[DD Mmmmmm YYYY]

MEMORANDUM FOR SAE

SUBJECT: Submittal of Substantiating Information to Support the [INSERT NAME OF PROGRAM] Milestone B Section 4252 Certifications and Determination

 Title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 4252 prohibits granting Milestone (MS) B approval for a major defense acquisition program until the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) makes specified certifications and determinations. This requirement has been in law since January 6, 2006. Before approving MS B, the statute, as amended, requires the MDA to: certify compliance with paragraphs (1), (2) and determine in writing compliance with the sixteen provisions in paragraph (3) of 10 U.S.C. 4252(a). Paragraphs (4) and (5) are applicable to space systems and naval vessels, respectively, and are not applicable to the [INSERT NAME OF PROGRAM AND ACRONYM] program.

 The supporting rationale for your consideration of the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program is provided below. Part 1 addresses the Preliminary Design Review (PDR) and Post-PDR assessment, and Part 2 addresses the demonstrated technology. Part 3 addresses the sixteen additional determinations, including affordability, trade-offs, cost and schedule estimates, funding availability, market research, and analysis of alternatives, etcParts 4 and 5 are not applicable.

 The following documents support the Part 1 and 2 certifications and the Part 3 determinations for the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program. When reviewed together, adequate information is contained therein to support the certification of the program pursuant to the provisions of Section 4252(a) of Title 10, U.S.C. The documents are:

* 1. SAF/AQR Delegation of Authority - Attendance of Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs) and Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Principle Formal Technical Reviews, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 1 (Notional language: - classified)
	2. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] PDR Independent Technical Review (ITR) Report, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 2)
	3. Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) approved Capabilities Development Document (CDD), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 3)
	4. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Final Report, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 4)
	5. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Initial Capabilities Document (ICD), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 5)
	6. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Material Development Decision (MDD) Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 6)
	7. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) AoA Study Guidance, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 7)
	8. CAPE Assessment of the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] AoA, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 8)
	9. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Market Research Report, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 9)
	10. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Technology Readiness Assessment (TRA) Plan, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 10)
	11. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B TRA Report, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 11)
	12. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] AoA Study Plan, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 12)
	13. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] ICD Gap Traceability Memo, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE], (TAB 13)
	14. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Joint Staff Validation of ICD Gap Traceability AoA, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 14)
	15. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] SAE\_AFMC/CC CDD Requirements Certification, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 15)
	16. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS A ADM, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 16 )
	17. Fiscal Year 2017 (FYI 7) President's Budget (PB) vs Required Funding for [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM], approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 17)
	18. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Affordability Assessment, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 18)
	19. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Tailored Acquisition Strategy, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 19)
	20. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B Cost Analysis Requirements Description (CARD), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 20)
	21. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B Service Cost Position (SCP) Independent Cost Estimate (ICE), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 21)
	22. OSD Office of CAPE [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B SCP/ICE Assessment Memorandum, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 22)
	23. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B Full Funding Endorsement, approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 23)
	24. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Class Justification and Approval (J&A) for Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD), Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP), and Full Rate Production (FRP), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 24)
	25. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] AoA Endorsement Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum (JROCM) [INSERT NUMBER], approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 25)
	26. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] CDD approval [INSERT NUMBER], approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 26)
	27. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] MS B Life Cycle Sustainment Plan (LCSP), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 27)
	28. [INSERT NUMBER] Final Depot Source of Repair (DSOR) Decision on [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] (hardware), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 28)
	29. [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] DSOR [INSERT NUMBER] (software), approved by [INSERT RANK FIRST LAST, OFFICE SYMBOL], [INSERT DATE] (TAB 29)

 The substantiating information in these documents combine to provide supporting analyses of the three parts discussed below.

1. Section 4252 Para (a)(1) and (a)(2) of title 10, U.S.C. requires the assurance of the existence of the following certifications before granting MS B approval.

*Part 1.*  *Has received a preliminary design review and conducted a formal post-preliminary design review assessment, and certifies on the basis of such assessment that the program demonstrates a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development (ASD(R&E)) and Air Force)):*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Program conducted its PDR through [INSERT DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION DEMONSTRATING HIGH LIKELIHOOD OF ACCOMPLISHING MISSION] *(Notional language: a series of sub-system reviews culminating in a system-level review during Technology and Manufacturing Risk Reduction formal technical reviews to XXXX (TAB 1). As a result, an XXXX led independent technical review team participated in the XXX sub-system and system reviews and conducted a post-PDR assessment which included the preliminary design, associated risks, and open issues or action items. XXXX completed its preliminary design review assessment and concluded the design exhibited a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission and recommended the program is on track and ready to proceed to critical design (TAB 2). This assessment determined the design is projected to meet all JROC CDD Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) (TAB 3), the allocated baseline has been established and is under configuration control, and the program risks are manageable effort.)*

Based on the above, I recommend you certify the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program has held a PDR and conducted a formal post-PDR assessment, and certify on the basis of such assessment that the program demonstrates a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission.

*Part 2.*  *Further certifies that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment, as determined by the milestone decision authority on the basis of an independent review and technical risk assessment conducted under section 4272 of this title;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (ASD(R&E), DASD(DT&E), and Air Force)):*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] AoA Final Report (TAB 4) followed the strategy of satisfying the ICD requirements (TAB 5) by [INSERT DESCRIPTION VALIDATING TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION IN A RELEVANT ENVIRONMENT] *(Notional language: selecting high technology level components that accelerate schedule in accordance with the MDD ADM (TAB 6) and prioritize cost effectiveness in accordance with the CAPE AoA study guidance (TAB 7). The results were validated in the CAPE Assessment of the XXXX AoA (TAB 8). The technology level to satisfy requirements in the JROC approved CDD (TAB 3) was further confirmed through XXXX demonstrations of critical technologies described in the Market Research Report (TAB 9). XXX held a competitive source-selection to down-select the best value XX supplier for XXX from the multiple suppliers capable of meeting the USAF requirements with high technology level components. An Air Force Independent Review Team (IRT) conducted a TRA in accordance with the TRA Plan (TAB 10) and assessed all XXX critical technologies at Technology Readiness Level (TRL) 6 or greater. ASD (R&E) in consultation with the DASD (DT&E) concurred with the findings and approved the TRA Report (TAB 11).*

Based on the above, I recommend you certify that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment, as determined by the Milestone Decision Authority on the basis of an independent review and assessment by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineeringin consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation.

1. Part 3 addresses the remaining sixteen provisions of the certification required by section 4252 Paragraphs (a)(3)(A-P) of title 10, U.S.C., and provides the basis for the MDA's determinations for the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program.

*Provision (3)(A): the program is affordable when considering the ability of the Department of Defense to accomplish the program's mission using alternative systems;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Joint Staff; Director, Cost Assessment Program Evaluation (D,CAPE); and Air Force)):*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program office examined the affordability of replacement systems through an AoA for the program. The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] AoA Final Report (TAB 4) followed the strategy of satisfying the ICD requirements (TAB 5) by [INSERT AFFORDABILITY DESCRIPTION] *(Notional language: selecting high technology level components that accelerate schedule in accordance with the MDD ADM (TAB 6) and prioritize cost effectiveness in accordance with the CAPE AoA study guidance (TAB 7) and the XXX AoA Study Plan (TAB 12). The AoA was in response to the ICD gap traceability memorandum (TAB 13). The Joint Staff validated the ICD gap traceability to a potential XXX solution on August 17, 2012 (TAB 14). The AoA examined many potential components and spiral development opportunities in multiple configurations to find the most operational utility for program cost. The team plotted the operational utility against life cycle cost for the capability subsets of the most promising alternatives. The selected subsets provided the most increased operational capability at the least risk and life cycle cost. The cost differences between the capability subsets largely reflected the developmental status of the proposed technology since the operations and support costs were similar across the alternatives, and were not an important discriminant.*

*The CAPE concurred with the AoA recommendations in its assessment (TAB 8). The Air Force acquisition community, to include the XXX and the XXXX, certified the JROC approved CDD requirements are feasible (TAB 15). The Department of the Air Force provided a full funding endorsement for Increment 1 (TAB 23) in accordance with the MS B SCP (Tab 21) after finding the program affordable.)*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program is affordable when considering the ability of the Department of Defense to accomplish the program's mission using alternative systems.

*Provision (3)(B): appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total life-cycle cost;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (DCAPE and Air Force))*

 [INSERT TRADEOFF ANALYSIS] *(Notional language: On xxx, the F-15 EPAWSS AoA Guidance (TAB 7) was approved by CAPE authorizing the AoA Study Team to commence the AoA process. The XXX AoA Study Plan (TAB 12) was produced to help distinguish among alternatives and define a quantified cost effectiveness risk trade space. The XXX AoA strategy was based on satisfying the ICD requirements (TAB 5) by selecting high technology level components that accelerate schedule in accordance with the MDD ADM (TAB 6) and prioritize cost effectiveness in accordance with the CAPE guidance. The AoA examined many potential components and spiral development opportunities in multiple configurations to find the most operational utility for the cost. The team plotted the operational utility against life cycle cost for the capability subsets of the most promising alternatives. The selected subsets provided the most increased operational capability at the least risk and life cycle costs. The cost differences between the capability subsets largely reflected the developmental status of the proposed technology since the operations and support costs were similar across the alternatives, and were not an important discriminant. The Air Force reviewed the results of the AoA which recommended a new, integrated, non-developmental xxx system with xxxxx capabilities. The xxx AoA Final Report was validated by xxx on xxxx and forwarded to the Director, CAPE for their assessment. On xxx, CAPE concluded that the AoA complied with the approved study guidance and is sufficient to inform future acquisition decisions (TAB 8). The Air Force subsequently used the AoA results to develop the CDD. The JROC approved CDD codified moving the xx into Increment xx to improve program schedule, affordability, and risk outcomes (TAB 3). The Air Force acquisition community, to include the xx and the xxx, certified that the JROC approved CDD requirements are feasible (TAB 15). The xxx TRA report assessed all xxx critical technologies at TRL 6 or greater. ASD (R&E) subsequently concurred with the findings of the TRA and approved the TRA Report (TAB 11).*

*The FYI 7 PB (TAB 17) fully funds Increment x within the Future Years Defense Programs (FYDP), as directed by the MS A ADM which also assigned affordability goals for the program (TAB 16). For MS B, the Air Force conducted an affordability review and prepared an xxx Affordability Assessment (TAB 18), to support its position that xxx is affordable in the context of the total resources available. The Air Force provided a MS B full funding endorsement for Increment 1 (TAB 23) in accordance with the MS B SCP (TAB 21), after considering per unit costs and total acquisition costs and subsequently established affordability caps for the program codified in the MS B ADM.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility and performance have been made to ensure the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program is affordable when considering per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made.

[IF WAIVING] *(Notional language: Therefore, I recommend that you waive that “Appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the future years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made” and make a determination that the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives without such a waiver. Also, you are required by section 4252(d)(2)(a) to notify Congress within 30 days of your waiver approval.)*

*Provision (3)(C): reasonable cost and schedule estimates have been developed to execute, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, the product development and production plan under the program*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (D, CAPE, Air Force Cost Analysis Agency (AFCAA), and Air Force))*

The Air Force will accomplish the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] acquisition in accordance with [INSERT DESCRIPTION FOR REASONABLE COST/SCHEDULE] *(Notional language: the approved Tailored Acquisition Strategy (TAB 19), the signed MS A ADM (TAB 16), and direction in the MS B ADM. The program's approved CARD for MS B (TAB 20) is the source requirements document for the cost and schedule estimate. AFCAA's MS B SCP/ICE established the program's cost and schedule estimate for Increment X (TAB 21). The OSD CAPE assessed and concurred with the adequacy of the Service estimate (TAB 22).)*

 Taken together, these documents support the provision that reasonable cost and schedule estimates have been developed to execute, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, the product development and production plan under the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] Program.

*Provision (3)(D): the estimated procurement unit cost for the program and the estimated date for initial operational capability for the baseline description for the program (established under section 4214 of this title) do not exceed the program cost and fielding targets established under section 4271(a) of this title, or, if such estimated cost is higher than the program cost targets or if such estimated date is later than the fielding target, the program cost targets have been increased or the fielding target has been delayed by the milestone decision authority;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), D, CAPE, and Air Force))*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] [INSERT RATIONALE]

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the estimated procurement unit cost for the program and the estimated date for initial operational capability for the baseline description for the program (established under section 4214) do not exceed the program cost and fielding targets established under section 4271(a) of this title.

*Provision (3)(E):* *funding is expected to be available to execute the product development and production plan for the program, consistent with the estimates described in subparagraph (C) for the program;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), D, CAPE, and Air Force))*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] [INSERT AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING DESCRIPTION] *(Notional language: acquisition strategy is based on satisfying validated requirements by selecting high technology level components to accelerate schedule and prioritize cost effectiveness to stay within affordability and schedule caps. The program's approved CARD for MS B (TAB 20) is the source requirements document for cost estimates. The program's cost and schedule estimates are captured within the SCP (TAB 21). The OSD CAPE concurred with the adequacy of the Service estimate (TAB 22). The Department of the Air Force provided a full funding endorsement for Increment X (TAB 23) in accordance with the MS B SCP (Tab 21). The FYXX PB (TAB 17) fully funds Increment X within the FYDP.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine funding is available to execute the product development and production plan under the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program, through the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made, consistent with the estimates described in subparagraph (C) for the program.

*Provision (3)(F): appropriate market research has been conducted prior to technology development to reduce duplication of existing technology and products;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy and Air Force))*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] team [INSERT MARKET RESEARCH CONDUCTED AND RESULTS] *(Notional language:*  *has had continuous contact with the XX market and performed continuous market research from early 20XX through the release of the TMRR Request for Proposal (RFP) on XXX. Upon TMRRRFP release, the Contracting Officer directed the XXX team to cease all communication with industry due to the start of the XX-led competition to down-select an XX supplier. XXX competitive down-selection of the XX supplier was consistent with the approved XXXX Tailored Acquisition Strategy (TAB 19).*

*Formal market research began in XX when a Sources Sought Synopsis (SSS) was posted to the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website. The SSS presented the XX program objectives, summarized program requirements, and sought input specifically from XX suppliers able to meet those requirements. XX companies responded with some general information regarding their XX capabilities. In late 2nd Quarter CY20XX, the XX team researched existing internal Air Force data associated with replacing the current XXX System, along with the SSS information secured in the previous quarter and held discussions with other similar DoD program office teams (e.g., XXX).*

*This information enabled the team to develop a more thorough and detailed Request for Information (RFI) for an XX system that was posted to the FBO website in XX. The amended RFI invited both XX suppliers and potential integrators to participate in four-hour, one­-on-one sessions with the XX Team. XX suppliers responded with viable approaches for providing the required XX capability (XXXX AND XXXX), XX supplier (XXX) responded with a limited-scope alternative to the XX subsystem. XX was the only respondent with the interest and the capability of performing the role of integrating the XX capability onto the XXX aircraft. The XX team then conducted follow-on meetings and site visits with the XX suppliers in order to assess the maturity of the technology, to gauge manufacturing readiness, and to resolve open issues.*

*Finally, all XX suppliers and potential integrators were invited to demonstrate their critical technology system components at the XXX test facility. The above market research, documented in the XXX Market Research Report (TAB 9), along with constant market surveillance, confirmed that XX was the only company with the capability and willingness to accept responsibility for total system integrated performance for the XX sub-system integrated onto the xxx weapon system. This market research also confirmed that while xxx is the only potential integrator in the marketplace, there are multiple xx suppliers with systems capable of meeting the United States Air Force (USAF) requirement. A Class J&A, covering EMD, LRIP and FRP phases, was approved on xxx authorizing the use of Other than Full and Open Competition procedures for the acquisition and integration of a new xx system onto the*

*xxx aircraft (TAB 24).*

*xxx held a competitive down-selection, consistent with the approved acquisition strategy, to select the best value xx supplier for xx among the multiple suppliers capable of meeting the USAF requirement, ultimately selecting xx. The USAF will benefit from the firm competitive supplier pricing options for work scope and data rights obtained during this competition. The firm competitive supplier pricing is documented in the TMRR contract and will be carried forward on the EMD, LRIP and FRP contracts.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine appropriate market research has been conducted prior to technology development to reduce duplication of existing technology and products.

*Provision (3)(G):* *the Department of Defense has completed an analysis of alternatives with respect to the program;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (D, CAPE and Air Force))*

[INSERT DESCRIPTION ON DoD ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES] *(Notional language: On XXX, the XXX AoA Study Guidance (TAB 7) was approved by CAPE authorizing the AoA Study Team to commence the AoA process. The XXXX AoA Study Plan, dated XXX, (TAB 12) was then produced to help distinguish among alternatives and define a quantified cost effectiveness risk trade space. The AoA followed the strategy of selecting high technology level components that satisfy XXX ICD (TAB 5) requirements to minimize cost and schedule. The XXX AoA Final Report (TAB 4) recommended a new, integrated, non-developmental XXX system with XXXX capabilities. The XXX AoA Final Report was validated by ACC on XXXX, endorsed by the JROC on XXX (TAB 25), and forwarded to the Director, CAPE for their assessment. On XXXX CAPE concluded the AoA complied with the approved study guidance and is sufficient to inform future acquisition decisions (TAB 8). The Air Force subsequently used the AoA results to develop the CDD. The JROC approved CDD codified moving the FOTD/MACM into Increment X to improve program schedule, affordability, and risk outcomes (TAB 3).*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the Department of Defense has completed an analysis of alternatives with respect to the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program.

*Provision (3)(H): the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has accomplished its duties with respect to the program pursuant to section 181(b) of this title, including an analysis of the operational requirements for the program;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (Joint Staff and Air Force))*

Section 181(b) of title 10, USC, requires that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) shall:

1. assist the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

(A) in identifying, assessing, and approving joint military requirements (including existing systems and equipment) to meet the national military strategy;

(B) in identifying the core mission area associated with each such requirement;

(C) in ensuring the consideration of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives for joint military requirements in consultation with advisors specified in subsection (d);

(2) assist the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in establishing and assigning priority levels for joint military requirements;

(3) assist the Chairman in consultation with the USD(C), USD(AT&L), and D, CAPE, in reviewing the estimated level of resources required in the fulfillment of each joint military requirement and ensuring that such resource level is consistent with the level of priority assigned to such requirement;

(4) assist acquisition officials in identifying alternatives to any acquisition program that meet joint military requirements for the purpose of section 2366(a)(b), section 2366(a)(1), and section 2433(e)(2) of this title; and

(5) assist the Chairman, in consultation with the commanders of the combatant commands and the USD(AT&L), in establishing an objective for the overall period of time within which an initial operational capability should be delivered to meet each joint military requirement.

[INSERT DESCRIPTION ON SECTION 181(b) DUTIES] *(Notional language: XXX remains a substantial portion of our tactical air forces essential to filling Operational Plan (OPLAN) requirements. xxx constitute a minority of xxxx aircraft; therefore, the xxx fleet will continue to fulfill a significant role in our force structure and xxx is critical to xxx survivability and lethality.*

*The xxx program office performed the xxxx AoA in response to ICD gap analysis (TAB 13). The Joint Staff had validated the ICD gap traceability to a potential xxx solution on xxxx (TAB 14). The xxx AoA was endorsed by the JROC on xxxx (TAB 25) and forwarded to the Director, CAPE for their assessment. On xxx the CAPE concluded that the AoA complied with the approved study guidance and is sufficient to inform future acquisition decisions (TAB 8). The results of the approved AoA were used to develop the xxx CDD (TAB 3). The CDD ratified the warfighter operational view for the improved xxxx capability xxx brings to the xxxx. The CDD defines the target IOC date for Increment x for the xxx as FY20xx (xx aircraft = 1 squadron modified) and for the xxx as FY20xx (xx aircraft = 1 squadron modified). The CDD defines Full Operational Capability (FOC) as all aircraft modified, all necessary personnel trained, and all required support equipment and spares in place.*

*The JROC reviewed and approved the xxx CDD and validated the KPPs via JROCM xxxx on xxx (TAB 26), noting that the program must return to the JROC for revalidation if the program were to exceed specified and documented thresholds.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the JROC has accomplished its duties with respect to the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program pursuant to section 181(b) of title 10, including an analysis of the operational requirements for the program.

*Provision (3)(I):*  *life-cycle sustainment planning, including corrosion prevention and mitigation planning, has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs throughout development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (ASD(Logistics and Materiel Readiness) (L&MR) (ASD(L&MR), and AT&L Corrosion Office))*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] LCSP for MS B provides a framework for overall sustainment of the program throughout its life-cycle (TAB 27). [INSERT DESCRIPTION ON LIFECYCLE PLANNING] *(Notional language: The LCSP describes the integration of product support development processes into the XXX acquisition strategy and systems engineering processes. The LCSP documents the product support strategy and associated metrics. It's major focus areas include; sustainment and maintenance concepts; product support performance; roles, responsibilities and management approach associated with acquisition, product support, availability and sustainment execution; and operating and support (O&S) costs. The LCSP is in accordance with the program description in the CARD and the sustainment cost estimates from development through program disposal are captured*

*in the MS B SCP/ICE (TAB 22).*

 *The XXX Corrosion Prevention and Control Plan (CPCP) assigns*

*responsibilities, and prescribes procedures for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion as stipulated under Section 2228 of Title 10, U.S.C., and Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 5000.67. The CPCP is identified in the LCSP and is being used jointly by program office and contractor personnel to ensure the system can operate in all the required environments with the minimum corrosion impact to the XXX and its life cycle costs. The*

*XXX corrosion prevention program identifies the materials, processes, techniques and management tasks required to integrate effective corrosion prevention and control throughout all phases of the XXX program. Corrosion control is being implemented by ensuring system support and life-cycle affordability considerations are addressed and trade-offs are considered while adhering to sound materiel selection practices, finish requirements, and corrosion requirements during the development and production of the XXX program.*

*The XXX program conducted an Independent Logistics Assessment (ILA) for MS B to assess the program's overall product support health (TAB 27, Annex 4). The assessment conditionally certified the program for MS B and found that XXX product support planning effectively addressed all 12 Integrated Product Support elements within the program and the added items for "Product Support Budget and Funding" and "Environmental Safety and Occupational Health." This assessment is based on an overall very strong XXX product support program with two concerns: 1) Acquisition of technical data to support potential organic Product Support Integration (PSI) and the government's intent to "move to Own the Technical Baseline"; and 2) concern over lack of integration planning of concurrent modifications. The program is working to define the PSI roles responsibilities over the life cycle for XXX and multiple on-going concurrent XXX modifications with respect to owning the technical baseline to ensure strategies align and are supported by contractual data and data rights requirements. The XXX division and the XXX program were working to accomplish the necessary integration between the multiple concurrent modifications prior to the ILA. Subsequently, the XXX Division established an integration office to institutionalize integration planning for the multiple concurrent modifications. The program has comprehensive plans in place to address the findings which should result in a green rating by MS-C.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine life-cycle sustainment planning, including corrosion prevention and mitigation planning, has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs throughout development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated.

*Provision (3)(J): an estimate has been made of the requirements for core logistics capabilities and the associated sustaining workloads required to support such requirements;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (ASD(L&MR))*

In order for the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] to comply with the DoDI 5000.02 and the requirements set forth in 10, U.S.C., Section 2464, the [INSERT DESCRIPTION ON LOGISTICS REQUIREMENTS] *(Notional language: HQ AFMC/A4DC Source of Repair Team performed a Source of Repair Analysis (SORA) of xxx in support of early depot planning activities. These results are documented in the DSOR memos # xxx dated xxx and xxx (TABs 28 and 29) which identified xxx as driving a Core capability requirement and designated the xxxx to provide organic depot support for hardware and software. The results of the DSOR are also documented in the program's LCSP (TAB 27) prepared for MS B. The xxx is replacing the existing TEWS currently being repaired at xxx. The existing depot workload supporting TEWS will be replaced by the depot workload supporting xxx. The workload analysis estimates the xxx program will generate sustaining depot peacetime repair hours of xxx hours per year for hardware maintenance and xxx hours per year for software maintenance.*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine an estimate has been made of the requirements for core logistics capabilities and the associated sustaining workloads required to support such requirements.

*Provision (3)(K): there is a plan to mitigate and account for any costs in connection with any anticipated de-certification of cryptographic systems and components during the production and procurement of the major defense acquisition program to be acquired;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (DoD Chief Information Officer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, (Tactical Warfare Systems) (DASD(TWS)), and Air Force))*

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program does not anticipate de-certification actions of cryptographic systems and components during the production and procurement of the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] system, therefore, there will be no connected costs for which to mitigate or account. However, if cryptographic decertification turns out to be required, the program office will work to add the associated costs to the xxx program cost estimate. [TAILOR STATEMENT BASED ON CERTIFICATION STATUS]*:*

Based on the above, I recommend you determine there is a plan to mitigate and account for any costs in connection with any anticipated de-certification of cryptographic systems and components during the production and procurement of the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program.

*Provision (3)(L): the program complies with all relevant policies, regulations, and directives of the Department of Defense;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT] *(Notional language: (D, ARA, DASD (TWS), and Air Force))*

Preparations for the MS B decision have included verifying the completion of the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements enumerated in DoDI.5000.85, “Major Capability Acquisition”, November 4, 2021. Each office endorsing this memorandum confirms that the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program complies with the policies, regulations, and directives under its cognizance. All applicable statutory and regulatory required documentation is complete and approved.

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program complies with the relevant policies, regulations, and directives of the Department of Defense.

*Provision (3)(M): the Secretary of the military department concerned and the Chief of the armed force concerned concur in the trade-offs made in accordance with subparagraph (B)*

Basis for determination (Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff, United States Air Force)

This provision is satisfied by the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force determination provided under separate cover.

*Provision (3)(N): the requirements of section 4402(e) of this title are met;*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT)

[INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM and APPLICABLE BACKGROUND INFO]

Based on the above, I recommend you determine the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program meets the requirements of section 4402(2) of this title.

*Provision (3)(O):*  *appropriate actions have been taken to negotiate and enter into a contract or contract options for the technical data required to support the program; and*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT])

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] [INSERT DESCRIPTION ON CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS]

Based on the above, I recommend you determine [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] took appropriate actions to negotiate their contracts.

*Provision (3)(P):  has approved the life cycle sustainment plan required under section 4324(b) of this title*

Basis for determination ([INSERT ACTIVITY(IES) PROVIDING INPUT])

The [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] [INSERT DESCRIPTION ON LIFE CYCLE SUSTAINMENT PLAN]

Based on the above, I recommend you determine [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] has an approved life cycle sustainment plan required under section 4324(b) of this title

 Overall Assessment: Based on the information referenced and provided above, and the input of the staff noted for each provision, I recommend you certify the [INSERT PROGRAM ACRONYM] program pursuant to section 4252 of title 10, U.S.C. [IF WAIVING A PROVISION] *(Notional language: waiving the following provisions:*

* *Section 4252(a)(3)(B), which states that, “Appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the future years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made;” and make a determination that the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives without such a waiver.*
* *Section 4252(a)(3)(D), which states that, “Funding is available to execute the product development and production plan under the program, through the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made, consistent with the estimates described in subparagraph (3)(C) for the program;” and make a determination that the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives without such a waiver.*
* *Section 4252(a)(3)(L), which states that, “The Secretary of the military department concerned and the Chief of the armed force concerned concur in the trade-offs made in accordance with subparagraph (3)(B):” and make a determination that the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives without such a waiver.*

*You are required by section 4252(d)(2)(A) to notify Congress within 30 days of your waiver approval, and by section 4252(d)(2)(B) to review the program no less often than annually until the certification components covered by the waivers have been satisfied.*

*These provisions in the certification requirement may and should be waived because, without such waivers, the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives. Specifically, the xxx program would not be able to: provide a new family of modernized GPS receivers that will deliver significantly improved capability to counter current and emerging PNT threats and enable military operations in a xxx environment where current legacy receiver performance would be compromised.)*

[INSERT FIRST MIDDLE LAST, RANK, USAF]

Program Executive Officer, [INSERT PROGRAM]

Tabs:

1. Attendance of Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs) and Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Principle Formal Technical Reviews, [INSERT DATE]
2. PDR Independent Technical Review (ITR) Report, [INSERT DATE]
3. Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) approved Capabilities Development Document (CDD), [INSERT DATE]
4. Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Final Report, [INSERT DATE]
5. Initial Capabilities Document (ICD), [INSERT DATE]
6. Material Development Decision (MDD) Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM), [INSERT DATE]
7. Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) AoA Study Guidance, [INSERT DATE]
8. CAPE Assessment of the AoA, [INSERT DATE]
9. Market Research Report, [INSERT DATE]
10. Technology Readiness Assessment (TRA) Plan, [INSERT DATE]
11. MS B TRA Report, [INSERT DATE]
12. AoA Study Plan, [INSERT DATE]
13. ICD Gap Traceability Memo, [INSERT DATE]
14. Joint Staff Validation of ICD Gap Traceability AoA, [INSERT DATE]
15. SAE\_AFMC/CC CDD Requirements Certification, [INSERT DATE]
16. MS A ADM, [INSERT DATE]
17. Fiscal Year 2017 (FYI 7) President's Budget (PB) vs Required Funding, [INSERT DATE]
18. Affordability Assessment, [INSERT DATE]
19. Tailored Acquisition Strategy, [INSERT DATE]
20. MS B Cost Analysis Requirements Description (CARD), [INSERT DATE]
21. MS B Service Cost Position (SCP) Independent Cost Estimate (ICE), [INSERT DATE]
22. MS B SCP/ICE Assessment Memorandum, [INSERT DATE]
23. MS B Full Funding Endorsement, [INSERT DATE]
24. Class Justification and Approval (J&A) for Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD), Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP), and Full Rate Production (FRP), [INSERT DATE]
25. AoA Endorsement Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum (JROCM) [INSERT NUMBER], [INSERT DATE]
26. CDD approval [INSERT NUMBER], [INSERT DATE]
27. MS B Life Cycle Sustainment Plan (LCSP), [INSERT DATE]
28. [INSERT NUMBER] Final Depot Source of Repair (DSOR) Decision (hardware), [INSERT DATE]
29. DSOR [INSERT NUMBER] (software), [INSERT DATE]
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