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PREFACE

This Guidebook is one in a series of AF/A5R developed guides describing Air Force Operational Capability Requirements Development and AF implementation of the JCIDS process.

There are no restrictions on release or distribution of this guidebook.

This Guidebook is a “how to” guide for use by all stakeholders participating in the AF requirements process -- and in some cases it includes the answer to the questions “why do we have to do it that way”, “where is that written” and “where do we find additional information.”

NOTE: Although the AF/A5R Requirements Development Guidebooks are generally non-directive in nature, they represent official guidance and procedures developed to ensure compliance with and implementation of overarching JCIDS and Acquisition policies. It is AF Policy (per AF/A5R direction and authority under HAF Mission Directive 1-56) that, to the maximum extent practical, AF Sponsors are expected to comply with the guidance and procedures described in the A5R Guidebooks.

If you have questions regarding specific information in the guidebook(s), or if you have suggestions for improvements, please contact the OPR:

OPR: Mr. Jim “Trip” Weyer, james.e.weyer.civ@mail.mil, 703-695-6244 (DSN 225)

AF/A5RP Portal Page. Additional guidance and information, to supplement this Guidebook is located on the AF Portal:

- To access the ASRP Requirements Portal Page: go to https://www.my.af.mil
- Navigate to “Organizations A-Z”, then type in “A5RP Requirements”
## Change Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Summary</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Release: Revised the Guidebook Volumes to align policy and guidance under new Vol 1, as the “Capstone Guidebook” and separate the procedural guidance and other best practices in subsequent guidebook volumes and handbooks</td>
<td>3 Oct 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vol 1, Policy and Guidelines (revised previous Vol 1, refined all policy info)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vol 2, Urgent Needs (major updates, revised the transition review portion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vol 3, JCIDS Deliberate Process (split out from Vol 1, reorganized layout)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vol 4, Modification Proposals (split out from Vol 1, minor edits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admin changes to reflect AF/A5RP (without the dash)</td>
<td>20 Mar 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: All other (non-admin) edits made with “track changes” turned on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edits to distinguish between AF/A5RP and CDWG (which is now under the “AFWIC” as a separate organization apart from A5R), including updates to narrative and process overview charts and graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporates edits suggested by AF/A3TI (Operational Training Integration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edits to clarify CSAF as the decision authority document associate with any program designated as a Major Defense Acquisition Program “MDAP” (to make the distinction for MDAP, vice ACAT I, per the statutory direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admin changes to reflect the new AF/A5 and AF/A8</td>
<td>31 Oct 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes to reflect CSAF-approved Requirements Decision Authority construct</td>
<td>Version 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporates guidance from the new 31 Aug 18 JCIDS Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin updates and errata changes (red line)</td>
<td>2 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ver 3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION to JCIDS DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENT ................................................................. 6

Figure 1.1 AF Implementation of the JCIDS Document Development Process -- Overview ....................... 6

1.1. JCIDS Document Descriptions. ................................................................................................................. 7

SECTION 2. AF PROCEDURES for JCIDS DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENT ............................................................. 9

PHASE 1 – Capability Based Assessment (CBA) .......................................................................................... 9

Figure 2.1 CBA Process -- Overview ........................................................................................................... 9

2.1. Capabilities Based Assessment (CBA) or Similar Study. ........................................................................ 9

2.1.1. Step 1) Study Initiation. ....................................................................................................................... 10

2.1.2. Step 2) Study Planning. ........................................................................................................................ 12

2.1.3. Step 3) CBA/Study Activity and Final Report. ..................................................................................... 14

PHASE 2 – ICD (Materiel Solutions or combination of Materiel and Non-Materiel) .................................... 16

2.2. Initial Capabilities Document (ICD). ........................................................................................................ 16

PHASE 3 – AoA (ANALYSIS OF MATERIEL ALTERNATIVES)....................................................................... 19

Figure 2.3 AoA Process -- Overview ........................................................................................................... 19

2.3. Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Documents - Overview. ......................................................................... 19

2.3.1. Step 1) AoA Study Initiation/Guidance. ............................................................................................... 20

2.3.2. Step 2) AoA Study Plan: ....................................................................................................................... 22

2.3.3. Step 3) AoA Activity and AoA Final Report: ......................................................................................... 23

PHASE 4 – Capability Development Documents (CDD and Variants)........................................................ 26

2.4. Draft (Preliminary) Capability Development Document ......................................................................... 26

2.5. Capability Development Document (CDD) and CDD Annex ................................................................ 29

2.6. CDD UPDATE/REVALIDATION .............................................................................................................. 32

VARIATIONS FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS ................................................................................................. 33

2.7. Information Systems Variants (IS-ICD and IS-CDD). .............................................................................. 33

Figure 2.7 IT Box Model -- Overview ........................................................................................................... 33
DCR Development (for “NON-MATERIEL” and NON-DEVELOPMENTAL MATERIEL Solutions) ...................... 37

2.8. DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation (DCR) - Overview. ................................................................. 37

2.8.1. Joint DCR. ........................................................................................................................................... 37

2.8.2. AF-only DCR. .................................................................................................................................... 39

SECTION 3. GENERAL PROCEDURES for ALL JCIDS DOCUMENTS (except CBA, AoA) ......................... 42

Figure 3.1. AF Process for Development of JCIDS Documents (i.e., all variants of ICD, DCR and CDD) ...... 42

3.1. Strategy Development and HPT Preparation [led by the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor]. ....................... 43

3.2. Requirements Strategy Review (RSR) [decision by the AFGK]. ......................................................... 44

3.3. High Performance Team (HPT) [led by the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor]. .......................................... 45

3.4. Initial Document Review [by AFGK]. ..................................................................................................... 46

3.5. Formal JCIDS Staffing [in IRSS and KM/DS]. ....................................................................................... 47

3.6. Comment Resolution [led by the Sponsor]. ......................................................................................... 48

3.7. MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor Internal Approval/Endorsement ............................................................ 49

3.8 Validation and Approval [AF and Joint level]. ...................................................................................... 49

APPENDIX 1 - GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION ............................... 51
SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION to JCIDS DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Figure 1.1 AF Implementation of the JCIDS Document Development Process -- Overview

The AF Implementation of JCIDS Process is run by AF/A5R
CDC Process is run by the “AFWIC” (AF/A5A)

Phase 1 (CBA/Study). May be “top-down” directed (via CDC process) or “bottom up” initiated (by MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor). Begins with CDWG approval of a Study Initiation Notice, followed by a Study Plan. Concludes with CDC review of the CBA/Study Final Report and selection of a course of action (COA).

Phase 2 (DCR or ICD). Following CDC review of the CBA/study results and COA, the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor prepares for a Requirements Strategy Review (RSR) prior to development of an appropriate JCIDS document, as directed (e.g. ICD or DCR). See Section 3.2 for details on the RSR.

Phase 3 (AoA). Following approval and validation of an ICD (or approval to use a non-AF ICD), the process continues with MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor development of draft AoA Study Guidance followed by an AoA Study Plan. All programs must go to the MDD (Acquisition) decision point for approval to actually begin an AoA. This phase concludes with CDC review of the AoA Final Report and selection of a course of action.

Phase 4 (CDD/CPD). Following CDC review of the AoA Final Report (and COA selection), the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor prepares for an RSR prior to development of the appropriate JCIDS document (e.g. Draft CDD for Milestone A, or CDD/CPD Annex for Milestone B/C). See Section 3.2.

• NOTE: After fielding and during Operations and Sustainment, programs may need to conduct modifications to upgrade fielded systems or to address urgent operational needs. See ASR Guidebook Volume 4 for more detail on documentation for Modification Proposals and see ASR Guidebook Volume 2 for more info on Urgent Operational Needs (UONs)
1.1. **JCIDS Document Descriptions.** Listed below is a more detailed summary of the different documents used to articulate capability requirements and associated gaps and to submit recommendations to the JCIDS Process for review and validation.

- **NOTE:** Format and content for JCIDS Documents (i.e., ICD, Draft CDD, CDD, CDD Annex DCR, and IS-ICD/CDD) are described in the JCIDS Manual. Format and content for all CBA/study and AoA documents (not JCIDS documents in the true sense) are described in the AF/A5R-OAS Handbooks.

- **NOTE:** For JCIDS documents designated by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper as “JCB Interest” or “JROC Interest”, the document must strictly comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. For JCIDS documents designated as “Joint Information”, Sponsors should comply with JCIDS format to the max extent practical, but strict compliance is not necessary or mandatory. The focus should be to make sure the documents capture the appropriate information at the necessary level of detail to support decision making and stakeholder coordination. Refer to Section 3 for more detail.

**Capabilities Based Assessment (CBA) or similar study.** The CBA/study is an assessment of assigned roles, missions, functions and operations to identify capability requirements, associated gaps and proposed materiel and/or non-materiel solutions. The CBA/study begins with a Study Initiation Notice, followed by Study Guidance and an approved CBA Study Plan and concludes when the results of the CBA/study are captured in the CBA/study Final Report (or study termination notice). The results of the CBA/study are used to inform decisions about an appropriate path forward to adequately address the capability requirements and potentially reduce or eliminate the associated gaps or accept the risk of doing nothing.

- **NOTE:** All AF-Sponsored CBA/Study efforts are subject to review and approval via the Capability Development Council (CDC) process, as described in section 2 of this Guidebook.

**DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation (DCR).** A DCR is used to recommend mitigating identified capability gaps with a “non-materiel” approach, by recommending changes in one or more of the DOTmLPF-P areas. A DCR may be used to propose non-materiel capability solutions as an alternative to or in conjunction with materiel solutions. A DCR may be initiated during any phase of the JCIDS or acquisition process.

**Initial Capabilities Document (ICD).** An ICD specifies capability requirements and associated gaps which represent unacceptable operational risk if left unmitigated. The ICD is also used to recommend mitigating identified gaps (in part or in whole) with materiel solutions, non-materiel solutions or some combination of both. A validated ICD (along with an approved AoA Study Plan) is an entrance criterion for the Materiel Development Decision (MDD) and entry into the Materiel Solution Analysis Phase of acquisition.

**Analysis of Alternatives (AoA).** The AoA is an analytical comparison of the operational effectiveness, suitability, risk, and life cycle cost of potential alternatives under consideration to satisfy the validated capability needs (usually stipulated in an approved ICD). The AoA begins with approved Study Guidance and AoA Study Plan, followed by a Materiel Development Decision (MDD) to enter into the Materiel Solution phase of acquisition to execute the AoA, which culminates with the production of the AoA Final Report.

- **NOTE:** This Guidebook contains procedures and content guidance for AoAs (Section 2.4), which at the date of publication of this Guidebook are in line with procedures outlined in DoDI 5000.02 and other acquisition instructions and regulations; however, AF/A5A oversees the conduct of AoAs, and AoA representatives should consult with AF/A5A in order to ensure they are following the most current procedures and CDC expectations.

**Draft (i.e. Preliminary) Capability Development Document (“Draft CDD” or “Draft CDD Annex, as appropriate).** A Draft CDD outlines the minimum essential information for technology maturation and preliminary design for development of a materiel solution or capability increment. A Draft CDD is an
entrance criterion for development of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction (TMRR) phase of acquisition and for the Milestone A acquisition decision.

- **NOTE:** A “Draft CDD” is a stand alone document JCIDS document limited in scope/content to support the Milestone A decision and TMRR Phase; the “Draft CDD” should not be confused with a “draft version” of the full CDD required later in the JCIDS process.

- **NOTE:** A “Draft CDD Annex” may be developed for an incremental program as a precursor to a CDD Annex to a previously-validated CDD. This strategy might be appropriate to support a Milestone A decision for entry into the TMRR phase of activity for a follow-on increment, block upgrade or other subsequent development/production based on a previously validated CDD.

- **NOTE:** Alternative abbreviations for the Draft CDD, such as “dCDD” are not used by JCIDS and may result in unnecessary confusion.

- The Draft CDD should, wherever possible, describe a Minimum Viable Product (MVP) to ensure RFPs and other documents are clear on the capability needed.

**Capability Development Document (CDD) and CDD Annex.** A CDD specifies the capability development performance attributes (KPPs, KSAs, and APAs) and other related information necessary to support the development of one or more increments of a materiel capability solution. A validated CDD is an entrance criterion necessary for the Development RFP release point and for the Milestone B acquisition decision for entry into the Engineering Manufacturing and Development (EMD) Phase of acquisition.
SECTION 2. AF PROCEDURES for JCIDS DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENT

PHASE 1 – Capability Based Assessment (CBA)

Figure 2.1 CBA Process -- Overview

2.1. Capabilities Based Assessment (CBA) or Similar Study. The CBA is an assessment of assigned roles, missions, functions and operations to identify capability requirements, associated gaps and proposed materiel and/or non-materiel solutions to reduce or mitigate gaps.

Purpose: The purpose of the CBA is to inform decisions about an appropriate path forward to address the capability requirements and reduce or eliminate any associated gaps. Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with all key stakeholders to fully define the scope of the operational deficiency.

- **NOTE:** For further detail, refer to the A5R-OAS CBA Handbook, available on the A5RP Portal Page.

Study Team: Ideally, core membership for a CBA Study Team will be the appropriate AF/A5A Functional Integration Division Lead, and include representatives from the appropriate mission area, Lead Command, Operating/Implementing Command(s), HAF Division(s), AFMC office of SDP&E, representatives from other agencies/services, combatant commands, and others as needed.
• **NOTE:** Sponsors must use Requirements Manager Certification Training (RMCT) certified requirements managers for the CBA/study and writing the Final Report. To comply with JCIDS guidance, Study Leads for CBA or any studies likely to result in development of JCIDS documents must be at least RMCT Level B (i.e. RQM 110 course). Study Sponsor/Lead should also complete CBA/study training provided by ASR-OAS, as well as the DAU online continuous learning module, CLR 250 Capabilities Based Assessment.

  o **NOTE:** Study Team planning, study activity and CBA/study document development (study initiation, study plan, and final report) must include direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS and AF/ASA. Study leads must be familiar with the ASR-OAS CBA Handbook as it represents the approved AF guidance and best practices for conducting the CBA/study.

• **NOTE:** All studies involving nuclear deterrence capabilities or missions must include direct assistance from the AF Nuclear Red Team (AFNRT). Due to the sensitive nature and limited distribution of AFNRT findings, study leads need to utilize an AFNRT advisor/consultant to inform the study. OPR is the AF Nuclear Weapons Center (AFNWC.NT.Workflow@us.af.mil).

• **NOTE:** MAJCOM/Agency POCs need to notify AF/A5RP before initiation or participation in any study or analysis activities, regardless of AF or non-AF sponsorship/leadership. Provide AF/A5RP with courtesy copies of any study initiation, guidance, study plan, and final report for any non-AF studies and analyses in which AF MAJCOM/Agency members are participating.

**Studies Repository.** The Joint Staff maintains a studies repository to facilitate visibility into, and potential reuse of studies related to capability requirements and the generation of capability requirement documents.

• **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS direction, organizations conducting studies must provide results of any studies or analyses intended to support capability requirement documents to the studies repository. Refer to the JCIDS Manual for further detail.

The CBA/study process consists of three major steps (and associated documentation produced by the Sponsor) as described below:

2.1.1. **Step 1) Study Initiation.**

**Study Initiation Notice.** To comply with JCIDS guidance, regarding any study (e.g. CBA or similar) intended for or likely to drive submission of new capability requirements in the JCIDS process, Sponsors (working through the AF/A5R SME) must provide a Study Initiation Notice via IRSS for review and approval by the CDWG (or higher), followed by submission to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper.

• **NOTE:** If a CBA (or other study) is in response to top down direction (e.g. Joint Staff, JCB/JROC, OSD, or CDWG/CDC), the designated Lead Command/Sponsor is still required to develop a Study Initiation Notice and submit it for CDWG (or higher) approval (as described in the following section) prior to proceeding with development of the CBA Study Plan or formal CBA activity.

**Purpose:** The main purpose of a Study Initiation Notice is to inform the AF and Joint community, allow important stakeholders to participate, and to ensure the CBA/study informs important capability development decisions. To improve the quality of CBAs and other similar capability studies — and to manage the expectations for what the study will and will not answer—the following information should be addressed in the Study Initiation Notice.

**Format/Content.** The Study Initiation Notice is a memo, signed by the Sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency Director of Requirements (or designated representative). The notional length of a Study Initiation Notice is two to three pages, but it may be more or less depending upon the complexity of the issue.
1. Summary/Overview

- Per JCIDS, the Study Initiation Notice must contain the following elements:
  - Title of study, executive summary/purpose
  - Participating organizations and intended completion date
  - Study Sponsor/Lead POC contact information
  - Tier 1-3 JCAs, or lowest JCA tier related to primary focus of study
  - AF use only: Linkage to Family of Concepts (FoC), Design Blueprint (DB) and Capability Development Guidance (CDG)

2. Justification -- Answer the question - Why it is important to conduct this CBA/study now?

- Discuss why this specific mission area or bounded set of activities needs to be assessed at this time. Reference core function support plan(s), AF/A9 risk assessments, or other authoritative document (AF/CC signed flight plan, presidential/congressional direction, Air Force Strategic Master Plan, etc.). If this CBA/study does not link to documented sources, then provide a discussion of why this effort benefits the Air Force. The AF is short of analytic resources and the intent is to show why this is a 3-star appropriate piece of work that needs to be done now.

- Identify key dependencies with other efforts. Does/will other work answer some of the key questions? Does previous analysis scope out some aspects of the problem? Will this effort in turn defer part of the problem to subsequent studies that this effort will feed?

- Identify the expected next step(s), i.e. key decisions the CBA/study is intended to support.

3. Scope -- Answer the question - What is the proposed scope of the CBA/study?

- Identify what specific mission area or bounded set of activities will be addressed by the assessment and/or analysis, and why that scope is appropriate.

- Identify the timeframe(s) (near, mid, or far) in which this capability is anticipated to deliver, and if known, the operational scenarios and missions that will be examined.

- Identify the questions to be answered by the assessments and/or analysis, and what major questions will remain after this study is completed. These are very important pieces of the Study Initiation Notice and the questions should link back to the decision(s) identified above: what will the CBA/study answer that will inform those decisions?

4. Study Execution

- Provide a short synopsis (1-2 paragraphs) of the analytic approach/methodology. Literature search? Statistical analysis of past data? Campaign modeling? Basic physics first principles? SME voting? Major data sources: actual data, DIA projections, data call from industry, etc.? Typically there will be several approaches and data sources.

- Expected schedule (when will it start, when is it expected to be finished), and what resources (money and manpower) will be used to conduct the assessments and/or analysis.

- Identify key precursor products: Joint Concepts, JCAs related to primary focus of study, Service CONOPS, FoC, DB, baseline architectures, threats and how they affect the schedule / resources needed.

- Which organizations are proposed to be on the core team executing the CBA/study?
• Identify any key challenges to meeting the timeline. This is especially true if the CDWG, SDP&E, or CDC structure may be able to facilitate getting past the challenge.

• Identify the anticipated classification level of the assessment/analysis and study report

Approval of Study Initiation Notice and Issuance of Study Guidance (as required). Not less than 14 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the Study Initiation Notice (memo) and supporting materials (via IRSS). Sponsors obtain CDWG (or higher) approval prior to proceeding with development of a CBA Study Plan. The approval decision and associated actions/guidance related to the study are documented in writing (e.g. capability decision memo, meeting minutes, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

• NOTE: AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS) provides a review/assessment of the Study Initiation Notice and this review must be conducted prior to CDWG review/approval.

Timelines: Sponsors provide all materials, no later than 14-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with ASR-OAS (7 days, minimum), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting).

Approval Authority. The CDWG is the review/approval authority for Study Initiation Notice. The CDWG Co-Chairs may elect to elevate the level of approval (e.g. AF/A5A, AF/A5, or CDC as appropriate).

• NOTE: Approval includes both the AF decision and direction/guidance regarding 1) approval of the proposed study initiation and 2) approval to forward the Study Initiation Notice to Joint Staff (for dissemination via KM/DS), or to other organizations as applicable.

Approval Criteria. In order to substantiate follow-on JCIDS requirements development activities, the Study Initiation Notice needs to address the following issues:

• Study Sponsor/Lead must be certified to at least RMCT Level B, i.e. the RQM 110 course.

• Problem statement, purpose, scope and schedule are clear and appropriate

• Timeframe and Operational Context to be used are consistent with strategy and CFSP

• Key Stakeholders are identified and represent the correct set of skills for the study

• AF/A5R-OAS POC and A5R SME are identified for direct support to the Study Team

Study Termination Notice. If the CBA/study is terminated prior to providing any significant results, the Sponsor (working through the AF/A5R SME) must provide a Study Termination Notice (via IRSS) for review by the CDWG, followed by submission to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper. Include the following information in the Study Termination Notice:

• Include the date and title of study from the original Study Initiation Notice.

• Purpose/reason for cancellation, and Sponsor POC contact info.

2.1.2. Step 2) Study Planning.

CBA Study Plan. A CBA Study Plan is developed to detail the approach to be followed in conducting the CBA/study. Additional guidance is available in the A5R-OAS CBA Handbook.
• **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS guidance, Sponsors must use RMCT certified requirements managers for development of the CBA Study Plan. Study Leads for CBA or similar studies likely to result in development of JCIDS documents must be certified at least RMCT Level B (i.e. RQM 110 course).

• **NOTE:** Sponsors and Study Teams conduct CBA planning and develop the CBA Study Plan with direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS.

**Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of the CBA Study Plan.** A CDWG (or higher) approved Study Initiation Notice is required prior to initiating development of the CBA Study Plan.

• **NOTE:** If a CBA (or other study) is in response to top down direction (e.g. Joint Staff, JCB/JROC, OSD, or CDWG/CDC), the designated Lead Command/Sponsor is still required to develop a Study Initiation Notice and submit it for CDWG (or higher) approval (as described in 2.1.1 above) prior to proceeding with development of the CBA Study Plan or formal CBA activity.

**Approval of CBA Study Plan.** The sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft Study Plan and supporting materials (via IRSS) for CDWG (or higher) approval prior to proceeding with CBA/study activity. The approval decision and associated actions are documented in writing (e.g. capability decision memo, meeting minutes, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

• **NOTE:** The AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS) conducts a review/assessment of the Study Plan and this review must be completed prior to CDWG review/approval.

**Timelines:** Sponsors provide all materials, no later than 14-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with A5R-OAS (up to 7-21 days), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting). CDWG Co-Chairs will determine the CDWG date for topics.

**Approval Authority.** The CDWG is the review/approval authority for the CBA Study Plan. The CDWG Co-Chairs may elect to elevate the level of approval (e.g. AF/A5A, AF/A5, or CDC as appropriate).

**Approval Criteria.** In order to substantiate follow-on JCIDS requirements development activities, the CBA Study Plan needs to address the following issues:

• Study Sponsor/Lead must be certified to at least RMCT Level B, i.e. the RQM 110 course.

• CBA/study planning and development of Study Plan involved direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS.

• Format and Content consistent with the AF/A5R-OAS CBA Handbook

• Problem statement, purpose, scope and schedule are clear and appropriate and defined

• Ground Rules, constraints, and assumptions are clear and appropriate

• Timeframe and Operational Context to be used are clear and appropriate

• Security classification level and clearance levels necessary for the study

• Team Members and Stakeholders represent the correct set of skills for the study

• AF/A5R-OAS POC and A5R SME are identified for direct support to the Study Team

**Completion/Exit Criteria for the CBA Study Plan.** A Study Plan approved by the CDWG (or higher) completes the CBA Study Plan development.
2.1.3. Step 3) CBA/Study Activity and Final Report.

CBA Final Report. The CBA/study Final Report captures and presents the methodology and results of the assessments and analysis derived from the Study Guidance and Study Plan. Additional guidance is available in the A5R-OAS CBA Handbook.

- **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS guidance, Study Leads for CBA or similar studies likely to result in development of JCIDS documents must be certified at least RMCT Level B (i.e. RQM 110 course).

- **NOTE:** Sponsors and Study Teams conduct the CBA Activity and develop the Final Report with direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for conducting the CBA/study. A CDWG (or higher) approved Study Plan is required prior to proceeding with the execution of any AF-led CBA or similar study.

- **NOTE:** The CBA/study must be conducted in accordance with the approved Study Initiation Notice, and Study Plan including any additional guidance from the CDWG or CDC (or higher).

Review of the Final Report. After the Sponsor/Study Team develops the CBA/study Final Report, and not less than 14 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the document and any supporting materials (via IRSS) for CDWG review followed by CDC (or higher) review and approval/decision on a selected course(s) of action.

- **NOTE:** The AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS) provides a review/assessment of the CBA/study Final Report and this review must be conducted prior to CDWG review.

Timelines: Sponsors provide all materials, no later than 14–30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with A5R-OAS (up to 7 days), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting). **Note:** CDWG Co-Chairs set the agenda for all topics. A topic will not necessarily meet the next available CDWG, based on priorities set by the CDG.

Review Criteria. In order to substantiate follow-on JCIDS requirements development activities, the CBA/study needs to address the following issues:

- Study Sponsor/Lead must be certified as RMCT Level B (or higher).

- CBA/study activity and development of Final Report involved direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS.

- Identification and prioritization of gaps and the degree of gap closure needed (all, or only partial) and recommendations regarding which gaps may not need to be addressed at this time (i.e. which gaps area at an already acceptable level of risk).

- Rough estimation of the degree to which each gap could potentially be mitigated by recommendations concerning the changes to Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTPs).
• Rough estimation of the degree to which each gap could potentially be mitigated with changes in DOTmLPF-P rather than pursuing a new materiel solution. This should include recommendations concerning any Joint DCRs or AF-only DCRs that should be developed.

• Recommendations about whether buying additional quantities of a previously fielded system would mitigate the gap. This should include recommendations concerning any Joint DCRs or AF-only DCRs that should be developed.

• Recommendations as to which gaps could be mitigated by making changes to ongoing acquisition efforts, and which ones may require a new materiel solution and should be included in an ICD.

• Identification of the key values and the trade space analysis that define the key values.

• Identification of the rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimates for each of the identified potential solutions (non-materiel or materiel).

• Identification of potential system dependencies on enabling capabilities, data and efforts (e.g. Intelligence Community data, infrastructure, sustainment, etc.).

• Identification and scope of additional information/analysis needed prior to initiation of any acquisition activities; to include ICD development or MDD request.

Completion/Exit Criteria for the CBA/study Final Report. A copy of the CBA/study Final Report (or study termination notice) reviewed by the CDWG and/or CDC (or higher) specifying the decision and/or recommendations for a way ahead/COA selection are documented in writing (i.e. capability decision memo) and archived in IRSS.

• The Sponsor POC submits the final version of the report (including any required edits) via IRSS and AF/A5RP submits a copy to the Joint Staff for archiving in the KM/DS Studies Repository.

• CBA/study outcomes and course(s) of action. The review of the CBA Final Report informs senior leader decisions in various AF processes (SPPBE, JCIDS, Acquisition, etc.) as to the course of action to take to address the results based on operational risk, affordability and numerous other factors. Potential outcomes may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

  o Accept the operational risk, maintain status quo – no further JCIDS action
  o Conduct further analysis, market research, SDP&E effort, S&T investments, etc. (including direction to contact/work with appropriate office or organizations to support these efforts.)
  o Support advocacy for establishing a resourcing/funding strategy if one does not already exist (may include direction to contact/work with appropriate office or organization to support planning/programming actions and assignment to an appropriate resource allocation panel, Lead Command, program office, program element, etc.)
  o Endorsement of “non-materiel” solution approach, e.g. TTP change, organizational change, or changes to DOTmLPF-P areas via a formal Joint, etc., and funding/resourcing strategies, etc. (including direction to contact/work with appropriate office or organizations, proceed to RSR/HPT Request (submitted to AFGK for approval prior to convening the HPT), etc.)
  o Endorsement of materiel/acquisition solution approach, including approval to proceed with development of appropriate strategies for acquisition and requirements, and to identify appropriate documentation and funding/resourcing strategies, etc. (including direction to contact/work with appropriate office or organizations, proceed to RSR/HPT request (submitted to AFGK for approval prior to convening the HPT), etc.)
PHASE 2 – ICD (Materiel Solutions or combination of Materiel and Non-Materiel)

Requirements Strategy Review (RSR) and High Performance Team (HPT). Sponsors (working through their AF/A5R SME) submit an RSR/HPT Request package (as described below) to obtain AFGK (AF/A5RP) approval prior to convening a High Performance Team (HPT) for any document writing event. The goal is to ensure development of the right JICIDS document at the right time, with the right people involved...

2.2. Initial Capabilities Document (ICD). An ICD is used to document capability requirements and associated gaps and the Sponsor’s intent to resolve those gaps through solutions which are materiel, non-materiel or a combination of both materiel and non-materiel.

- NOTE: A validated ICD along with approved AoA Study Guidance and AoA Study Plan, will be required to proceed to a Materiel Development Decision (MDD) review for approval to enter to the acquisition process to pursue a materiel solution. The MDD is an acquisition decision forum.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of an ICD, 1) A CBA (or equivalent study) approved by the CDC (along with the official AF recommendation on way forward indicating approval for ICD development to support material/acquisition approach) or 2) AF/A5A (or higher) approval to use a non-AF CBA or similar study is required prior to submitting an RSR/HPT Request for development of an AF-sponsored ICD.

START. Strategy Development for the ICD. The HPT strategy establishes the path necessary to develop a quality ICD that is capable of guiding future capability requirements development activities. Continuous
collaboration with key stakeholders ensures the requirements strategy addresses required capabilities identified in the CBA/study and/or applicable Joint and AF concepts, capabilities-based planning documents and other pertinent guidance. Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the requirements strategy and HPT membership.

**Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event.** AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of any AF-sponsored ICD.

- The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/A5R SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request package via IRSS not later than 30-21 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to **Section 3.1 thru 3.3** of this Guidebook for more detail on the RSR and HPT.

During the review of the HPT strategy for an ICD, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Proposed nomenclature - the title of an ICD should reflect the proposed type of approach associated with the core mission or gap area being addressed, for example:
  - *TAC-P Modernization* (for an ICD recommending a modernization approach)
  - *Tanker Recapitalization* (for an ICD recommending recapitalization approach)
  - “Next Gen...” (for an ICD recommending transformational approach)
- Timeframe when the capability needs to be delivered (IOC/FOC).
- Potential interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers.
- Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
- Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
- Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
- Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of HPT Lead and Acquisition POC's
- Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for completion of the ICD (see figure 3.1 and notes)
- **Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA**

**Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing.** After the ICD is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft document and any supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/A5RP and the A5R SME for AFGK approval to initiate formal JCIDS staffing in IRSS and KM/DS.

- See **Sections 3.4 thru 3.6** for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.
  - **NOTE:** For JCIDS documents designated “JCB Interest” or “JROC Interest”, the document must strictly comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. For documents designated “Joint Information”, Sponsors should comply with JCIDS format to the max extent practical.
- Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see **Section 3.7**.)
Step 3. Validation and Approval of the ICD. Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.).

- **NOTE:** The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to: 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAF the designated AF RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation/approval and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

- **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the process, AF documents may be submitted to the Joint Staff for review by the FCB Working Group(s) and/or FCB immediately following the eAFROC and AF/A5R approval – i.e. FCB review may be concurrent with AF validation staffing to the CSAF/VCSAF AF RDA.

**AF Validation Staffing.** Decisions are documented in writing via requirements decision memo (RDM) signed by the designated Requirements Decision Authority (RDA), as determined by AF/A5R.

- **NOTE:** AF validation and approval includes both the AF decision/direction regarding validation of the document and the approval to forward to JCB and/or JROC, when applicable -- i.e. CSAF/VCSAF a decision memo, signed by the RDA is required prior to releasing the document beyond the FCB level.

**Validation Criteria.** During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss:

- Summary of the operational context for understanding the need and the solution trade space. This summary should include: desired operational outcomes, desired effects to achieve outcomes, and an overview of how capabilities are envisioned to be employed, including enabling capabilities.

- Description of the capability gap(s) and the operational and/or force management risk of not filling the gap(s) that includes a clear description of current/programmed capability compared to the capability required to meet the mission now and/or at a specified future timeframe including a description of the analysis used to determine required capabilities.

- The methodology/rationale used to determine the operational attributes and initial objective values for each gap identified in the ICD with reference to the key supporting analysis.

- The initial affordability assessment within the context of the appropriate portfolio.

- Proposed recommendation(s) for the type of approach(s) to mitigate the capability gap(s) along with supporting rationale and analysis including recommendation regarding the degree to which each gap needs to be closed (all, or only partial), considering risk, affordability and timeframe.

- An assessment of analysis accomplished to date (CBA, study, business case analysis, etc.) and a determination of readiness to proceed with development of draft AoA Study Guidance and AoA study planning, and/or necessity for additional follow-on analysis, systems engineering or development planning, as appropriate.

**Completion/Exit Criteria for the ICD.** A copy of the final document with validation page, i.e. the signed memo (AF RDM and/or JROCM), posted in IRSS and submitted to Joint Staff for archiving in KM/DS.

- **NOTE:** The ICD must be reviewed/validated through AF/A5R (as a minimum) prior to submitting the associated draft AoA Study Guidance for review by the CDWG. The ICD must be validated and approved (completed) prior to submitting the associated AoA Study Plan for review by the CDWG, unless approved by the CDWG Chair (or higher).
PHASE 3 – AoA (ANALYSIS OF MATERIEL ALTERNATIVES)

Figure 2.3 AoA Process -- Overview

2.3. Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Documents - Overview. The AoA is conducted during the Materiel Solution Analysis Phase of acquisition (following the materiel development decision by the MDA) and is an analytical comparison of the operational effectiveness, suitability, risk, and life cycle cost of alternatives under consideration to satisfy validated capability needs (usually stipulated in an approved ICD).

- **NOTE:** This Guidebook contains procedures and content guidance for AoAs, which at the date of publication of this Guidebook are in line with procedures outlined in DoDI 5000.02 and other acquisition instructions and regulations; however, AF/A5A oversees the conduct of AoAs, and AoA representatives should consult with AF/A5A in order to ensure they are following the most current procedures and CDC expectations.

**Purpose.** The purpose of the AoA is to help decision-makers understand the trade space for new materiel solutions to satisfy an operational capability need, while providing the analytic basis for the performance attributes documented in follow-on JCIDS documents.

- **NOTE:** The AoA is not a source selection where a particular materiel solution is identified, but rather refines the scope of potential alternatives and helps refine the requirements attributes.
Study Team: Sponsors, including AF/A5A FID Teams, are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the AoA Study Team. Ideally, the AoA Study Team evolves from the ICD HPT membership as well as those involved in the supporting analysis to date (CBA, study, business case study, market research, development planning, systems engineering, etc.)

- **NOTE:** Sponsors must use RMCT certified requirements managers for accomplishment of the AoA and development of the AoA Final Report. To comply with JCIDS, Study Leads for studies likely to result in development of JCIDS documents must at least RMCT Level B (i.e. RQM 110 course). Study Sponsor/Lead should also complete AoA training provided by ASR-OAS, as well as the DAU online continuous learning module, CLR 151 Analysis of Alternatives.

- **NOTE:** Study Team planning, study activity and document development for AF-sponsored AoAs must include direct assistance from AF/ASR-OAS. Study leads must be familiar with the ASR-OAS AoA Handbook as the approved AF guidance and best practices for conducting the AoA.

- **NOTE:** All studies involving nuclear deterrence capabilities or missions must include direct assistance from the AF Nuclear Red Team (AFNRT). Due to the sensitive nature and limited distribution of AFNRT findings, study leads need to utilize an AFNRT advisor/consultant to inform the study. OPR is the AF Nuclear Weapons Center (AFNWC/NTJ)

- **NOTE:** MAJCOM/Agency POCs need to notify AF/ASRP and AF/A5A before initiation or participation in any study or analysis activities, regardless of AF or non-AF sponsorship/leadership. Provide AF/ASRP with courtesy copies of any study guidance, study plan, and final report for any non-AF studies and analyses in which AF MAJCOM/Agency members are participating.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for proceeding with any AF AoA documentation. Sponsor must have the following prior to proceeding with development of AoA documents: 1) AF/ASR validation review of the associated ICD or 2) AF/ASR approval to proceed with AoA documentation based on a previously validated non-AF ICD.

- **NOTE:** MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor must also show evidence the supporting analysis and other pre-acquisition activities (e.g. business case study, market research, development planning, systems engineering, concept characterization, etc.) are sufficiently complete to enable the Study Team to accurately determine issues and constraints for inclusion in the AoA Study Guidance.

The AoA consists of three distinct documents; AoA Study Guidance, AoA Study Plan, and the AoA Final Report, as described below:

2.3.1. Step 1) AoA Study Initiation/Guidance. AoA Study Guidance is developed to address the critical areas that need to be explored during the AoA. This study guidance builds upon knowledge gained during the ICD HPT event and during the trade space characterization and candidate solution sets selection phases of the associated development planning (DP) effort.

- **NOTE:** The Sponsor develops draft AoA Study Guidance with direct assistance from AF/ASR-OAS and AF/A5A.
- **NOTE:** Draft AoA Study Guidance must be written in accordance with the ASR-OAS AoA Handbook.
- **NOTE:** ASR-OAS recommends Sponsors start with the OSD, CAPE guidance template and add to it as necessary to ensure all AF required information is included to meet the approval criteria below. Sponsors should engage with appropriate OSD CAPE Action Officers early in the Study Guidance development to ensure the staffing and approval process goes smoothly and quickly.
Approval of the AoA Study Guidance. After the Sponsor/Study Team develops the draft AoA Study Guidance, and not less than 14-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the document and any supporting materials (via IRSS) for CDWG review followed by CDC AF/A5A Director (or higher) approval (and release to OSD/CAPE, if required). The AF approval decision and associated actions are documented in writing (e.g. capability decision memo, meeting minutes, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

- **NOTE:** The AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS and AF/A5A) provides a review/assessment of the AoA Study Guidance and this review must be conducted prior to CDWG review/approval.

- **NOTE:** CDWG review constitutes “staffing” (there is no formal JCIDS staffing for AoA documents).

Timelines: Sponsors provide all materials, no later than 14-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with A5R-OAS (up to 7 days), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review, (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting).

Approval Authority. The Director, OSD/CAPE is the approval for all AoA documentation associated with ACAT ID/JROC Interest programs. For those AoAs where Director, CAPE elects not to provide oversight, the CDC Chair may serve as the approval authority (may be delegated, but no lower than GO/SES Level).

Approval Criteria. Draft AoA Study Guidance must be written in accordance with the A5R-OAS AoA Handbook. During final review and approval, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the following:

- Background - discuss the specific ICD gaps that are to be addressed by the AoA. This section should also discuss the previous analysis efforts leading up to the AoA, and identify all approved concepts that address the capability gap being studied.

- Mission Areas and Mission Tasks – there must be agreement among the decision makers and stakeholders regarding which mission area capability gaps to address first, followed by agreement on appropriate mission tasks associated with those capability gaps. Operational capabilities and mission tasks should be traceable to the CBA/study and ICD and be able to be decomposed into lower-level measures (i.e. effectiveness, suitability and performance).

- Identify the purpose - what decisions the AoA is supporting.

- Identify the scope and focus of the analysis. Most importantly, this section needs to identify those areas that are NOT part of the AoA.

- Identify the key questions the stakeholders and decision makers need answered by the AoA.

- Overarching ground rules, constraints and assumptions for the analysis. This section should include identification of the affordability constraints.

- Alternatives - identify the specific alternatives to include those the decision makers identified as part of the trade space.

- Threats & Scenarios - identify the specific threats associated with this mission area and the scenarios to be used in the AoA.

- Measures of Effectiveness (MOE), Measures of Performance (MOP) and Measures of Suitability (MOS) – identify and prioritize specific measures associated with the mission tasks decision makers are most interested in to support. There should be at least one measure traceable to each mission task from the gaps identified in the CBA.
• Life Cycle Cost Analysis - identify the specific considerations for the life cycle cost analysis.
• Sensitivity and Risk Analysis - identify the specific considerations for sensitivity analysis and risk analysis such as: any areas where the decision makers need to know the impact to operations if less than optimal performance is accepted.
• Sufficiency - identify how and by whom the sufficiency review is to be accomplished.
• Oversight - identify the oversight and stakeholder involvement, including AF/A5A.
• Deliverables - identify deliverables and the timelines associated with each deliverable.
• Security – specify the security classification level for the analysis, identify security challenges and how they will be mitigated.
• Experimentation – identify experimentation events SDP&E may leverage to support the AoA Completion/Exit Criteria for AoA Study Guidance. A copy of the final approved/signed AoA Study Guidance provided to AF/A5RP for archiving in IRSS.

2.3.2. Step 2) AoA Study Plan: The AoA Study Plan is developed to detail the approach to be followed in conducting the AoA study.

• NOTE: Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the AoA Study Team. Ideally, the AoA Study Team evolves from the ICD HPT membership as well as the CBA Study Teams and should include coordination with appropriate OSD CAPE Action Officers to ensure it meets the intent of the Study Guidance.

• NOTE The Sponsor must develop the AoA Study Plan with direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) to begin development of the AoA Study Plan. 1) An approved/signed AoA Study Guidance Memo and 2) an approved ICD with signed validation memo are required to proceed with development of the AoA Study Plan.

• NOTE: Signed AoA Study Guidance must be completed prior to submitting the AoA Study Plan for review and approval, unless approved by the CDWG Chair (or higher).

Approval of the AoA Study Plan. After the Sponsor/Study Team develops the AoA Study Plan, and not less than 44-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the document and any supporting materials (via IRSS) for CDWG review followed by CDC AF/A5A Director (or higher) approval (and release to OSD/CAPE, when required). The AF approval decision and associated actions are documented in writing (e.g. capability decision memo, meeting minutes, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) archived in IRSS.

• NOTE: The AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS and AF/A5A) conducts a review/assessment of the AoA Study Plan and this review must be conducted prior to CDWG review/approval.

• NOTE: CDWG review constitutes “staffing” (there is no formal JCIDS staffing for AoA documents).

Timelines: Sponsors provide all materials, no later than 44-30 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with A5R-OAS (up to 7 days), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting).
Approval Authority. The Director, OSD/CAPE has authority for all AoA documents associated with ACAT ID/JROC Interest programs (but exercises this authority primarily when the USD, AT&L is designated as the MDA). For those AoAs where the Director, CAPE elects not to provide oversight/authority, the CDC Chair may serve as the decision authority (may be delegated, but no lower than GO/SES level).

Approval Criteria. The AoA Study Plan must be written in accordance with the A5R-OAS AoA Handbook and approved AoA Study Guidance. During final review and approval, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the following:

- Definition of the specific gaps that are being addressed in the AoA.
- Definition of baseline capability to include existing and/or planned and programmed systems.
- Identification of the stakeholders and their roles/responsibilities in the AoA.
- Plan to address the key questions identified in the AoA Study Guidance.
- Plan to address the alternatives identified by the AoA Study Guidance and any others to be considered during the study. These alternatives include methods of employment and other critical systems/enablers necessary to make them effective. This includes discussion about the implications and/or dependencies identified about the alternatives and how those dependencies are to be factored into the analysis.
- Description of the analytical methodology to be used and must include the following: Measures of Effectiveness, Performance, and Suitability; decomposition of the gaps and key questions; traceability to measures used to establish minimum values in ICD (from CBA/study), cost work breakdown structure; methodology to determine alternatives ability to mitigate gaps; methodology to explore trade space and description of what sensitivity analysis is to be done to determine key parameters and Thresholds/Objectives for the Draft CDD; methodology to construct cost capability comparisons; methodology for factoring in the dependencies identified for each alternative; and threats and scenarios to represent the operational environment.
- Identify responsible OPRs for Intelligence Supportability, Fully Burdened Cost of Fuel, Operational Energy, and Operational Training Infrastructure.
- Planned timeframe/date for AoA Study completion and delivery of AoA Final Report

Completion/Exit Criteria for the AoA Study Plan. A copy of the final AoA Study Plan (with written approval), posted in IRSS along with a sufficiency/approval memo signed by the Director, CAPE (when required).

- **NOTE:** Normally, a Study Advisory Group (SAG), chaired by OSD/CAPE is convened to oversee the execution of ACAT ID/JROC Interest AoAs. In situations where the AoA Study Lead and/or SAG elects to significantly revise the conditions, assumptions, mission tasks, or alternatives in the AF-approved AoA Study Plan, the AF Sponsor must notify the CDWG Chair. In such cases, the CDWG may request the Sponsor provide an interim progress briefing to the CDWG or CDC.

2.3.3. Step 3) AoA Activity and AoA Final Report: The AoA Final Report captures and presents the methodology and results of the analysis conducted in accordance with the AoA Study Guidance and AoA Study Plan.

- **NOTE:** Sponsors conduct the AoA activity and develop the AoA Final Report with direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS. Early engagement with OSD CAPE will help ensure smooth coordination and approval.
Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for conducting the AoA. 1) An approved AoA Study plan with AF capability decision memo (and/or CAPE memo, when required) and 2) an Acquisition Decision Memo (ADM) signed by the MDA (e.g. ADM from the Materiel Development Decision) authorizing/directing the AF/Sponsor to enter into the Material Solution Analysis phase to begin the AoA are both required to initiate the AoA Activity.

- **NOTE:** The AoA must be conducted in accordance with the approved Study Guidance and Study Plan including any guidance in the ADM.
- **NOTE:** Acquisition processes and procedures are governed by appropriate DoD 5000-series and AF 63-series publications, the details of which are outside the scope of this Guidebook.

Review of the AoA Final Report. After the Sponsor/Study Team develops the AoA Final Report, and not less than 14 days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the document and any supporting materials (via IRSS) for CDWG review followed by CDC (or higher, e.g. CSAF for MDAPs) review and approval for release to OSD/CAPE for sufficiency review (when required).

- **NOTE:** The AF/A5R SME (in consultation with AF/A5R-OAS) conducts a review/assessment of the AoA Final Report and this review must be conducted prior to CDWG review/approval.
- **NOTE:** CDWG review constitutes the “staffing” (there is no formal JCIDS staffing for the AoA).
- **NOTE:** AoA Final Reports associated with JCB/JROC Interest documents must also be submitted to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper for review, per the procedures in the JCIDS Manual.

**Timelines:** Sponsors provide all materials, no later than **14-30** days prior to the scheduled CDWG meeting in order to accommodate 1) the review by the AF/A5R SME along with A5R-OAS (up to 7 days), and 2) dissemination of the topic/materials to the CDWG members for review (at least 7 days prior to the CDWG meeting).

**AoA Review Authority.** The Director, OSD/CAPE has authority for all AoA documents associated with ACAT ID/JROC Interest programs (but exercises this authority primarily when USD, AT&L is designated as the MDA). For those AoAs where the Director, CAPE elects not to provide oversight/authority, the CDC Chair may serve as the decision authority (may be delegated, but no lower than GO/SES level).

- **NOTE:** The review of AoA results by the CDWG/CDC is not an “approval” (in the strict sense), but rather serves to establish the AF position on the results, and/or a decision on recommended alternative(s), and selected/preferred course(s) of action. The CDC may recommend alternative(s) different from those suggested in the study when such a decision would better serve the management and prioritization of AF Capability Development and Strategic Planning.

**AoA Review Criteria.** During review of the AoA Final Report, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the following:

- Identification of what enablers were addressed and how they align with those outlined in the MDD acquisition decision memo and in the AoA study guidance.
- Answers to the key questions identified in the AoA Study Guidance. These need to be answered sufficiently for decision makers to support the upcoming decisions.
- Identification of the performance, cost, schedule and risk drivers and how they were further explored in sensitivity analyses.
- Illustration of the trade space through life cycle cost, schedule, performance, and risk analysis. These need to clearly identify for the decision makers where the potential trade-offs exist, the
tradeoffs that were evaluated, the operational risk associated with the performance and to what degree the capability gap(s) are to be mitigated.

- Identification of all potential KPPs and KSAs and analytical evidence to support the threshold and objective values (i.e. cost-capability analysis).
- Sensitivity of each alternative to analysis assumptions and if they are sensitive to specific scenarios.
- Sensitivity of each alternative to thresholds and objectives; including identification of associated life cycle cost drivers and how sensitive the cost is to those values.
- Scope of any additional information/analysis needed prior to initiation of any acquisition activities; to include requesting a milestone decision.
- Identification of how the cost of each alternative lines up with the affordability constraints identified at MDD and in the AoA Study Guidance (as applicable).
- Identification of suitability issues and any supportability requirements discovered during the effectiveness analysis. Identify alternatives that maximize human performance and provide safe and effective operations, maintenance, and support functions.
- Screening criteria, methodology and results.
- Identification of the effectiveness, cost, and risk of each alternative
- Identification of a preferred alternative(s).

Completion/Exit Criteria for the AoA Final Report. A copy of the final AoA Report with AF capability decision memo (and JROCM, when required, e.g. for JCB or JROC Interest) posted in IRSS and submitted to the Joint Staff for archiving in KM/DS along with a sufficiency memo signed by the Director, CAPE (when required).

- Typically, the review of the AoA Final Report by the MDA occurs at an In Process Review (IPR) DAB (or similar service equivalent review) to determine the phase of entry based on the AoA results and decisions/recommendations from the AF and/or JROC. May go to:
  - Milestone A for Tech Maturation (Sponsor proceeds to RSR/HPT for a Draft CDD)
  - Milestone B or C for development/production (proceed to RSR/HPT for a CDD)
  - Milestone C for production (proceed RSR/HPT for a CPD)
### PHASE 4 – Capability Development Documents (CDD and Variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-requisite to begin an AF CDD/CDD Annex</th>
<th>HPT Prep</th>
<th>RSR</th>
<th>HPT Event</th>
<th>Document Review</th>
<th>Formal JCIDS Staffing</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
<th>AF Validation &amp; Approval</th>
<th>Joint Validation &amp; Archiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Level</td>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>ADM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAF GO Level</td>
<td>CICD</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAF O-6 Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAFSME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Level (START)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Approval of AoA Final Report or AF/ASR Validation Review of Draft CDD or CDD as applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: strategy must be consistent with acquisition direction to proceed to next the milestone phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/ASK Checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreBrl Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Edit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC = Capability Development Council (GO-level, chaired by VCSAF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM = Capability Decision Memo (via CDWG/CDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT = High Performance Team (Sponsor-led team of stakeholders and subject matter experts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR Pkg = HPT Request (Checklist, Briefing, and Request Memo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGK = AF Gatekeeper (decision by Director, ASRP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA = AF Validation/Approval decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDM = Requirements Decision Memo (via eAFROC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCB/JROC = Joint Validation of JCIDS doc’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements Strategy Review (RSR) and High Performance Team (HPT). Sponsors (working through their AF/A5R SME) submit an RSR/HPT Request package (as described below) to obtain AFGK approval prior to convening a High Performance Team (HPT) for any document writing event. The goal is to ensure development of the right JCIDS document at the right time, with the right people involved...

2.4. Draft (Preliminary) Capability Development Document ("Draft CDD" or "Draft CDD Annex", as appropriate). The Draft CDD outlines the minimum essential information for technology maturation and preliminary design for development of a materiel solution, or capability increment. A validated Draft CDD is an entrance criterion for development of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction (TMRR) phase of acquisition and for the Milestone A acquisition decision.

- **NOTE:** A Draft CDD is limited in scope/content to support the Milestone A decision and TMRR Phase as a stand-alone JCIDS document; the Draft (Preliminary) CDD should not be confused with a draft version of the full CDD required later in the JCIDS process.

- **NOTE:** A "Draft CDD Annex" may be developed for an incremental program as a precursor to a CDD Annex to a previously-validated CDD. This strategy might be appropriate to support a Milestone A decision for entry into the TMRR phase of activity for a follow-on increment, block upgrade or other subsequent development/production based on a previously validated CDD.
Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of the Draft CDD. 1) A validated ICD and 2) an AoA Final Report reviewed by the CDWG/CDC, along with the written AF recommendation (i.e. signed capability decision memo) indicating the selected way forward are both required prior to submitting an RSR/HPT Request package for development of the Draft CDD.

- **NOTE:** The requirements strategy must be consistent with acquisition decision/direction to proceed to Milestone A for entry into the Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction phase of acquisition and other guidance or direction in the acquisition decision memo (ADM).

- **NOTE:** In cases where an AF Sponsor proposes to use a Non-AF ICD or Non-AF AoA (or alternative analysis) to initiate the Draft CDD, the documents must be reviewed (and approved for use) by AF/A5R prior to submitting the RSR/HPT Request package for the associated Draft CDD.

**START. Strategy Development for the Draft CDD.** Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the requirements strategy and HPT membership. Ideally, the HPT evolves from the ICD HPT and AoA Study Team membership.

- **NOTE:** The Sponsor must develop the Draft CDD strategy with direct assistance the AF/A5R SME.

- The Draft CDD contains the following sections (as a minimum, to comply with JCIDS format and content guidance), refer to the JCIDS Manual for additional detail on each section:
  - **Operational Context (CDD Section 1),** with focus on the summary of the Service and joint concepts and/or CONOPS.
  - **Capability Discussion (CDD Section 3),** with focus on the summary of the previously validated capability requirements being addressed in the Draft CDD.
  - **Program Summary (CDD Section 4),** with focus on the synchronization of System of Systems (SoS) efforts across other CDDs, CPDs, and DCRs, and identification of dependencies on any legacy or future enabling capabilities.
  - **Development KPPs, KSAs, and APAs (CDD Section 5),** with focus on the initial/draft performance attribute(s) resulting from the AoA or similar studies. Initial/draft attributes for the mandatory KPPs, or justification for why they are not applicable, must also be provided.
  - **Other System Attributes (CDD Section 6),** with focus on attributes which require significant efforts during the TMRR phase of acquisition.
  - **Joint interoperability (CDD section 7),** with a focus on how the individual system will interoperate within the joint environment including any physical or net-ready interoperability effects on joint operations or operations with allies and partners. Additionally, Sponsors should include information that may enhance innovation
  - **Technology Readiness (CDD Section 10),** with focus on identifying the critical technologies which need to be matured during the TMRR phase of acquisition. In cases where the acquisition strategy describes multiple increments of a capability solution, this section must describe the critical technologies to be matured for each increment.

**Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event.** AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of any AF-sponsored Draft CDD.

- The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/A5R SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request package via IRSS not later than 30 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to Section 3.1 thru 3.3 for more detail on the RSR and HPT.
During the review of the HPT Strategy for a Draft CDD, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Proposed title of a Draft CDD should reflect the particular system/solution approach
- Results of the AoA (or similar study) and preferred concept/alternative(s) for the solution.
- Specific gaps which are to be addressed in the Draft CDD.
- Approach for trade space analysis during development of attributes and threshold/objective values
- Status of technology readiness for identified critical technology elements
- Potential interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers.
- Intelligence supportability requirements and Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs).
- Affordability and schedule goals for the technology maturation phase of acquisition.
- Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
- Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
- Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
- Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of key leadership positions (i.e. HPT Lead, HPT Facilitator(s), and Acquisition POC)
- Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for the Draft CDD (see figure 3.1 and notes)
- Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA

Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing. After the Draft CDD is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft version of the document and supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/A5RP and the A5R SME followed by AFGK approval to initiate formal AF staffing via IRSS.

- See Sections 3.4 thru 3.6 for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.
  - NOTE: A Draft CDD is not normally required to be submitted to the Joint Staff for staffing.
- Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see Section 3.7.)

Step 3. Validation and Approval of the Draft CDD. Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.)

- NOTE: The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAFthe designated RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

- NOTE: A Draft CDD is not normally required to be submitted to the Joint Staff for FCB review.
AF Validation Staffing. Decisions are documented in writing via a requirements decision memo (RDM) signed by the designated RDA, as determined by AF/A5R.

- **NOTE:** A Draft CDD is not normally required to be submitted to the Joint Staff for joint validation.

Validation Criteria. During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss:

- Mission area/portfolio overview to include: CONOPs, threats, current versus required capabilities, and operational risk assessment.

- Technology readiness with focus on the critical technology elements (CTEs) which need to be matured during the TMRR phase of acquisition

- Intelligence supportability requirements and Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs).

- Initial Technology Maturation KPPs, KSAs and APAs (including initial attributes for the mandatory KPPs/KSAs or justification for why they are not applicable) with supporting methodology, rationale and analysis for initial threshold (T) and objective (O) values.

- Sponsor should be able to identify which attributes (KPPs, KSAs, and APAs) are the primary drivers of cost, and technology/schedule risk and describe how affordability and risk reduction tradeoffs were considered as threshold/objective values were developed.

Completion/Exit Criteria for the Draft CDD. A copy of the final version of the Draft CDD with validation page, i.e. signed validation memo (AF RDM and/or JROCM, when required), posted in IRSS for archiving.

---

2.5. Capability Development Document (CDD) and CDD Annex. A CDD (or CDD Annex, as required) is used to outline an affordable increment(s) of militarily useful, logistically supportable, and technically mature capability and identifies the operational requirements necessary for design, production, fielding and sustainment the proposed system, or capability increment, . The CDD or CDD Annex contains a carefully selected minimum set of prioritized system level performance attributes (KPPs, KSAs, and APAs), each of which have to be balanced against the constraints of cost, schedule, and risk.

- A validated CDD or CDD Annex is an entrance criterion necessary for the Development RFP Release Decision Point in support of the development phase of acquisition and the Milestone B decision as well as the subsequent Milestone C production decision and initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E).

- The CDD Annex is a streamlined document used to support development of a follow-on increment, block upgrade or other subsequent development/production based on a previously validated CDD. It allows Sponsors to provide documentation specific to what is different from the parent CDD.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of a CDD. 1) An approved AoA Final Report which has been submitted to the validation authority for review, and 2) a completed Draft CDD (if applicable, i.e. when proceeding from Milestone A/TMRR Phase) which has been reviewed/validated through AF/A5R (as a minimum)

- **NOTE:** In cases where an AF Sponsor proposes to use a Non-AF ICD or Non-AF AoA (or alternative analysis) to initiate the CDD, the documents must be reviewed (and approved for use) by AF/A5R prior to submitting the RSR/HPT Request package for the associated AF-sponsored CDD.
NOTE: The sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency must also show evidence that acquisition activities (e.g. technology development, preliminary design, etc.) are sufficiently complete to enable the HPT to accurately determine requirements attributes for inclusion in the CDD.

START. Strategy Development for the CDD. Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the requirements strategy and HPT membership.

Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event. AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of any AF-sponsored CDD. The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/A5R SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request package to AF/A5RP via IRSS not later than 30-21 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to Section 3.1 thru 3.3 for more detail on the RSR and HPT.

During the review of the HPT Strategy for the CDD, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Proposed nomenclature; the title of a CDD should reflect the particular system/solution and increment (if applicable), for example:
  - B-2 EHF SATCOM and Computer Upgrade CDD (for a modernization program)
  - T-X CDD, KC-X CDD (for a recapitalization or replacement program)
- Results of the AoA (or similar study) and preferred concept for the solution.
- The scope for the proposed strategy/solution (e.g. single increment, multiple increments), and which gaps are to be mitigated in the CDD/increment.
- Potential interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers.
- Current/projected Technology Readiness and Manufacturing Readiness levels.
- Timeframe for capability fielding (IOC/FOC) and how it is to be sustained.
- Intelligence supportability requirements and Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs).
- Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
- Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
- Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
- Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of key leadership positions (i.e. HPT Lead, HPT Facilitator(s), and Acquisition POC)
- Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for completion of the CDD (see figure 3.1 and notes)
- Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA

Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing. After the CDD is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft version of the document and supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/ASRP and the ASR SME followed by AFGK approval to initiate formal JCIDS staffing via IRSS and KM/DS.

- See Sections 2.3 thru 3.6 for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.
NOTE: For JCIDS documents designated by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper as “JCB Interest” or “JROC Interest”, the document must strictly comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. For JCIDS documents designated as “Joint Information”, Sponsors should comply with JCIDS format to the max extent practical, but strict compliance is not necessary or mandatory.

- Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see Section 3.7.)

**Step 3. Validation and Approval of the CDD.** Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.)

- **NOTE:** The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

- Specific AF Attestations obtained in conjunction with CDD:
  - **Testability Attestation.** For all AF programs, AFOTEC attests (via official memo to AF/A5R) that capability requirements and proposed system level performance attributes as described in the CDD have been reviewed and determined to be testable and measurable (i.e. for determining suitability and effectiveness). EXCEPTION: For Air Force programs where a Lead Command is the lead operational test organization (OTO), the OTO/CC submits the attestation.
  - **Feasibility Attestation.** For all AF programs, AFMC or AFSPC attests (via official memo to AF/A5R) that the capability requirements and proposed system level performance attributes as described in the CDD have been reviewed and determined to be feasible (i.e. technically achievable and executable within the estimated schedule and budgeted lifecycle costs).
  - **Design Attestation.** For all AF programs, AFWIC attests (via official memo to AF/A5R) that the proposed capability is in alignment with the latest DB.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAF the RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation/approval and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

- **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the validation process, AF documents may be submitted to the Joint Staff for review by the FCB Working Group(s) and/or FCB immediately following the eAFROC and AF/A5R approval – i.e. FCB review may be concurrent with AF validation staffing to the CSAF/VCSAF-designated AF RDA.

**AF Validation Staffing.** Decisions are documented in writing via a requirements decision memo (RDM) signed by the designated RDA, as determined by AF/A5R.

- **NOTE:** AF validation and approval includes both the AF decision/direction regarding validation of the document and the approval to forward to JCB and/or JROC for Joint Validation, when applicable – i.e. CSAF/VCSAF decision memo, signed by the RDA is required prior to releasing the document beyond the FCB level for final joint validation by the JCB and/or JROC.

**Validation Criteria.** During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss:

- Mission area/portfolio overview to include: threat, current versus required capabilities, and operational risk assessment.
- CONOPS, OV-1 and key linkages to other enabling capabilities and program dependencies.
- Program description - outline what gaps are to be mitigated, by increment (if applicable)
• Portfolio affordability review to include development, procurement and operations and sustainment cost goals/caps and current funding.

• Intelligence supportability requirements and Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs), as required.

• Energy Supportability Analysis, if required.

• KPPs, KSAs, APAs (including mandatory KPPs/KSAs or justification for why they are not applicable) with supporting rationale and analysis for threshold (T) and objective (O) values.

• Sponsor should be able to identify which attributes (KPPs, KSAs, and APAs) are the primary drivers of cost, and technology/schedule risk and describe how affordability and risk reduction tradeoffs were considered as threshold/objective values were developed.

• Joint interoperability and effects on joint operations or operations with allies and partners

• Technology and Manufacturing readiness levels.

• Status of required AF or Joint Certifications and Endorsements.

• Proposed schedule (IOC and FOC details) and planned operational quantities.

Completion/Exit Criteria for the CDD. A copy of the final version of the document with validation page, i.e. the signed validation memo (AF RDM and/or JROCM, when required), posted in IRSS and submitted to the Joint Staff for archiving in KM/DS.

2.6. CDD UPDATE/REVALIDATION.

Scenario 1. Program Changes and Trades, “Tripwire”, etc. A CDD update/revalidation is required if a change to KPP(s) is necessary after validation, the program experiences a 10% or greater growth over their current baseline or 25% over their original baseline as defined in the Acquisition Program Baseline (APB), a 10% or greater reduction in operational inventory quantities from the previously stated CDD procurement numbers, or a 12-month or greater schedule slip of IOC or FOC from the previously stated CDD schedule (IOC or FOC) date.

Scenario 2. Program Updates for Milestone C, Production Phase. A previously validated and approved CDD or an updated and revalidated CDD is an entrance criterion necessary for the RFP release in support of the production phase of acquisition and the Milestone C decision. If changes to a previously validated CDD are necessary to support the Milestone C decision and entry into the production phase, an updated CDD may be developed and staffed to obtain re-validation of refined requirements and system level attributes (KPPs, KSAs, APAs and other attributes).

• NOTE: For any proposed changes to a previously validated CDD, the Sponsor must contact AF/A5RP to determine the appropriate level of AF review and approval.

• NOTE: Proposed changes to KPPs, KSAs, APAs and/or other attributes must be accompanied by a funding strategy and schedule that have been coordinated with the appropriate program office.
VARIATIONS FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS


Figure 2.7 IT Box Model -- Overview

**Solutions requiring software development only with no hardware development...**

**guided by an abbreviated “IT Box” model and IS-ICD or IS-CDD variants**

---

**IT-Box Model.** The IT-Box Model, as described in the JCIDS manual, provides IS programs greater flexibility to incorporate evolving technologies and achieve faster responses from requirements validation processes by calling for fewer iterations through the JCIDS process. The IS variants allowed by the IT-Box Model (i.e. IS-ICD and IS-CDD) are narrowly focused on software development efforts and are not appropriate for hardware development or for capturing overarching capability requirements. See the JCIDS Manual for additional detail.

- **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS guidance, when a program is designated as either a “MAIS” or “MDAP”, a regular ICD followed by an IS-CDD or a regular CDD must be used.

- **NOTE:** A Defense Business System is an IS that is not part of a weapon system, or directly involved in the fulfillment of military or intelligence missions. Defense Business Systems are not subject to JCIDS and are not normally reviewed by AF/A5R or the CDWG/CDC.

The IS-ICD and IS-CDD are variants of the regular ICD and CDD implementing the IT Box Model used to document capability requirements and associated capability gaps where the intended capability solution approach involves research, development, and acquisition of applications system software, and the projected lifecycle costs exceed $15M.

- **NOTE:** All hardware associated with the IT Box Model must be COTS/GOTS and hardware modification is restricted to that necessary for system integration and enhancements to meet requirements specified in the IS-ICD or IS-CDD or for hardware refresh due to obsolescence.

Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of an IS-ICD or IS-CDD: 1) A CBA or equivalent study (for an IS-ICD) or AoA (for IS-CDD) approved by the CDC (along with the official AF recommendation on way
forward indicating approval for IS-ICD or IS-CDD development) or 2) AF/A5R approval to use any non-AF study (CBA or similar study, or AoA) is required prior to submitting an RSR/HPT Request for development of an AF-sponsored IS-ICD or IS-CDD.

- **NOTE:** In cases where an AF Sponsor proposes to use a Non-AF CBA (or similar study) to initiate the ICD, the CBA/study must be reviewed (and approved for use) by AF/A5R (or higher) prior to submitting the RSR/HPT Request package for the associated AF-sponsored IS-ICD or ICD-CDD.

- **NOTE:** The CBA/analysis must also provide rationale and analysis to justify gap mitigation via an information systems solution.

**START. Strategy Development for an IS-ICD or IS-CDD.** AF Sponsors are encouraged to use the “IT-Box” Model for all programs that meet the criteria. For capability requirements likely to be addressed by a mix of IS and non-IS solutions, Sponsors must use the regular ICD format and consider an IS-CDD after ICD validation to streamline the IS portion of solution development.

- **NOTE:** Per the JICDS Manual, the key difference in usage of IS-ICDs and IS-CDDs is whether the AoA takes place before or after delegating authorities under the IT Box.

- For an IS-ICD to be appropriate, it must be very clear from the CBA/study that an IS solution is the only viable approach to be considered for the particular gap(s). Any AoA-type analysis after delegating authorities under the IT Box would therefore only need to consider IS alternatives.

- An IS-CDD is more appropriate when an IS solution is not presumed at the time the ICD is validated, or when other materiel and/or non-materiel solution(s) are expected to be necessary along with the IS solution. The IS-CDD is a result of the AoA conducted in the MSA phase and represents an IS solution for part or all of the capability requirements validated in the ICD.

**Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event.** AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of any AF-sponsored IS-ICD or IS-CDD.

- The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/A5R SME) submits a RSR/HPT Request package to AF/A5RP via IRSS not later than 30 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to Section 3.1 thru 3.3 for more detail on the RSR and HPT.

During the review of the HPT Strategy for the IS-ICD or IS-CDD, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Review proposed nomenclature; the title should reflect the particular system/solution, e.g.:
  - **TAC-P Close Air Support (CAS) IS-ICD** (for a IS follow-on to a platform upgrade program)
  - **JSpaC Mission System (JMS) Inc III IS-CDD** (for an incremental MAIS program)
- Discuss the risk assessment (applicable to all documents).
- Specific gaps which are to be mitigated in the IS-ICD or IS-CDD.
- Possible interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers
- Timeframe when the capability needs to be delivered (IOC/FOC)
- Intelligence supportability requirements and Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs).
- Review cost estimates to ensure solution remains affordable with respect to available RDT&E and Lifecycle funding.
• Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
• Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
• Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
• Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of key leadership positions (i.e. HPT Lead, HPT Facilitator(s), and Acquisition POC)
• Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for the IS-ICD or IS-CDD (see figure 3.1 and notes)

**Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA**

**Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing.** After the document is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft version of the document and supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/A5RP and the A5R SME followed by AFGK approval to initiate formal JCIDS staffing via IRSS and KM/DS. See Sections 3.4 thru 3.6 for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.

- Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see Section 3.7.)

**Step 3. Validation and Approval of the IS-ICD or IS-CDD.** Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.)

- **NOTE:** The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAF the designated RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation/approval and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

- **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the validation process, AF documents may be submitted to the Joint Staff for review by the FCB Working Group(s) and/or FCB immediately following the eAFROC and AF/A5R approval – i.e. FCB review may be concurrent with AF validation staffing to the CSAF/VCSAF designated RDA.

**AF Validation Staffing.** Decisions are documented in writing via a requirements decision memo (RDM) signed by the designated RDA, as determined by AF/A5R.

- **NOTE:** AF validation and approval includes both the AF decision/direction regarding validation of the document and the approval to forward to JCB and/or JROC for Joint Validation, when applicable – i.e. CSAF/VCSAF decision memo signed by the AF RDA is required prior to releasing the document beyond the FCB level for final joint validation by the JCB and/or JROC.

**Validation Criteria.** During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss:

- The proposed/approved governance structure (copy of organizational charter).
- The methodology/rationale for the initial minimum values for each capability requirement identified in the document with reference to the key supporting analysis.
- Review of costs, funding and schedule.
• CONOPS Summary that provides the operational context for understanding the need and the solution trade space. This summary should include: desired operational outcomes, effects produced to achieve outcome, intelligence support needs, how capability complements Joint Forces and enabling capabilities, as required.

• Description of the capability gap(s) and the operational/force risk of not addressing the gap.

Completion/Exit Criteria for the IS-ICD or IS-CDD. A copy of the final version of the document with validation page, i.e. the signed validation memo (AF RDM and/or JROCM, when required), posted in IRSS and submitted to J8 for archiving in KM/DS.

• NOTE: The status of programs using the IT-Box Model is normally reviewed by the Lead FCB every two years. Sponsors submit the topic for AF/A5R review prior to FCB review.

IS-ICD or IS-CDD Revalidation. An IS-ICD or IS-CDD requires revalidation in the following situations:

• If any new capability requirements need to be added beyond the scope of the previously validated document, per the original validation memo.

• If program development and integration or sustainment funding increases by 10% or more than what is identified in the document, per the original validation memo.
### DCR Development (for “NON-MATERIEL” and NON-DEVELOPMENTAL MATERIEL Solutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Level</th>
<th>Pre-requisite to begin an AF sponsored DCR</th>
<th>HPT Prep</th>
<th>RSR</th>
<th>HPT Event</th>
<th>Document Review</th>
<th>Formal JCIDS Staffing</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
<th>AF Validation Review</th>
<th>Joint Validation &amp; Archiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### HAF GO Level

- **CDC:** CDC Approval of CBA Final Report and direction to proceed with an AF-only or Joint DCR

#### HAF O-6 Level

1. **AFGK:**
   - AFGK Checks
   - HPT Prep

2. **AFGK:**
   - AFGK Checks
   - HPT Event

#### AF/ASR SME

3. **AFGK:**
   - AFGK Checks
   - HPT Event
   - STAFFING AF: IRSS (Joint: KMDS)

4. **AFGK:**
   - AFGK Checks
   - HPT Event
   - Final Draft

5. **AFGK:**
   - AFGK Checks
   - HPT Event
   - Final Edits

#### Sponsor Level (START)

- **RSR Pkg:**
  - HPT Request (Checklist, Briefing and Request Memo)

**NOTE:** A DCR may be submitted at any time during the requirements process, when a non-materiel solution(s) has been identified as an effective means to address a capability gap and the recommendations are to be implemented across joint organizations/OPRs.

### 2.8. DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation (DCR) - Overview

DCRs document recommendations for non-materiel and non-developmental materiel (e.g., COTS/GOTS) solutions being proposed as an alternative to, or complement of, a materiel solution. Refer to the JCIDS Manual for additional guidance on DCRs.

- **NOTE:** A DCR may be submitted at any time during the requirements process, when a non-materiel solution(s) has been identified as an effective means to address a capability gap and the recommendations are to be implemented across joint organizations/OPRs.

#### 2.8.1. Joint DCR

A Joint DCR is used when proposed solutions require implementation of changes by other organizations outside the Sponsor component (i.e. for changes beyond just AF organizations).

- **NOTE:** AF service specific change recommendations do not use a Joint DCR; they are captured using the AF internal Change Recommendation processes or an AF-only DCR, if necessary.
Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for AF development of a Joint DCR. AFGK approval (via review of the RSR/HPT Request package) is required to proceed with development of an AF-sponsored Joint DCR.

- **NOTE:** Typically, results from a CBA or similar DOTmLPF-P study, analysis, or assessment are used to identify the specific change recommendations. The CBA/analysis must also provide the rationale and analysis to justify gap mitigation via a DOTmLPF-P approach.

**START. HPT Strategy Development for a DCR.** The DOTmLPF-P Change strategy requires extensive and close collaboration with key stakeholders and DOTmLPF-P functional process owners to ensure the requirements strategy addresses required capabilities identified in a CBA and/or DOTmLPF-P analysis. Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the requirements strategy and HPT membership.

**Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event.** AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of any AF-sponsored Joint DCR.

- The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/ASR SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request package to AF/ASRP via IRSS not later than 30 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to Section 3.1 thru 3.3 for more detail on the RSR and HPT.

- Contact AF/ASRP for details on HPT guidance specific to DCR development.

During the review of the HPT Strategy for the Joint DCR, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Proposed nomenclature; DCR title should reflect the particular mission/functional area
- Specific gaps which are to be mitigated in the DCR
- Timeframe when the recommendations need to be implemented
- Potential interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers
- Cost estimates (as applicable) and funding sources to ensure solution remains affordable with respect to available funding
- Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
- Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
- Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
- Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of key leadership positions (i.e. HPT Lead, HPT Facilitator(s), and Acquisition POC)
- Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for completion of the DCR (see figure 3.1 and notes)
- Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA

**Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing.** After the Joint DCR is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft document and supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/ASRP and the ASR SME followed by AFGK approval to initiate formal JCIDS staffing via IRSS and KM/DS. See Sections 3.4 thru 3.6 for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.
• **NOTE:** Change recommendations must be properly coordinated with the Joint and AF functional process owners (FPO’s) to ensure the solutions are implemented in accordance with the appropriate processes for the type of non-materiel solution (e.g., training, doctrine, policy, manpower, facilities, etc.) Refer to the JCIDS Manual for additional detail on Joint FPO’s.

Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see Section 3.7.)

**Step 3. Validation and Approval of the Joint DCR.** Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.)

• **NOTE:** The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAF the designated RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation/approval and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

• **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the validation process, AF documents may be submitted to the Joint Staff for review by the FCB Working Group(s) and/or FCB immediately following the eAFROC and AF/A5R approval – i.e. FCB review may be concurrent with AF validation staffing to the VCSAFRDA.

**AF Validation Staffing.** Formal decisions are documented in writing via a decision memo signed by VCSAFthe designated RDA, as determined by AF/A5R.

• **NOTE:** AF validation and approval includes both the AF decision/direction regarding validation of the document and the approval to forward to JCB and/or JROC for Joint Validation, when applicable – i.e. VCSAF-a decision memo, signed by the AF RDA) is required prior to releasing the document beyond the FCB level for final joint validation by the JCB and/or JROC.

**Validation Criteria.** The Joint DCR must comply with JCIDS Manual format/content guidance. During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the following:

• The purpose of the change(s) and associated benefits (e.g. cost or manpower savings)
• Any potential road-blocks (e.g. funding, resource or time constraints)
• Specific Gap(s) to be mitigated in the DCR
• Projected implementation costs, and identified sources of funding
• Demonstrate approval of impacted stakeholders to include the functional process owner(s) responsible for oversight of the DOTmLPF-P specified area(s).

**Completion/Exit Criteria for AF-sponsored Joint DCR.** A copy of the final version of the document with validation page, i.e. the signed JROCM, posted in IRSS and submitted to the Joint Staff for archiving in KM/DS.

**2.8.2. AF-only DCR.** AF-only DCRs may be used to document recommendations for AF unique non-materiel and non-developmental materiel solutions to gaps identified during a CBA or similar DOTmLPF-P analysis.

• An AF-only DCR may be submitted at any time during the requirements process, when a non-materiel solution(s) has been identified as an effective means to close a capability gap and the recommendations are to be implemented solely by AF organizations/OPRs.
Entry Criteria (Prerequisites) for development of an AF-only DCR. AFGK approval (via review of the RSR/HPT Request package) is required to proceed with development of an AF-only DCR.

- **NOTE:** Typically, results from a CBA or similar DOTmLPF-P study, analysis, or assessment are used to identify the specific change recommendations. The CBA/analysis must also provide the rationale and analysis to justify gap mitigation via a DOTmLPF-P approach.

- **NOTE:** If the recommended solutions require changes in other components outside the AF, then a Joint DCR must be used.

START. HPT Strategy Development for an AF-only DCR. The DOTmLPF-P Change strategy requires extensive and close collaboration with key stakeholders and DOTmLPF-P functional process owners to ensure the requirements strategy addresses required capabilities identified in a CBA and/or DOTmLPF-P analysis. Sponsors are expected to establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop the requirements strategy and HPT membership.

**Step 1. Strategy Review and HPT Event.** AFGK approval followed by a Sponsor-led HPT event is required for development of an AF-only DCR.

- The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/ASR SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request package to AF/ASRP via IRSS not later than 30-21 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. Refer to Section 3.1 thru 3.3 for more detail on the RSR and HPT.

- Contact AF/ASRP for details on HPT guidance specific to DCR development.

During the review of the HPT Strategy for an AF-only DCR, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the document preparation and HPT membership to include the following:

- Ensure entry criteria (pre-requisites) are met as described above
- Proposed nomenclature; DCR title should reflect the particular mission/functional area
- Risk Assessment (applicable to all documents)
- Specific gaps which are to be mitigated in the DCR.
- Timeframe when the recommendations need to be implemented
- Potential interdependencies with other AF or joint systems/solutions or other enablers
- Cost estimates (as applicable) and funding sources to ensure solution remains affordable with respect to available funding
- Expected timeframe/date when the Sponsor expects to submit the document for initial staffing
- Projected follow-on requirements oversight/reviews and interaction with stakeholders from the Joint Staff, other Services and OSD (if required)
- Proposed HPT membership (names and organization represented), location, dates and format (live or virtual), including any issues/concerns with support, funding, security, etc.
- Certification and Training (RMCT) and experience of key leadership positions (i.e. HPT Lead, HPT Facilitator(s), and Acquisition POC)
- Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for completion of the DCR (see figure 3.1 and notes)
Step 2. Document Review & Formal Staffing. After the AF-only DCR is developed, the sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency POC submits the draft document and supporting materials (via IRSS) for review by AF/A5RP and the A5R SME followed by AFGK approval to initiate formal AF staffing via IRSS.

- See Sections 3.4 thru 3.6 for more detail on Initial Document Review and formal JCIDS staffing.

  NOTE: Change recommendations must be properly coordinated with the AF functional process owner to ensure the solutions are implemented in accordance with the appropriate processes for the type of non-materiel solution (e.g., training, doctrine, policy, manpower, facilities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOTmLPF-P Area</th>
<th>AF Functional Process Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF Doctrine</td>
<td>Air University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Organizations</td>
<td>Air Staff – A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Training</td>
<td>HQ AETC and Air Staff - A3T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Materiel</td>
<td>SAF/AQ and AFMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Leadership &amp; Education</td>
<td>HQ AETC / Air University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Personnel</td>
<td>Air Staff – A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Facilities</td>
<td>Air Staff – A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Policy</td>
<td>Various POCs – Topic Specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Following completion of comment resolution, Sponsors normally conduct an internal review (as required) before the document goes forward for final validation and approval (see Section 3.7.)

Step 3. Validation and Approval of the AF-only DCR. Following completion of sponsoring MAJCOM/Agency internal process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing (see section 3.8.)

  • NOTE: The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package for AF validation staffing. Note: AF-only DCRs are not required to be submitted for joint review or validation.

AF Validation Staffing. Formal decisions are documented in writing via a decision memo signed by VCSAF the designated RDA, as determined by AF/A5R.

Validation Criteria. To the maximum extent practical, AF-only DCRs comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. During final review and validation, Sponsors need to be prepared to discuss the following:

- The purpose of the change(s) and associated benefits (e.g. cost or manpower savings)
- Any potential road-blocks (e.g. funding, resource or time constraints)
- Any gap(s) mitigated
- Projected implementation costs, and identified sources of funding
- Demonstrate approval of impacted stakeholders to include the functional process owner(s) responsible for oversight of the DOTmLPF-P specified area(s).

Completion/Exit Criteria for an AF-only DCR. A copy of the final document with validation page, i.e. the signed AF RDM, posted in IRSS and submitted to the Joint Staff for archiving in KM/DS.
### SECTION 3. GENERAL PROCEDURES for ALL JCIDS DOCUMENTS (except CBA, AoA)

**Purpose/Scope.** Please NOTE: This section provides a general description of the procedures and guidance common to all JCIDS documents (i.e., ICD, CDD/CPD and DCR). Air Force procedures implement, but does not replace, the over-arching JCIDS process guidance. Document-specific details are located in **Section 2.**

**Figure 3.1. AF Process for Development of JCIDS Documents (i.e., all variants of ICD, DCR and CDD/CPD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-requisite to begin an AF Document</th>
<th>HPT Prep</th>
<th>RSR</th>
<th>HPT Event</th>
<th>Document Review</th>
<th>Formal JCIDS Staffing</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
<th>AF Validation &amp; Approval</th>
<th>Joint Validation &amp; Archiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key HAF-level Decision Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is this the right document, at the right time with the right people involved...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the document ready to enter into formal staffing...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAF GO Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAF O-6 Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAF SME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor Level (START)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This is a general depiction of a process that is tailorable based on document type (ICD, DCR, and CDD/CPD) and particular circumstances. Refer to **Section 2** for document-specific process.**

**START:** Sponsors initiate JCIDS document development by collaborating with key stakeholders to develop the requirements strategy and prepare to assemble a High Performance Team (HPT).

**Step 1:** Requirements Strategy Review (RSR). Following review of CBA/study or AoA results and strategy/COA selection, the Sponsor (working through their AF/A5R SME) submits an RSR/HPT Request Package to obtain AFGK approval prior to convening a High Performance Team (HPT) for a JCIDS document writing event. The goal of the RSR/HPT Request is to ensure development of the right JCIDS document at the right time, with the right people involved.

**Step 2:** Document Review. Following the HPT event, the Sponsor submits a draft version of the document for review by the AFGK to obtain approval to initiate formal JCIDS staffing via IRSS and KM/DS.

**Step 3:** Validation & Approval. Following formal JCIDS staffing and comment resolution the Sponsor submits the final draft document for “validation staffing” up to the CSAF (for ACAT I) or the VCSAF appropriate RDA.

- **NOTE:** Joint review required beyond AF validation is determined by the Joint Staffing Designator (JSD).
Sample Plan of Action & Milestones (POAM) for JCIDS Document Development:

- **HPT Request**: submitted no less than 21 days prior to the planned HPT Event; AFGK check takes 5-10 days, leaving 10-15 days prior to the HPT to respond to corrective actions.
- **HPT Event**: 4-5 days (for ICD, DCR, CPD, CDD Update or CDD Annex) or 7-10 days for a CDD; virtual HPTs or other approaches for document development that drag on for months are not acceptable.
- **Post HPT Activity**: 3-4 weeks for internal cleanup and MAJCOM/Agency review; post HPT cleanup and internal MAJCOM/Agency review that drags on for months is not acceptable.
- **Document Review and Formal Staffing**: 5-10 days for initial gatekeeper checks and cleanup followed by 21 days for formal staffing and review. This is the standard JCIDS timeline.
- **Comment Resolution**: 30 days (max). At the end of the 30 days, the Sponsor must submit an updated document and a report of any unresolved comments. This is the standard JCIDS timeline. Comment adjudication that drags on for months is not acceptable.
- **Validation Staffing**: eAFROC will be open for 14 days for GO level vote. Any non-concur vote should be immediately addressed with the Sponsor (do not wait until the end of the eAFROC period).
- **AF Validation & Approval**: plan on 5 days for a decision memo signed by AF/A5R, or AF/A5 and 10-14 days for a decision memo signed by VCSAF or CSAF. AF/A5RP has direct access to the VCSAF (as the JROC Principal) and CSAF (as the Chief Requirements Officer for MDAPs).
- **Joint Validation & Approval**: FCB Review is run concurrent with staffing to VCSAF/CSAF the AF RDA. 14 days for JCB, 14 days for JROC, then another 10 days to get a coordinated/signed JROCM.

3.1. Strategy Development and HPT Preparation [led by the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor]. The requirements document development process begins with Sponsor engaging all key stakeholders to develop a strategy and course(s) of action to address requirements gaps (typically identified by a CBA or similar study, DOTmLPF-P analysis, or following completion of an AoA).

**Key Stakeholder Involvement.** Thorough development of requirements strategy/course(s) of action (COAs) needs to involve key stakeholders across all functional and support areas to include programmers/core function leads and requirements SMEs (A5/8/9 reps), acquisition life cycle management (SAF/AQ, AFMC, SMC, AFLCMC, A4), test & evaluation, interoperability (A6), intelligence (A2) and risk/analysis (A9, A5R-OAS). Stakeholders may include outside agencies, other services, joint staff, OSD, etc.

- **NOTE: Refer to A5R Guidebook, Vol 1 for further detail on Key Stakeholders and roles.**
- **NOTE: For JCIDS documents with the potential to be designated by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper “JCB Interest” or “JROC Interest”, the document must strictly comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. For JCIDS documents likely to be designated “Joint Information”, Sponsors should comply with JCIDS format to the max extent practical, but strict compliance is not necessary or mandatory. The focus should be to make sure the documents capture the appropriate information at the necessary level of detail to support decision making and stakeholder coordination.**
- **NOTE: Sponsors are encouraged to work through AF/A5RP to initiate a dialogue with Joint Staff Gatekeeper early in document development process regarding proposed JSD and potential JPRs, this will ensure the staffing and approval process goes as smoothly and quickly as possible.**

**Goal.** The main goal of requirements strategy development and HPT preparation is to establish a course of
action to develop the right document, at the right time, with the right people involved to best enable timely fielding/implementation of a successful capability solution and comply with senior leader direction and applicable strategic guidance.

- **NOTE:** Each requirements strategy is tailored to support the proposed approach (non-materiel or materiel) and the proposed implementation or phase of acquisition, as applicable. See Section 2 for further detail on specific strategy development unique to each particular type of document.

### 3.2. Requirements Strategy Review (RSR) [decision by the AFGK]

Following collaboration with key stakeholders to develop the requirements strategy and course(s) of action, the Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/ASR SME) submits the topic via IRSS for AFGK approval prior to convening the High Performance Team (HPT) for document development.

- Formal HAF-level approval (via the Requirements Strategy Review) is required prior to a Sponsor convening the HPT or conducting any substantive document development activity. Specifically, Sponsors should not begin development of any JCIDS document until the HPT strategy has been reviewed and approved by the AFGK.
- The AFGK is the approval authority for AF Sponsors to convene an HPT, but the decision may be elevated to AF/ASR if required to review significant changes that may have occurred since the original strategy/COA was approved or since the predecessor document was validated (e.g. significant changes in strategic guidance, CONOPS, threats, operational mission profile(s), risk assessment, affordability/funding, or schedule/timeframe, etc.)

**Purpose of the Requirements Strategy Review (RSR):** The main purpose of the RSR is to ensure the Sponsor is ready to convene the High Performance Team for document development. This includes reviewing the timing, program status, funding, HPT membership, and the location/format for the proposed HPT event.

- **GOAL:** The overall goal of the Requirements Strategy Review process is to preclude AF Sponsors from accomplishing substantive work on a document only to find out they did it wrong... (e.g. not the right document, not the right timing, or didn’t have the right people involved) and then they have to re-accomplish previous work, or get stuck on a path for a document that is inconsistent with the accepted approach for JCIDS implementation.

**RSR/HPT Request Package.** The Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/ASR SME) submits a RSR/HPT Request package to AF/ASRP via IRSS not later than 30-21 days prior to the start of the proposed HPT event. See the ASRP Portal page for RSR/HPT Request Package template and checklist. Briefing templates are maintained in IRSS.

- Request memo; endorsed by Sponsor requirements policy office (O-6 level)
- RSR Checklist; completed by Sponsor (all questions need to be answered)
- Presentation Materials (slides, etc.); follow guidance/templates from AF/ASRP (posted in IRSS)
- **Proposed Plan of Action & Milestone (POAM) for completion of the document (see sample above)**
- **Specific recommendations for: proposed JSD, potential JPRs (if any) and proposed AF RDA**
- Supporting materials; endorsements, decision memos, assessments (as required)

**RSR/HPT Request - Approval Criteria.** The Sponsor must demonstrate the HPT Strategy and POAM were developed in collaboration with all key stakeholders, including appropriate resourcing reps (to include planners and programmers) and Implementing Command reps (to include systems engineering, test, sustainment, and acquisition-intelligence analysts.)
• **NOTE:** Each HPT strategy is tailored to support the proposed document. See Section 2 for further detail on the specific strategy approval criteria for each particular type of document.

RSR/HPT Request - Decision/Approval. The AFGK provides the document Sponsor with specific guidance and required actions to be accomplished (as necessary). The formal AFGK decision and associated actions are documented in writing (e.g. memo, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

• **NOTE:** Any direction or action items must be accomplished by the Sponsor before convening the HPT or during the HPT, etc. (as applicable or as directed). Compliance with AFGK direction will be verified before the draft document will be accepted for review and staffing (or as directed).

### 3.3. High Performance Team (HPT) [led by the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor]

The High Performance Team concept is used to develop AF-sponsored JCIDS documents (i.e. ICD, CDD, CPD-CDD Annex, CDD Update, IS-ICD/CDD and DCR).

**Purpose.** The purpose of the HPT is to provide the appropriate level of cross-functional involvement in requirements generation from the ICD through the CPD-CDD/Update/Annex to produce executable, risk-based, fiscally informed requirements that deliver affordable capabilities at optimal cycle time to the warfighter. The HPT concept accelerates the document development process, improves the quality of the document, and can provide an enduring forum for developing, fielding/implementing, and sustaining operational systems.

**Training and Certification for HPT Members.** To comply with JCIDS guidance, the Sponsor HPT lead, the Acquisition POC, and the HPT facilitator(s) must be RMCT Level B certified. All other HPT members must complete RMCT Level A as a minimum, and are highly encouraged to be RMCT Level B certified.

• Refer to the A5R Guidebook Volume 1, Section 3 for further information on Requirements Manager Certification Training (RMCT).

**HPT Membership.** HPT success hinges on participation from members with strong functional and requirements expertise.

• **HPT Lead.** The Sponsor designates an appropriately experienced requirements manager (RMCT Level B certified, as a minimum) to lead all HPT document development activity.

• **Acquisition POC.** The acquisition POC should be an appropriately experienced program manager or systems engineer (as appropriate) and must be RMCT Level B certified, as a minimum.

  • **NOTE:** AFMC/A5R and/or AFSPC (for SMC programs) provide assistance to the Sponsor and AFGK in identifying the appropriate acquisition POC(s) to participate on the HPT.

• **HPT Facilitator(s).** A representative from AF/A5R (normally the A5R SME and/or Sponsor Policy rep) facilitates the HPT. In situations where an AF/A5R SME are unable to participate, AF/A5RP can provide just in time training and other assistance, as needed. Additionally, AF/A5RP maintains checklists, guides, templates, best practices and tips to ensure consistency and standardization in AF document development. See the A5RP Portal page.

• **Core and Support Members.** Core members are typically present for all HPT activities, but participation can be tailored based on the subject matter, subject to approval during the RSR. Support members are typically not physically present during the HPT event, but must be available via phone or e-mail for reach back. See table below for sample HPT membership.
HPT MEMBERSHIP

Core Membership:
HPT Lead (Sponsor rep), Acquisition POC (PM or Systems Engineer), SDP&E, Test, Intel, Communications, Logistics/MX, other service/agency users
Facilitator(s): AF/A5R SME or Sponsor Policy & Process SME

Support Membership:
Resources: AF Planning and Programming (Panel reps), SAF/FM, Manpower
Acquisition and Test: SAF/AQ, AFMC/A5R, AF/TEP, AFOTEC
Supportability and Survivability: SAF/IE (Energy), AF/A2 (Intel), SAF/A6 (Net-Ready), AF/A4 (Logistics/MX), AETC (Force Development Training), AF/A3 (Operational Training), AFHSIO (HSI), AF/A10 (CBRN), AF/A5RK (Cyber)
Other: SAF/A6 (DODAF Architectures), AF/A9 (Risk Assessments), A5R-OAS Reps (Analysis)
Policy & Process: AF/A5RP and Sponsor POC’s, AF/A5R FCB rep (Joint Staff POC’s)

- Refer to ASR Guidebook Volume 1 for further detail on Key Stakeholders and roles.

3.4. Initial Document Review [by AFGK]. Following the HPT event, the Sponsor (working through their IRSS POC and the AF/A5R SME) submits the draft version of the document via IRSS for review by A5R SME and ASRP followed by AFGK approval to enter into formal JCIDS staffing via IRSS and KM/DS. AFGK decision is documented in writing (e.g. memo, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

- NOTE: For JCIDS documents with the potential to be designated by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper as “JCB Interest” or “JROC Interest”, the document must strictly comply with JCIDS Manual format and content guidance. For JCIDS documents likely to be designated as “Joint Information”, Sponsors should comply with JCIDS format to the max extent practical, but strict compliance is not necessary or mandatory. The focus should be to make sure the documents capture the appropriate information at the necessary level of detail to support decision making and stakeholder coordination.

Document submission is accompanied by a memo signed by the Sponsor’s requirements policy office (O-6 level) verifying the document has been reviewed at the MAJCOM (or equivalent) level for compliance with initial review criteria listed below:

- NOTE: Denial of entry into formal staffing is based primarily on failure to meet the Joint Staff Gatekeeper initial review criteria, as described in the JCIDS Manual. This includes the following:
  - CBA, Studies or other supporting data missing or not provided in IRSS and KM/DS
    - NOTE: IRSS POCs should link to the supporting documents via IRSS or upload the supporting files to the document record.
  - Predecessor document missing or not provided in IRSS and KM/DS
    - NOTE: IRSS POCs should link to the predecessor documents via IRSS or upload the supporting files to the document record.
  - Exceeding the allowable page count – or achieving page count by not using 12 pitch Times New Roman font and 1” margins
  - Missing or incomplete DoDAF Architecture Views
    - NOTE: The appropriate AF and Joint Staff document reviewers need to be granted access to ALL architecture views.
Incomplete or unclear representation of capability gaps.

- **NOTE:** Except in rare cases, the capability requirement is not the same as the capability gap. In most cases, there is some level of legacy capability, and the gap must be presented as the difference between the legacy capabilities and the capability requirements, along with the operational impact or risk.

- Values specified as “TBD” or unquantified descriptions in the definition of operational attributes (in the ICD) or KPPs/KSAs/APAs (in the CDD/CDD/CPD Annex).

- **NOTE:** Sufficient analysis must be available to support all proposed initial objective values (in ICDs) and proposed threshold/objective values (in CDDs/CDD Annexes).

- Omission of any of the mandatory KPPs without appropriate justification.

- Incomplete or missing life cycle cost data

- Unclear or omitted discussion of interdependencies between the proposed capability and enabling capabilities, or other capabilities within System of Systems approach.

- **NOTE:** The AFGK is the approval authority for entry into formal staffing, but the decision may be delegated to the A5RP Branch Chief level, unless critical issues or concerns require O-6 level intervention and resolution prior to submission or acceptance by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper.

- **NOTE:** Document rejection prevents initiation of the joint staffing process until corrective actions are taken, and the revised document is accepted by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper.

### 3.5. Formal JCIDS Staffing [in IRSS and KM/DS]

Following AFGK initial document review, the Sponsor updates the document as required/directed and submits a staffing-ready draft version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate formal JCIDS staffing. AF/A5RP assigns a formal tasking in IRSS for formal AF staffing/commenting and forwards the document to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper via KM/DS for initial review and formal (joint) document review and commenting.

Regardless of potential Acquisition Category (ACAT) or proposed requirements validation authority, AF-sponsored JCIDS Documents ICDs, CDDs, CPDs, and Joint DCRs are submitted to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper to determine the appropriate staffing process and validation authority.

- **NOTE:** Document Checklists (based on JCIDS Manual format and content) are maintained on the A5RP Portal page and in IRSS, to assist document developers and document reviewers. Other specific criteria for document review and approval is specified in Section 2 of this Guidebook.

#### Joint Certifications/ Endorsements

Depending on the nature of the requirement(s) (e.g. mandatory KPPs, intelligence supportability, etc.), Sponsors may need to secure additional joint certifications/endorsements during the staffing process. Refer to the JCIDS Manual for additional guidance on the joint certification/endorsement process.

Sponsors are encouraged to work through the HAF functional (e.g. AF/A2 (Threat and Intel), AF/A3T (Operational Training Infrastructure), AF/A6 (Net Ready KPP), SAF/IEN (Energy KPP), etc.), along with the AF/A5R SME and FCB reps to engage JCIDS process stakeholders at any time prior to formal staffing to help ensure documents are developed in a way that does not require significant rework during staffing. This is particularly important when a Sponsor intends to request a waiver or exemption for any certifications/endorsements (e.g. Sponsors proposing exemptions to any of the mandatory KPPs).
• **NOTE:** The JCIDS Manual contains separate sections (Annexes to Enclosure D) which provide content guidance to Sponsors for each of the mandatory KPPs, intelligence supportability, and weapons safety as part of document development (i.e. writing guides).

• **NOTE:** The JCIDS Manual contains separate sections (Annexes to Enclosure F) which provide certification/endorsement guidance for review of mandatory KPPs, intelligence supportability, weapons safety, and DOTmLPF-P as part of document staffing (i.e. reviewer guides).

**Document Commenting Phase.** AF reviewers submit comments per the IRSS tasking instructions. Identify comments as “critical,” “substantive,” or “administrative” as described below. Proper justification for critical or substantive comments must be provided in the CRM.

• **NOTE:** In order for data to upload properly, comments must be submitted using the Comment Resolution Matrix (CRM) template as provided (i.e. no alterations or deletions to the template).

• **Critical.** A critical comment indicates a “non-concur” position on the document until the comment is satisfactorily resolved. Critical comments should be restricted to critical issues regarding KPPs and KSAs, concepts of operations, violation of policies and directives, and other fundamental issues concerning cost, schedule or performance that would bring into question the rationale for the document to be approved.
  
  o **NOTE:** Per JCIDS Guidance, critical comments may also address text or issues which would otherwise be considered Substantive, but if not corrected would prevent the document from serving its intended purpose, lead to the withholding of a mandatory certification or endorsement, or result in disapproval by the validation authority.

  o **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS guidance, any organization submitting a critical comment must obtain GO/SES endorsement from their organization prior to submitting comments in IRSS. The name of the GO/SES endorser is required in the IRSS task response and is captured in the IRSS coordination report.

• **Substantive.** A substantive comment indicates a "Concur, with comment" response to the staffing, but scope and quantity of several substantive comments may also lead to a "Non-concur" response to the staffing until satisfactorily adjudicated. A substantive comment addresses minor or moderate changes to correct or clarify minor factual inaccuracies, information that is incorrect, misleading, confusing, or inconsistent with other sections.

• **Administrative.** An administrative comments address typographical, formatting, or grammatical errors or changes to writing style to make the document easier to read and understand without substantively changing the content of the document.

3.6. **Comment Resolution [led by the Sponsor].** At the completion of the formal staffing phase, AF/A5RP consolidates all comments for AF-sponsored documents into two CRMs; one CRM contains comments from AF review and the second CRM contains comments from the Joint review. Sponsors use the CRMs to record adjudication action taken in response to each comment. The Sponsor must show the rationale for not fully accepting a critical or substantive comment.

  **Timing/Suspense:** Per the JCIDS Manual procedures, the Sponsor has 30 calendar days to adjudicate comments. Upon completion of comment adjudication (or at the end of the 30 days), the Sponsor is expected to submit the updated draft version of the document for validation and approval, along with disposition of all comments and status of any unresolved comments.
3.7. MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor Internal Approval/Endorsement. Following completion of comment resolution, MAJCOM/Agency Sponsors conduct an internal review (as required) to approve the document before it goes forward for final HAF-level review and validation staffing.

MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor Endorsement. Documents submitted for formal validation and approval are accompanied by a transmittal letter signed by:

- Commander (CC) for documents designated for CSAF approval
- Director of Requirements (5/8/9) for all other documents

- **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the staffing process, Sponsors may submit documents to AF/A5RP to request initiation of validation and approval (i.e. proceed with the eAFROC) concurrently with staffing required to obtain the MAJCOM/Sponsor endorsement memo.

- **NOTE:** The MAJCOM/Sponsor endorsement/transmittal letter must be obtained prior to initiating the AF validation staffing portion, i.e. the package will not be submitted to AF/A5R for approval to move forward until all eAFROC items (listed below) are complete.

3.8 Validation and Approval [AF and Joint level]. Following completion of internal MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor process, the Sponsor POC submits the updated, final validation-ready version of the document to AF/A5RP via IRSS to initiate eAFROC and validation staffing.

- **NOTE:** The eAFROC and Validation Staffing is not a commenting phase. The purpose is to route the document for final certifications/endorsements/attestations (as required) and for AF validation.

- **NOTE:** Validation and Approval criteria are tailored to support the document. See Section 2 for further detail on the specific approval and/or validation criteria for each particular type of document.

**eAFROC Review:** AF validation and approval begins with stakeholder review (conducted as an eAFROC in IRSS). The eAFROC affords a final review by all stakeholders to “vote” on whether or not they agree the document is ready to go forward for final AF and/or joint validation, including:

- Ensure comments have been properly adjudicated, or proper justification to proceed with unresolved comments (e.g. appeal to the validation authority, adjudicate at FCB/JCB, etc.)
- Ensure comment adjudication has not created secondary issues that would preclude validation
- Provide and/or ensure any required certifications, endorsements or attestations (or waivers) are obtained prior to validation
  - **NOTE:** To comply with JCIDS, for documents designated as “Joint Integration”, Joint Staff certifications, endorsements (or waivers) must be obtained prior to AF validation. This includes proper adjudication of comments made by Joint Staff certifiers/endorsers during staffing.
- Ensure MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor endorsement is obtained prior to initiating AF validation staffing
The eAFROC review concludes with AF/A5R approval to 1) forward the package to CSAF/VCSAF, the designated AF RDA (as determined by AF/A5R) for AF validation staffing and 2) forward the document to the FCB to begin joint validation, when required.

- **NOTE:** In an effort to expedite the validation process, AF documents may be submitted to the Joint Staff for review by the FCB Working Group(s) and/or FCB immediately following the eAFROC and AF/A5R approval – i.e. FCB review may be concurrent with AF validation staffing to the CSAF/VCSAF, AF RDA.

AF Validation Staffing. Formal decisions are documented in writing (i.e. requirements decision memo, RDM) and approved by the CSAF (for documents associated with any program designated as a Major Defense Acquisition Program “MDAP”) or the VCSAF–designated RDA (for all other documents), as determined by AF/A5R.

- **NOTE:** AF validation and approval includes both the AF decision/direction regarding validation of the document and the approval to forward to JCB and/or JROC for Joint Validation, when applicable. AF approval (i.e. CSAF/VCSAF decision memo, signed by the AF RDA) is required prior to releasing the document beyond the FCB level for final joint validation by the JCB and/or JROC.

Document Completion. After AF validation and approval (and joint validation, when required) the Sponsor provides a copy of the final version of the document via IRSS. AF/A5R ensures the final document (with signed validation/decision memo attached) along with all supporting material is posted in IRSS. AF/A5R also forwards a copy to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper for archiving in KM/DS (regardless of ACAT or JSD).

- **NOTE:** Completion (exit) criteria are tailored to support the document. See Section 2 for further detail on the specific completion criteria for each particular type of document.

- **NOTE:** The document is the official document of record and must be updated to reflect any changes made during formal validation and review.
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Terms

NOTE: The purpose of this glossary is to help the reader understand the terms listed as used in this publication. It is not intended to encompass all terms. See pertinent Joint and AF specific publications for standardized terms and definitions for DoD and AF use.

Affordability – The degree to which the life-cycle cost of an acquisition program is in consonance with the long-range modernization, force structure, and manpower plans of the individual DoD Components (military departments and defense agencies), as well as for the Department as a whole. Affordability constraints force prioritization of requirements, drive performance and cost trades, and ensure that unaffordable programs do not enter the acquisition process.

Capability - The ability to complete a task or execute a course of action under specified conditions and level of performance through combinations of means and ways across the doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, and policy (DOTmLPF-P) to perform a set of tasks to execute a specified course of action.

Capability Gap - The inability to meet or exceed a capability requirement, resulting in an associated operational risk until closed or mitigated. The gap may be the result of no fielded capability, lack of proficiency or sufficiency in a fielded capability solution, or the need to replace a fielded capability solution to prevent a future gap. [CJCSI 5123/CJCSI-3170]
**Capability Requirement (or Requirement, Need)** - A capability which is required to meet an organization’s roles, functions, and missions in current or future operations. To the greatest extent possible, capability requirements are described in relation to tasks, standards and conditions in accordance with the Universal Joint Task List or equivalent DoD Component Task List. [CJCSI 5123/CJCSI 3170]

**Capability Solution** - A materiel solution or non-materiel solution to satisfy one or more capability requirements (or needs) and reduce or eliminate one or more capability gaps

**Cost-Capability Analysis (CCA)** – A process that helps define the trade space between cost, schedule/technology risk and performance and how it relates to the “value to the warfighter.”

**DOTmLPF-P** – Doctrine, Organization, Training, materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy (Where the little “m” is non-developmental materiel) [JCIDS Manual]

**Feasible** - A requirement that is technically achievable and executable within the estimated schedule and budgeted life cycle cost.

**Full Operational Capability (FOC)** - Full attainment of the capability to effectively employ a weapon, item of equipment or system of approved specific characteristics, which is manned and operated by a trained, equipped and supported military force or unit. The specifics for any particular system FOC are defined in that system’s Capability Development Document and Capability Production Document.

**Initial Operational Capability (IOC)** - That first attainment of the capability to employ effectively a weapon, item of equipment, or system of approved specific characteristics with the appropriate number, type, and mix of trained and equipped personnel necessary to operate, maintain, and support the system. It is normally defined in the CDD and CPD.

**Lead Command** - Lead command designation establishes advocacy for weapon systems during their life cycle and clarifies responsibilities for all using and supporting organizations. The designated lead command provides a primary input into the process of developing and maintaining a force structure with a balance of complementary capabilities. Lead command designation is not exclusive to major commands (MAJCOMs); Field Operating Agencies (FOAs) and Direct Reporting Unites (DRUs) may also be designated as Lead Commands. [Governed by AFPD 10-9]

**Materiel Development Decision (MDD)** - The MDD review is the formal entry point into the acquisition management system and is mandatory for all programs. The MDD is based on a validated requirements document (an ICD or equivalent requirements document) and the completion of the Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Study Guidance and the AoA Study Plan. This decision directs execution of the AoA, and authorizes entry into the Materiel Solution Analysis Phase of acquisition.

**Materiel Capability Solution** - Correction of a deficiency, satisfaction of a capability gap, or incorporation of new technology that results in the development, acquisition, procurement, or fielding of a new item (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, and related software & data, spares, repair parts, and support equipment, but excluding real property, installations, and utilities). In the case of family of systems and system of systems approaches, an individual materiel solution may not fully satisfy a necessary capability gap on its own. [CJCSI 5123/CJCSI 3170]

**Non-Materiel Solution** - Changes to doctrine, organization, training, (previously fielded) materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, or policy implemented to satisfy one or more capability requirements (or needs) and reduce or eliminate one or more gaps, without the need to develop or purchase new materiel capability solutions. The “little m” materiel portion is restricted to existing equipment, by use of existing materiel in alternate applications as an adaptation or repurposing not originally envisioned. [CJCSI 5123/CJCSI 3170]
**Objective Value** - The objective value is only applicable when a higher level of performance (above the threshold value) represents a significant increase in operational utility. Context must be provided to articulate what specific operational impact or risk is further mitigated if the performance were to reach the objective value. If applicable, the objective value must be feasible and achievable but may involve higher risk in life cycle cost, schedule or technology. Performance above the objective value does not warrant additional expenditure. [JCIDS Manual]

**Threshold Value** - A minimum acceptable operationally effective or suitable value below which the utility of the system becomes questionable. The threshold value for a performance attribute (KPP, KSA or APA) must also be considered achievable within the projected life cycle cost, schedule and technology at low to moderate risk. [JCIDS Manual]

**Validation** – The review and approval of capability requirement documents by a designated validation authority. The JROC is the ultimate validation authority for capability requirements unless otherwise delegated to a subordinate board or to a designated validation authority in a Service, CCMD, or other DOD Component. [CJCSI 5123/CJCSI 3170]

---

**Abbreviations and Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACAT</td>
<td>Acquisition Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>Acquisition Decision Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFGK</td>
<td>AF Gatekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoA</td>
<td>Analysis of Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Capabilities-Based Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Capability Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Capability Development Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWG</td>
<td>Capability Development Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTS</td>
<td>Commercial off the Shelf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Capability Production Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Comment Resolution Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCR</td>
<td>DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Manufacturing Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCB</td>
<td>Functional Capabilities Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOTS</td>
<td>Government off the Shelf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT</td>
<td>High Performance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD</td>
<td>Initial Capabilities Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSS</td>
<td>Information &amp; Resource Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCB</td>
<td>Joint Capabilities Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JROC</td>
<td>Joint Requirements Oversight Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JROCM</td>
<td>JROC Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSD</td>
<td>Joint Staffing Designator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM/DS</td>
<td>Knowledge Management &amp; Decision Support (system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPP</td>
<td>Key Performance Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td>Key System Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRIP</td>
<td>Low-Rate Initial Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Milestone Decision Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>AF/A5R Office of Aerospace Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT&amp;E</td>
<td>Operational Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>Requirements Strategy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;E</td>
<td>Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>