PREFACE

This guidebook explains the framework for oversight and implementation of the Air Force process for validation of operational capability requirements in support of overarching Capability Development efforts and in compliance with the main processes for “Requirements” via the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), for “Acquisition” via the Defense Acquisition System (DAS), and for “Resourcing” via the Air Force Strategy, Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution (SPPBE).

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

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 Requirements and Acquisition policies. Per AF/A5R direction and authority under HAF Mission Directive 1-7, to the maximum extent practical, Air Force Sponsors are expected to follow the guidance and procedures described in the AF/A5R Guidebooks or coordinate with AF/A5RP for tailoring.

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

OPR: James “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 A5RP Requirements Portal Page: go to https://www.my.af.mil
- Navigate to “Organizations A-Z”, then type in “A5RP Requirements”
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SECTION 1. OVERVIEW

Figure 1.1 Capability Development - Overview

Capability Development. This guidebook explains the framework for Air Force oversight and implementation of operational capability requirements development in support of overarching Capability Development efforts and in compliance with the main processes for “Requirements” via the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), for “Acquisition” via the Defense Acquisition System (DAS), and for “Resourcing” via the Air Force Strategy, Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution (SPPBE).

- **NOTE:** “Capability” is more than just equipment… it is the combination of People, Training, Equipment, across the entire spectrum of DOTMLPF-P... that is, Doctrine, Organizations, Training, Materiel (equipment), Leadership & Education, Personnel, Facilities and Policy. For example, equipment without properly trained people to operate and maintain it, is not a capability...

- When we talk about Materiel Solutions, we use “little m” to indicate previously fielded or non-developmental, “off the shelf” items… the type of materiel that can be obtained without going through formal JCIDS and DAS processes. The “Big M” is used to indicate solutions that require new development and/or new production of equipment via formal acquisition process.
1.1. “Capability Requirements” Defined. Capability requirements development activities are conducted in response to formal assessments of the AF’s ability (in both capability and capacity) to accomplish assigned roles, missions, functions and operations and associated risks. First we have to underscore the proper terminology used to describe capability requirements, capability gaps, and capability solutions.

Capability Requirement (Need). A capability requirement reflects a need to be able to accomplish or perform a certain task, set of tasks, or mission(s), under a specific set of conditions or constraints, and to a minimum level of performance in order to be considered effective and/or acceptable.

- **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 entire DOTMLPF-P spectrum to perform a set of tasks to execute a specified course of action.

- **Note: Requirements “Validation”**: In order to be considered valid, a capability requirement (need) is determined to be established by, derived from and traceable to assigned roles, missions, functions and operations. When referring to the “requirement”, it is important to distinguish between the capability requirement (e.g. the task, the thing that needs to be done), from the conditions or constraints under which it will be done, and the standards or degree to which it needs to be done.

- **Note: A capability requirement can only be fully understood in the context of a Concept of Operations (CONOPs) and how the capability will need to be integrated and supported in the intended operating environment. Well-written requirements have appropriately detailed descriptions of the task(s), conditions, standards, measures and a CONOPs.**

Attributes and Measures. Attributes describe the mission level and system level performance and suitability characteristics (e.g. speed, distance, range, payload, survivability, etc.) necessary to provide the required capability, under the given conditions, meeting at least the minimum acceptable (threshold) level of performance and at an acceptable or manageable level of operational risk. Measures of capability are related to both the quality of capability (also called proficiency; is it good enough?) and to the quantity or capacity/amount of the capability (also called sufficiency; do we have enough?)

- **Note: In JCIDS, system level attributes are expressed in terms of Key Performance Parameters (KPPs), Key System Attributes (KSAs), Additional Performance Attributes (APAs), Other System Attributes, and similar terms. Measures are expressed in terms of threshold (minimum acceptable) values and objective values (desired but still justifiable as being necessary, but associated with higher cost or technical risk, etc.)**

Capability Gaps and Risk Assessments. The difference (if any) between the capability requirement (i.e. what we need to be able to do, or how much we need) and the currently fielded capability as represented by our organizations, training, equipment, etc. (i.e. what we are actually able to do, or not able to do), represents the **capability gap**, if any exists. The risk of not addressing the gap illustrates the severity and/or level of urgency in developing a capability to mitigate the gap, either in part or in total.

- **Note: Gaps are expressed in terms of not being able to achieve the minimum threshold value of acceptable performance or suitability. Risk may be expressed as risk to mission, or risk to the force and is an integral part of decision making about addressing capability gaps.**

Capability Solutions and Opportunities. Our ability to provide a needed capability comes in the form of all materiel and non-materiel approaches we take to provide a fielded solution that meets warfighting needs. This includes a complementary mix of doctrine (and concepts), organizations (and basing), training (and mission rehearsals), materiel (equipment), leadership and education (force development), people
(manpower and skills), facilities (and support infrastructure) and policy – collectively known as the DOTMLPF-P areas.

- **Note: When we examine our ability or inability to provide the necessary capability, we fully examine this entire DOTMLPF-P spectrum to assess our potential gaps and risk, and identify potential solutions from each of the appropriate DOTMLPF-P areas.**
  
  - **Non-Materiel Solutions:** Changes to doctrine, organization, training, alternate use of existing equipment (e.g. change in tactics, techniques or procedures), leadership and education, personnel, facilities, or policy changes, etc. without the need to develop or purchase new materiel capability solutions.
  
  - **Materiel Capability Solutions:**
    - “Little m” - non-developmental, “off the shelf” items, equipment purchases and procurements that do not require new development or production contracting
    - “Big M” –items that require new development and/or new production contracts via formal acquisition processes

- **Capability Opportunities:** Innovations or other new approaches and items or enhancements that are not necessarily associated with a specific capability gap, but are aligned with valid mission requirements (or needs).

### 1.2. AF Implementation of JCIDS (“Requirements” Process)

The AF utilizes tailored variations of JCIDS (again, JCIDS is the Joint Capability Integration and Development System) for the development of operational warfighting capability requirements documentation as described in Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 5123, the associated Manual for the Operation of JCIDS (the JCIDS Manual) and DoD Instruction 5000-series.02, Operation of the Defense Acquisition System Pathways.

- **Note: It is important for all stakeholders in the requirements process to have a solid understanding of the overarching Joint and Defense level policies and guidance. Additional information is also available via requirements manager training as described in section 3.3 of this Guidebook**

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force (CSAF) is designated as the Chief Requirements Officer for the Air Force. The Deputy Chief of Staff, Strategy, Integration and Requirements, AF/A5 (through AF/A5R) is the OPR for implementation of AF operational capability requirements development, as described in HAF Mission Directive 1-7.

**MAJCOM/Agency Requirements Sponsors.** Sponsorship is assigned to a MAJCOM/Agency to lead the development of capability requirements and associated documentation for their assigned systems, programs, functions and/or missions. Sponsorship includes, but is not limited to advocating for resourcing, manpower, and any other support necessary for the conduct of requirements development activities.

- **NOTE: Specific Sponsor responsibilities are addressed in Section 3 of this Guidebook.**

### 1.3 Scope of AF/A5R Requirements Oversight

The particular characterization of solution categories determines the process oversight and decision authority for the decisions to be made about capability solutions – the process and procedures described in the AF/A5R Requirements Development Guidebooks (hereafter referred to simply as the A5R Guidebooks) are the main processes used to develop and field new weapon systems, information systems and other operational systems with direct impact on Joint warfighting (what we refer to as operational warfighting capabilities). Special Access Programs follow the Guidebook procedures to the greatest extent practical (contact the AF/A5RP Special Project branch for more information.)
Exceptions: There are many other processes and governance for development of capabilities and AF systems or equipment purchases that do not utilize the requirements process as governed by AF/A5R; examples include, but are not limited to business system capability, medical support, manpower and education requirements, facilities and infrastructure, etc. Unless otherwise required to obtain Joint review and/or validation of requirements documents via the AF/A5R requirements process, the following authorities apply:

*Note: The exceptions listed below apply to those organizations and agencies that have been granted specific authority to “determine requirements” for their assigned area. These authorities are inherent to the organization or agency, and their authority does not come from AF/A5R, per se. Organizations or agencies using their own authority should have their own process and their own form of documentation – organizations or agencies choosing to utilize the documents specified in the AF/A5R Guidebooks need to follow the AF/A5R process for development and approval of those documents. Bottom line: outside organizations do not have independent authority to develop or approve/validate any of the documents described in the AF/A5R Guidebooks, except by following the AF/A5R process.*

- Business Systems and capabilities are managed under the governance of the Business Capability Acquisition Cycle (BCAC) and described in Air Force Manual 63-133 and under the Defense Business Council, as governed by DoD Instruction 5000.75. The AF lead is the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force for Management (SAF/MG).

- Medical capabilities and medical support equipment and supplies are managed by the Surgeon General Requirements Oversight Council (SGROC) under the governance and funding authority of the Defense Health Agency. *Note: Sponsors comply with AF/A5R process guidelines, as applicable, when proposing a solution approach that utilizes any of the AF/A5R proscribed processes or documents (i.e. Urgent Needs, Modification Proposals, Middle Tier of Acquisition Requirements Documents, and any variation of JCIDS document or formal JCIDS review/validation). The AF lead is the Medical Support Agency (AFMSA/SG5).*

- Intelligence capabilities that are primarily or wholly funded with National Intelligence Program (NIP) funds are developed, reviewed and validated in accordance with the Intelligence Community Capability Requirements (ICCR) process. The AF lead is the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (AF/A2).

- The Nuclear Weapons Council has oversight of nuclear weapons activities per DOD Instruction 5030.55. Note. Sponsors comply with AF/A5R policy and process, as applicable, when developing DoD or military-specific components or subcomponents to a nuclear weapon. The AF lead is Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration (AF/A10).

- Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has validation authority for Special Operations-Peculiar (SO-P) capabilities including SO-P urgent operational needs. The AF lead is HQ Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC/A5R).

- Capabilities and equipment primarily related to Security Forces (SF) functional areas are managed under the authority of the AF Security Forces Center (AFSFC) and under the governance of AF/A4S. *Note: Sponsors comply with AF/A5R process guidelines, as applicable, when proposing a solution approach that utilizes any of the AF/A5R proscribed processes or documents (i.e.
Urgent Needs, Modification Proposals, Middle Tier of Acquisition Requirements Documents, and any variation of JCIDS document or formal JCIDS review/validation). HQ Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC/A5R) is the command OPR for SF capability requirements.

- Capabilities and equipment primarily related to Civil Engineering (CE) functional areas are managed under the authority of the Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC) and under the governance of AF/A4C. Note: Sponsors comply with AF/A5R process guidelines, as applicable, when proposing a solution approach that utilizes any of the AF/A5R proscribed processes or documents (i.e. Urgent Needs, Modification Proposals, Middle Tier of Acquisition Requirements Documents, and any variation of JCIDS document or formal JCIDS review/validation). HQ Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC/A5R) is the command OPR for CE capability requirements.

- Review and approval for capability requirements and modification proposals related to Common Support Equipment (CSE) is delegated to AFMC/A5R.

1.4. Key Tenets of AF Capability Requirements Development. Capability requirements validation and development and fielding of both materiel and non-materiel capability solutions are accomplished consistent with AF direction and priorities in alignment with the AF’s Capability Development Guidance (CDG), resourcing policies, and with acquisition policies. Operational capability requirements development operates simultaneously with full cooperation and close coordination of all stakeholders and enablers, especially the resourcing, and acquisition communities.

- NOTE: Validated capability requirements and system level performance attributes provide the basis for defining the products that are acquired through the acquisition system; and the SPPBE process determines resource allocations and provides the funds necessary to execute planned programs as well as constraining the entire process to seek affordable solutions.

- NOTE: Throughout a product’s life cycle, adjustments may have to be made to keep the requirements, acquisition and resourcing processes aligned. Capability requirements and system performance attributes may have to be adjusted to conform to technical and fiscal reality. Acquisition programs may have to adjust to changing requirements and funding availability. Programmed and budgeted funds may have to be adjusted to make programs executable or to adapt to evolving validated capability requirements and priorities.

KEY TENET -- STABILITY. Stable support for capability requirements and resourcing are important for successful program execution. Stakeholders and process owners work closely together to adapt to changing circumstances as needed, and to identify and resolve issues as early as possible.

- Program stability necessitates effective and ongoing communication between resourcing, acquisition and user functional leads including but not limited to direct involvement in the SPPBE review process, and participation in program reviews conducted under the governance of the acquisition and requirements processes.

KEY TENET -- AFFORDABILITY. Analysis and investment review is necessary to avoid starting or continuing solution approaches or acquisition programs that cannot be executed or supported within reasonable expectations for future budgets. Assessing affordability is crucial for establishing fiscal feasibility of the program, informing Analyses of Alternatives (AoAs), guiding capability requirements and engineering tradeoffs, and setting realistic program baselines to control life-cycle costs or other implementation and support expenses.

- Affordability management necessitates effective and ongoing communication between acquisition and the user/functional leads on the cost and risk implications associated with
capability attributes and design parameters. For materiel acquisition approaches, the Program Manager (PM) is responsible for the systems engineering trade analysis showing how cost and capability vary with major design parameters in materiel acquisition programs. For more detail, refer to DoDI 5000.02, Enclosure 8.

KEY TENET -- TIMELINESS. Timing relates to both the timeframe in which the capability is needed and the schedule for which we should realistically expect to be able to achieve implementation or initial/full capability fielding. Timing provides the framework for determining how long we have to accomplish development and fielding of a solution. A program or initiative doesn’t necessarily have to go fast to provide a solution that is “on time.”

- **Timeliness depends on when the capability is needed.** Timing is expressed in terms of the expected or desired timeframe for completion of actions necessary to achieve Initial Operational Capability (IOC), also known as initial fielding or initial/limited deployment in some cases. Timing and schedule are also expressed in terms of the final or “Full” Operational Capability (FOC) which is when we need or expect delivery of the final full capability (or when the final production and fielding will be completed).

- **Urgent/Rapid Process:** When time is the most important factor, when we need something right away because of the risk to the force, or risk to the mission – we utilize what is known as the urgent or rapid process. With this approach, we may need to “take what we can get” and trade off some performance by accepting a less than full capability in order to field a capability solution as soon as possible.

- **Normal/Deliberate (or deliberative) Process:** When we don’t need the capability right way, when we are required to take our time and find an optimal approach, we utilize what is known as the deliberate process. This involves balancing the trades between finding best performance, at the right price, and which meets our timeline. We may choose to take more time, to get a better price or a better product.

- **Agile/Streamlined Process:** When necessary, in order to expedite the fielding of capability to the warfighter and addressing capability gaps, requirements sponsors and solution developers seek out and utilize courses of action that provide the best option to minimize the time it takes to develop and field solutions:
  - **NOTE:** Preferred options include selecting approaches that utilize “off the shelf” or commercially available items, existing designs with mature technology and proven concepts, etc. while avoiding options that require lengthy development, use of immature technology or complex software or other integration challenges.

- In the interest of further expediting requirements and solution implementation timelines, decision making should utilize the most expeditious means available; electronic staffing and/or direct communication is the preferred method of review whenever practical.
  - **NOTE:** Decision/approval authorities should be delegated to the lowest level commensurate with the activity and in a manner that promotes timely action.
  - **NOTE:** The MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor, in conjunction with the Program Office/PM and resourcing/budgeting community should seek and use all available authorities and/or waivers to expediously provide an acceptable level of information sufficient to support the decision being made, consistent with governing policies and statutes.
**KEY TENET -- FEASIBILITY.** Feasibility is the measure of whether or not the solution approach is considered to be in the “realm of the possible.” The solution approach is considered feasible when we expect it is something we will actually be able to accomplish given the amount of time, technology and resources we have available to develop and field or implement the solution.

- **Non-Materiel Approaches:** For non-materiel approaches, this means we need to seek out and utilize solution approaches that can actually be implemented, within the available resource and time constraints, and will have the desired impact to provide the capability or address the gap. There needs to be solid and coordinated support for taking the action, mainly by identifying the functional process owner(s) who acknowledge their role and agree to take the necessary action, including any allocation of resources in the form of funding, manpower, etc.

- **Materiel Approaches:** For materiel solution approaches, per acquisition policy, the acquisition program leadership and specifically, the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) participates in the validation review of capability requirements documents to ensure feasibility. This feasibility review takes place prior to final requirements document validation (by the requirements validation authority) in order to ensure compliance with the intent of this policy, and statutory requirements of 10 USC section 2547(b).

  - **Feasibility Attestation.** For AF-sponsored capability development documents (CDDs) and CDD Annexes, the Implementing Command (AF Materiel Command (AFMC) or AF Space Command (AFSPC), as appropriate), provides written attestation that the capability requirements and performance attributes as described in the document have been reviewed and determined to be feasible (i.e. technically achievable and executable with respect to program cost and fielding targets, at low to moderate program risk). The feasibility determination includes a PM assessment and is coordinated with the Program Executive Officer (PEO); dissenting viewpoints of the PM and/or PEO are included and explained in the attestation memo. The attestation memo is provided to AF/A5R in conjunction with document review prior to final validation staffing.

  - **Testability Attestation.** For all AF programs, AFOTEC attests (via official memo to AF/A5R) that capability requirements as described in the CDD or CDD Annex 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.

1.5. IRSS (AF) and KM/DS (Joint) Staffing Tools

**Information & Resource Support System (IRSS).** IRSS (pronounced “iris”) is a web-based tool on the SIPRNet AF Portal designed to facilitate processing and tasking of AF and non-AF sponsored capability requirements documents, assessments and analysis for AF review. IRSS is also used for archiving AF-sponsored capability requirements documents and all associated decision/validation memo’s.

- **NOTE:** Each AF organization/office responsible for reviewing capability-requirements documents (including CBA/study and AoA) designates an IRSS POC responsible for receiving and responding to taskings, and uploading sponsored documents and supporting materials into IRSS (if applicable).

- **NOTE:** For documents and related data classified above the secret level or protected by SAP/SAR or ACCM designations, contact AF/A5RP, Special Projects Branch. Documents are processed and tasked in IRSS by providing pointers to the systems where the documents can be found.
- **NOTE:** Access to the IRSS system requires users to first obtain a SIPRNet AF Portal account.

Knowledge Management/Decision Support (KM/DS). KM/DS is the Joint Staff electronic staffing and repository system on SIPRNet. The Joint Staff Gatekeeper manages the organization of requirements data on the KM/DS system and ensures Sponsors provide studies or other data supporting their capability requirement documents prior to initiation of formal joint staffing, when required.

- **NOTE:** AF/A5RP ensures copies of AF-sponsored documents are archived in both IRSS and KM/DS.

Classification and Releasability. Document Sponsors are reminded to follow classification marking guidance to include direction that the use of “Not Releasable to Foreign Nationals” (NOFORN) caveat on Department of Defense (DoD) Information, to include contract documents, shall not be applied to non-intelligence information except for Naval Nuclear Propulsion Information and the National Disclosure Policy document (NDP-1).
**Figure 1.6. Capability Requirements Process Overview.**

**START** - Before any action can be taken, Requirements Managers and Requirements Sponsors first:

- **Identify Capability Requirements (Mission Needs) related to assigned roles, missions, functions...**
- **Then determine if there are any associated Capability Gaps which present an Unacceptable Risk**
- Assess and propose potential solution approaches to address gaps and mitigate risk

**NOTE:** Sponsors considering potential courses of action (COAs) to address gaps start small (with non-materiel approaches, modifications to existing systems, etc.) and work their way up (to more complex materiel approaches, larger programs) and new development (especially for immature technology, software intensive projects, etc.) is seen as a last resort when all other options have been explored and exhausted and deemed not suitable to address the gap(s).
Figure 1.7 Scope of AF/A5R Solution Approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution Approaches</th>
<th>Requirements Documentation</th>
<th>Requirements Guidance</th>
<th>Implementation Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Needs Process: for urgent acquisition of materiel solutions for Combat / Contingency Ops; Initial fielding within 2 years</td>
<td>Urgent Operational Need (UON) or Joint Urgent/Emergent Operational Need (JUON/JEON)</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 2</td>
<td>DoD 5000.02, Encl. 13 and AFPAM 63-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Non-materiel solutions including Non-developmental (off the shelf) equipment purchase (&quot;little m&quot;)</td>
<td>DOTmlPF-P Change Recommendation (DCR), only as needed i.e. change implementation across multiple agencies, MAJCOMs, Services, etc.</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 3</td>
<td>DOTmlPF-P Functional Area; Other Transaction Authority (OTA) to procure commodity/stock items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications: for upgrades and enhancement of fielded systems</td>
<td>AF Form 1067, and Modification Proposal Addendum (as required)</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 4</td>
<td>AFI 63-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tier of Acquisition (MTA): for materiel solutions via Rapid Prototyping or Rapid Fielding; completed within 5 years</td>
<td>Rapid Prototyping Requirement Document (RPRD) or Rapid Fielding Requirement Document (RFRD)</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 5</td>
<td>NDAA FY 2016, Sec 804 (Public Law 114-92) and AFI 63-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Solution Development: the normal (deliberate) process for new warfighting system development and/or production and fielding</td>
<td>Initial Capability Document (ICD), and Capability Development Document (CDD) and CDD Annex (for increments)</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 3</td>
<td>DODI 5000.02 and AFI 63-101/20-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems (IT-Box) for software system development</td>
<td>IS-ICD or IS-CDD (IS variants of regular ICD and CDD, i.e. IT Box)</td>
<td>AF/A5R Guidebook, Volume 3</td>
<td>DODI 5000.02 and AFI 63-101/20-101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most “non-materiel” solutions do need to come thru the AF/A5R process — each DOTMLPF-P areas has its own process for coordination and approval of changes. "Little m", equipment purchases can be done without formal acquisition governance

In the requirements process governed by AF/A5R, the selection of the appropriate requirements pathway is addressed by what we call a Requirements Strategy Review — where our goal is to determine if you are in the right process, for the right document, at the right time, with the right people involved (before wasting time only to be told you did it wrong).

Each approach option has distinct procedures and documentation and sources of detailed and specific guidance are listed in this table — refer to the appropriate Guidebook volume for further detail.

- **NOTE:** The scope of Operational Capability Requirements and the AF/A5R process is for warfighting mission areas, weapon systems, warfighting command and control, and similar areas (think A3, A5 and A8) — our process and documentation is for warfighting mission needs and is not intended to address or the entire realm of support functions (e.g., base-level comms, CE, Security, Medical, etc.)

- **Bottom Line:** do not assume that all “requirements” have to come thru AF/A5R and/or utilize the process and documentation strategies we utilize – first, figure out which mission area might be likely to provide solution implementation and contact them – before you end up on the wrong path, and have to start over...
SECTION 2. REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT and GOVERNANCE

Purpose. This section describes the various levels of oversight and decision authority for review, processing, validation and decision making regarding AF-sponsored capability requirements.

- NOTE: Per HAF Mission Directive 1-756, AF/A5 (through the Director, AF/A5R) is responsible for all aspects of AF Capability Requirements Development. The Requirements Integration Division (AF/A5RP) is the policy-process owner for AF requirements process and implementation of JCIDS.

- Formal HAF-level approval/validation decisions are captured in writing (e.g. Requirements Decision Memo, meeting minutes, email, staff summary, decision chart, etc.) and archived in IRSS.

Section 2A – Headquarters Air Force (HAF)-Level Oversight

2.1. HAF Requirements Subject Matter Expert (SME). AF/A5R identifies a SME for each operational capability topic to support HAF-level review and decision making. When a functional requirements SME does not reside within an AF/A5R division, the designated AF/A5R Division Chief identifies an appropriate HAF SME to support the topic (e.g. SME from AF/A3, A4, A2/6, etc.) The SME facilitates communication between the MAJCOM/Agency Sponsor and the various HAF and Joint requirements process owners and stakeholders and assists in providing prep sessions for senior leaders prior to decision meeting and other forums. The designated AF/A5R Division Chief provides an O-6 level SME endorsement of each assigned topic as part of the AF Gatekeeper review (as described below).

2.2. AF Gatekeeper (AFGK). The Division Chief, AF/A5RP (O-6/GS-15 level) serves as the AFGK; day to day functions are handled at the Process Integration branch level (and/or the Special Projects branch, for topics classified higher than Collateral Secret). The AF Gatekeeping function serves as the entry point for formal review of requirements documents and topics at the HAF level and is the single point of entry to the Joint Staff and the JCIDS process. Sponsor are not to go direct to Joint Staff without first contacting the AFGK.

- An AFGK Review is conducted by AF/A5RP along with an appropriate AF/A5R division(s), HAF Subject Matter Expert (HAF SME) including other stakeholders as appropriate (e.g. AF/A5A-OAS, AFMC/A5R, etc.) to assess a Sponsor’s readiness to meet the entry criteria for the next step in the process. In order to ensure successful development of the right document, at the right time, with the right people involved, Sponsors contact AF/A5RP for AFGK Review prior to beginning substantive work on any particular requirements document.

- AFGK Review may be conducted via various communication methods including (but not limited to) face-to-face meetings, email, phone call, teleconference, etc. Formal AFGK decisions are documented in writing and archived in IRSS.

2.3. AF Capability Development Council (CDC). The AF capability development governance bodies (Working Group and Council) serve to prioritize, integrate, and verify new and ongoing capability development efforts across the enterprise to ensure key strategic questions related to operational capability have AF senior leadership direction. The capability development governance is part of the newly established Air Force Warfighting Integration Capability (AFWIC, or AF/A5A) which operates under the authority of AF/A5, but is separate and distinct from AF/A5R. For more detail, refer to AFI 90-1101, Strategic Planning and Programming Process and the Charter for the AF Capability Development Council.
CDC interaction with AF/A5R Requirements Development. The capability development governance bodies provide oversight for initiation of AF-sponsored operational capability studies and analysis (i.e. CBA or similar study and AoA) and associated documentation intended or expected to result in, or support the development of an appropriate requirements document(s).

**Special Instructions.**

- The capability development governance bodies do not have authority to direct a Sponsor to initiate an AoA. The AoA is a formal part of the Materiel Solution Analysis (MSA) Phase of acquisition, therefore, an Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) signed by the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) for the program, authorizing or directing the AF/Sponsor to begin an AoA, is required prior to initiation of AoA analysis.

- The capability development governance bodies do not validate/approve the JCIDS capability requirements document(s) nor do they direct or approve development of specific JCIDS documents or other requirements documentation. Before beginning substantive work on any particular requirements document, Sponsors should contact AF/A5RP for an AFGK Review to coordinate approval for a tailored requirements document strategy.

**NOTE:** The review of CBA or AoA results by the capability development Governance bodies is not a “validation” in the JCIDS sense, but rather serves to establish the AF position on the results, and/or a decision on recommended alternative(s), and preferred course(s) of action. The CDWG or 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.

**NOTE:** The JCIDS and DAS processes may exercise additional Joint and OSD oversight of AoA documents as described below, and per CJCSI 5123 and DoD Instruction 5000.02.

### 2.4. AF Requirements Oversight Council (AFROC)

The AFROC consists of the group of AF operational capability requirements stakeholders and organizations (as reflected in the IRSS distribution list, with principal GO/SES level representation from key stakeholders from HAF 3-letters and MAJCOM/Agency 5/8/9 equivalent offices) who may be tasked to review and make recommendations on AF-sponsored documents as part of JCIDS validation and approval. The Director, AF/A5R serves as the AFROC Chairman and decision authority regarding recommendations made during AFROC review.

**NOTE:** AFROC review may be conducted in-person, virtually (e.g. VTC) or via electronic staffing (as an “eAFROC”) utilizing IRSS. Note. In the interest of expediting JCIDS and DAS timelines, eAFROC is the preferred method of review whenever practical. Stakeholders are expected to fully participate in AFROC activities when tasked, and provide representatives who can speak on behalf of their organization.
2.5. **Air Force Requirements Decision Authority (RDA).** To comply with statutory guidelines, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force (CSAF) is the AF decision authority for requirements documents associated with any program designated as a Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAP). Unless otherwise specified, the AF decision authority for all other requirements decisions may be delegated.

2.5.1. The CSAF has delegated RDA designation responsibility to AF/A5R, per 31 Aug 2018 AFRDM. The AF/A5R adopted construct for designation of AF RDA is outlined in the table below.

- **NOTE:** Per JCIDS, the final validation authority for requirements that have significant impact to the joint force or otherwise require higher level joint review and validation (as determined by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper or statutory mandates) also require joint requirements oversight and validation, typically after review and approval by the AF RDA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AF Requirements Decision Authority (RDA)</th>
<th>Criteria for Designation (by law, by logic, by similar level to the acquisition and resourcing decision authority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CSAF                                    | - Programs Designated as MDAP  
- Programs where SECAF or USD/A&S is MDA  
- ”Top Down Directed” requirements from CSAF or higher  
- Specifically designated as such by CSAF or higher |
| VCSAF                                   | - JROC Interest (non-MDAP)  
- Specifically designated as such by VCSAF or higher |
| AF/A5                                   | - JCB Interest (including AF sponsored Joint DCRs)  
- Programs where SAF/AQ is MDA |
| AF/A5R                                  | - JCB Interest (as delegated by AF/A5)  
- UON validation (and designation of sponsor for UONs)  
- Programs with AF cross-functional/domain impact  
- AF-only DCRs (cross MAJCOM or cross functional actions)  
- Programs requiring HAF-level resourcing action |
| MAJCOM/Agency (GO/SES Level)            | - MAJCOM-only programs where an AFPEO is MDA (including modification proposals below $100M)  
- Actions within MAJCOM resourcing/budget authority  
- Direct Fielding to Ops & Sustainment (direct coordination with AFPEO for product support strategy) following AF-level approval of fielding/transition decision |
| MAJCOM/Agency (O-6 Level)               | - MAJCOM-only programs where a PM is MDA (including modification proposals below $100M)  
- Actions within program office resourcing/budget authority |
Section 2B - Joint Requirements Oversight

2.6. Functional Capabilities Boards (FCBs). The FCBs are the first level of joint oversight and advise the Joint Capabilities Board (JCB) and Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) on issues within their Joint Capability Area (JCA) portfolio(s). The FCBs are O-6 level forums chaired by a Joint Staff General or Flag Officer, or civilian equivalent. Refer to CJCSI 5123 (JROC Charter and Implementation of JCIDS).

- NOTE: AF/A5RP provides an O-6 AF FCB Lead and Action Officer(s) to each FCB to ensure AF interests are represented throughout the Joint process.

- NOTE: The Division Chief, AF/A5RP provides the formal coordination and approval of AF FCB Lead recommendations for the official AF position on non-AF sponsored documents (designated as JCB or JROC Interest) submitted to AF for coordination via IRSS and KM/DS.

2.7. Joint Integration Forums. The Joint Staff J8 leads periodic integration meetings at the O-6 level and at the General Officer/Flag Officer level for deliberation of cross-cutting JCIDS issues.

- NOTE: The Division Chief, AF/A5RP is designated as the AF representative to the Joint Integration forums and oversees the activities of the AF FCB Leads and Action Officers on behalf of AF/A5R.

2.8. Joint Capabilities Board (JCB). The JCB is one level above the FCBs and advises the JROC on issues within and across the JCA portfolios. The JCB is a 2-star level forum chaired by the Director, J8. Refer to CJCSI 5123 (JROC Charter and Implementation of JCIDS) for further detail.

- NOTE: The Director, AF/A5R serves as AF Principal to the JCB and the Division Chief, AF/A5RP serves as the “plus one”.

2.9. Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC). The JROC is the highest level oversight and the JCIDS process owner. The JROC is a 4-star level forum chaired by the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS). Refer to CJCSI 5123 (JROC Charter and Implementation of JCIDS).

- NOTE: VCSAF serves as AF Principal to the JROC and the Director, AF/A5R serves as the “plus one”.

2.9.1. Cyber Requirements Evaluation Board (CREB). US Cyber Command has been given validation authority for Cyber-Operations capabilities and associated requirements validation. Programs under the purview of the CREB will typically be exempt from FCB, JCB and JROC review, as determined by the Joint Staff Gatekeeper. AF Cyber Operations requirements follow normal procedures thru the CDC and AFROC oversight. The Director, AF/A5R is the AF representative to the CREB. For more information, contact the HAF lead for Cyber Requirements, AF/A5RK.

Section 2C - Additional Oversight

2.10. Director, OSD Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE). For ACAT ID programs (programs with Department of Defense level acquisition oversight), the Director, CAPE is the approval authority for study guidance for Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) and for AoA Study Plans. CAPE also provides the “sufficiency” assessment/approval of the associated AoA Final Report.

- NOTE: For those AoAs where Director, CAPE elects not to provide oversight, the Capability Development Council (CDC) Chair may serve as the decision authority (may be delegated, but no lower than the GO/SES level).

Study Advisory Group (SAG). Normally, a SAG is convened to oversee the execution of studies and AoAs where the Director, CAPE has oversight of the study.
• **NOTE:** In situations where the AoA Study Lead and/or SAG elects to significantly revise the conditions, assumptions, mission tasks, or alternatives after the Capability Development Working Group (CDWG) and/or CDC review, the AF Sponsor notifies the CDWG chair. In such cases, the CDWG may request the Sponsor provide an interim progress briefing to the CDWG or CDC.

2.11. *(Acquisition) Milestone Decision Authority (MDA).* The MDA is the designated individual with overall responsibility for an acquisition program. The MDA has the authority to approve entry of an acquisition program into the next phase of the acquisition process and is accountable for cost, schedule, and performance reporting to higher authority, including Congressional reporting.

• **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.

**Section 2D - JCIDS Document Validation, Updates and Program Reviews**

2.12. **JCIDS Document Validation.** Per JCIDS, the validation of a requirement document does not expire unless specifically withdrawn by the validation authority or the document sponsor, and as long as the strategic guidance, operational plans, Service and Joint concepts, CONOPS, and other guidance justifying the validation of the original capability requirement document are still valid. Significant changes to the strategic guidance, threats or available funding may require reassessment, update, and/or revalidation of previously validated capability requirement documents by an appropriate validation authority.

• **NOTE:** Procedural guidance for JCIDS document review and validation may be found in the A5R Guidebook Volume 3 and in the JCIDS Manual.

2.13. **JCIDS Document Change/Update and Re-validation.** Capability requirements are not expected to be static during the product life cycle. As knowledge and circumstances change, consideration of adjustments or changes may be requested by acquisition, budgeting, or requirements officials. Any requested changes relating directly to the substance of the document (i.e. performance attributes, cost, schedule and/or quantity), render the document invalid for the purpose of follow-on process (e.g. milestone decision review, contract award, etc.) until the requirements document is reviewed and revalidated by the appropriate JCIDS validation authority.

• **NOTE:** For any proposed JCIDS document change/update, the Sponsor, working through their MAJCOM/Agency requirements policy and process office contacts AF/A5RP to determine the appropriate level of AF and Joint review and approval. Proposed changes are accompanied by a funding strategy and schedule that have been coordinated with the appropriate program office and Program Executive Officer (PEO).

• **Formal AF decisions regarding document change/update or revalidation are documented in an official memorandum. Note:** AF/A5RP provides a copy of the decision memo and updated document (as required) to the Joint Staff Gatekeeper for archiving.

2.14. **Joint Program Reviews.** Sponsors coordinate with the appropriate AF/A5R Division and the AF/A5RP FCB Lead and obtain AF/A5R approval (as a minimum) prior to submitting any presentation(s) to the JCB/JROC for Joint review. This includes any JCIDS change/update or revalidation, Tripwire Review, Critical Intelligence Parameter (CIP) Breach, or Nunn-McCurdy Breach/Critical Change Review, etc. For more detail on the JCB/JROC review procedures, refer to the JCIDS Manual.
Section 3 – ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1. Sponsoring Major Command (MAJCOM)/Agency Responsibilities.

- Ensure collaboration with requirements, acquisition and SPPBE stakeholders to identify, evaluate, develop, field and sustain operational/warfighting capabilities. The intent is to facilitate timely development of affordable and sustainable operational systems needed by warfighters.

- Utilize recommended guidelines for document content and format as described in the AF/A5R Requirements Development Guidebooks and the JCIDS Manual, to the maximum extent practical or request approval from the appropriate authority for tailoring or exception/exemptions. Ensure each document POC or HPT Lead is properly trained and certified via the guidelines in Section 3.3.

- Utilize approved risk assessments when developing requirements risk assessments for programs within their portfolio. Provide risk assessment data in support of CD Governance, AFROC and SPPBE decision bodies, and others as required.

- Ensure the proper development and documentation of DoD Architecture Framework (DoDAF) products, Concept of Operations (CONOPs) (including Operational Mission Profile/Mode Summary as described by JCIDS and DoDI 5000.02) and concepts relevant to the mission context and required to support capability requirements analysis, acquisition, test, training, operations and sustainment.

- Maintain close coordination with the acquisition Program Office beginning with the requirements strategy development and throughout the requirements and acquisition process to ensure the development and documentation of affordable and feasible capability attributes and measures (consistent with available funding, time and technology).

- Ensure key systems engineering considerations, as identified by the acquisition program office, program manager, PEO or MDA (including, but not limited to operational safety, suitability, and effectiveness; environmental, safety, and occupational health; human systems integration; maintenance and sustainment engineering; product and system integrity; and software engineering) are appropriately addressed in requirements documents.

- For intelligence-sensitive programs/initiatives, coordinate with the supporting intelligence representatives to detail the future threat environment and assess the extent of intelligence supportability, mission data, and infrastructure support that is necessary for the capability to be fully fielded, supported and sustained.

- In conjunction with the acquisition Program Office/program manager, produce cost capability analysis, to inform cost-capability tradeoffs and support presentation of results to CDC governance, requirements and acquisition forums.

- Ensure life cycle sustainment requirements and considerations are appropriately addressed in requirements documents.

- Ensure derived/technical requirements and specifications contained in System Requirements Documents (or equivalent) are accurately translated from the parent capability requirements document(s) and avoid unintended/unnecessary cost growth or schedule delays. Provide coordination as described in AFI 63-101/20-101.

- Coordinate with the appropriate AF/A5R Functional Division and/or AF FCB Lead before interacting with the Joint Staff, CCMD staffs and/or OSD on requirements matters. Obtain AF/A5R approval (as a minimum) prior to submitting any presentation(s) for review or decision.
- Establish effective dialog with key stakeholders to fully develop study teams for studies and analysis intended to or likely to result in development of requirements documents. Conduct studies and analysis and develop associated documentation with direct assistance from AF/A5R-OAS. Follow the guidance described in the AF/A5R-OAS CBA and AoA Handbooks.

- Submit a Study Initiation Notification memo for CDC Governance approval prior to initiating any CBA (or similar study) or AoA and obtain CDC Governance approval for all associated CBA and AoA activity and associated documentation.

- Notify the CDWG Chair before initiation or participation in any study or analysis activities, regardless of AF or non-AF sponsorship or leadership. Provide CDWG Chair with courtesy copies of any study guidance, study plan, and final report for any studies and analyses in which AF MAJCOM/Agency members are participating.

- Maintain a 12-month forecast of upcoming requirements development events for all programs in their portfolio, including estimated dates for upcoming document development events. Submit topic forecasts AF/A5RP for planning purposes.

- Adhere to the procedural guidance as described in the AF/A5R Requirements Development Guidebooks, to the maximum extent practical, and contact AF/A5RP to coordinate deviations and exceptions/exemptions or requests for tailoring, etc.

3.2. Key Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities. Responsibilities for organizations and individuals participating in the AF operational capability requirements development process are described in this section. This list is not exhaustive; other organizations not specified in this document may provide expertise in certain situations to assist in the production of AF-sponsored capability requirements documents. Similar stakeholders are also located at the MAJCOM level.

Table 3.1. Summary of Key Requirements Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Symbol</th>
<th>Functional Area of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAF/AQ</td>
<td>Acquisition Policy, AFI 63-101, AFI 63-146 and AFPAM 63-128: OPR is SAF/AQX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SAF/CN        | Deputy Chief Information Officer (CIO)  
Enterprise IT and Services (networking and communications)  
SME for Architecting and products (DoDAF viewpoints)  
SME for Cyber Security considerations and certifications |
| SAF/IE        | SME for Energy Supportability Analysis (ESA)  
Liaison with Joint Staff J4 for Energy KPP: OPR is SAF/IE |
| AF/A2/6       | Integration and Oversight of AF ISR and Info Dominance Mission Area Capabilities  
SME for Intel Supportability, Intel Mission Data, Critical Intel Parameters (CIPs)  
Liaison with Joint Staff J2 and DIA for Threat and Intel Certifications  
Liaison with Joint Staff J6 for Interoperability Certification and Net-Ready Attribute |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF/A3</td>
<td>Operations and Readiness, Global Force Management (GFM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA): Air Traffic Control and NAVAIDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Force Agency for Modeling and Simulation (AFAMS): Live-Virtual-Constructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SME for Operational Training Infrastructure (OTI): OPR is AF/A3TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SME for Air Force Weather capabilities: OPR is AF/A3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements Authority for Aircrew Flight Equipment (AFE) programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements Authority for Electronic Flight Bag (EFB): via AFFSA and HQ AMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/A4</td>
<td>Agile Combat Support for systems, installation and mission support needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SME for Civil Engineering, Security Forces and Base Defense capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/A5</td>
<td>AF Warfighting Integration Capability (AFWIC): OPR is AF/A5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat for Capability Development Council (CDC): AF/A5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF implementation of JCIDS (requirements process): OPR is AF/A5RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat for AF Requirements Oversight Council (AFROC): OPR is AF/A5RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/A8</td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Programming (resourcing process): OPR is AF/A8X and A8P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/A9</td>
<td>SME for the Comprehensive Core Capability Risk Assessment Framework (C3RAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/A10</td>
<td>Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SME for Chem-Bio Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) issues: OPR is AF/A10S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/TE</td>
<td>Test and Evaluation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFOTEC</td>
<td>Operational Test &amp; Evaluation and Testability Attestation memo for CDDs/CPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ AFMC</td>
<td>SME for Life Cycle Management Center (LCMC) acquisition management issues and feasibility attestation for programs under LCMC management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oversight of Installation and Mission Support Center (IMSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Oversight of AF Security Forces Center (AFSFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Oversight of AF Civil Engineering Center (AFCEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements Authority for Common Support Equipment (CSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ AFSPC</td>
<td>SME for Space and Mission Center (SMC) acquisition management issues and feasibility attestation for programs under SMC management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ AETC</td>
<td>SME for Force Development Training and Education issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Requirements Manager Certification Training (RMCT). The following guidance outlines the implementation of the AF RMCT Program.

Accountability. All AF organizations are accountable for ensuring responsibility for JCIDS documents rests only with fully trained personnel, especially document content POCs and validation authorities. AF organizations identify and update the status of their RMCT positions to AF/A5RP annually.

NOTE: The following are considered AF key positions for RMCT certification:

- Requirements Strategy Development (Sponsors).
- Requirements Strategy Review/Approval (HAF).
- Study leads, HPT leads, facilitators, and document content POCs (Sponsors), OAS Advisors.
- Signature/approval decision authority for requirements endorsement, certification, attestation or validation/approval.
- FCB Working Group, FCB, JCB, JROC representatives (principals and alternates).

AF RMCT Levels: All AF organizations determine RMCT certification levels for their assigned positions/personnel using the following guidance:

Level A. Positions in which duties involve contributing to the requirements process by reviewing and commenting on documents, providing technical, domain or subject matter expertise, or support to staffing and coordination of requirements documents.

- Training Required: AF Requirements Orientation Briefing and the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) CLR 101 online course. Note: CLR 101 is optional for GO/SES positions, they take RQM 403 or RQM 413 (refer to Level D below).
- AF Examples: IRSS POC, executive officer for a requirements senior leader, admin support for JCIDS packages and/or actions.

Level B. Positions in which duties include “significant” and direct involvement with requirements generation and document development.

- Training Required: AF Requirements Orientation Briefing, and the DAU CLR 101 and RQM 110 online courses.
- AF Examples: Study/Analysis (e.g. CBA or AoA) Lead, HPT Lead, document “Content POC”, Requirements Team Lead, Requirements AO/Analyst, FCB Working Group action officer, Requirements Branch Chief or Deputy Division Chief.

Level B+. Same criteria as Level B, plus positions designated by organization as requiring additional expertise in Requirements Policy and Process (e.g. HAF/Sponsor Policy & Process personnel, Requirements Team Leads, etc.) Training for Level B+ is the same as Level B, plus the AFIT REQ 211 classroom course.

- NOTE: beginning in FY17 the REQ 111 course was re-designated as REQ 211, AF Capability Requirements Development. Members who previously completed REQ 111 are encouraged, but not required to compete REQ 211 (it is essentially the same course with a new name.)

Level C. Positions in which duties are primarily providing leadership and supervision in requirements generation and document development; and organizational representatives to JCIDS forums to include FCB Working Groups, FCB, JCB and JROC.
• Training Required: AF Requirements Orientation Briefing, the DAU CLR 101 and RQM 110 online courses, and the RQM 310 resident course taught at Fort Belvoir, VA.

• AF Examples: AF representative to FCB or Integration forums, JCB/JROC alternate or “plus one” (below GO/SES level), Requirements Division Chief or Deputy Director (below GO/SES level).

**Level C+**. Same criteria as Level C, plus positions designated by organization as requiring additional expertise in Requirements Policy and Process (e.g. HAF/Sponsor Policy & Process personnel, Requirements Team Leads, etc.) Training for Level C+ is the same as Level C, plus the AFIT REQ 211 classroom course.

• **Note: beginning in FY17 the REQ 111 course was re-designated as REQ 211, AF Capability Requirements Development. Members who previously completed REQ 111 are not required to compete REQ 211 (it is essentially the same course with a new name.)**

**Level D.** (GO/SES positions only) Positions in which duties include approving draft documents for submittal into JCIDS, providing senior leadership and oversight of analysis/assessments, requirements generation, document development, coordination, and validation/approval.

• Training Required: AF Requirements Orientation (tailored, as required), and either RQM 403 (3-star/below) or RQM 413 (4-star).

• AF Examples: Commander, Director of Requirements, JCB/JROC principal.

**Training and Certification Timeline.** Failure to complete the certification training by the applicable suspense date(s), or earlier as directed, may preclude individuals from participating in the requirements process until training is completed. Specific circumstances may apply (i.e. document POCs complete certification prior to submitting document for staffing.)

• AF Requirements Orientation Briefing: completed within first 30 days (standard briefing developed and maintained by AF/A5RP to be used by all AF organizations). Tailored briefings are suitable for GO/SES level orientation, as required.

• DAU CLR 101 and RQM 110 (or RQM 403/413, for GO/SES members) course(s), IAW JCIDS Manual: completed within first 90 days.

• RQM 310 course (level C): completed after being in the position for approximately 4-6 months, but no later than 12 months.
  
  • **NOTE: DAU metrics indicate the optimum time to attend RQM 310 is when personnel have attained 4-6 months of experience working in their associated requirements positions/duties.**

• REQ 211 course (select positions): should be completed after being in the position for approximately 4-6 months, but no later than 12 months, as available.
  
  • **Note: beginning in FY17 the REQ 111 course was re-designated as REQ 211, AF Capability Requirements Development. Members who previously completed REQ 111 are not required to compete REQ 211 (it is essentially the same course with a new name.)**
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AFI 99-103, Test and Evaluation
AFPD 10-9, Lead Command Designation and Responsibilities for Weapon Systems
CJCSI 5123, Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and Implementation of JCIDS
Manual for the Operation of Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System
DoD Directive 5000.71, Rapid Fulfillment of Combatant Commander Urgent Operational Needs
DoDD 5000.01, Defense Acquisition System [under revision]
DoDI 5000.02, Operation of the Defense Acquisition System (DAS) [under revision]
AF/A5RA-OAS CBA Handbook
AF/A5RA-OAS Measures Handbook
AF/A5RA-OAS AoA Handbook
AF/A5RP Requirements Page on the AF Portal (requires AF Portal sign-on to gain access):
https://www.my.af.mil; navigate via “Organizations”, then type in “A5RP Requirements”.

Requirements Process Key Terms

NOTE: The purpose of this glossary is to help the reader understand the terms listed as used in this publication and throughout the requirements process. 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.

Air Force Warfighter Integration Capability (AFWIC) – In this Guidebook, AF/ASA performs all “AFWIC” duties: The AFWIC concept is to centralize the Air Force’s focus on innovation, concept development, capability development and future force design. The AFWIC explores and war-games innovative solutions, develop an integrated Family of Concepts, and lead capability development efforts across the Air Force. Through those efforts, AFWIC develops a single, multi-domain future force blueprint that will identify, guide, and prioritize future force development and resource alignment improving Air Force agility, readiness, and lethality in the joint fight.
**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 (Business):** Defense Business Systems and processes, involving routine admin functions (not NSS), IT infrastructure and cybersecurity [Governed by DoDI 5000.75]

**Capability (Operational/Warfighting):** Weapon Systems and NSS, and associated DOTMLPF-P involving direct accomplishment of military missions [JCIDS Manual]

**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. [JCJSI 5123]

**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]

**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. [CJCSI 5123]

**Cost-Capability Analysis (CCA)** – A process that helps define the tradespace 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 Occasionally, the Materiel area is shown as a little “m” to indicate a non-materiel or non-developmental materiel approach

**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 Units (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]

**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 “materiel” portion is restricted to existing equipment, by use of existing materiel in alternate applications as an adaptation or repurposing not originally envisioned.

**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 is 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 is considered 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) represents a level of performance that is 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]

---

**Requirements Process Abbreviations and Acronyms**

- ACAT — Acquisition Category
- ADM — Acquisition Decision Memorandum
- AFGK — AF Gatekeeper
- AoA — Analysis of Alternatives
- APA — Additional Performance Attribute
- CBA — Capabilities-Based Assessment
- CDC — Capability Development Council
- CDD — Capability Development Document
- CDM — Capability Decision Memo
- CDWG — Capability Development Working Group
- CI — Configuration Item
- CIP — Critical Intelligence Parameter
- COTS — Commercial off the Shelf
- CPD — Capability Production Document
- CRM — Comment Resolution Matrix
- CTE — Critical Technology Element
- DCR — DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation
- DP — Development Planning
- EMD — Engineering & Manufacturing Development
- FCB — Functional Capabilities Board
FOC — Full Operational Capability
GOTS — Government off the Shelf
HPT — High Performance Team
ICD — Initial Capabilities Document
IOC — Initial Operational Capability
IRSS — Information & Resource Support System
IS — Information System
JCA — Joint Capability Area
JCB — Joint Capabilities Board
JROC — Joint Requirements Oversight Council
JROCM — JROC Memorandum
JSD — Joint Staffing Designator
KM/DS — Knowledge Management & Decision Support (system)
KPP — Key Performance Parameter
KSA — Key System Attribute
LRIP — Low-Rate Initial Production

MDA — Milestone Decision Authority
MDD — Materiel Development Decision
MOE — Measure of Effectiveness
MOP — Measure of Performance
MOS — Measure of Suitability
MTA — Middle Tier of Acquisition (aka “804”)
“804” is a reference to 10 USC, section 804
OAS — AF/A5RA Office of Aerospace Studies
OT&E — Operational Test and Evaluation
PM — Program Manager
RDM — Requirements Decision Memo
RFP — Request for Proposal
RSR — Requirements Strategy Review
SME — Subject Matter Expert
S&T — Science & Technology
SoS — System of Systems
T&E — Test and Evaluation