide mission essential support to our customer base.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Software Dev Tool

Item Description: Software Development Tools

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.376	0.376	1	0.600	0.600	1	0.600	0.600

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT TOOLS

Category: Software. In order to provide standardization throughout the Software Factory, the purchase of commercial off-the-shelf software (COTS) tools is necessary. Additionally, by centralizing the use of these software development tools, money would be saved in software licensing and training for individual use.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: A major problem area in today's Information Technology (IT) industry is the use of heterogeneous mixtures of models of computation. Much time and money is lost when each component/system being designed has to be completed by different entities. This area could be used for a broad range of applications including real-time systems and hardware/software so the designer can focus on the problem and not the tools. In addition, configuration management in the Software Factory is not standardized and results in manual performance reporting. Solution: Purchase standard set of software tools

3. Alternatives considered: SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT TOOLS is a part of the standard suite of software described under the Software Tools EA.

A. Status Quo

B. Purchase Standard set of Software tools

4. Impact if not acquired: Without the identified capital investment, the Software Factory will fall behind in advanced technology capabilities, which in turn inhibit our ability to acquire and retain software development efforts throughout the Air Force and DoD. We will not be able to support current ongoing efforts using state-of-the-art technology, nor support AIS's that depend on continuous software upgrades and customer support to sustain them. This will jeopardize our competitive Central Design Activity position and impact incoming revenue needed to sustain operations. Without this purchase, software development costs will increase due to the need to support many non-standardized software tool sets. Funding will have to increase for current projects and delivery times will be negatively impacted. Without standardization, the Software Factory cannot effectively train software developers in standard tool sets. As a result, this will prevent the Software Development Division from establishing a versatile pool of knowledgeable and skilled manpower. These tools will also allow for a streamlined training approach establishing a work force with higher competency levels. If not acquired, the development environment, could potentially lose approximately \$25M in new business opportunities annually.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA. Encompasses previous line items under one project and EA. Projects combined include: Development Environments and Compilers, Configuration Management/Modernization and the Management Information Systems (MIS) Upgrade.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Spectrum

Item Description: Spectrum

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.500	0.500	1	0.500	0.500	1	0.500	0.500

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: Spectrum

Spectrum Systems Development Architecture (SSDA) is the preferred software "re-use" tool for new development and reengineering. The SSDA tool will save scarce technical resources and reduce construction and sustainment of application software products and services by providing us with "re-use" capability.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

The MSG currently lacks sufficient "re-use" capability. Re-use will enable us to "re-use" existing software components, data components, data models, business functions, application architecture, test cases, and documentation for future applications. Re-use is the key to reducing future development cycles, thus reducing development costs and increasing productivity and competitiveness with industry.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Spectrum Software Purchas

4. Impact if not acquired:

Failure to fund will result in the MSG not reducing future development cycles, thus increasing development costs and decreasing productivity and competitiveness with industry.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: SW Developmt Tools
Item Description: Software Development Tools
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.000	0.000	1	1.775	1.775	1	0.820	0.820

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: SW Development Tools

The MSG lacks a number of software tools critical to accomplishing modeling, tracking, programming, testing and development efforts. These functions are critical to meeting our customers needs and providing a level of service needed to generate appropriate levels of funding.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

MSG is a Central Design Activity (CDA) and as part of their mission, re-engineers applications systems. The Tech Refresh effort uses a standard software development environment. The tool-set includes a number of software tools critical to accomplishing modeling, tracking, programming, testing and development efforts.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Development Tools Purchas

4. Impact if not acquired:

Failure to have the proper tools in place will preclude the MSG from attaining CMM Level 3. This is necessary to attain and maintain industry standards. With the newer tools, the software development effort can be accomplished at lower cost to the customer.

5. Regulatory implications: None

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA - Savings Investment Ratio (SIR) = 1.158

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Materiel Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: SW GCSS-AF Reqmnt
Item Description: Software for GCSS-AF Requirement
Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
1	0.039	0.039	0	0.000	0.000	1	0.510	0.510

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: GCSS-AF

Global Combat Support System-Air Force (GCSS-AF) eventually will include all of the combat support information system activities at a base. Instead of supply having a stovepipe database system, security police having another system, and various other agencies all having independent systems, all common Air Force enterprise data will be accessible to authorized people who need the information.

2. Current deficiency/problem and how it is solved:

GCSS was directed by PMD0923(7)1 19 Aug 96. An integration contractor was selected in Dec 96 and is responsible for selecting standard architecture and tools to build the integrated Combat Support environment. Nearly all MSG managed systems align to the Combat Support/GCSS-AF functional domain. Message Oriented Middleware and Database Persistence are major pieces of the overall GCSS architecture. Based on current GCSS direction, the MSG is posturing to establish a production environment. This plan is evolving over the next two years. The basis of the MSG Infrastructure Plan is to build program code libraries that will be used Central Design Activity (CDA) wide. Implementation of the plan is based on a three-tier structure. These three-tiers include: 1) Client, supporting the presentation of the data only; 2) Application Server, which support data manipulation and storage, and 3) Data Security.

3. Alternatives considered: Status Quo

Purchase GCSS-AF Production Environmen

4. Impact if not acquired:

Using a standard architecture and tools, the GCSS standard environment will lead to reduced development and maintenance cost. Lack of funding will result in loss of cost avoidance/savings that would be achieved with purchase. Failure to fund will result in nearly all MSG managed systems not meeting GCSS standards; leading to system degradation.

5. Regulatory implications: Program Management Decision - PMD0923(7)1 19 Aug 96

6. EA is on file at HQ MSG/FMA

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: SWT Test Tools

Item Description: SWT Test Tools

Capital Category: Software Development (Externally developed)

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	1	0.130	0.130	0	0.000	0.000

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: SWT TEST TOOLS. Category: Software. The Test and Evaluation Division is responsible for testing all Automated Information Systems (AIS) acquired, developed, and maintained by HQ SSG. The need to produce quality systems quicker, better, cheaper, and completely integrated requires the use of effective automated tools. The concept is to use computers to drive the design, development and test processes thus saving time, reducing costs and ensuring quality.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: SSG currently has a few quality software tools in use, however like computers, these software tools must be upgraded and replaced to keep pace with technology. The current inventory does not provide some capabilities and too few of others. This software suite needs to be enlarged by purchasing new software and upgrading others. The current software suite does not address the design/development function of the overall SSG process. Solution: Take a pro-active approach to the overall Systems Engineering Process (SEP) and equip the SW staff with the software tools necessary to maintain and enhance our competitive edge in developing, maintaining and supporting the needs of the war fighter.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Purchase Software Tools (Tool Purchase)

4. Impact if not acquired: If not acquired, the mission and capabilities of the Software Factory will continue to erode. As the SEP process is matured, it is vital that we nurture the advancement of automated capabilities. Without these tools, functions will continue to be performed manually causing the organization to fall behind other development activities that have faster and leaner development cycles. The risk of losing business opportunities in the future would be high.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

Capital Budget Input Report

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates
Standard Systems Group February 2002

FUND9B
(Dollars in Millions)

Item Name: Bldg 888 Addition
Item Description: Bldg 888 Addition (Chiller)
Capital Category: Minor Construction

2001 AC			2002 AF			2003 R		
Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost	Item Quantity	Item Cost	Total Cost
0	0.000	0.000	0	0.000	0.000	1	0.156	0.156

Item Justification/Impact if Not Provided:

1. Description and Purpose: Bldg 888 Addition (Chiller)

Category: Minor Construction. SSG needs to place Bldg 888 on its own chiller to provide occupants a reliable source for their cooling requirements.

2. Current Deficiency/problem and how it is solved: The existing chilled water lines providing water to building 888 are old and have failed three times in the past three years. Training has recently been set up in this building and brings in personnel from all AF locations. The Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning system must be reliable in order not to impact scheduling of classes. This is especially significant due to TDY travelers attending classes at this location. Solution: An addition should be constructed for Bldg. 888 to house the new chiller system.

3. Alternatives considered:

- A. Status Quo
- B. Construct Addition to Bldg 888

4. Impact if not acquired:

Lost Productivity: The SSG workforce must maintain a high level of productivity to remain competitive with private industry. The lack of proper protection for the new chiller equipment will lead to equipment failure and loss of HVAC. This HVAC loss will, in turn greatly impact worker productivity.

Security: Securing the new chiller equipment within the building structure decreases the possibility of sabotage, vandalism, and mower damage. Without the building addition, the HVAC system is more vulnerable.

Work Environment: The environment in the office is a primary Quality of Life element. Loss of power, which in turn creates a loss in HVAC, will negatively impact the work environment.

5. Regulatory implications - (local, state, and/or federal): None

6. EA is on file at HQ SSG/FMA.

\$ in Millions

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

FY	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Reprogs</u>	<u>Approved Proj Cost</u>	<u>Current Proj Cost</u>	<u>Asset/ Deficiency</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
ADPE & Telecom						
01	Customer Support Enhancement		0.425	0.232	(0.193)	Per HQ AFMC/FMR approved reprogrammign (26 Apr 01 letter)
01	Test Environment Upgrade		0.418	0.466	0.048	
01	LAN Upgrade HW		0.743	0.858	0.115	
01	Data/Video System		0.150	0.107	(0.043)	
01	Enterprise Infrastructure Platform		0.160	0.160	0.000	
01	Virtual Information Center (VIC)		0.130	0.122	(0.008)	
01	ITAC Lab Requirements		0.150	0.208	0.058	
01	Storage Area Network		0.300	0.295	(0.005)	
01	Data Warehouse					
01	Development Server		0.150	0.087	(0.063)	
01	GCSS Test Model		0.135	0.138	0.003	
	Total		2.761	2.673	(0.088)	
Software						
01	FM Toolkit		0.566	0.551	(0.015)	
01	Customer Support Enhancement		0.232	0.194	(0.038)	
01	LAN Upgrade SW		0.610	0.515	(0.095)	
01	Defense WCF Accounting System (DWAS)		4.400	2.240	(2.160)	2.000 carryover request approved.
01	Data Warehouse Development		0.000	0.052	0.052	
01	SW Development Tools		0.428	0.376	(0.052)	
01	ITAC Lab Requirements		0.000	0.149	0.149	
01	Spectrum		0.500	0.500	0.000	
01	SW Development Tools		0.125	0.000	(0.125)	

FUND 9D
Capital Budget
Execution

\$ in Millions

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

01	Enterprise Intergration Platform	0.600	0.520	(0.080)
01	GCSS Test Model	0.110	0.039	(0.071)
	Total	7.571	5.136	(2.435)

Non-ADPE & Telecom

01	System Furniture	0.660	0.658	(0.002)
01	Data/Video Sys Equ	0.012	0.002	(0.010)
01	LAN Upgrade Equip.	0.007	0.003	(0.004)
01	Reconfigure old AQ area	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Total	0.679	0.663	(0.016)
	FY01 Total	11.011	8.472	-2.539

<u>FY</u>	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Reprogs</u>	<u>Approved Proj Cost</u>	<u>Current Proj Cost</u>	<u>Asset/Deficiency</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
						Requirements review yielded price adjustments. Proposed Reprogramming.
02	LAN Upgrade HW Test Environment		1.018	0.775	(0.243)	
02	Upgrade Customer Support Enhancement		0.665	0.683	0.018	
02	Enterprise Infrastructure Platform		0.650	0.078	(0.572)	
02	MSG VTCN Hub, Switch, Lan Upgrade		0.230	0.230	0.000	
02	Network Servers		0.260	0.260	0.000	
02	Virtual Office		1.375	1.375	0.000	
	Total		4.433	3.636	-0.797	
Software						
02	FM Toolkit		0.450	0.398	(0.052)	
02	LAN Upgrade SW		0.769	0.377	(0.392)	Proposed Reprogramming.

\$ in Millions

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

	Customer Support				
02	Enhancement	0.000	0.053	0.053	
02	SWT Test Tools	0.130	0.187	0.057	
02	SW Development Tools	0.600	0.511	(0.089)	
02	Spectrum	0.500	0.500	0.000	
02	SW Development Tools	1.775	1.775	0.000	
	Total	4.224	3.801	-0.423	
Non-ADPE & Telecom					
02	System Furniture (MILCON Companion)	1.108	1.108	0.000	
02	LAN Upgrade	0.512	0.034	(0.478)	Proposed Reprogramming for UPS.
02	Integrated Ops Supt UPS (MILCON Companion)	0.000	0.500	0.500	Proposed Reprogramming.
	Total	1.620	1.642	0.022	
	FY02 Total	10.277	9.079	-1.198	

<u>FY</u>	<u>Approved Project</u>	<u>Reprogs</u>	<u>Approved Proj Cost</u>	<u>Current Proj Cost</u>	<u>Asset/Deficiency</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
ADPE & Telecom						
03	LAN Upgrade		0.902	0.902	0.000	
03	Customer Support Enhancement		0.650	0.650	0.000	
03	Test Environment Upgrade		0.517	0.517	0.000	
03	Enterprise Infrastructure Platform		0.265	0.265	0.000	
03	MSG VTCN Hub, Switch, Lan Upgrade		0.140	0.140	0.000	
03	Network Servers		1.538	1.538	0.000	
03	Virtual Office		0.272	0.272	0.000	
	Total		4.284	4.284	0.000	

\$ in Millions

Air Force Working Capital Fund
Information Services Activity Group
Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget Estimates

Software

03	FM Toolkit	0.450	0.450	0.000
03	LAN Upgrade	0.879	0.879	0.000
03	SW Development Tools	0.600	0.600	0.000
03	Spectrum	0.500	0.500	0.000
03	SW Development Tools	0.820	0.820	0.000
03	SW GCCS-AF Requirement	0.510	0.510	0.000
	Total	3.759	3.759	0.000

Non-ADPE & Telecom

03	LAN Upgrade Equip.	0.052	0.052	0.000
03	Systems Furniture	1.452	1.452	0.000
03	Old AQ Area Renovation	0.350	0.350	0.000
	Total	1.854	1.854	0.000

Minor Construction

03	Bldg. 888 Addition (Chiller)	0.156	0.156	0.000
03	Bldg. 856 Generator	0.343	0.343	0.000
	Total	0.499	0.499	0.000

	FY03 Total	10.396	10.396	0.000
--	-------------------	---------------	---------------	--------------

Activity Group Capital Investment Summary
Component: United States Transportation Command
Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(\$ in Millions)

Line Number	Item Description	FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
		Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
A.	Equipment						
A(1)	Replacement						
	Mechanized storage system - AMC		\$0.1		\$2.2		\$2.3
	Bridge Crane (replace) - MTMC			1		1	\$4.0
	Truck Forklift - MTMC	2	\$1.0	2	1.2		
	Railroad Brush Cutter - MTMC	1	\$0.3				
	Rough Terrain Contaonier Holder (RTCH) - MTMC			6	\$3.8		
	50 Ton Crane Truck - MTMC			1	\$0.3		
	Fire Trucks - MTMC					2	\$0.5
	Front End Loader - MTMC					1	\$0.2
	Grader - MTMC					1	\$0.1
	Railroad Maintenace Equipment- MTMC					3	\$0.5
A(2)	Productivity	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0
A(3)	New Mission	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0
A(4)	Environmental Compliance	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0	0	\$0.0
	Subtotal		\$1.4		\$7.5		\$7.6
B.	ADPE & Telecomm						
	AIT-AMC		\$1.6		\$3.9		\$2.9
	C2IPS		\$4.4		\$0.8		\$0.0
	CAMPS		\$0.4		\$0.2		\$0.2
	CAMS		\$1.1		\$1.6		\$1.6
	ELECTRONIC RECORDS		\$0.0		\$0.0		\$0.1
	GATES		\$2.2		\$1.8		\$2.6
	GDSS		\$1.4		\$7.2		\$5.9
	L-BAND SATCOM		\$0.7		\$0.7		\$0.7
	OWCP		\$1.6		\$2.6		\$1.9
	SYSTEM INTEGRATION		\$3.7		\$1.7		\$2.3
	TDC		\$6.0		\$5.2		\$8.1
	WING LAN - AMC		\$2.6		\$3.0		\$4.8
	IC3		\$2.5		\$2.0		\$0.3
	ICE		\$0.6		\$1.2		\$0.2
	AUTOSTRAD 2000		\$3.9		\$2.8		\$4.4
	AIT-MTMC		\$1.0		\$1.0		\$1.0
	CFM		\$1.0		\$0.8		\$1.5
	ITV		\$3.3		\$2.0		\$3.6
	TOPPS		\$2.8		\$1.0		\$1.0
	WPS		\$0.4		\$0.5		\$2.0
	ASN		\$0.1		\$0.0		\$0.0
	BDSS		\$1.2		\$0.0		\$0.0
	CMD PRESENTATIONS		\$0.1		\$0.0		\$0.0
	Defend the Computing Environment		\$0.7		\$0.3		\$0.4
	Defend the Network Infrastructure		\$0.7		\$0.7		\$0.9
	GCCS		\$0.3		\$0.0		\$0.7
	GTN		\$0.7		\$0.0		\$0.0
	GTN 21		\$0.0		\$7.8		\$4.0
	INFOSTRUCTURE		\$0.0		\$6.1		\$0.0

	JMCG	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.2
	LAN	\$3.9	\$2.8	\$0.6
	SMS	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.3
	VTC	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Subtotal	\$49.7	\$57.7	\$52.2
C.	Software Development (Internally Developed)			
	IC3	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$1.7
	ICE	\$3.8	\$4.1	\$4.2
	AUTOSTRAD 2000	\$1.7	\$1.8	\$1.5
	AIT-MTMC	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$1.0
	CFM	\$8.8	\$6.7	\$7.7
	COE	\$0.9	\$0.0	\$0.0
	CAB	\$2.5	\$1.2	\$0.5
	ITV	\$9.0	\$9.0	\$9.1
	TFMS - MTMC	\$5.3	\$4.0	\$0.0
	TOPPS	\$2.5	\$2.8	\$2.5
	WPS	\$3.9	\$6.7	\$5.5
	Subtotal	\$41.5	\$39.4	\$33.7
D.	Software Development (Externally Developed)			
	ACFP	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$1.4
	AIT-AMC	\$1.7	\$2.3	\$0.9
	C2IPS	\$10.6	\$0.0	\$0.0
	CAMPS	\$4.8	\$3.9	\$3.6
	CAMS	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$1.1
	COINS	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$0.3
	GATES	\$5.5	\$5.4	\$5.4
	GDSS	\$3.7	\$12.7	\$12.0
	L-BAND SATCOM	\$1.0	\$0.6	\$0.6
	SYSTEM INTEGRATION	\$9.0	\$12.4	\$11.0
	ASN	\$2.8	\$2.6	\$2.7
	BDSS	\$1.2	\$2.1	\$2.0
	DEFEND THE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.5
	DEFEND THE NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.5
	DTR-CUSTOMS BORDER CLEARANCE	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7
	GCCS	\$0.1	\$0.6	\$0.6
	GTN	\$39.7	\$10.5	\$6.0
	GTN 21	\$0.0	\$17.3	\$35.8
	INFOSTRUCTURE	\$0.0	\$2.4	\$2.5
	JMCG	\$2.0	\$1.2	\$1.1
	LAN-HQ	\$2.0	\$0.2	\$0.2
	LOGBOOK	\$0.9	\$0.8	\$0.7
	SMS	\$1.5	\$1.0	\$0.6
	TFMS - HQ	\$4.8	\$3.4	\$2.0
	TMS	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3.7
	Subtotal	\$94.5	\$85.2	\$95.9
E.	Minor Construction			
	\$100,000 to \$499,999.99 - AMC	\$8.6	\$9.1	\$11.0
	\$100,000 to \$499,999.99 - MTMC	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.8
	\$100,000 to \$499,999.99 - DCS	\$0.4	\$0.5	\$0.5
	Subtotal	\$9.8	\$10.4	\$12.3
	Grand Total	\$196.9	\$200.2	\$201.7

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description Equipment			D. Activity Identification Various TWCF Units		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement			\$126.0			\$2,200.0			\$2,300.0
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$126.0			\$2,200.0			\$2,300.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$126.0			\$2,200.0			\$2,300.0
Narrative Justification:									
FY01 FY02 FY03 BPIE Flightline Maintenance \$1,185 \$2,200 \$2,300 Equipment replacement funds are used to support Base Procured Investment Equipment items for flightline maintenance.									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)						A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB			
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-MATERIEL HANDLING EQUIP(MHE)		D. Activity Identification			
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement			\$1,252.0			\$5,300.0			\$5,300.0
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$1,252.0			\$5,300.0			\$5,300.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$1,252.0			\$5,300.0			\$5,300.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU) is the premier DOD ammunition terminal and is considered a vital part of the strategic CONUS power projection platform supporting warfighting CINCs around the world. It is relied upon to maintain a high optempo consisting of ammunition resupply missions, prepo operations, and FMS operations. The terminal is authorized two bridge cranes which are track mounted. These cranes are responsible for the timely and efficient transfer of containers from rail to truck chassis and their subsequent delivery shipside for loading. If the cranes are not replaced in the near future, the strategic impact will be MOTSU's inability to meet the warfight CINC RDD, especially in time of crisis or war. One crane will be replaced in FY03 (\$4M). Terminal throughput capability is directly affected by these cranes. Second crane will be refurbished and upgraded in FY 02 (\$1.2). Increased optempo has also resulted in the requirement to produce six 25 tons Rough Terrain Container Handlers(\$2.6M). Current Mission requirements require the terminal to borrow RTCHs to meet operational needs. It is getting more difficult to borrow from others as demands increase on the owners to fully utilize their equipment. Two additional forklifts are also needed, (227K). Railroad tracks are a key component of the terminal infrastructure. Over 100 miles of track needs to be maintained to Federal Rail Administration standards. Track maintenance equipment is over 11 years old and downtime is increasing due to the nonavailability of repair parts. Tie Inserter(\$250K), Tie Crane (\$180K), and a Spike Drive (\$270K) need replacement to prevent operational track closures. Emergency electrical Generator is needed for our Pacific Division (\$273K). Finally, a new Ballast Regulator is needed for track maintenance(\$300K).</p> <p>As stated in FY02 discussion, the Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU) is vital to CONUS power projection in support of warfighting CINCs. The Bridge Crane (\$4M) is the procurement action mentioned in FY02. These cranes are responsible for the timely and efficient transfer of containers from rail to truck chassis and their subsequent delivery shipside for loading. Terminal needs to replace a fire pumper and multipurpose fire truck (\$680K). These vehicles are 15 and 11 years old, respectively. Fire pumper is the first out fire apparatus for one of the fire stations and is backed up by the multipurpose truck. Multipurpose fire truck is used extensively to meet the unique fire needs of Sunny Point because of its versatility. AR 420-90 and DODI Fire & Equipment Services Regulations state that two company fire departments will have two first class fire apparatus and one in reserve. One of the most utilized pieces of heavy equipment needing replacement is the grader (\$100K). It plays a key role in maintenance of over 50 miles of unimproved roads used for force protection and operational readiness. It is also used for land management to maintain 100 miles of road ditches minimizing flooding. A front end loader (\$220K) is needed to maintain unpaved roads, load or move dirt, maintain drainage of railroad track areas, and keep fire lanes open. During the 1999 hurricanes (3), front end loaders were vital to terminal hurricane recovery efforts. Additionally, vast amounts of lumber are discharged from vessels making movement by front end loader essential to the operation of our reclaim yard. A new 50 Ton Truck Mounted crane (\$300K) is needed to lift derailed railroad cars and locomotives. This mobile crane is also used to lift other extra heavy objects at the terminal.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description ACFP			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	2								
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,777.0			\$1,800.0			\$1,400.0
C(3) Deployment			\$200.0			\$240.0			
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,977.0			\$2,040.0			\$1,400.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$1,977.0			\$2,040.0			\$1,400.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Program Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AMCs Command and Control (C2) program to generate wind optimized flight plans for the USAF. Provides cost avoidance of \$3M yearly in aircraft fuel costs. - Aircrews and flight planners access system world-wide through the Local User Interface (LUI) software installed on PCs or laptops. Users access through the Non-classified Internet Protocol Routing Network (NIPRNET) or dial-up via a modem. - Provides aircrews and flight planners with optimized flight plans that take into account winds, temperature, aircraft drag, established airways, air refueling tracks, and avoid areas. - By FY99, will also provide flight crews current weather information and Notice to Airmen (NOTAMS) increasing safety of flight. <p>Requirements: Purchase new hardware to support AMC contingency requirements for flight plan generation. Modernize existing flight planning software to support previously identified requirements for airlift support.</p> <p>IOC: FY97/3 (software and hardware) FOC: FY02/3 (software and hardware) Life-cycle Costs: \$58.65M through FY2020 Date Cost Analysts: Jun 97</p> <p>Cross Flow Requirements - Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides information to: C-17 mission computer, AF Mission Support System (AFMSS), Combined Mating and Rnaging Planning System (CMARPS), Combat Flight Planning System (CFPS), and Meteorological Automated Information System (MAIS). - Receives information from: Air Force Weather Agneycs Global Weather Central Database (GADB), National Imagery & Mapping Agency (NIMA) Digital Aeronautical Flight Information File (CAFIF), CMARPS, DFPS, and MAIS. <p>Impact if not funded: Delays in operational missions as crews wait for flight plans to be processed. Current validated requirement is for 250 flight plans per hour; current hardware provides only 125 per hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant delays in development of flight plans for AMC missions during contingency operations. AMC mission requirements. Hardware maintenance costs will escalate due to continued use of obsolete computer hardware. Current equipment will be over five years old -- Unable to comply with SecDef Year 2000 testing and fixing direction. Delay in migrating the software to open systems architecture, increasing operating costs due to proprietary platforms. - Cannot become Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE) compliant. Will slow efforts to achieve full operational capability (FOC), increasing future development costs. - Efforts to provide new three dimensional model optimization flight plan will be significantly delayed; new model will further reduce fuel expenses. - Will be unable to support full two-way integration with AFMSS and reduce current planner workload resulting from duplication of effort. Aircrews will not have easy access to web-based optimized flight planning from home stations, enroutes, or deployed locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy access could further reduce aircraft fuel expenses by \$700K annually. - Will slow or impede efforts to reduce aircrew workload or centralize flight planning operations as required by the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC) and AMCs mission planning Concept of Operations. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002					C. Line No. & Item Description AMC AIT		D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,572.0			\$3,878.0			\$2,950.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,572.0			\$3,878.0			\$2,950.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,650.0			\$2,260.0			\$950.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,650.0			\$2,260.0			\$950.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$3,222.0			\$6,138.0			\$3,900.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: The AMC AIT program seeks to integrate automatic identification technology into AMC port business processes to support force readiness, provide in-transit visibility (ITV), and meet the goals of the DoD CONOPS, USTRANSCOM AIT plan and AMC AIT plan. The AIT program will work closely with the Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES) to directly support AMCs mobility operations worldwide. AMC, as the DoD single manager for airlift, requires timely and accurate information gathered from worldwide locations to plan, execute and monitor multi-theater airlift. AIT will provide information to the Tanker Airlift Control Center, HQ AMC, and USTRANSCOM with integrated functionality to deploy and sustain forces globally. Migration to an AIT environment is a step in achieving real time (near real time) ITV.</p> <p>Program Description: GATES is the AMC program to develop an integrated, open, transportation system providing visibility of cargo and passenger assets moved by AMC. It will migrate and modernize HQ AMC transportation systems from the proprietary Honeywell/Wang DPS 90 mainframes to an open system platform/environment. Applications software will be developed based on capturing AMCs transportation business processes and integrate complete systems requirements. GATES is in concert with AMC C4 Systems Master Plan to achieve an open systems, integrated command architecture by adopting standard protocols, software development standards, interfaces, Commercial Off-The Shelf Software (COTS), and Government Off-The-Shelf Software (GOTS) in a cost effective manner.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description C2IPS			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,489.0			\$800.0			\$0.0
B(2) Computer Software			\$1,000.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer			\$1,900.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
Subtotal			\$4,389.0			\$800.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design			\$5,275.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C(2) System Development			\$5,300.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$10,575.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$14,964.0			\$800.0			\$0.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Program Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides critical, wing and unit-level Command and Control (C2) information to AMC wing and unit commanders and decision makers. - Centralized "electronic greaseboard" capability for C2 of AMC active duty, AFRES, and ANG airlift, air refueling wings/squadrons and other mobility, fixed, and deployable field units worldwide. - Supports Air Mobility execution, tracking and analysis for both fixed and deployed sites. Supports peacetime, wartime, contingency and humanitarian air mobility requirements. - C2IPS migrates into GDSS in FY03. <p>IOC: June 1992 (software and hardware) SOR: FY03 (software and hardware).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C2IPS is to interoperate with the Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS) in accordance with the TBMCS Program Management Document. - Migration to an Air Mobility Command corporate environment will be in accordance with the AMC C4 Master Plan. - Analysis dependent on future migration planning and development within the Theater Battle Management program. <p>Life-cycle Costs: \$57,086,000. --Total Life Cycle Cost estimated at \$523M (Est 1992). Software development funding (including funding of ESC/GAM System Program Office APPN 3600) also received via TBMCS program: 98 - \$4.426M, 99 - \$10M, 00 - \$11.7M, 01 - \$9.4M, 02 - \$2.2M, 03 - \$2.3M, 04 - 07 \$0.0M.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funds will be obligated by AFMC/ESC/GAM in the development of required C2IPS system interface capabilities and system functionality associated with the TBMCS program open systems migration. <p>Date of Cost Analysis: Apr 1996</p> <p>Cross Flow Requirements -- Interfaces: G0-81, Contingency Theater Automated Planning System (CTAPS), Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS), Satellite Communications (SATCOM), Global Decision Support System (GDSS), Global Air Transportation System (GATES), and Unit Level Planning and Scheduling (ULPS).</p> <p>Impact if Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability at wing and unit to efficiently manage airlift and aerial refueling resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- No real-time visibility of schedules, arrivals, departures, and summary level load information. -- Inability of wings and units to access dynamic communications networks that utilize DDN, AUTODIN, HF radio, UHF satellite, and wireline communications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --- Networks provide the critical communications connectivity needed during contingencies - C2IPS equipment is required to implement a "Worldwide air mobility command and control network" in support of AMC, ACC, USAFE, and PACAF. - Jeopardizes system conformance to Defense Information Infrastructure-Common Operating Environment (DII-COE) in FY01-03. - Failure to migrate to planned AF TBMCS and Air Mobility Command corporate C2 environments - Direct impact on Warfighters: Limited in-theater C2 interfaces with air mobility C2 information. - System inefficiencies if client/server architecture is not continually upgraded, including periodic scheduled hardware replacement. - AMC will not receive the full range of scheduling capabilities to optimize training and mission execution for aircrews, aircraft and airspace resources. - Cannot support CINTRANS objective to exploit emerging information technologies to meet USTRANSCOM in-transit visibility requirement. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)						A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB			
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002					C. Line No. & Item Description CAMPS		D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	1	\$356.0	\$356.0	1	\$217.0	\$217.0	1	\$221.0	\$221.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$356.0			\$217.0			\$221.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design	1	\$3,798.0	\$4,798.0	1	\$3,864.0	\$3,864.0	1	\$3,577.0	\$3,577.0
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$4,798.0			\$3,864.0			\$3,577.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,154.0			\$4,081.0			\$3,798.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Program Description: - AMCs primary C2 system for integrated planning, analysis, and scheduling of mobility assets in peacetime, crisis, contingency, and wartime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides AMCs planners and schedulers with the automated tools necessary to analyze plan and schedule these requirements. - Legacy systems (ADANS and CMARPS) run on a local area network (LAN) of SUN file servers and workstations in a client/server environment. - CAMPS migration system will run in a Windows NT client/server environment. Includes workstations and file servers operating on each of the separate command and control (C2) LANs at HQ AMC (Unclassified, SECRET, and Top Secret). - OSD-approved C2 migration system to replace two aging legacy C2 systems. Recommended by USTRANSCOMs Joint Transportation Corporate Information Management (CIM) Center (JTCC) for migration status. - Includes funding for software development/migration to a Defense Information Infrastructure-Common Operating Environment (DII-COE) compliant corporate environment, and for hardware procurement to improve technological efficiency and system performance. <p>IOC: Apr 1999 (CAMPS software and hardware) Migration Completion Date (MCD): 2001 (CAMPS software and hardware) Life-Cycle Cost of Software Development Efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAMPS: \$23,176,000 (total of FY98-07 capital investment costs) - AMC Deployment Analysis System (ADANS): \$41,689,000 (total of FY86-97 costs) (Note: ADANS is one of two legacy AMC C2 systems being migrated to CAMPS.) <p>Date of Cost Analysis: CAMPS FY98-07 Economic Analysis, Apr 97 Cross flow requirements -- Interfaces: Global Command and Control System (GCCS) for Time Phased Force Deployment Data (TPFDD) requirements and resulting mobility schedules. Global Transportation Network (GTN) for Special Assignment Airlift Mission (SAAM) requests and status. AMCs primary execution C2 system, the Global Decision Support System (GDSS), for airlift schedules, air refueling events and track information, airfield information, and mission delay information. AMCs Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES) for airlift channel requirements. Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS) for developing air refueling requirements.</p> <p>Impact If Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - USTRANSCOM and joint customers will lose visibility of airlift missions scheduled to meet joint requirements. - AMC unable to maintain and improve complex airlift planning to meet changing USTRANSCOM/AMC requirements. - Loss of capability to efficiently plan and schedule airlift missions to meet real-world requirements. Unable to integrate automated decision support tools into planning and scheduling process. - Unable to improve integration with and information flow to both joint and AMC C2 systems, increasing potential for loss of critical C2 data between systems. - Hardware maintenance costs will increase and efficiencies provided by new technologies will be lost due to continued use of outdated hardware platforms. Management and maintenance of two separate programs for airlift and mobility planning and scheduling resulting in increased operations and maintenance costs. Training requirements will increase (the current system is not user friendly) due to vulnerable reliance on operator/user experience. - Loss of benefits provided by new, migrated C2 planning/scheduling system include: increased efficiency in use of limited airlift assets, reduced flying of "empty" (e.g. pre-positioning/de-positioning legs) or low cargo weight missions, timely and accurate contingency support through more efficient planning tools, improved asset tracking, and improved response to supported CINCs requirements. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description CAMS			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	20	\$26.0	\$525.0	10	\$50.0	\$500.0	10	\$50.0	\$500.0
B(2) Computer Software	15	\$2.0	\$24.0	15	\$2.0	\$24.0	15	\$2.0	\$24.0
B(3) Telecommunications			\$550.0			\$1,103.0			\$1,090.0
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,099.0			\$1,627.0			\$1,614.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design	1	\$423.0	\$423.0	1	\$500.0	\$500.0	1	\$500.0	\$500.0
C(2) System Development	1	\$183.0							
C(3) Deployment			\$183.0			\$200.0			\$200.0
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$400.0			\$323.0			\$416.0
Subtotal			\$1,006.0			\$1,023.0			\$1,116.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,105.0			\$2,650.0			\$2,730.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintenance system responsible for tracking all maintenance actions scheduled, in-progress, and completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Connectivity to 36 major stateside AMC wings and 13 enroute locations -- Resides on a central database at Tinker AFB -- The Defense Megacenter-Oklahoma City provides mainframe computer support on a fee-for-service basis - Allows for faster and more accurate accomplishment of maintenance actions on the strategic airlift and tanker fleet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Increase in aircraft availability - per a 1989 study - an 8% increase for stateside alone - The G081 program, initiated under the Airlift Service Industrial Fund (ASIF), transferred to DBOF-T in FY89 - Capital investment funds are necessary to provide LG infrastructure (LAN), client/server capability, move to an open environment, support Broker. Continue enhancement of maintenance capabilities such as reducing the weight of airlift and tanker aircraft by providing digital capabilities vice technical manuals as well as purchase flightline/ISO wireless LAN/mobil terminals, remote access servers, bar-coding equipment, and graphical user interface software to enhance data entry into the system. <p>Hardware/Software IOC: FY1998/FOC: FY2004 Software Development Life-cycle Costs: \$10,331,900 Economic Analysis Approved/Signed: 11 Apr 96</p> <p>Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global Decision Support System (GDSS), Command and Control Information Processing System (C2IPS), Global Transportation Network (GTN), Standard Base Supply System (SBSS), Reliability and Maintainability Management Information System (REMIS), Comprehensive Engine Mgt System (CEMS), and Logistics Composite Module (LCOM) <p>Impact If Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capability to identify and allocate in-commission AMC aircraft by tapping one database will be lost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Aircraft availability increase (+8%) due to automated system use would be lost. -- USTRANSCOM, Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC), and mobility planners will not have central visibility of the status of AMCs worldwide fleet. - Aircraft maintenance systems will not be logistically supportable. - Will not be able to implement DoD directed joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistic Support (CALS) which would impede integration with deploying C2 systems. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description COINS			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development				2	\$493.0	\$985.0	2	\$143.0	\$285.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$985.0			\$285.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$985.0			\$285.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commercial Operations Integrated System (COINS). - Air Mobility Command (AMC) unique, multi-user, online information system supporting contracting commercial airlift to augment AMCs airlift <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Primary activities include: requirements entry, contractual document generation, payment accounting, and report generation -- Contractual documents include contracts, purchase orders, delivery orders, modifications, and contract line items -- Payments executed and tracked against invoices from contractors -- Provides capability to examine history of all contract actions and produce statistical data - Initial/Final Operating Capability (IOC/FOC): - Software - June 1995/2000, Hardware - June 1995/1999 <p>Life Cycle Cost:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total Development Life-cycle Costs: \$1,369,500. -- Software development costs included in Fiscal Year Defense Plan (FYDP) due to reengineering efforts. Funding is increased in FY2000 to start software modifications necessary to run on upgraded equipment planned in FY2000. - Economic Cost Analysis completed in 1996. <p>Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides a batch transmission interface with the Procurement Management Reporting System (PMRS) at Wright-Patterson AFB. <p>Impact If Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Serious system degradation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Loss of contractor support would cripple efforts to implement mandated changes. -- Inability to implement constantly changing Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) would have major implications. -- Inability to implement substantial new requirements will render the system ineffective. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description Electronic Records			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									\$100.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$100.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$100.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides a standardized DoD directed unclassified Electronic Records Management System for Air Mobility Command (AMC) enroute support units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Defense Information System Agency (DISA) certified commercial off-the-shelf software meeting standards in accordance with DoD 5015.2-STD. -- Install hardware and software. -- Store active records on base at the Air Force Network Control Center and inactive records at a Defense MegaCenter. - Provides critical management of records in the electronic environment in support of the Paperwork Reduction Act. - Provides information world-wide to support AMC war fighting capability. - Complies with DoD requirements to implement an Electronic Records Management System by YR 2003. <p>Initial Operating Capability: FY 03/1 Full Operation Capability: FY 03/4</p> <p>Supports AF Mission Need Statement USAF 005-97, 14 Oct 98; HQ AFCA Operational Requirements Document, 10 May 99; Baseline Requirements Analysis, April 97; Economical Analysis, April 98 and Implementation Plan, 6 Jul 99; DoD Strategic Plan 2003, 28 Jul 95; Joint Vision 2010, Information Superiority (page 18); USAF Comm & Infor Straegic Plan Task 5, Manage Information (Vol II, Page 48, AMC Strategic Plan 2000, 2k, Deficiency 98I34 and USTC Strategic Plan Goals & Objectives 4.2 and 4.5.</p> <p>Interfaces: Defense Message System Workflow (Electronic Coordination) Records Information Management Systems All C4S and C4ISR systems that create official government records</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT FUNDED: ERMS is needed because continuing loss of administrative manpower threatens AMCs ability to safeguard and retrieve records IAW the Paperwork Reduction Act. Without ERMS there will be no automated method for record retrieval, and operational decisions will be made without rapid access to relevant records. Electronic records, especially e-mail, are frequently not treated as records; thus, records of operational decisions are lost and accountability is weakened. AMC currently spends over \$8.5M per year buying paper, printing documents, and storing the resulting records in office space or dedicated staging areas. Failure to implement ERMS at enroute locations will result in \$1M additional expense over ten years.</p>									

GATES (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description Gates			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$2,241.0			\$1,790.0			\$2,570.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$2,241.0			\$1,790.0			\$2,570.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design			\$5,395.0			\$5,310.0			\$5,310.0
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$125.0			\$125.0			\$125.0
Subtotal			\$5,520.0			\$5,435.0			\$5,435.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$7,761.0			\$7,225.0			\$8,005.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES) directly supports AMCs mobility operations worldwide. AMC, as the DoD single manager for airlift, requires timely and accurate information gathered from worldwide locations to plan, execute and monitor multi-theater airlift. GATES will provide the Tanker Airlift Control Center, HQ AMC, and USTRANSCOM with integrated functionality to deploy and sustain forces globally. Migration to an open environment is a critical step in achieving portability, reusability, and cost reductions for communications and computer systems.</p> <p>Project Description: GATES is the AMC program to develop an integrated, open, transportation system providing visibility of cargo and passenger assets moved by AMC. It will migrate and modernize HQ AMC transportation systems from the proprietary Honeywell/Wang DPS 90 mainframes to an open system platform/environment. Applications software will be developed based on capturing AMCs transportation business processes and integrate complete systems requirements. GATES is in concert with AMC C4 Systems Master Plan to achieve an open systems, integrated command architecture by adopting standard protocols, software development standards, interfaces, Commercial Off-the-Shelf Software (COTS), and Government Off-the-Shelf Software (GOTS) in a cost effective manner.</p> <p>Software Initial Operating Capability (IOC): Nov 97 Software Full Operating Capability (FOC): Jun 99 Hardware Initial Operating Capability (IOC): Nov 97 Hardware Full Operating Capability (FOC): Jun 99 Software Development Life-cycle Costs: \$56,052,260 Economic Analysis Completed: 22 Mar 96</p> <p>Interfaces: Conus Freight Management (CFM), Defense Finance and Accounting System (DFAS), Airlift Service Industrial Fund Integrated Computer System (ASIFICS), Command and Control Information Processing System (C2IPS), Global Transportation Network (GTN), Transportation Coordinated-Automated Information Management System (TC-AIMS II), Cargo Movement Operations System (CMOS), Global Decision Support System (GDSS), Commercial Reservation System (CRS), Worldwide Port System (WPS), Transportation Operational Personal Property Standard System (TOPS), etc.</p> <p>Impact If Not Funded: Insufficient funding for this program will force HQ AMC to continue to depend on the current closed, expensive, proprietary transportation systems environment. AMC and JTCC customers will continue to be denied the improved data quality, data standardization, and intransit visibility essential for C2 efficiency and decision making. Lack of funding will prevent AMC compliance with DoD 3 year migration mandate and delay AMCs transportation systems from properly implementing applications that support the Common Operating Environment (COE). An increase in long term maintenance costs by delaying implementation of an integrated architecture with supporting increased functionality will occur.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description GDSS			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,110.0			\$7,195.0			\$5,900.0
B(2) Computer Software			\$294.0						
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,404.0			\$7,195.0			\$5,900.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design			\$2,926.0			\$11,800.0			\$11,105.0
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$810.0			\$855.0			\$855.0
Subtotal			\$3,736.0			\$12,655.0			\$11,960.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,140.0			\$19,850.0			\$17,860.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Program Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HQ AMCs primary, force-level Command and Control (C2) system with 20 developmental, test, and operational GDSS host computers fielded providing C2 information to lower echelons via interface with the AMC C2 Information Processing System (C2IPS). C2IPS migrates into GDSS in FY03. - Disseminates aircraft schedules, tracks aircraft departures and arrivals, provides flight following functions, and provides automated tools to aid decision making process - Customers include the AMC Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC), Alternate TACC (ATACC), Air National Guard Readiness Center (ANGRC), Air Force Reserve (AFRES) Headquarters, Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC), Air Combat Command (ACC), Pacific Air Force (PACAF), United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE), and three thousand mobility customers at over 60 worldwide locations - Provides automated interface tying critical intransit visibility, time phased force deployment requirements, planning, scheduling, mission planning, mission execution, and joint systems into a cohesive C2 system. <p>IOC: FY89 (hardware and software) SOR: 4th Qtr FY04 (hardware and software) Life-cycle Cost: (FY97-FY06) is \$124,198,000 - Total Development Life-cycle costs is \$51,838,000</p> <p>Software development costs included in FYDP due to increasing requests for external interfaces requiring development efforts. Funding increase in FY99 starts software modifications necessary to run upgraded equipment planned in FY00.</p> <p>Date of Cost Analysis: Oct 95 (FY96 Economic Analysts)</p> <p>Cross Flow Requirements - Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AMC system interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C2IPS, AMC Deployment Analysis System (ADANS), Combine Mating and Ranging Planning System (CMARPS), Broker, Aerial Port Automated C2 System (APACCS), Global Aerial Transportation Execution System (GATES), Automated Computer Flight Planning (ACFP), Airfield Suitability Visual Display System (ASVDS), LBAND Satellite Communication (LBAND). Provides data interface enabling intransit cargo visibility. Other system interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air National Guard Management Utility (ANGMU), Air Weather Network, ARINC Data Network Service (ADNS), Air Terminal C2 System (ATCCS), Defense Data Network (DDN), Global Transportation Network (GTN), Global Command and Control System (GCCS), Contingency Operations Mobility Planning System (COMPES), Forward Supply System (FSS), Table Management Distribution System (TMDS), and the TRANSCOM LOGBOOK. Projected system interfaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AMC Corporate Database (ACDB), Secret GTN, TRANSCOM Regulating and C2 Evacuation System (TRAC2ES), TRANSCOM single mobility system, and the Theater Battle Management Core System (TBMCS). <p>Impact if not funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant reduction in AMC TACC and other customers listed above; capability to perform basic flight scheduling, decision making and flight following. Loss of required cargo, intransit visibility interface. - All other sites supported by GDSS will experience reduced capability to perform C2 of AMC resources or access data. - Ability to identify and allocate AMCs valuable resources will be significantly reduced. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description L-BAND SATCOM			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	1	\$663.2	\$663.0	1	\$700.0	\$700.0	1	\$700.0	\$700.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$663.0			\$700.0			\$700.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design	1	\$980.4	\$980.0	1	\$563.0	\$563.0	1	\$580.0	\$580.0
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$980.0			\$563.0			\$580.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$1,643.0			\$1,263.0			\$1,280.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SATCOM (Inmarsat Aero-C) interface between airborne aircraft and the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC), also extends to the Tanker Air Lift Control Element (TALCE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Laptop computer used to send and receive email-like messages in the aircraft, including passenger and cargo manifest information -- Automatic position reporting updates to Global Decision Support System (GDSS) for airlift C2 information -- Satisfies Air Mobility Master Plan deficiencies for airborne C2 and communications connectivity -- IOC Feb 97, FOC 3Qtr/FY98 - Ground-based SATCOM (Inmarsat M-Phone) interface between "non L-Band equipped" aircraft and the TACC, also extends to the TALCEs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- SATCOM phone and laptop computer used to send and receive email-like messages prior to departure and/or after arrival including passenger and cargo manifest information -- Partially satisfies remote In-Transit Visibility (RITV) deficiency connectivity -- IOC 2Qtr/FY00, FOC 2Qtr/FY01 <p>Economic Analysis: FQ3/97</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future connectivity to wings and command posts for airlift C2 information - FY01+ funds are for transition to the Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) architecture and incorporate HF datalink capabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- GATM provides the connectivity and aircraft upgrades to allow AMC aircraft to fly in the commercial oceanic tracks. Any excess GATM capability will be used for C2. The current system design allows switching to the new system. The fundline allows AMC to make use of the extra aircraft status information available through GATM and to make use of the HF datalink capability. <p>Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TACC Operations Cells (via Email) and Global Decision Support System (GDSS), to update Global Transportation Network (GTN) - Provides aircraft position reports for passenger and cargo manifest reports per USTRANSCOM direction. <p>Impact If Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Program already minimally funded. Any reduction in funding will seriously degrade the entire system by limiting hardware purchases, software upgrades/corrections, and system support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- The result would be excessive system degradation and down time which would eliminate the systems reliability from both TACC and aircrew perspectives. - C2 connectivity will not move to the follow-on commercial SATCOM system projected for installation under the GATM program. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)						A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB			
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002			C. Line No. & Item Description OWCP			D. Activity Identification			
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications	2	\$745.0	\$1,490.0	1	\$2,500.0	\$2,500.0	1	\$1,779.0	\$1,779.0
B(3) Other Computer	1	\$117.0	\$117.0	1	\$117.0	\$117.0	1	\$117.0	\$117.0
Subtotal			\$1,607.0			\$2,617.0			\$1,896.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$1,607.0			\$2,617.0			\$1,896.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description: The Objective Wing Command Post (OWCP) provides modernization and standardization of Command, Control, Communications and Computer (C4) systems in all AMC command posts (CP) and en route Air Mobility Control Centers (AMCC). These Command and Control (C2) agencies are functionally responsible for emergency actions, mission management/mission monitoring, maintenance coordination, and operational reporting in support of the AMC Global Reach Mission. The units they support are responsible for airlift of troops, cargo, and passengers (including the President and members of the Cabinet), as well as aerial refueling and aeromedical evacuation. The CP/AMCC serves as the focal point for coordinating and controlling all actions required to prepare an AMC mission aircraft for departure, as well as providing coordination of maintenance, aerial port, and operational services for all transient aircraft.</p> <p>FY98 funds provide console and Digital Recorder upgrades at Ramstein FY98 funds also provide FLV upgrades at Elmendorf, Aviano, and Andersen; also GTE Engineering support FY99 funds provide Console and Digital Recorder upgrades at Yokota and McGuire FY00 funds provide FLV at Travis FY00 funds also provide Console and Digital Recorder upgrades for Charleston, Kadena, and Dover FY01 funds provide Console and Digital Recorder upgrades at Andersen and Rhein Main FY02 funds provide Console and Digital Recorder upgrades at Osan, Aviano, and Incirlik FY03 funds provide FLV at Incirlik, Lajes, and Rota FY04 funds provide for System Equipment refresh FY05 funds provide for System Equipment refresh</p> <p>OWCP C4 Initiatives IOC: FY95 FOC: FY05; however, due to Air Staff directed realignments, added sites may require C4 system upgrades Cost Analysis: Completed September 1997</p> <p>Interfaces: Standard interfaces to telephone consoles include High Frequency (HF), Very High Frequency (VHF), Ultra High Frequency (UHF), UHF Satellite Communications (SATCOM), and Land Mobile Radios (LMRs), as well as pagers and voice recorders</p> <p>Impact If Not Funded: Failure to fully fund this program will result in continue stovepiping of C4 systems at each CP/AMCC. C4 system upgrades based upon individual "fixes" will greatly impair full implementation of AMC standards developed from the CP Template produced by AFC4A. The nonstandard systems developed would negatively impact CP/AMCC controller training at a critical time, during the transition from officer to enlisted senior controllers. Taken together, substandard and nonstandard C2 systems will greatly degrade the CP/AMCC ability to support USTRANSCOM intransit visibility requirements and, therefore, AMCs Global Reach objectives.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)						A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description System Intergration		D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03	
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
A. Equipment								
A(1) Replacement								
A(2) Productivity								
A(3) New Mission								
A(4) Environmental Compliance								
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0		\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm								
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$3,712.0			\$1,744.0		\$2,283.0
B(2) Computer Software	13	\$1.0	\$16.0					
B(3) Telecommunications	1	\$2.0	\$2.0					
B(3) Other Computer								
Subtotal			\$3,730.0			\$1,744.0		\$2,283.0
C. Software Development								
C(1) Planning/Design			\$1,277.0			\$5,000.0		\$4,850.0
C(2) System Development	5	\$191.0	\$2,545.0			\$7,184.0		\$5,875.0
C(3) Deployment								
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$5,227.0			\$250.0		\$250.0
Subtotal			\$9,049.0			\$12,434.0		\$10,975.0
D. Minor Construction								
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0		\$0.0
TOTAL			\$12,779.0			\$14,178.0		\$13,258.0
Narrative Justification:								
<p>AMCs Global Reach mission requires the transportation of cargo, passengers, and fuel anywhere in the world at any time. Thus, the demands for information sharing on a global scale are increasing; information must be shared across functions, locations, and organizations. In contrast, AMCs current systems operate with independent command and control systems developed for specific functional areas. These systems were built using incompatible design specifications. Thus, information sharing between systems is only possible through costly interfaces between systems, which often render the information passed between systems unreliable due to timing and translation errors. Further, inconsistencies in systems documentation makes managing the impact of change difficult if not impossible.</p> <p>Project Description:</p> <p>AMCs C4 Systems Master Plan (C4SMP) spells out AMCs long range goal of fielding a seamless, integrated, global Air Mobility C4 System. This project examines AMCs missions to identify an integrated set of requirements for Air Mobility command and control (C2) for the future. These requirements lead to systems architectures/designs and plans that guide future systems development and feed into DoD wide initiatives. There are seven specific tasks. Funding increases from previous input are due to addition of Task 7:</p> <p>Task 1 - Build an enterprise wide architecture of all functions associated with Air Mobility, wide in scope, limited in detail. The primary purpose of these models is to provide long term planning of information systems development.</p> <p>Task 2 - Build functional area models limited in scope to a specific function or set of functions. These models will provide greater detail on the specific requirements for a functional area, and will facilitate the transition from architecture to design.</p> <p>Task 3 - Define and manage the interfaces between the commands current information systems. Includes interoperability testing of new functional software releases.</p> <p>Task 4 - Design and development of the corporate information environment. Includes detailed base-lining of current systems and reengineering or redeveloping them to include AMC architectures and standards.</p> <p>Task 5 - Develop an integrated tool set for systems analysis, design, development, and maintenance.</p> <p>Task 6 - Comply with the Information Technology Reform Act (ITMRA).</p> <p>Task 7 - Modernize AMC C2 enterprise architecture under the Initiative Mobility 2000 (M2K). M2K will revolutionize the commands C2 data flow connectivity, data processing, data base management and information display capabilities to position the command for more efficient and responsive air mobility operations in the 21st century. By leveraging Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) equipment installation and digital data link technologies for the first time ever, AMC will realize near-real-time, global, end-to-end data connectivity between the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC) and all mobility aircraft, and between TACC and Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) aircraft and CRAF carrier Operations Control Centers for rapid mission information sharing and coordination. This initiative consists of three critical subcategories: Aircraft Enabling Technology, Communication Pipeline and Integrated Flight Management (IFM) with Collaborative Decision Making (CDM). Requirement is in the USTRANSCOM CINCS IPL. Approved M2K Economic Analysis 2 Apr 99.</p> <p>Systems Integration Software Development Life-cycle Costs: \$119,745.5K in the FYDP (FY02-07) Systems Integration Economic Analysis Completed: 6 Oct 95 Interfaces: HQ AMC Standardization interfaces with all DoD data standardization. Directly, our standardization effort interfaces with HQ AMC, Air Force, TRANSCOM, Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) and Defense Information System Agency (DISA). To data/process modeling tools (DEF0 and IDEF1X), HQ AMC data standardization tool (AFIRDS) and Air Force and DoD level Repositories, to transportation and DoD C2 systems. M2K Interfaces: Advanced Computer Flight Plan, Consolidated Air Mobility Planning System, LG Broker, Global Air Transportation Execution System, Global Decision Support System, Global Air Traffic Management System</p> <p>A FOC date of FY05 was determined by using the proposed candidate application schedule, which is under revision. To provide a single IOC date is not feasible because System Integration is an integrated project, not a single system. As each system functionality is integrated into AMCs corporate information environment, there will be a cost savings.</p> <p>Impact If Not Funded: Our current stovepipe systems will continue to deliver inaccurate and untimely information to the people performing and served by, the airlift and air refueling missions. AMC risks being inoperable with other MAJCOM elements and in noncompliance with both the Air Force and DoD standardization and migration programs. M2K: Limited connectivity will result in the inability to effectively command and control (C2) mobility forces during normal, contingency, and wartime scenarios. In contingencies and wartime, this will result in slower delivery of resources to the theater CINC and reduced ability to meet Latest Arrival Date (LAD) at the port of debarkation.</p> <p>- Lack of this connectivity will affect worldwide force deployment and commander situational awareness.</p>								

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description TDC			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	2	\$220.0	\$5,199.0	1	\$2,200.0	\$2,200.0	2	\$2,200.0	\$4,400.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications	1	\$1,000.0	\$610.0	2	\$720.0	\$1,440.0	2	\$1,000.0	\$2,000.0
B(3) Other Computer			\$190.0			\$1,560.0			\$1,720.0
Subtotal			\$5,999.0			\$5,200.0			\$8,120.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,999.0			\$5,200.0			\$8,120.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Project Description: Theater Deployable Communications (TDC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System composed of a high capacity tri-band SATCOM terminal (Lightweight Multiband Satellite Terminal) and a communications computer infrastructure package (integrated Communications Access Package) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Joint, interoperable, lightweight, modular, high capacity, and deployable -- Consists of data, voice, and message communications capability - Reduces size, and reliance on shortfall sustainment communications capability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Reduces demand on airlift for initial communications by two-thirds -- Provides more efficient scalable initial capability - Provides connectivity back to the Tanker Airlift Control Center (TACC) and USTRANSCOM - Supports Global Reach Laydown initiative and USTRANSCOM Strategic Plan FY1998-FY2017 - Integrated Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Technology - Initial Operating Capability (IOC)-FY98, Full Operational Capability (FOC)-FY05 - Cost Analysis completed Dec 99 <p>Interfaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All DOD systems adhering to commercial networking standards (ISDN, Ethernet, serial) - Supports Global Transportation Network (GTN), Global Command and Control System (GCCS), Command and Control Information Processing System (C2IPS), Global Decision Support System (GDSS), Core Automated Maintenance System (CAMS), Joint Deployable Intel Support System (JDISS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Connectivity provided to Defense Information Systems Network (DISN), Defense Data Network (DDN), AUTODIN, MILNET, DISNET1 - Provides communications with ACC and any co-located Army or Navy units (TDC is the AF deployed network and communications infrastructure) <p>Impact if Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TDC responds to DOD Defense Planning Guidance FY94-99 which calls for "improved integration of national, theater and tactical intelligence and C3 systems, and theater and tactical communication systems." - Contingency communications elements will not be able to provide initial bare-base deployable communications (TDC-new capability) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- No base level communication support and very limited C2 communication support available to AMC deployed forces at bare base or austere stage, enroute, or off-load locations within the first 30 days of a deployment - Sustaining communication equipment shortfall will continue to tax limited airlift capabilities; tactical communications equipment will continue to experience problems with limited military satellite availability - Functional users will acquire stove-piped transmission capabilities reducing interoperability and increasing competition for limited SATCOM assets - Will not meet strategic goals for the Defense Transportation System (DTS) with approved timeframe 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description Wing LAN			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware	24	\$56.0	\$1,318.0	48	\$62.0	\$2,980.0	79	\$60.0	\$4,770.0
B(2) Computer Software	24	\$53.0	\$1,281.0						
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									\$26.0
Subtotal			\$2,599.0			\$2,980.0			\$4,796.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,599.0			\$2,980.0			\$4,796.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Program Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides programmed resources to give bases standardized capabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Provides greater interoperability within the command and units - Provides all AMC users the ability to collect, retrieve, create, store, share, and present information electronically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Improve personnel effectiveness and efficiency. - Command-wide desktop computer based electronic network designed to access both command and control C2 information and office automation functions from one computer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Implements departmental (intra-building) LANs and office information system capabilities -- Provides centralized management of software resources -- Real-time information transfer/sharing capability - Provides computer hardware (servers, and network interface hub equipment), and network operating system (NOS) - Provides intra-building infrastructure, cabling, connectors, and ancillary equipment to complete network <p>Initial Operating Capability (IOC) and Full Operating Capability (FOC) dates are not applicable to this program that provides equipment for the intra-building infrastructure at every AMC base and e route locations only.</p> <p>Cost analysis: Completed August 1996</p> <p>Cross Flow Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All systems and all commands/services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Downward directed systems such as CITS, DMS, GCCS, GCSS, GDSS, C2IPS etc. -- Supports the electronic mail system for information flow within and outside the command. <p>Impact If Not Funded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wing LAN provides access to many vital information systems and services. Without it, users cant access electronic mail, world wide web file sharing, Command and Control Information processir systems , Global Combat Support Systems, Defense Messaging System, and base level data processing applications. 									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Sealift Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description IC3			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$2,497.0			\$2,031.0			\$253.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$2,497.0			\$2,031.0			\$253.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,337.0			\$2,050.0			\$1,665.0
C(3) Deployment			\$733.0						
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$2,070.0			\$2,050.0			\$1,665.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$4,567.0			\$4,081.0			\$1,918.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>IC3: Integrated Command, Control, and Communication Project (IC3) is MSCs migration program to integrate systems and business process from deliberate planning through execution in a common operating environment. IC3 will become an extension of the GCCS infrastructure allowing MSC to reduce redundancy in hardware, software and communications while maintaining compatibility with DOD, DON, and Transportation migration initiatives. IC3 systems will interface with Transcoms GTN to provide ship schedules. JMCG (Joint Mobility Command Group) to provide information for decision making and JFAST execution and deliberate planning. IC3 also will interface with joint systems such as JOPES operating in GCCS for operations/exercise/contingency requirements and MTMCs WPS or ITV data. Hardware: FY 01 \$524K; FY 02 \$439K Software: FY 01 \$1,570K; FY 02 \$1,420K; FY 03 \$1,200K</p> <p>Mobile Communications: Provide support for mobile command and control for standardized communication. Hardware: FY 01 \$1,808K; FY 02 \$1,342K; FY 03 \$253K. Software: FY 01 \$300K; FY 02 \$300K; FY 03 \$465K</p> <p>VTC: Provides enhancement/replacement of Video Teleconference capabilities and support of virtual command center (support JMCG.) Hardware: FY 01 \$165K Software: FY 01 \$200K</p> <p>EC/EDI: Electronic Commerce/Electronic Data Interchange provides a client server infrastructure that support data repositories and data warehouse requirements, standardization, and readiness. Hardware: FY 01 \$250K Software: FY 02 \$330K</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Sealift Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description ICE			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$678.0			\$1,192.0			\$206.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$678.0			\$1,192.0			\$206.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$2,708.0			\$2,745.0			\$2,701.0
C(3) Deployment			\$1,108.0			\$1,385.0			\$1,542.0
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$3,816.0			\$4,130.0			\$4,243.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$4,494.0			\$5,322.0			\$4,449.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Systems Development: Includes support for systems integration, test, implementation, documentation, and training. Some of the systems involved include: FMS (Financial Management System), TFMS (Transportation Financial Management Systems) the new Transcom financial management information system, and IAMS (Intergrated Acquisition Management System) MSCs implementation of DODs Standard Procurement System (SPS). New initiatives and requirements include support of ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) and DTS (Defense Travel System) solutions. Software: FY 01 \$808K; FY 02 \$1,245K; FY 03 \$1,201K</p> <p>LAN: Provides equipment and software to implement LANs at all offices, area commands, and headquarters. Software includes such items as Windows (Latest Versions), Oracle, Logbook, and Global Transportation Network (GTN.) Equipment includes servers, routers, micros, Asynchronous Transfer Module (ATM) switches, printers, etc. Software Deployment increase is attributed to recurring software licensing and implementation of innovative/upgrades of commercial off-the-shelf software. Hardware: FY 01 \$678K; FY 02 \$1,192K; FY 03 \$206K Software: FY 01 \$508K; FY 03 \$42K</p> <p>Data Warehouse: Provides support for implementation of the Defense Transportation System (DTS.) This technology will apply online analysis software (CLAP) to the data supporting DTS. Involve the use of drill down graphic display techniques to data structure for direct fast retrieval and data mining by users, managers, and staff. Software: FY 01 \$2,500K; FY 02 \$2,885; FY 03 \$3,000K</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-AUTOSTRAD 2000 (A-2000)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$3,900.0			\$2,800.0			\$4,400.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$3,900.0			\$2,800.0			\$4,400.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,731.0			\$1,800.0			\$1,500.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,731.0			\$1,800.0			\$1,500.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,631.0			\$4,600.0			\$5,900.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Transportation Data (Autostrad) 2000 initiative maintains MTMCs automation architecture in an Open Systems Environment (OSE) infrastructure. While major automated information systems at MTMC are developed by project managers under full DoD life cycle/ MAISRC procedures, the A2000 program provides the Information Mission Area (IMA) common-user utilities to support the MTMC population at large. The program supports approximately 2100 individuals at 52 locations worldwide--headquarters, 4 major subordinate commands and ports. It provides on-going modernization of the underlying core of common-user utility functions such as: a common user open access data, mission systems; data access tools to allow the analytical staff access to all MTMC data and manipulate it as needed; optical storage COTS ADP and offering numerous retrieval advantages; CD ROMS to replace hard copy library stacks with electronic library services; CD ROM based electronic preparation and printing of forms; video teleconferencing and low cost VI COTS. Among other, A2000 provides Local Area Networks (LAN), communications backbone, communications infrastructure upgraded at ports and piers, radio replacements, Web application to provide a common user interface to MTMCs broad customer based and contract support for unique requirements.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-AUTOMATIC ID TECHNOLOGY(AIT)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0			\$1,000.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,000.0			\$2,000.0			\$2,000.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Automatic Identification Technology (AIT) is a suite of technologies that enables the automatic capture of source data rapidly and accurately and transfer the data to AISs with little or no human intervention, thereby enhancing the ability to identify, track document, redirect, and control deploying and redeploying forces, equipment, personnel and sustainment ammunition. AIT will streamline the logistics process and enhance the CINCs warfighting capability by providing ITV of critical assets and personnel in the transportation pipeline. MTMC will maximize augmentation kits worldwide and only implement fixed AIT solutions at selected sites. AIT capability will be provided at CONUS ports supporting use of mobile AIT force projection platforms as well as OCONUS permanent or contingency ports used for reception of forces during contingencies. AIT procured, configured, and installed will be integrated with other components of the DOD infrastructure and interface with automated information systems.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-CONUS FRT MGMT SYSTEM (CFM)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,000.0			\$800.0			\$1,500.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,000.0			\$800.0			\$1,500.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$8,800.0			\$6,650.0			\$7,650.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$8,800.0			\$6,650.0			\$7,650.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$9,800.0			\$7,450.0			\$9,150.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>CONUS Freight Management (CFM) CFM is a comprehensive freight management information system developed and managed by the Military Traffic Management Command. It supports the MTMC mission by providing the traffic management system for DOD commercial freight transportation services. This complex mission involves over 800 shippers, 19000 carrier tenders of service, and 2.3 million freight shipments annually. The principle purposes of the CFM are to: provide prepayment audit support of carrier freight bills submitted to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service for payment; interface capabilities for 17 standard DOD information systems for Bills of Lading and Transportation Discrepancy Reporting via Electronic Data Interchange; provide shipment information on Defense assets to include intransit visibility date between origin and destination in support of readiness; and provide an up to date centralized database of commercial carrier tenders of service accessible to all DOD users. The System is embarking on a revised operating concept that will significantly improve CFMs ability to meet its users technology enhancements. ETA provides DOD transportation officials a one touch resource for acquiring, tracking, receiving, purchasing, and reconciling all transportation services. The system will provide high level data quality edits with instantaneous in the clear error messages and the ability to determine total costs of shipment prior to shipment pickup by the carrier. It will utilize Electronic Commerce (EC) and Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) standards.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-COMMON OP ENVIRONMENT(COE)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$905.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$905.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$905.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Common Operating Environment (COE) and Data Standards Military operations have required the ability to respond to crisis situations anywhere in the world, on a moments notice. Information must flow seamlessly and quickly among DoD organizations, CINCs, and command centers to the warfighter to assess operations and quickly develop new tactical strategies to deal with changes in the battlefield environment. Interoperability is essential in such a wartime scenario. The DoD Joint Technical Architecture (JTA) is a key element in DoDs overall strategy to achieve this capability. The JTA is the result of collaboration among the Services, Joint Staff, USD (AT&T), ASD (CDI), DISA, DIA and other elements of the Intelligence Community. Its open standards, based approach, offers significant opportunities for reducing costs cutting development and fielding time through enhanced software portability, use of COTS, ease of systems upgrades and hardware independence. The JTA standards specify the logical interfaces in command, control and intelgency systems, and the communications and computers that directly support the warfighter. OSD memorandum 22 Aug 96, mandates that all emerging systems and systems upgrades comply with the JTA guidelines. Funds are needed to meet JTA guidance, bringing us into the Defense Information Infrastructure Common Operating Environment (DII COE), and the Common Data Environment (CDE).</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-CARGO AND BILLING SYS (CAB)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$2,500.0			\$1,200.0			\$500.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$2,500.0			\$1,200.0			\$500.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,500.0			\$1,200.0			\$500.0
Narrative Justification:									
Cargo and Billing System (CAB) - formerly Defense Joint Accounting System (DJAS) Provides support for MTMCs non-core financial business functions. Provides functionality that will enable editing of incoming transportation operational data, associate contract, and DTS rates to produce cost and sales files, fulfill inquiry and reporting requirements as it pertains to all DTS ocean cargo movement and handling. Supports DJAS and TFMS requirements.									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-INTRANSIT VISIBILITY PRGM (ITV)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$3,327.0			\$1,993.0			\$3,600.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$3,327.0			\$1,993.0			\$3,600.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$8,954.0			\$8,967.0			\$9,156.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$8,954.0			\$8,967.0			\$9,156.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$12,281.0			\$10,960.0			\$12,756.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Intransit Visibility (ITV) Program funds a number of initiatives such as development of new automated capabilities designed to support ITV, establishment of interfaces between MTMC and a variety of DoD, Service, USTRANSCOM and its components, and commercial carrier industry systems, transitioning legacy systems to standard integrated migration systems; development of enhancements to satisfy new requirements; insertion of technology such as Automated Information Technology (AIT) and Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) to improve and expand on transit visibility reporting; supporting USTRANSCOM, DoD, and DA data standardization and functional business process improvement objectives; and systems integration activities at various operating echelons. Specific initiatives are: 1) the Intergrated Booking System (IBS), which replaces four inefficient obsolete systems. IBS will provide a standard traffic management baseline to support booking operations worldwide; 2) the Intergrated Computerized Deployment System (ICODES) ship stow planning capability and intergration to WPS; 3) the Assesst Mangement System (AMS) for the management of DoD and leased container and rail assets; 4) intergration of AIT which enables automatic capture of source data rapidly and accurately and transfer to AISs; 5) the Deployable Port Operations (DPOC)/ Mobile Port Operation Center (MPOC) which is a highly mobile deployable, self-sustaining and flexible configuration that provides the capability to respond quickly to a variety of tactical scenarios during contingencies anywhere in the world. NOTE: This chart includes costs of the following subsystems: Asset Management System (AMS), Integrated Computerized Deployment System (ICODES), Integrated Booking System (IBS), and Intransity Visibility (ITV).</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-TRANSPORTN FIN MGT SYS(TFMS)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$5,333.0			\$4,000.0			\$0.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$5,333.0			\$4,000.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,333.0			\$4,000.0			\$0.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Transportation Financial Management System (TFMS)</p> <p>The USTRANSCOM and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) have conducted a comprehensive review of financial management and accounting procedures and systems at all of the Transportation Command Components including MTMC. As a result of this review, the MTMC Financial Management System (FMS) was identified as not in compliance with the Guide to Federal Requirements for Financial Management Systems and CFO Act of 1990 as amended by the Government Management Reform Act of 1994. The current MTMC system was designed 25 years ago and is no longer capable of meeting minimal operational needs. It has not been upgraded to keep pace with either technology or functional requirements.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-TRANS OP PERS PROP SYS(TOPPS)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$2,790.0			\$1,040.0			\$1,000.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$2,790.0			\$1,040.0			\$1,000.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$2,564.0			\$2,828.0			\$2,529.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$2,564.0			\$2,828.0			\$2,529.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,354.0			\$3,868.0			\$3,529.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Transportation Operational Personal Property Standard System (TOPPS) is a multi-service system chartered by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). TOPPS will automate and standardize personal property shipment and storage functions at both CONUS and OCONUS intallation level. Development of this DoD directed joint program is required to provide necessary automated implementation of the Personal Property Movement and Storage Program worldwide. The TOPPS system is being developed in a modular phased approach and is fielded in the same manner. Proof of concept was successfully demonstrated and Initial Operational Capability (IOC) and achieve in February 1989. Currently, development of required baseline functional capabilities is 89% complete. Phase I Phase II deployment to DoD and Coast Guard CONUS and OCONUS have been completed. TOPPS hardware modernization upgrade is planned for August FY00 with completion and fielding by FY01. Additional development in the out years will be required to support new business process re-engineering iniatives, changes in policies, and procedures of the DoD Personal Property Movement and Storage Program as defined by regulation guidance, the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), system interfaces meeting Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) requirements and future responds to Engineering Change Proposal Software (ECP-S) that support the system need to the user community. Electronic Data Interchange (EDI). TOPPS complies with requirements of DoDs Technical Architecture for Information Systems (TAFIM). Complete Full Operational Capability (FOC), worldwide of the TOPPS approved baseline is projected for completion FY01 and was approved by the General Steering Committee (GOSC) in January 2000. TOPPS is approved CIM migration system.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-WORLDWIDE PORT SYS (WPS)			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$400.0			\$500.0			\$2,000.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$400.0			\$500.0			\$2,000.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$3,855.0			\$6,705.0			\$5,505.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$3,855.0			\$6,705.0			\$5,505.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$4,255.0			\$7,205.0			\$7,505.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Worldwide Port System (WPS) provides movement control support, and facilitates force development. WPS is an automated information system (AIS) initiative that meets DoD goals and requirements for water port management of common user cargo moving in the Defense Transportation System (DTS). WPS will replace four aging AIS that support ocean terminal management and cargo documentation missions. WPS is essential to rapid force projection and effective intransit visibility of unit and sustainment cargo. This program provides movement control in support of the Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP), initiated as the result of lessons learned from Desert Shield/Storm and Congressionally mandated Mobility Requirements Study (MRS). When fully fielded, WPS will support MTMC ocean terminals, US Navy port activities and US Army Forces Command (USAR Transportation Terminal Units and active component Automated Cargo Documentation Detachments) with worldwide war fighting support missions. Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) applications and AIT device will be intergrated into WPS and will facilitate the cargo documentation process as the port.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1), C(2) ASN			D. Activity Identification TCJ4-LTS		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$135.0			\$0.0			\$12.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$135.0			\$0.0			\$12.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$2,822.0			\$2,599.0			\$2,749.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$2,822.0			\$2,599.0			\$2,749.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,957.0			\$2,599.0			\$2,761.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>This project is to develop the capability to accurately project the arrival of cargo at Air Mobility Command operated CONUS Aerial Ports of Embarkation (APOE) 96 or more hours in advance. Advance Shipping Notice (ASN) will minimize port hold times, increase APOE through-put, and facilitate aircraft scheduling for optimum effectiveness and efficiency, thereby significantly enhancing customer support. In short, this capability will significantly enhance organic air system velocity. ASN will create the necessary tools to improve the transportation scheduling processes and thereby allow a reduction in port hold times (part of system velocity) by one to two days. Air Mobility Command statistics indicate that a days reduction in pipeline time saves about \$47M annually. Creation of ASN capability would save \$46M-\$70M annually. Other potential capabilities/benefits (such as the possible creation of time definite delivery capabilities which would significantly decrease requirements for safety stocks) are not included in the the above estimate. Funding will involve: contract studies, hardware purchase, ADP systems analysis and programming, and travel and per diem. The hardware must be robust enough to process all Defense Automatic Addressing System (DAAS) supply transactions, Transportation Operational Personal Property System (TOPS), unaccompanied baggage transactions, and other transactions identifying impending shipments through complex predictive algorithms, on a real time basis. Cost of required changes to the software of interfacing systems is included.</p> <p>ASN Capital Sunk Costs: ASN Capital Programmed Costs: Software Dev \$17.734M Hardware: \$.372M ASN Total Cost: Software Dev \$17.734M Hardware: \$.372M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2) BDSS			D. Activity Identification TCJ4-BC		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$1,200.0			\$0.0			
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$1,200.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,214.0			\$2,100.0			\$1,990.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,214.0			\$2,100.0			\$1,990.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,414.0			\$2,100.0			\$1,990.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: The Business Decision Support System (BDSS) will provide transportation managers the tools to monitor the overall performance of the DTS. BDSS will employ state-of-the-art data warehousing technologies to integrate historical operational and financial data from a variety of sources. BDSS will use data mining tools to facilitate data queries and reports. It will incorporate statistical analysis and operations research tools to facilitate demand forecasting, profiling and benchmarking activities. The development of BDSS is critical to provide CINTRANS the capability to conduct trend analysis and forecasting in support of the USTRANSCOM mission. GTN cannot support this requirement because it does not produce aggregated reports nor does it contain financial data. BDSS will integrate both financial and operational data from an intermodal perspective, providing CINTRANS the capability to conduct the true intermodal analysis necessary to ensure the efficient operation of the DTS. Funding will involve: hardware purchase, and contractor assistance to define requirements, draft operational requirements document, draft concept of operations, build data cubes, construct the data platform, and identify appropriate forecasting and optimization tools.</p> <p>BDSS SUNK COSTS: \$1,882K BDSS CAPITAL PROGRAMMED COSTS: \$17,062K BDSS TOTAL COSTS: \$17,062K</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) Command Presentation Systems			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$83.0						
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$83.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$83.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The USTRANSCOM Command Presentation Systems are extensively used on a daily basis for high level briefing and presentations. Audio visual technology is constantly being improved to enhance the presenters ability to project information in the best possible way. To remain current with technology in future years, money must be budgeted to cover these upgrades. Computer Replacement - updates all conference room presentation computers with new machines with the latest capabilities and applications. Twenty-six computers are replaced every five years. Projector Replacement - updates the conference room projectors as they age and become obsolete. Each year the oldest projectors, and their associated mounting and wiring, are replaced with the newest commercial projectors. All projectors are replaced over a five year period. Room Upgrades - Two auditoriums, six conference rooms, and one command center periodically undergo updating. Room upgrades reconfigure the presentation systems with the latest controls, replace worn components and add or improve capabilities.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware: \$2.3M Programmed Costs: Hardware: \$.1M Total Costs: Hardware: \$2.4M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(4) Defend the Computing Environment			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$692.0			\$250.0			\$384.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$692.0			\$250.0			\$384.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support						\$750.0			\$460.0
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$750.0			\$460.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$692.0			\$1,000.0			\$844.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification. Defend the Computing Environment funds are for security engineering support to systems development/configuration changes and for security capabilities which protect the computing environment, such as virus protection, configuration management, auditing, etc. In order to have a strong security posture within the command, security must be built into USTRANSCOM systems from the ground up. In addition, security must be retrofitted into legacy systems that continue to fulfill an operational need. Consideration must also be made for the computing environment current systems exist in and new systems will be fielding into. The primary beneficiary of this initiative is GTN. Emphasis is on the GTN feeder systems operated by the Transportation Component Commands. Failure to implement system/computing environment security will expose the critical feed data populating GTN to hostile, offensive information attack leading to the corruption and possible destruction of the GTN database.</p>									
<p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware: 0.5M Software: 1.0M Capital Program Costs: Hardware: 3.2M Software: 2.7M Total Costs Hardware: 3.7M Software: 3.7M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(4) Defend the Network Infrastructure			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$700.0			\$700.0			\$896.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$700.0			\$700.0			\$896.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$168.0			\$400.0			\$460.0
Subtotal			\$168.0			\$400.0			\$460.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$868.0			\$1,100.0			\$1,356.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification. Defend the Network Infrastructure funds are for the development and fielding of a comprehensive, command-wide network security architecture (hardware, software, analysis tools, personnel, etc.) to protect, defend, report and analyze the security status of the commands networks. This architecture will extend current HQ USTRANSCOM network security capabilities out to our Transportation Component Commands and provide the CINC a true, command-wide status of security activities across the whole of the Defense Transportation System (DTS). This network security capability will be operationally focused and process oriented to include the following capabilities: monitoring and measuring C4 activities, identifying and prioritizing threats, defending against attack, coordinating responses to attack, and applying lessons learned both through procedural/process changes and technology enhancements.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware: 0.5M Software: 1.0M Capital Program Costs: Hardware: 5.9M Software: 2.7M Total Costs Hardware: 6.4M Software: 3.7M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description C(2) DTR/ Customs Border Clearance			D. Activity Identification TCJ4-LTC		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development						\$700.0			\$720.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$700.0			\$720.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$700.0			\$720.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Customs Process Automation Program (CPA) will develop a methodology, functional process, and supporting technical infrastructure to automate Defense Transportation Systems (DTS) shipping documents, commercial bills of lading, and related customs and border clearance documents. These documents must then be distributed in an electronic environment on a near real-time basis to offices throughout the DTS, its corporate business partners, and civil customs/border clearance authorities, both in the US and abroad. The project seeks to populate these electronic forms with integrated information currently available in several existing DOD Transportation systems, including the Transportation Coordinators Automated Information Management System II (TC-AIMS II), the Global Transportation Network (GTN), the Global Air Transportation Execution System (GATES), the Worldwide Port System (WPS), the Global Freight Management System (GFM), The Cargo Management Operations Systems (CMOS) and the Distribution Standard System (DSS). If this software development effort is not complete, DTS shipments will continue to be frustrated unnecessarily, incurring significant costs and severely impacting the readiness of our warfighting commands. Funding will involve development of a concept of operations, integrating data from the systems identified, developing electronic shipping documents, commercial bills of lading and customs/border clearance form in UN/EDIFACT, XML, or some other format and that means to distribute them electronically to all who need them over the World WideWeb (WWW) or NIPERNET.</p> <p>CAPITAL SUNK COSTS: Software Development: \$0 Hardware \$0 CAPITAL PROGRAMMED COSTS: Software Development: \$2.919M Hardware \$0 TOTAL COSTS: \$2.919m HARDWARE \$0</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1), C(2) Command Center/GCCS			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$263.0						\$700.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$263.0			\$0.0			\$700.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$120.0			\$600.0			\$600.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$120.0			\$600.0			\$600.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$383.0			\$600.0			\$1,300.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: Global Command and Control System (GCCS) is a top-down directed program from OSD, managed by the Joint Staff/J3/J6. To continue providing support for the CINC's command and control mission and to integrate the transportation functions into GCCS, it will be necessary to continue to upgrade the hardware/software architecture of GCCS/GCCS-T for USTRANSCOM. FY03 and FY07 budget includes the life-cycle replacement for the GCCS server suite equipment. This life-cycle replacement complies with the USTRANSCOM approved 4 year life-cycle replacement policy. Replacement of older hardware, as well as, future upgrades of software to keep current with the GCCS program, is necessary in order to provide efficient and timely service to the CINC and the Component Commanders.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware: 5.189M Software: 1.17M Capital Program Costs: Hardware: 7.005M Software: 7.05M Total Costs: Hardware: 12.194M Software: 8.22M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1)(2) C(1)(2)(3) GTN			D. Activity Identification GTN PMO		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$599.0						
B(2) Computer Software			\$139.0						
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$738.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design			\$1,859.0			\$340.0			
C(2) System Development			\$35,961.0			\$10,121.0			\$6,000.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$1,910.0						
Subtotal			\$39,730.0			\$10,461.0			\$6,000.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$40,468.0			\$10,461.0			\$6,000.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Global Transportation Network (GTN) is USTRANSCOMs solution to provide a central, integrated source of accurate and timely transportation information to Defense Transportation System (DTS) planners, decision makers, and users through the World Wide Web. GTN provides in-transit visibility and C2 decision support functions, and collects, integrates and stores information from over 25 military and 30 commercial systems that support the DTS mission. GTN provides the transportation module of GCCS, the transportation domain for GCSS, and will host the JOPES Scheduling and Movement module. GTN provides near real time visibility of global and multimodal military movement of passengers, cargo, and patients during peacetime, wartime, and contingencies. GTN is DODs authoritative source for in-transit visibility of unit and sustainment movement information. Provides Command and Control support to the CINCs, Services, and other agencies associated with the DTS. USTRANSCOM FY2001 Strategic Guidance: "GTN is the USTRANSCOM solution to the Joint Force Commanders need for secure, real-time transportation information. The Federal CIO Council, Center of Excellence for Information Technology (CEIT) awarded U.S. Transportation Command (GTN) as a CEIT 2001 award winner. Due to obsolescence and supportability issues, USTRANSCOM has come to the realization that GTN needs significant rework and technology refresh. A follow-on development, GTN 21, is planned for contract award in FY02 with minimal additional system development on the current GTN system. Funding requirements identified in FY02 and FY03 will allow for the prime contractor overhead support functions (Program Management, Systems Engineering, contracting and budgeting) and award fee based upon performance of projects already funded and under development. Sustainment of the current system is required until Initial Operational Capability (IOC) of GTN 21 is reached.</p> <p>GTN Capital Sunk Costs: Software Dev \$148.08M, Hardware \$20.415M GTN Capital Program Costs: Software Dev \$80.497M, Hardware \$2.142M GTN Total Costs: Software Dev \$228-581, Hardware \$22.557M AMP Capital Sunk Costs: Software Dev. \$8.5M, Hardware \$0 Capital Program Costs: Software Dev. \$16.6M, Hardware \$0, Total Costs Software Dev \$25.1M H/W\$0 JFAST Capital Sunk Costs: \$5.713M, Software Dev H/W \$0 Programmed Costs: Software Dev \$13.290M, H/W \$0 Total Costs Software Dev \$19.003 M and H/W \$0</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(1)(2)(4) GTN 21			D. Activity Identification GTN PMO		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware						\$7,800.0			\$4,000.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$7,800.0			\$4,000.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design						\$2,150.0			\$1,750.0
C(2) System Development						\$13,088.0			\$31,918.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support						\$2,062.0			\$2,132.0
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$17,300.0			\$35,800.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$25,100.0			\$39,800.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Global Transportation Network for the 21st Century (GTN 21) is intended to replace the current operational GTN system, USTRANSCOMs primary tool to provide Intransit Visibility (ITV) to Defense Transportation System (DTS) users. Current GTN is becoming unsupportable, is experiencing technical obsolescence and does not fully satisfy validated operational requirements. Upgrades to the current system are very costly and time consuming and due to design limitations, the current system will never be able to satisfy all operational requirements. The GTN 21 design will ensure flexibility to adapt to future changing technology by complying with the USTRANSCOM Enterprise Architecture. GTN supports USTRANSCOMs command and control (C2) mission requirement for planning, directing and controlling operations of assigned forces pursuant to global transportation management. GTN 21 will provide a web-based computer and communications infrastructure serving approximately 6,500 users from a central server location at Scott AFB, IL. It will be a near real-time global defense transportation information system integrating and presenting deployment-related data from DOD and commercial automated data processing systems. It will contain schedule, position, and transportation status data for cargo shipments and military personnel. As information is updated in over 20 independent military and commercial transportation tracking systems, relevant data will be automatically transmitted to GTN 21, stored in the database, and processed and presented to users. GTN 21 will receive the transmitted information, correlate it to related movement data from other systems, and organize its database to present a unified consistent view of cargo and passenger movement. GTN 21 will include a classified subsystem that stores and processes sensitive information which will be available to appropriately cleared users. GTN 21 is an ACAT 1AM program. The Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) is OASD(C3I). The GTN 21 System Program Director reports to the Air Force Program Executive Office, Command & Control and Combat Support (AFPEO/CS&CS) and the Program Management Office is collocated with USTRANSCOM at Scott AFB IL. GTN 21 Capital Sunk Costs: Software Dev \$0, Hardware \$0M; GTN 21 Capital Program Costs: Software Dev \$163.100M, Hardware \$48.200M; GTN 21 Total Costs: Software Dev \$163.100M, Hardware \$48.200M.</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2) Infostructure			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware						\$6,109.0			
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$6,109.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development						\$2,389.0			\$2,461.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$2,389.0			\$2,461.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$8,498.0			\$2,461.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification:</p> <p>USTRANSCOM initiated the Infostructure program to transform USTRANSCOM into a fully-integrated, Electronic Business organization with established electronic commerce relationships with DOD/commercial customers and suppliers.</p> <p>The USTRANSCOM Infostructure program will provide the majority of the computing environment as defined by the Enterprise Architecture to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementing standard analytical and display tools that provide information based on mission capabilities - Migrating existing ways of managing data from information supporting separate applications/systems to a corporate approach that treats information as a resource to facilitate our total information needs <p>Executing the CINC responsibilities of USTRANSCOM requires a robust integrated supply of information from numerous data sources. In this data rich environment, there is a compelling need for data architecture that standardizes the mechanisms for distilling raw data into information for the decision makers and takes advantage of the economies of scale in both software and hardware. Hardware funds are required to purchase software licenses, servers for WEB access, and robust data base capability. System development funds are required to adapt GOTS/COTS software tools to USTRANSCOM administrative and business needs. Continued support is required to maintain a fully functional and operational system.</p> <p>Sunk Costs: Hardware \$0M Software: \$0M</p> <p>Programmed Costs: Hardware \$38.542M Software: \$15.555M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2) JMCG			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$279.0			\$0.0			\$160.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$279.0			\$0.0			\$160.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,966.0			\$1,230.0			\$1,075.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,966.0			\$1,230.0			\$1,075.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$2,245.0			\$1,230.0			\$1,235.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: Joint Mobility Control Group (JMCG) is the organizational structure for reporting and tasking all transportation requirements within DOD. The JMCG is the operational arm of USTRANSCOMs command and control architecture. System development funds are required for software development work on collaborative planning tools and Integrated Customer Support (ICS). Collaborative planning uses a groupware application that provides support to the JMCGs reengineering goals and provides the JMCG the required flexibility in C2 functionality and in intra-command center communications. The current tool at USTC is InfoWorkSpace. The budget provides funds for migration to the DOD standard tool when identified. Collaborative Planning FOC is FY03. ICS is a project intended to satisfy the JMCG requirement to migrate to an integrated and timely customer relations management process as stipulated in Strategic Objective 1.1. ICS func are required to develop a customer self-help web page, an intelligent call routing function and a unified view of DTS service options. The number of transportation specialists equipped with the ICS tools will increase significantly between FY03 and FY06. ICS FOC is FY07. System development funds are also required to adapt various COTS software tools to the Mobility Control Center environment and perform DITSCAP evaluations throughout the budget period. Hardware funds are required to purchase classified LAN equipment for broadband connectivity within the command centers at USTRANSCOM and the TCCs. Investment of these capital funds will produce a more robust data communications system and allow JMCG to meet transportation requirement bandwidth demands. Hardware funds are required to install a Computer Telephony Interface (CTI) that will facilitate improved customer relationship management in ICS. Some hardware funding in FY05/FY06 will replace MCC equipment that is obsolete or approaching its end of useful life.</p> <p>Sunk Costs: Hardware: \$3.572M Software: \$1.72M Programmed Costs: Hardware: \$1.7533M Software: \$13.5207M Total Costs: Hardware: \$5.3253M Software: \$15.2407M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2)(4) LAN			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware			\$3,937.0			\$2,802.0			\$605.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$3,937.0			\$2,802.0			\$605.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,675.0						
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support			\$300.0			\$230.0			\$230.0
Subtotal			\$1,975.0			\$230.0			\$230.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$5,912.0			\$3,032.0			\$835.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: The USTRANSCOM Command and Control Information System (C2IS) is comprised of classified and unclassified segments and WAN connectivity with component commands. Hardware includes infrastructure upgrades to support increasing performance and bandwidth requirements to include fiber optic installation, intelligent switch/router upgrades and wide area network (WAN) connectivity. The current DTS Theater LAN assessment project covers both unclassified and classified LANs but needs to be expanded to ensure successful implementation of enhancements. Computer server infrastructure upgrades replace outdated / unsupported hardware and establish minimum requirements for fielding WIN2K. CPS and VTC include sustainment an upgrade of HQ USTRANSCOM Command Presentation Systems and Video Teleconferencing. Engineering to assess theater centric baseline for C4 systems available at worldwide DTS sites. One MITRE IA/IP Security Engineer. FY05: \$8M to fund network components for the new B1900 Annex Building.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware \$2.516M Software: \$.3M Capital Programmed Costs: Hardware: \$26.75M Software: \$2.4M Total Costs (Sunk + Programmed): Hardware: \$29.266M Software: \$2.7M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002					C. Line No. & Item Description C(2) Logbook		D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$927.0			\$787.0			\$763.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$927.0			\$787.0			\$763.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$927.0			\$787.0			\$763.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: Logbook is an automated web-based information sharing tool developed to support the Command Center Operations for the Joint Mobility Command Group (JMCG). It is designed to manage time critical data which flows through command centers. It is the primary information sharing tool for the JMCG. Logbook provides an information sharing method that permits concurrent commentary and iterative work on linked tasks. Users can more efficiently collaborate since this tool delivers information to team members simultaneously, thus facilitating individual and team decision making. No other Command and Control (C2) system provides this functionality in a single application. Continued development of the application is required to support USTRANSCOMs command and control architecture. Future funding is required due to the rapid growth of Logbook based on user requirements and USCINTRANS direction.</p> <p>Sunk Costs: Hardware: 0 Software: 0 Programmed Costs: Hardware .1.7M Software \$8.2M Total Costs: Hardware 1.7M Software \$8.2M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2) SMS			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									\$300.0
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$300.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$1,529.0			\$1,000.0			\$600.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$1,529.0			\$1,000.0			\$600.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$1,529.0			\$1,000.0			\$900.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: The Single Mobility System (SMS) will provide visibility of all requirements throughout the Defense Transportation System to better match those requirements with available assets. The system will consist of two parts: The Single Air Mobility System and the Single Sea Mobility System. SMS interfaces with existing Command and Control (C2) systems to provide a web based composite picture for decision makers at headquarters through component and unit levels. The aim of SMS is not to create a major new C2 system but rather to bridge the gaps between existing systems and to use those existing systems wherever possible. SMS will permit the consolidation of mobility requirements, creation of missions from those requirements, and the buying and selling of existing missions between units to more effectively utilize available assets. These missions will then be tracked through execution and post mission reporting by SMS through currently existing C2 systems or SMS modules designed to perform these functions where they do not exist. No other C2 system provides this functionality in a single application. System design funds are required to complete design specifications and documentation for SMS. System development funds are required for software development of all functional modules subsequent to the prototype. Continued development of the application is required to support USTRANSCOMs command and control architecture.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware: \$.1M Software: \$1.4M Capital Program Costs: Hardware: \$.45M Software: \$6.8M Total Costs Hardware: \$.55M Software: \$8.2M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(1) C(2) TFMS			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware						\$0.0			
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development			\$4,758.0			\$3,400.0			\$2,000.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$4,758.0			\$3,400.0			\$2,000.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$4,758.0			\$3,400.0			\$2,000.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Narrative Justification: Required to provide J8 with an integrated Transportation Financial Management System (TFMS). Will provide the Commander in Chief, USTRANSCOM the financial management information needed to manage Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF) funded operations. The first year of the program will include system development or the configuration of a summary level cost accounting module to meet the USTRANSCOM and TCC requirements. From the second year and beyond the program will provide for detailed development and modification of the cost accounting module to meet the TCC financial management system migration. Part of the effort will include integrating the TCC migratory accounting and financial management systems to the corporate HQ USTRANSCOM financial management system. Impact if not funded: This program is designed to integrate the financial functions of USTRANSCOM and its component commands. Failure to fund this program will effect the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the TFMS. USTRANSCOM will be unable to provide the senior transportation decision makers and the Chief Financial Officer with critical financial data needed to make more informed transportation decisions.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Software: \$.554M. Programmed Costs: Software: \$20.593M, Hardware: \$.8M Total Costs: Software: 21.147M Hardware: \$.8M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description C(2) TMS			D. Activity Identification TCJ5		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									\$3,700.0
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$3,700.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$3,700.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>The Analysis Mobility Platform (AMP) is an end to end transportation modelling shell to which models are added to obtain an end to end simulation of the Defense Transportation System (DTS) for both peace and war. AMP allows users to rapidly set-up, tailor, and extend transportation and logistics models to support programmatic analysis; wargames and exercises; execution and deliberate planning functions. AMP is the architecture that will allow all USTRANSCOM approved models and simulations to share common data and interface dynamically in order to help accomplish and optimize USTRANSCOMs peacetime and wartime missions. AMP will link models used to analyze peacetime and contingency operations with GTN to obtain plan versus actual (PVA) analysis. AMP is funded \$2.2M in FY02 and \$2.05M in FY03.</p> <p>Joint Flow and Analysis System for Transportation (JFAST) is modelling and simulation program that is integrated into the AMP modelling environment and produces the deliberate planning, crisis action planning, and transportation feasibility analysis function for USTRANSCOM, the Unified Commands, and the NCA. JFAST is the system of choice for deliberate planning and is used at over 80 sites worldwide. JFAST is funded \$1.65M in FY02 and FY03.</p> <p>Aerial Port of Debarkation (APOD) is a model to analyze an APOD or enroute airfield in order to maximize the throughput at that airfield for the minimum amount of transportation enablers (enablers=forklifts, fuel trucks, material handling equipment, airport infrastructure and the necessary personnel to handle and move cargo and passengers through the airport) for USTRANSCOMs peacetime and wartime missions. The APOD model will be integrated into the AMP modelling environment to enhance the detail of the end to end depiction of the DTS in order to optimize the efficient use of the commercial and DOD transportation assets. APOD funding begins in FY05.</p> <p>SUNK COSTS: Hardware: \$0 Software: \$16.7M PROGRAMMED COSTS: Hardware \$0M Software \$23.7M TOTAL COSTS: Hardware \$0M, Software \$40.4M</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date USTRANSCOM HQ/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description B(3) VTC			D. Activity Identification TCJ6		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications			\$463.0						
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$463.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
TOTAL			\$463.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Video-Teleconferencing (VTC) Enhancement: Funding used to expand or improve the capabilities of the existing facilities and/or create new facilities within USTRANSCOM. A completely new CINC VTC Studio is budgeted for FY01. The addition of a DVS-G circuit to the J6 conference room studio is planned for FY06. DITSCAP certifications for the VTC function are budgeted for FY00, FY03, and FY06. VTC desktop - a replacement for the existing desktop system will be installed in two phases starting in FY01. The new system will connect to 50, upper level management desks throughout the Headquarters. The desktop system will be LAN based and cover both classified and unclassified connections. Video Teleconference Studio (VTS) - Procurement of replacement equipment for aging hardware is planned to maintain VTC capability. As a minimum, the current coders/decoders will be replaced as they reach the end of their service life starting in FY02. The current coder/decoder is no longer in production and will only be supported through 03. As the VTC network migrates from the Defense Commercial Telecommunications Network (DCTN) to the DISN Video Services-Global (DVS-G) network, funding will be necessary to convert some studio equipment to new standards and capabilities.</p> <p>Capital Sunk Costs: Hardware \$.604M Software 0 Programmed Costs: Hardware \$1.900M Software 0 Total Costs: Hardware \$2.504M Software 0</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Air Mobility Command/Transportation/February 2002					C. Line No. & Item Description Minor Construction		D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction			\$8,635.0			\$9,100.0			\$11,000.0
Subtotal			\$8,635.0			\$9,100.0			\$11,000.0
TOTAL			\$8,635.0			\$9,100.0			\$11,000.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>- Over the past couple of fiscal years an average of \$8.3M has been invested in TWCF minor construction (MC) requirements. The increased funding in the out-years will ensure necessary facilities are available for TWCF units and operations. This base level funding is absolutely necessary to construct such things as additional apron parking, freight and equipment storage, blast deflectors and maintenance space. The demand for airlift is continuously increasing as we are the only heavy lift capability in the world, so the needs for airlift facilities and infrastructure also continue to increase.</p> <p>- While the command has a basic MC funding level of approximately \$6.0M annually there are emerging requirements. AMC/CV directed mandatory force protection and anti-terrorism measures be installed in all of our AMC passenger terminals which began in FY00. Currently there are over \$4.5M in requirements identified at 5 overseas terminals to meet the first phase of the initiative. Requirements for the remaining en-route and CONUS locations are being developed, as force protection requirements continually evolve. After force protection initiatives for all passenger terminals are complete, the next AMC anti-terrorism force protection priority is for protection measures in all freight terminals, then for all contract air terminal operations, and finally for Naval Air Station airlift operations areas. In FY97, AMC/CC directed material handling equipment (MHE) be placed into shelters to prevent premature deterioration of the equipment. Aircraft generation equipment is also included in this facility initiative. AMC has a minimum of \$6M in MHE and AGE covered storage to construct. These facilities will help preserve many of our 770 pieces of material handling equipment, a \$336M investment, including the flagship of our airlift material handling fleet our expensive Tunnor (60K) loaders. The covered storage for equipment initiative is a high priority, AMC/CC directed program. This is work over and above what is identified in the facility investment strategy. Additional funds are also needed to complete new pavement work. Many pavements we use were never intended for the heavy aircraft and heavy loading/unloading operations we conduct on a daily basis. The concentration of aircraft in one third of the enroute locations we used in the past, has taxed existing ramp/parking space. Overall, AMCs pavements are deteriorated and are currently limiting aircraft operations at several locations. Parking spaces and freight storage also need to be increased.</p> <p>- The AMC TWCF investment strategy is in line with the Department of Defense Transportation Vision for the Twenty-first Century. Its intent is to ensure sustainability and quality of life. One of the guiding principles requires us to invest in transportation programs, systems, and enhancements that support mobility requirements, asset visibility, and efficient transportation operations.</p> <p>INTERFACES: None</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT FUNDED</p> <p>- Funding cuts will impact our ability to support critical AMC/CC, wing commander, 615 AMSG/CC, and 621 AMSG/CC requirements to enhance or improve mobility operations and provide adequate force protection through the construction of new facilities and additions in the CONUS and en-route infrastructure.</p> <p>- Projects that go unfunded are pushed further to the out-years creating facility shortfalls we cannot recover from unless MC funding is increased.</p> <p>- Funding cuts will have a negative impact on our ability to provide seamless airlift from point of origin to destination, to provide quality customer service, and to bring our existing facilities up to AMC and Air Force standards. Many AMC TWCF facilities are old, inadequate facilities far from meeting acceptable standards, especially at our en-route locations. Pavements requirements continue to grow for both new parking/loading/refueling areas and for pavements deteriorating from heavy airlift use. Unfunded pavements requirements will result in limitations on AMCs ability to deliver passengers and cargo anywhere in the world. Passengers, troops, and valuable cargo and equipment will remain inadequately protected from terrorist threats. A multi-million dollar MHE and AGE equipment inventory will continue to be exposed to the elements causing the expected life span of this high priced equipment (including our costly flagship 60K Tunnor loaders) to rapidly deteriorate.</p>									

Exhibit Fund-9B Activity Group Capital Investment Justification
 Minor Construction (Atch)

Project Category	QTY	FY01	QTY	FY#01YEAR #	QTY	FY#02YEAR #
A/C GROUND EQUIP (AGE) STORAGE	5	1,669	2	653	2	955
AERIAL DELIVERY SYSTEM	1	216	0	0	1	465
AIRFIELD LIGHTING	1	207	1	353	0	0
AIR FREIGHT TERMINALS	4	863	2	526	1	356
AIR FREIGHT/PAX TERMINALS	1	288	4	756	4	1,725
APRON PARKING	2	800	2	392	3	956
BLAST DEFLECTORS	1	216	1	357	0	0
COMMAND POSTS		0		0	1	314
FLEET SERVICES	1	142	1	480	2	516
FUEL HYDRANTS		0	0	0	0	0
GENERAL PURPOSE MAINT SHOPS		0	1	325	1	251
MAINTENANCE HANGARS	4	1,223	2	622	3	1,252
OIL WATER SEPARATOR - WASH RACK		0	1	255	0	0
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINT SHOPS	1	144	1	321	1	174
RATE FLUCTUATIONS/CHANGE ORDERS/DESIGN	75	1,500	75	1,500	75	1,500
STAGING/STORAGE YARDS	1	216	1	152	0	0
TEST CELLS		0	0	0	0	0
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	2	575	1	125	1	153
WEIGHING SCALE	2	432	0	0	0	0
SQUADRON OPERATIONS		0	2	615	0	0
ENGINE MAINTENANCE	1	144	1	115	1	476
COVERED MHE STORAGE		0	5	1,553	5	1,907
Total		\$8,635.0		\$9,100.0		\$11,000.0

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 PB		
B. Component/Activity/Date Military Traffic Management Command/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description MTMC-MINOR CONSTRUCTION			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction			\$800.0			\$800.0			\$800.0
Subtotal			\$800.0			\$800.0			\$800.0
TOTAL			\$800.0			\$800.0			\$800.0
Narrative Justification:									
<p>Minor Construction FY02</p> <p>Additional lighting is needed to provide five foot-candles of light for the North and South Wharf Hardstands at MOTSU (Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point) allowing efficient lighting for execution of nighttime operations in support of the Warfighting CINC RDD, especially in time of crisis or war. Light poles must be installed at the outer edges of the paved areas to provide clearance for operations (loading/unloading of various vehicles). The 110 foot poles will be installed with mechanical devices to lower/raise luminaries for maintenance and protection during adverse weather situations, such as hurricanes. NW Hardstand is estimated at \$250K and SW Hardstand is also estimated at \$250K. In addition, Sunny Point needs to improve its Fire Training Building by adding a new burn room and LP gas burners. These improvements are required to meet NFPA code requirements. Training is currently suspended pending correction of code violations. Accomplishment of training backlog will insure fire fighters are prepared to meet potential demands inherent in the terminals mission. Design is planned for FY 02 (\$50K) along with initial construction (\$155K) and to be finished in FY 03 (\$340K). Design is also needed to modify the Supply Building and for a new Mailroom due to an organizational mission change for the terminal (\$95K).</p> <p>Minor Construction FY03</p> <p>The Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU) is the premier DOD ammunition terminal and is considered a vital part of the strategic CONUS power projection platform in support of warfighting CINCs around the world. It is relied upon to maintain a high optempo consisting of ammunition resupply missions, prepo operations, and FMS operations. In FY 03, construction continues on the new Fire Training Building (\$340K). Construction of the Supply Building modifications will be accomplished (\$350K) providing much needed office space. Finally, construction will begin on the new Mailroom which is anticipated to be completed in FY 04 (\$110K).</p>									

Activity Group Capital Investment Justification (\$ in Thousands)							A. Budget Submission FY 2003 ABES		
B. Component/Activity/Date Defense Courier Service/Transportation/February 2002				C. Line No. & Item Description Minor Construction			D. Activity Identification		
Element of Cost	FY01			FY02			FY03		
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A. Equipment									
A(1) Replacement									
A(2) Productivity									
A(3) New Mission									
A(4) Environmental Compliance									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
B. ADPE/Telecomm									
B(1) Computer Hardware									
B(2) Computer Software									
B(3) Telecommunications									
B(3) Other Computer									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
C. Software Development									
C(1) Planning/Design									
C(2) System Development									
C(3) Deployment									
C(4) Mgt/Tech Support									
Subtotal			\$0.0			\$0.0			\$0.0
D. Minor Construction	1	\$401.0	\$401.0	1	\$500.0	\$500.0	1	\$500.0	\$500.0
Subtotal			\$401.0			\$500.0			\$500.0
TOTAL			\$401.0			\$500.0			\$500.0
Narrative Justification:									
01 - Baltimore: Expansion of vault to meet operational requirements.									
02 - HQ: Building addition to meet operational requirements.									
03 - Ramstein: Relocation of DCSS Rhein Main to consolidate with DCSS Ramstein.									

CAPITAL BUDGET EXECUTION
Component: United States Transportation Command
Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(\$ in Millions)

FY	Approved Projects	FY02 PB Amount	Reprogs	Approved Proj Cost	Current Proj Cost	Asset/ Deficiency	Explanation
01	Equipment except ADPE & Telcomm	\$2.5	-\$1.1	\$1.4	\$1.4	\$0.0	
01	ADPE & Telecom	\$55.3	-\$5.6	\$49.7	\$49.7	\$0.0	
01	AIT/AMC	\$1.6	\$0.0	\$1.6	\$1.6	\$0.0	
01	C2IPS	\$7.0	-\$2.6	\$4.4	\$4.4	\$0.0	Realigned to C2IPS
01	CAMPS	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.0	
01	CAMS/G081	\$1.1	\$0.0	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$0.0	
01	GATES	\$3.6	-\$1.4	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES S/W
01	GDSS	\$2.2	-\$0.8	\$1.4	\$1.4	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES/TDC H/W
01	LBAND SATCOM	\$0.8	-\$0.1	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES H/W
01	OWCP	\$1.7	-\$0.1	\$1.6	\$1.6	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES H/W
01	SYSTEM INTEGRATION	\$5.3	-\$1.6	\$3.7	\$3.7	\$0.0	Realigned to USTC LAN
01	TDC	\$5.2	\$0.8	\$6.0	\$6.0	\$0.0	Realigned from GDSS H/W
01	WING LAN - AMC	\$2.6	\$0.0	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$0.0	
01	IC3	\$2.5	\$0.0	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$0.0	
01	ICE	\$0.7	-\$0.1	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.0	Rounding
01	AIT/ MTMC	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
01	AUTOSTRAD 2000	\$3.9	\$0.0	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$0.0	
01	CFM	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
01	ITV	\$3.3	\$0.0	\$3.3	\$3.3	\$0.0	
01	TOPPS	\$2.2	\$0.6	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$0.0	Realigned from WPS H/W
01	WPS	\$1.0	-\$0.6	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.0	Realigned to TOPPS H/W
01	ASN	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	
01	BDSS	\$0.1	\$1.1	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.0	Realigned from GTN H/W and BDSS S/W
01	CMD PRESENTATIONS	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	
01	DEFEND THE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	
01	DEFEND NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	
01	GCCS	\$0.7	-\$0.4	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.0	Realigned to GTN (AMP) S/W
01	GTN	\$2.0	-\$1.3	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	Realigned to BDSS S/W and GTN S/W
01	JMCG	\$1.2	-\$0.9	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.0	Realigned to JMCG S/W
01	LAN	\$1.9	\$2.0	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$0.0	Realigned from AMC for WINDOWS 2K
01	VTC	\$0.7	-\$0.2	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	EOY reprogramming
01	Software Development	\$130.6	\$5.4	\$136.0	\$136.0	\$0.0	
01	ACFP	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	
01	AIT/ AMC	\$1.6	\$0.1	\$1.7	\$1.6	\$0.1	Rounding
01	C2IPS	\$8.0	\$2.6	\$10.6	\$10.6	\$0.0	Realigned from C2IPS H/W
01	CAMS/G081	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
01	CAMPS	\$4.8	\$0.0	\$4.8	\$4.8	\$0.0	
01	COINS	\$0.6	-\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	Realigned to USTC LAN
01	GATES	\$3.9	\$1.6	\$5.5	\$5.5	\$0.0	Realigned from GATES H/W
01	GDSS	\$3.7	\$0.0	\$3.7	\$3.8	-\$0.1	
01	LBAND SATCOM	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
01	SYSTEM INTEGRATION	\$9.1	-\$0.1	\$9.0	\$9.0	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES H/W
01	IC3	\$2.1	\$0.0	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$0.0	

CAPITAL BUDGET EXECUTION
Component: United States Transportation Command
Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(\$ in Millions)

FY	Approved Projects	FY02 PB Amount	Reprogs	Approved Proj Cost	Current Proj Cost	Asset/ Deficiency	Explanation
01	ICE	\$3.8	\$0.0	\$3.8	\$3.8	\$0.0	
01	AUTOSTRAD 2000	\$1.8	-\$0.1	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$0.0	Realigned to TFMS S/W
01	AIT/MTMC	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
01	CFM	\$8.8	\$0.0	\$8.8	\$8.8	\$0.0	
01	COE	\$0.9	\$0.0	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$0.0	
01	CAB	\$2.5	\$0.0	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$0.0	
01	ITV	\$9.0	\$0.0	\$9.0	\$9.0	\$0.0	
01	TFMS-MTMC	\$4.0	\$1.3	\$5.3	\$4.0	\$1.3	Realigned from TOPPS and AUTOSTRAD S/W
01	TOPPS	\$3.8	-\$1.3	\$2.5	\$3.8	-\$1.3	Realigned to TFMS S/W
01	WPS	\$3.9	\$0.0	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$0.0	
01	ASN	\$2.8	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$0.0	
01	BDSS	\$1.4	-\$0.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.0	Realigned to BDSS H/W
01	DEFEND NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	\$0.0	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	EOY reprogramming
01	GCCS	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	EOY reprogramming
01	GTN	\$38.1	\$1.6	\$39.7	\$39.7	\$0.0	Realigned to BDSS H/W
01	JMCG	\$1.2	\$0.8	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	Realigned from JMCG H/W
01	LAN - HQ	\$2.3	-\$0.3	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	Realigned to AMP H/W
01	LOGBOOK	\$1.2	-\$0.3	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$0.0	EOY reprogramming
01	SMS	\$1.5	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$0.0	
01	TFMS - HQ	\$4.8	\$0.0	\$4.8	\$4.8	\$0.0	
01	Minor Construction	\$9.9	\$0.0	\$9.8	\$9.8	\$0.0	
01	TOTAL FY	\$198.3	-\$1.3	\$196.9	\$196.9	\$0.0	

CAPITAL BUDGET EXECUTION
Component: United States Transportation Command
Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(\$ in Millions)

FY	Approved Projects	FY02 PB Amount	Reprogs	Approved Proj Cost	Current Proj Cost	Asset/ Deficiency	Explanation
02	Equipment except ADPE & Telcomm	\$10.5	-\$3.0	\$7.5	\$7.5	\$0.0	Procurement split between FY02 and FY03
02	ADPE & Telecom	\$63.0	-\$5.3	\$57.7	\$57.7	\$0.0	
02	AIT/AMC	\$3.9	\$0.0	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$0.0	
02	C2IPS	\$6.5	-\$5.7	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.0	Funding requirement moved to GDSS
02	CAMS/G081	\$1.6	\$0.0	\$1.6	\$1.6	\$0.0	
02	CAMPS	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	
02	GATES	\$4.2	-\$2.4	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$0.0	Realigned to GATES S/W and INFOSTRUCTURE
02	GDSS	\$3.0	\$4.2	\$7.2	\$7.2	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	LBAND SATCOM	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	
02	OWCP	\$2.6	\$0.0	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$0.0	
02	SYSTEM INTEGRATION	\$1.7	\$0.0	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$0.0	
02	TDC	\$5.2	\$0.0	\$5.2	\$5.2	\$0.0	
02	WING LAN-AMC	\$3.0	\$0.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0	
02	IC3	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	
02	ICE	\$1.2	\$0.0	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.0	
02	AIT/MTMC	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
02	AUTOSTRAD 2000	\$2.8	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$0.0	
02	CFM	\$1.5	-\$0.7	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	ITV	\$4.5	-\$2.5	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	TOPPS	\$2.0	-\$1.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	WPS	\$1.0	-\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	Realigned to INFOSTRUCTURE
02	BDSS	\$0.1	-\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	Realigned to INFOSTRUCTURE
02	CMD PRESENTATIONS	\$0.2	-\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	Realigned to LAN
02	DEFEND THE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	\$0.7	-\$0.4	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.0	Realigned to Defend Comp Envr S/W
02	DEFEND NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	
02	GCCS	\$0.6	-\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	GTN 21	\$7.8	\$0.0	\$7.8	\$7.8	\$0.0	
02	INFOSTRUCTURE	\$0.1	\$6.0	\$6.1	\$6.1	\$0.0	INFOSTRUCTURE H/W consolidation
02	JMCG	\$1.0	-\$1.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	LAN - HQ	\$2.8	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$0.0	
02	TFMS	\$0.3	-\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	Realigned to INFOSTRUCTURE
02	VTC	\$0.1	-\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	Realigned to LAN
02	Software Development	\$119.3	\$5.3	\$124.6	\$124.6	\$0.0	
02	ACFP	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	
02	AIT/AMC	\$2.3	\$0.0	\$2.3	\$2.3	\$0.0	
02	C2IPS	\$8.0	-\$8.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	CAMPS	\$3.9	\$0.0	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$0.0	
02	COINS	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
02	G081	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
02	GATES	\$3.5	\$1.9	\$5.4	\$5.4	\$0.0	Server buys moved from FY01 to FY02
02	GDSS	\$4.6	\$8.1	\$12.7	\$12.7	\$0.0	Realigned to GDSS
02	LBAND SATCOM	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.0	
02	SYSTEM INTEGRATION	\$12.6	-\$0.2	\$12.4	\$12.4	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment

CAPITAL BUDGET EXECUTION
Component: United States Transportation Command
Activity Group: Transportation
Date: February 2002
(\$ in Millions)

FY	Approved Projects	FY02 PB Amount	Reprogs	Approved Proj Cost	Current Proj Cost	Asset/ Deficiency	Explanation
02	IC3	\$2.1	\$0.0	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$0.0	
02	ICE	\$4.1	\$0.0	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$0.0	
02	AUTOSTRAD 2000	\$1.8	\$0.0	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$0.0	
02	AIT/MTMC	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
02	CFM	\$6.7	\$0.0	\$6.7	\$6.7	\$0.0	
02	COE	\$0.7	-\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	CAB	\$1.2	\$0.0	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.0	
02	ITV	\$9.0	\$0.0	\$9.0	\$9.0	\$0.0	
02	TFMS - MTMC	\$4.0	\$0.0	\$4.0	\$4.0	\$0.0	
02	TOPPS	\$2.8	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$2.8	\$0.0	
02	WPS	\$4.5	\$2.2	\$6.7	\$6.7	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	ASN	\$2.9	-\$0.3	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	BDSS	\$2.0	\$0.1	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$0.0	Realigned from ABDM
02	DEFEND THE COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT	\$0.4	\$0.3	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	Realigned form Defend Comp Envr H/W
02	DEFEND NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.0	
02	DTR-CUSTOMS BORDER CLEARANCE	\$1.0	-\$0.3	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	GCCS	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.0	
02	GTN	\$10.7	-\$0.2	\$10.5	\$10.5	\$0.0	Realigned to INFOSTRUCTURE S/W
02	GTN 21	\$15.8	\$1.5	\$17.3	\$17.3	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	INFOSTRUCTURE	\$2.0	\$0.4	\$2.4	\$2.4	\$0.0	Realigned from GTN S/W
02	JMCG	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	LAN - HQ	\$0.3	-\$0.1	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	USTC directed adjustment
02	LOGBOOK	\$0.8	\$0.0	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.0	
02	SMS	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	
02	TFMS - HQ	\$3.4	\$0.0	\$3.4	\$3.4	\$0.0	
02	Minor Construction	\$10.4	\$0.0	\$10.4	\$10.4	\$0.0	
02	TOTAL FY	\$203.2	-\$3.0	\$200.2	\$200.2	\$0.0	