

20 MAY 2004



Civil Engineering

**OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF REAL
PROPERTY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED
KINGDOM**

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at:
<http://www.e-publishing.af.mil>

OPR: 3AF/HQ (Lt Col Lonny P. Baker)
Supersedes 3AFR 85-3, 11 June 1994.

Certified by: 3AF/HQ (Col John E. Watkins)
Pages: 24
Distribution: F

This pamphlet implements and supplements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 32-10, *Air Force Installations and Facilities*, Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-1001, *Operations Management*, USAFE Instruction 65-105 Order for Construction, Supplies and Services from British Government Agencies, the 1951 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), the 1973 United States/United Kingdom (UK) Cost Sharing Arrangement (CSA) as supplemented and joint operating Defence Estates-US Forces (DE-USF). It provides information and procedures that are specific to maintaining, repairing, constructing and operating real property facilities in the UK. This pamphlet applies to all US Air Force Civil Engineering (CE) personnel in the UK. Maintain and dispose of records created by prescribed processes in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 37-139, *Records Disposition Schedule*.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This document is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.

1.	General:	2
2.	Facility Assessments:	5
3.	Direct Scheduled and Planned Work Requests:	5
4.	Self-Help Work:	7
5.	Materiel Acquisition:	8
6.	Utilities:	8
7.	Financial Management:	8
8.	Facility Project Development and Management.	13
9.	Deployed Unit Employment--"Troop Labor":	19

Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION 21

1. General:

1.1. Scope. This pamphlet applies to CE organizations responsible for operating and maintaining the infrastructure of Royal Air Force (RAF) stations and other facilities in the UK provided for the use of the US Government (USG) by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on behalf of Her Majesty's Government (HMG). It provides guidance on the UK-specific CE structure, the partnering relationship with HMG and methods of operation. The Base Civil Engineer (BCE) manages a combined work force of US military and civilian personnel and the MOD Civil Engineer Labor Force (CELF) (employed through the RAF Personnel and Training Command (PTC)).

1.2. Concept. Working with the representatives of HMG provides USAF CE with a unique opportunity. The good relationship between US Air Force CE and DE-USF should be fostered and strengthened at every opportunity. To this end, the tenets of partnering can be adopted. Partners are responsible for their actions, expect and provide professionalism, resolve conflicts and respect each other's interests within the limits of the governing documents.

1.3. Agencies and Responsibilities:

1.3.1. 3 AF/A47 is the office of primary responsibility or collateral responsibility for joint and multi-base CE policy actions affecting United States Forces (USF)-occupied MOD stations that are not delegated to the US Air Forces in Europe/Civil Engineer (HQ USAFE/CE). While HQ USAFE/CE directs programs and reports directly to base-level organizations, the 3 AF Commander is responsible to HQ USAFE for program accomplishment.

1.3.1.1. Works with the 3 AF International Relations Division (3 AF/IR) in the preparation of memoranda between 3 AF and agencies of HMG that incorporate CE components. Coordinates with MOD and DE-USF concerning CE policy actions affecting all USF-occupied MOD stations.

1.3.1.2. Manages and coordinates actions in preparation for and resulting from deployments of CE personnel, units or equipment. Assigns taskings issued by or through the USAFE Theater Aerospace Operations Center (U/TASC) to the appropriate unit or units for accomplishment.

1.3.1.3. Resolves infrastructure management situations or actions that are determined to involve or affect more than a single base.

1.3.2. The BCE is responsible for all matters concerning the operation and maintenance of real property. The BCE exercises financial responsibilities as described in paragraph 7.3. The BCE coordinates with the Defence Estates Manager (DEM) (formerly the Associate CE) and the RAF commander to ensure that, where appropriate, UK legislation is applied and adhered to. The CE organization is modified by the presence of the DEM and the parallel DE-USF organization within the unit. In the integrated organization, US-paid MOD personnel may fill supervisory positions.

1.3.3. The DEM is a DE-USF employee working in-house to provide technical and contracting support with DE-USF staff and UK-civilian contractors. The DEM is the DE-USF manager for the MOD Estate and has public accountability to the MOD. The DEM and his or her staff work for and report directly to DE-USF. The DEM works closely with the BCE within the CE unit structure to facilitate and evaluate work accomplishment by contractors employed by DE-USF. The DEM also works with the RAF commander on all matters concerning the ownership of the estate. The DEM is responsible to the BCE for actions funded via the USAFE Form 100, **Supplies or Ser-**

vices Order Under US-UK Government Agreements (paragraph 7.). The DEM is responsible to the BCE for contractor-performed maintenance, repair and construction as delegated by DE-USF.

1.3.3.1. The DEM has direct involvement in work performed by contractors on the station. These actions and responsibilities include:

1.3.3.1.1. Performing facility inspections.

1.3.3.1.2. Providing quality control for work done by contractors and in-house DE-USF staff, including functional management (safe systems of work, technical supervision).

1.3.3.1.3. Providing resources to perform real property maintenance, repair and operation service when necessary to augment the US Air Force and CELF work force.

1.3.3.1.4. Informing the BCE concerning UK-specific requirements and policies.

1.3.3.1.5. Maintaining the installation copy of the DE-USF Code of Practice (CP) and DE technical and safety documentation.

1.3.3.1.6. Providing DE-USF representation on committees and meetings as agreed with the BCE.

1.3.3.2. The DEM (or staff) normally supports and attends the following:

1.3.3.2.1. Facilities board, siting board and working panels

1.3.3.2.2. Environmental protection committee

1.3.3.2.3. Traffic safety coordinating group

1.3.3.2.4. Energy steering committee

1.3.3.2.5. Combined safety council

1.3.4. The USAFE Regional CE (HQ USAFE/CEW) (formerly HQ USAFE/CER) provides direct support to the BCE for all major projects. The responsibilities and mission of HQ USAFE/CEW are stated in USAFE Mission Directive 38, *Detachment 1, USAFE Civil Engineer Squadron*. This office is the USAFE agent responsible for the design and construction management of all Department of Defense (DoD) major construction projects (over \$750,000) and military construction (MILCON) projects in the UK. HQ USAFE/CEW works directly with DE-USF to accomplish major, MILCON and NATO projects. This office is responsible for US portion of NATO works in the UK, France, Spain, Portugal, Denmark and Norway. HQ USAFE/CEW provides USF oversight and accountability, design and construction policy, regional environmental expertise and wartime construction management in these countries. The USF program managers (PM) at HQ USAFE/CEW perform many of the project management functions performed or delegated by the BCE at the base level.

1.3.5. DE-USF:

1.3.5.1. Headquarters DE-USF exercises the delegated authority of HMG as the business unit within the MOD responsible for the provision of facilities, project execution and contractual support on MOD stations occupied by USF and NATO. The DE-USF manager is responsible for the management and performance of all projects; contract work and technical support at USF stations not performed by in-house forces, deployed units (paragraph 9.), or via direct

contracting (paragraph 3.3.). A brief explanation of division responsibilities is as follows:

1.3.5.1.1. The Major Projects Division provides complete management support for projects; from initial cost advice to complete project design, tender evaluation, construction management and project close out. This division works closely with the BCEs and HQ USAFE/CEW. They work directly with the engineering flight on projects performed by contract that exceed the DEMs delegation authority and are not part of HQ USAFE/CEWs or NATO programs.

1.3.5.1.1.1. The contracts branch is responsible for preparing specifications and letting contracts.

1.3.5.1.1.2. The MOD office for the NATO Secretariat is assigned to this division.

1.3.5.1.2. The Operations and Maintenance Division provides management and support for all contracted operations for which the BCE is responsible that fall within the DEMs management authority. The operations and maintenance manager has line responsibility for all DEMs and their personnel located on bases and for the Technical Support Team (TST) located at Stirling House.

1.3.5.1.3. The TST provides professional engineering and technical support to the DEM, HQ USAFE/CEW, the engineering flight and contractors on engineering, operations, preventative maintenance, fire, environmental and safety issues. The TST prepares and programs Facility Support Contracts (FSC) and assists with professional inspections. The TST appoints, supports and audits all authorized persons (AP) and advises the BCE on compliance with UK statutory regulations for maintenance actions. The TST performs fire certification (UK and US) for all new facilities, provides guidance on UK health and safety legislation and performs UK building regulation compliance inspections and design reviews as required.

1.3.5.1.4. Business Support. All non-MILCON work carried out by DE-USF for United States Forces is invoiced to BCEs by the Defence Bills Agency (DBA) at Liverpool. MILCON and P713 (military family housing improvement) project invoices are directed to HQ USAFE/CEW. Defense Accounting and Finance Service-Europe (DFAS-EU) at Vogelweh Air Station makes reimbursement to DE-USF after validation by base Financial Services Office (FSO) (paragraph 7.).

1.3.5.1.5. The Quality Management Team is responsible for project document review and job-site contractor monitoring to ensure correct project accomplishment.

1.3.5.2. Management of Work. DE-USF responsibilities include project planning, engineering, designing, letting contracts, pre-financing, construction management, financial management, maintenance and repair work, inspection and recommendation of acceptance of services as requested by USF. DE-USF is tasked with supporting USF in the stewardship of their assigned stations in compliance with UK legislation. DE-USF also manages the NATO Security Investment Program in the UK. The USG reimburses DE-USF on the basis of actual contractor costs for providing these services plus a fixed percentage (7.5 percent) known as Departmental Expenses. Departmental Expenses are the USG portion of the overhead costs incurred by DE-USF in executing services on behalf of USF. MOD pays all additional overhead costs (paragraph 7.2.3.).

1.3.6. The RAF commander is the senior RAF representative on each USF-occupied RAF station with the authority and responsibilities of a commanding officer for RAF personnel and MOD civilians (except MOD Police, DE-USF personnel and British employees directly hired by the US Air Force) in accordance with the RAF Commander's Directive. The RAF commander acts as the RAF estates manager and works with the DEM in the property management of the station. The RAF commander advises and assists the USF commander and BCE on all matters of UK procedures and protocol, MOD policy and RAF support and regulations.

1.3.7. The 3 AF RAF Liaison Officer for Armaments (3 AF/RAFLO/ARM) participates in the planning and design approval for any project or facility involving the handling, storage, maintenance and transportation of weapons, munitions and explosives to, from or within the UK. This includes all projects located within identified explosives outer quantity distances.

2. Facility Assessments:

2.1. Purpose. Summarize UK-specific requirements for conducting essential facility assessments to identify facility maintenance and repair requirements.

2.2. UK and DE-USF Assessments. Where similar requirements exist, the BCE and DEM should arrange for the consolidation of information obtained from USF and DE-USF facility assessments. Where overlapping US and UK assessment requirements have different intervals, the more frequent assessment should be performed to meet the requirement.

2.2.1. The BCE should review assessment and documentation requirements incorporated into the Base Facility Management Agreement (BFMA) and other US-funded maintenance or operations contracts prepared by DE-USF. The nature of such actions should be examined to verify that the requirements call for US funding or accomplishment and the actions are not redundant.

2.2.2. USF funds all assessment and inspection actions and contracts that support the US mission. NATO funding should be obtained when appropriate. USF are not required to accomplish or fund UK, MOD or DE-USF inspections, assessments, documentation requirements or frequencies that do not have a US, DOD or NATO counterpart. It is US policy and a treaty driven obligation to conduct US activities in a manner, which meets the health and safety (H&S) requirements of UK legislation. Where an H&S assessment action is requested or incorporated by DE-USF into a US-funded contract, USF safety and inspection procedures should be examined to evaluate them for substantial compliance with the requirement. Where substantial compliance is not present or is incomplete, a suitable cooperative program should be implemented in consultation with DE-USF. Where USF funding or implementation is determined to be inappropriate, DE-USF may fund and accomplish the desired actions upon notification to the BCE and verification that the proposed activity has been scheduled to minimize mission impact.

2.3. Procedures. UK procedures and guidance for conducting facility assessments are provided in the DE-USF CP section 1.3. The Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) Infrastructure Condition Standard is not a USAFE-approved standard, but is available as a guide.

2.4. Assessment Frequencies. Frequencies for conducting assessments vary according to mission criticality, safety and environmental factors, facility age, condition, occupancy, etc. In most cases, DE-USF assessment frequencies are driven by UK statutory requirements for compliance with H&S or other directives. These assessments are not necessarily directed on USF.

3. Direct Scheduled and Planned Work Requests:

3.1. Purpose. Summarize UK-specific procedures for receiving, documenting, issuing and tracking work requests.

3.2. Concept. Ref AFI 32-1001, Section B, paragraph 3, AFI 32-1022, *Planning and Programming Non-appropriated Fund Facility Construction Projects*, AFI 32-1032, *Planning and Programming Real Property Maintenance Projects using Appropriated Funds*, and USAFE Supplement 1.

3.3. Direct Contracting. The BCE may employ direct contracting for maintenance and construction when circumstances make it more practical than utilizing the services of DE-USF. In such cases, the BCE advises DE-USF in writing of the appropriate details as required in the CSA paragraph 3(2). The CSA paragraph 3(2) provides DE-USF with the option to object to the employment of direct contracting within 15 days of receipt of the notice. If DE-USF does object and the BCE still decides to use direct contracting, resolution should be made through discussion between the BCE and the DEM. If necessary, the issue may be elevated to 3 AF/A47 and DE-USF or higher for resolution. The BCE advises the MOD Personnel Office (MODPO) if the proposed action could have impact on MOD personnel. The applicability of UK regulations concerning Transfer of Undertaking-Protection of Employment (TUPE) is evaluated. Expenditures and management for direct contracting are the sole responsibility of the BCE.

3.4. Employment of USF Personnel. USF CE personnel do not require UK certification to perform on-station duties that (as directed by UK law) must be performed by a skilled person (SP), as long as an appropriate AP sets up, inspects, and where appropriate, supervises the work. The BCE may obtain AP and SP training and certification for USF personnel. This action complies with CP sections 2.1030, 2.1070, 2.203 and 2.5080 concerning interviews and SP or AP certification training. Work on permitted systems requires the continuous, on-site presence of an SP and the certification of work plans and completion by an AP.

3.4.1. All personnel performing direct-scheduled work, planned work or recurring work on real property installed equipment or performing on-site supervisory duties in the 0X1, 0X2, 1X1, 4X1 and 4X2 CE specialty codes must have AP or SP certification or be accompanied by a certified person (as directed by UK law). This requirement includes any work performed in a "confined space" as defined in the MOD Safe Systems of Work-Safety Rules and Procedures (SRP)--SRP 01 (Electricity), 02 (Boilers and Pressure Systems), 03 (Petroleum), and 06 (Confined Spaces [Draft]).

3.4.2. US Air Force Reserve, RED HORSE, or US Air National Guard CE personnel deployed to a UK station may perform work with prior approval of the BCE and notification to the DEM (paragraph 3.3. and 9.3.1.). The BCE provides technical and supervisory support to ensure all work complies with appropriate US and UK standards and safety requirements.

3.5. DE-USF Methods of Contracting. Operations and maintenance work that is beyond the capabilities of the BCE's work force is normally performed using FSCs as identified in the BFMA. The contract scope is agreed between the BCE and DEM. An FSC is normally awarded for 3 years and can be extended to 5 years. It may include preventive maintenance, grounds maintenance, project management, design services, inspection services, supply of materials, and the hiring of plant and equipment and call-out service. The BCE should ensure that all actions provided in the contract are required by USF (paragraph 2.2.). It is important for the BCE to keep the DEM and the MODPO informed on mission or funding changes affecting the workload of contractors. Facility support contractors can pro-

vide flexibility for changing contract activity requirements. Authorization to perform work is provided by DE-USF.

3.5.1. FSC 1 (Maintenance). A lump sum contract providing either engineering services or total facility maintenance is required, for a specified period, for the complete installation or facility (and repairs up to a limit) by resident staff and the 24-hour on-call service.

3.5.2. FSC 2 (Rates Work/Multiple Trades). Multi-trade FSC work is similar to SABER (Simplified Acquisition of Base Engineer Requirements) and can be ordered, priced using a published schedule of rates and carried out quickly. There are maximum single order limits for work performed under an FSC 2.

3.5.3. FSC 3 (Projects and Work Orders). A term contract framework for consultant services with no minimum commitment to place orders.

3.5.4. FSC 4 (Grounds Maintenance). A lump sum or rates-based term contract for grounds maintenance, landscaping and other gardening work.

3.5.5. FSC 5 (Region-Wide Rates Based Contracts). A term contract similar to FSC 2 used to provide specialist capabilities for more than one station.

3.5.6. Specialist Term Contract (STC). An STC is awarded for work on a specific schedule of equipment and can include emergency calls (example: inspection and maintenance of boilers).

3.5.7. Jobbing Orders. Local contractors with no formal contract or conditions for work are available for on-call completion of minor specialist work. Maximum cost restrictions apply.

3.6. Work Cancellation. The DEM should be informed and provided a copy of each canceled work order that involves a contractor or is in planning at DE-USF. This enables expeditious reporting and coordination of canceled work to DE-USF. If a work order or project is determined to have been aborted, the requirements of paragraph 4(2) of the CSA apply (paragraph 8.20).

4. Self-Help Work:

4.1. Purpose. Summarize UK-specific procedures for accomplishing facility maintenance, repair and modifications through self-help. Reference AF Pamphlet (AFPAM) 32-1098, *Base Civil Engineer Self-Help Guide*, and AFPAM 32-1098, USAFE Supplement 1.

4.2. Personnel Briefing. Personnel managing and working in the self-help program should be briefed on pertinent aspects of UK and MOD requirements for performing the projects, repairs and maintenance that can be done on MOD stations. Emphasize the differences between US and UK utility systems and the certification requirements. It should be coordinated with the DEM.

4.3. Procedures. Support from DE-USF is directed through the DEM. Planning assistance should be provided in all cases, with technical advice and inspection by an SP or AP where electrical or mechanical systems or confined spaces may be affected. USF personnel may not be fully aware of UK requirements and MOD Safe Systems of Work as they apply to a self-help project.

4.4. Self-help Store. An appropriate AP to identify material that is incorrect for the UK should review all publications, videotapes and detailed mock-ups available in the self-help store. A card should be prepared and attached for any errors and omissions that can be corrected with an addendum. Mock-ups should be marked to show actions requiring SP or AP involvement.

4.5. Guidance. The installation self-help guide, local self-help store operating instructions and checklists for common self-help jobs should prominently incorporate specific notes, cautions and warnings concerning UK requirements.

5. Materiel Acquisition:

5.1. Purpose. Summarize UK-specific procedures for materiel transactions processed by the Materiel Acquisition Element (MAE).

5.2. Procedures. DE-USF can provide contractual support to procure materiel through local or national sources. DE-USF may charge Departmental Expenses only on the cost of the contractor exclusive of procured materiel costs. DE-USF is responsible for materiel until a US or US-paid employee's signature of receipt is provided (excluding blanket purchase agreement transactions, international merchant's purchase authorization card transactions and purchases that are US administered). Personnel should be knowledgeable of UK Control of Substances Hazardous to Health standards and directives.

6. Utilities:

6.1. Purpose. Summarize UK-specific policy and procedures for provision of utility services to USF facilities in the UK.

6.2. Concept. Ref AFI 32-1061, *Providing Utilities to US Air Force Installations*. Under the terms of the NATO SOFA and the 1976 USAFE/MOD Agreement for Accommodation (Utilities) Services to the US Air Force in the UK, utilities are provided by the MOD to the USF on MOD property. The RAF commander, through the station warden, is the agent and manager for utility contracts.

6.3. Procedures. In most cases, utilities are paid for by the MOD with reimbursement (where appropriate) provided by the USF. MOD contracting performs contract negotiation and review. Contracts for major accounts are reviewed annually and minor accounts are reviewed every 3 years. The BCE should provide a representative to the negotiations and subsequent reviews. For large utility users, private utility companies electronically bill the MOD paying office in Glasgow, Scotland. This office reconciles utility readings with the RAF station warden. If no objection is raised and verified, the MOD paying office makes the payment. When the RAF station warden receives the MOD paid invoice, arrangements are made through financial management for reimbursement. This process minimizes interest penalties for late payment. The RAF station warden and payment by Financial Management (FM) send small utility bills (such as for small, off-station sites) directly to the owning organization for reconciliation.

7. Financial Management:

7.1. Purpose. This paragraph defines UK-specific areas of responsibility for the BCE, CE Resource Flight (CERF), and DE-USF in managing element of expense investment code (EEIC) 570 facility operations and maintenance and EEIC 52X project funds.

7.2. Terminology:

7.2.1. Fixed Costs. CELF and firefighter wages, the 1.5 percent payroll surcharge expenses, transport and stores.

7.2.2. Variable Costs. The contractual costs of recurring work, maintenance by DE-USF contractors, risk, contingencies, minor construction and associated departmental expenses.

7.2.3. Departmental Expenses. A 7.5 percent surcharge (specified in the CSA) added by DE-USF to the progress payments made to UK contractors on behalf of USF. The fee during design is set at 6 percent with the additional 1.5 percent recovered when design is complete.

7.2.4. Management of Financial Risk. DE-USF creates a risk register for the major elements of a project to identify an appropriate level of additional obligation that is added to the project cost. The risk set-aside covers occurrences that cannot be forecast on the expectation that some of the identified actions may become necessary. DE-USF is authorized to expend funds against a risk element up to the amount listed on the register. The USF PM is notified of the expenditure. Any requirement above the allowance is approved by the USF PM. This funding is not to be used for project changes or contingencies. The unexpended obligation is retained until physical handover is performed, then an appropriate portion may be deobligated. A risk assessment method used throughout the MOD is applied to each element of the project. This approach provides for compliance with the CSA paragraph 4(5).

7.3. BCE Financial Responsibilities. These activities are normally delegated to the appropriate offices or program managers by the BCE.

7.3.1. Initiates USAFE Forms 100 for:

7.3.1.1. EEIC 52X and 72X projects

7.3.1.2. EEIC 53X Design actions

7.3.1.3. EEIC 570 facility operations and maintenance (O&M) projects and 5703X actions

7.3.1.4. Non-Appropriated Fund (NAF) projects, accommodation services and tenant requirements

7.3.2. Revises USAFE Form 100 for all cost reductions or overruns.

7.3.3. Monitors current status of ongoing 52X and 570 activities.

7.3.3.1. When an invoice submitted for payment by DE-USF cannot be paid within 30 days of the date of submittal due to a dispute, error or funding shortfall, the reason for non-payment should be provided to DE-USF with a copy to HQ 3 AF/A47. The CSA paragraph 4(5) directs the submission of a report to HMG within 3 months for any late payment. If a requirement for action by DE-USF has been identified as the cause for delay, a response from DE-USF should be requested.

7.3.3.2. When execution of a project leads to a claim for injury or damages from a British citizen, the DEM or DE-USF PM obtains all pertinent information from the contractor and provides it to the BCE or USF PM for transmittal to the installation judge advocate and HQ 3 AF/A47/Judge Advocate/International Relations (JA/IR) as directed in the CSA.

7.4. CE Resource Management Responsibilities. The CERF should understand UK financial terminology and accounting structure and DE-USF reports available for use and analysis. DE-USF has UK contractual responsibilities and should also understand USF financial management requirements and procedures. Quarterly reconciliation meetings with the BCE and the DEM are recommended. USF

financial management guidance is contained in USAFE Instruction 65-105. MOD accounting responsibilities are held by the DBA.

7.5. Authorizing Funds. The USAFE Form 100 is the only document used by the BCE to obligate funds to DE-USF for accomplishing facility maintenance, facility projects and other separately funded actions. The CERF processes USAFE Forms 100 in accordance with USAFE Instruction 65-105. HQ USAFE/ CEW PMs use the USAFE Form 11, **UK Construction Fund Authorization**, for the same purpose on major and MILCON projects. For time-sensitive or "straddle-bid" program projects, DE-USF may tender a project upon receipt of a written guarantee of funding from the BCE. A USAFE Form 100 should follow as soon as possible.

7.6. Minor Construction. DE-USF work orders should be recorded to determine the value for real property capitalization. In this way, an AF Form 332, **Base Civil Engineer Work Request**, can remain valid into the next fiscal year. It is essential that DE-USF contractual work orders be coded for the fiscal year in which they are raised.

7.7. EEIC 570 Upfunding. DE-USF technical officers should notify the CERF when additional funds are required. The BCE can then obtain and authorize additional funding. Contractor work orders cannot be issued in excess of the current-year authorized funding shown on the USAFE Form 100. Work orders should not be charged against prior fiscal year EEIC 570 USAFE Forms 100. It is imperative that copies of work orders are forwarded promptly to the CERF.

7.8. USAFE Form 100. The BCE uses the USAFE Form 100 to authorize DE-USF to initiate design and construction actions on the part of the selected contractors. It is prepared and issued to DE-USF as described in USAFE Instruction 65-105, Section B. More than one geographical location can be included on a USAFE Form 100 to reduce the administrative workload. Fund authorizations on initial USAFE Forms 100 are based upon funding advice obtained through the base FSO. USAFE Forms 100 for NAF projects clearly identify the actions to which NAF are to be applied. When the actual fixed cost of a project varies significantly from the initial estimate, a revised USAFE Form 100 should be sent to DE-USF and the DFAS-EU to update the shred-out between fixed costs and contractual elements of cost. Revisions to USAFE Forms 100 for EEIC 570 funds clearly state why the revision is necessary. If additional funds are provided, revised USAFE Forms 100 should state the area being increased. Exchange rate changes should have no effect on the funding in pounds sterling (£) since the O&M rate of exchange is normally fixed at the annual budget rate for the entire fiscal year during which the USAFE Forms 100 are executed. The fixed exchange rate does not necessarily apply to reimbursable activities or all tenant organizations. A status review of a new project is required to ensure expenses are covered under the Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account before the "fixed" exchange rate is used. The unit comptroller can provide the correct exchange rate.

7.8.1. Reporting. The DFAS-EU is notified of the total £ amounts chargeable to each USAFE Form 100. Copies of the USAFE Form 100 are provided to the appropriate resource advisors. The normal reporting cut-off date is the last day of each month, and the cut-off date for the fiscal year is 30 September.

7.8.2. Fiscal Year-end Closeout. During March (end of UK fiscal year) and September, DE-USF and the CERF jointly examine expenses weekly (daily during the last week). The CERF should consider the expenses accrued in dollar terms in those areas which are subject to currency fluctuations and ensure additional funds, for example, unobligated balances, are used whenever possible. Once the final fixed cost charges for the year have been determined, DE-USF should issue con-

tractual work orders to the value of the contractual balance. However, there should not be an excessive number of work orders issued during September solely to spend the balance of funds. All available funds should be obligated for work orders that can be scheduled and accomplished without unnecessary delay. Unneeded balances should be deobligated by revising the USAFE Form 100.

7.9. EEIC 52X Design, Project Funding and Payment Procedures. The BCE initiates the design phase by issuing a design instruction (DI) to DE-USF supported by a USAFE Form 100. In accordance with the CSA, paragraph 4(5), DE-USF is paid 7.5 percent Departmental Expenses based on the actual final cost of each project. In order to meet programming and US law requirements, these expenses should be broken down into two components. Public law dictates that no more than 6 percent can be paid for design. The remaining 1.5 percent is allowed for supervision, inspection, overhead and handling (SIOH). In order to ensure this ratio is strictly adhered to, it is essential that the USAFE Form 100 show the DE-USF shred-out of 6 percent design funding, 1.5 percent SIOH 52X/592 funds and the 52X/592 funding provided. DE-USF contracts for the majority of the design as a component of the project contract and then charges Departmental Expenses on the contract invoice.

7.9.1. DE-USF normally submits an invoice for 2 percent of the current working estimate (CWE) at the ready-to-advertise (RTA) stage. Upon obtaining approval of the 100 percent design, DE-USF submits an invoice for the remaining 4 percent or the agreed percentage of the CWE. If a project is canceled, project abort fees may be applicable (paragraph 8.20.). The design portion of the Departmental Expenses is considered paid until final accounting is accomplished just prior to project financial completion.

7.9.2. The BCE requests EEIC 52X funding based on the pre-tender estimate, or if accomplished by a maintenance term contractor, their quotation plus the 1.5 percent for SIOH. Upon receipt of EEIC 52X funding, the BCE issues a revised USAFE Form 100 with a dual fund cite, i.e. 6 percent of the CWE for design EEIC 532 funding and the CWE plus 1.5 percent SIOH in EEIC 52X funding. As construction progresses, DE-USF issues invoices for progress payments as appropriate, including the prorated 1.5 percent SIOH. Therefore, the 1.5 percent portion of the 7.5 percent Departmental Expenses is included in each payment. When the DBA issues a DE-USF certified invoice to the BCE, the CERF verifies that the invoice is correct. The BCE may sign the certification or delegate that authority to the USF PM or the CERF. The CERF should then forward the invoice to the DFAS-EU within 3 working days. DFAS-EU should then make payment to DE-USF within 8 working days. Since payments to contractors are made under British Contracting Authority, the DE-USF certified invoice is sufficient confirmation that the work was accomplished.

7.9.3. When a user change order is approved, the estimated cost of the change, in the appropriate 52X funding plus 7.5 percent Departmental Expenses (DEs), is upfunded to the USAFE Form 100. The cost of the change plus 1.5 percent is charged to EEIC 52X and 6 percent charged to EEIC 532 designs. Care should be taken to ensure that Departmental Expenses in excess of 7.5 percent are not paid.

7.9.4. If 52X/592 funds are changed on a project, then 532 funds should be adjusted accordingly. If the modification is due to a change in scope, then current year funds are cited. If there is no change in scope, use the fund cite for the fiscal year in which the obligation was originally made. The financial year cited is the year the EEIC obligation was originally made. This meets the bona fide need rule. Should the financial year be a lapsed appropriation, then current year funds are used.

7.10. EEIC 52X Accounting Procedures:

7.10.1. Cost Overruns. DE-USF or the DEM should provide the earliest possible notification of impending project cost overruns to the BCE. In cases where prior notification has not been possible, revised USAFE Forms 100 may still be issued depending upon project year fund availability and project approval. The amount authorized on each USAFE Form 100 is not exceeded without prior approval of the BCE, nor is additional work added without an approved DD Form 1391, **FY__ Military Construction Project Data** (or computerized equivalent), an approved change order, and a revised USAFE Form 100. The DE-USF PM ensures an upfund and a revised USAFE Form 100 are obtained when the cost of the project exceeds the amount authorized. Cost overruns generally fall into one of three categories:

7.10.1.1. Scope Increase. Where a cost overrun on a prior year project is attributable to an increase in the scope of work, the overrun is funded from current year funds. The increase should not be made by revising the original USAFE Form 100. Prepare a new USAFE Form 100 for the scope increase using the same project number, citing current year funding and the cause of the increase. An increase in scope is not an after-the-fact cost overrun.

7.10.1.2. Potential Overruns. Potential cost overruns can occur when a project is funded before going out for bid and the lowest acceptable bid from competing contractors exceeds funds authorized on the USAFE Form 100. Additional funds are obtained before the award of a contract. Particular care should be taken to prevent prior-year cost overruns.

7.10.1.3. After-the-fact Cost Overruns. This type of cost overrun usually occurs when final contractor invoices exceed the cost on the original contractor work orders. This condition should be anticipated or identified as early as possible. The most frequent cause is project changes. Upfund procedures should be applied to prevent a shortfall when the contractor's invoice is processed by DE-USF.

7.10.2. Prior-Year Upfund Procedures. When an after-the-fact cost overrun is discovered, the budget office should be advised. Additional funds should then be requested via the obligation adjustment reporting system from the fiscal year in which the original USAFE Form 100 was obligated. If funds are not available, prior year funds should be requested from HQ USAFE.

7.10.3. Physical Completion. Nearing physical completion of individual facilities or projects, DE-USF provides the documentation necessary to complete handover of the facility to the BCE for review by the engineering flight. After the engineering flight performs the US Air Force acceptance inspection, the BCE or designated representative signs the statement indicating US Air Force acceptance or non-acceptance of work, places the copies in the project folder and returns the original to DE-USF. The engineering flight forwards the project folder to the resource advisor when project acceptance is accomplished. For minor construction work, the folder is forwarded to real property management for initial capitalization based upon physical completion. The folder is then returned to Engineering to be held until financial completion.

7.10.4. Financial Completion. Within 6 months after handover, the DE-USF PM should have a close estimate of the final project costs. Any remaining risk elements and contractor difficulties should be identified. The DE-USF PM should provide this estimated final cost to the USF PM for adjustment of the project obligation. Upon payment of the contractor's final invoices, the DE-USF PM produces appropriate certification that a project is financially complete. The final certification should be provided within 4 months of the completion of any actions associated with the warran-

tee. In special cases, contractual arrangements may require more time. DE-USF should provide the certification to the USF PM within 6 months after physical completion of a project that does not include a warranty period. The BCE should request a statement of cause from DE-USF when the delay is extended.

7.10.4.1. Upon receiving the preliminary certification from the DE-USF PM, the CERF performs a final account reconciliation. The amounts on any final invoices accompanying the certification may be subject to amendment during reconciliation. DE-USF reassesses the 6 percent design cost based upon the total cost of the project excluding Departmental Expenses. Upon completion of the reconciliation and agreement the DE-USF PM issues the certification to the BCE.

7.10.4.2. Upon receipt of the certification, the CERF certifies the final invoice if sufficient funds remain. The CERF ensures the actual cost of the project plus 1.5 percent is paid from 52X and not more than 6 percent of the actual cost for design from the fiscal year and exchange rate from which the original USAFE Form 100 was obliged. The CERF should request a credit if the payments for design exceed 6 percent. The CERF forwards the certification to the FSO/DFAS-EU for payment. The CERF contacts DFAS-EU to request closure of the USAFE Form 100 and project accounts and deobligation of remaining funds. The DFAS-EU prepares a Standard Form 1034, **Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal**, to pay the final claim and sends a copy of the disbursement voucher to the CERF.

7.10.5. Upfund for Financial Completion. Upon receipt of the upfund approval, the CERF forwards the DE certification of financial completion to the DFAS-EU for final payment. When the payment is made, the contract cost of the project plus 1.5 percent is funded from 52X, and 6 percent funded from EEIC 532 for design. DE-USF thereby receives the contract cost of the project plus 7.5 percent.

7.11. Non-Appropriated Fund Projects - Accounting Procedures. USAFE Forms 100 are prepared by the CERF for NAF projects. USAFE Forms 100 for NAF projects clearly identify the actions to which NAF are to be applied. Payments to DE-USF for NAF projects are certified by the BCE and made directly by NAF/FM.

7.11.1. When a project accomplished by contract through DE-USF is to be funded and paid for by a NAF activity (AAFES, Credit Union, etc.), there is a NAF letter of intent to fund the action. The letter should identify the specific actions to be funded with NAF. This letter constitutes the NAF activity's agreement to fund and pay their share of the costs. There should be a statement that the activity will pay all contract costs if the project is aborted.

7.11.2. Distribution of USAFE Form 100 will be in accordance with USAFE Instruction 65-105 except that minimum distribution should also include one copy to the FSO performing the accounting functions for the NAF custodian and two copies to the CERF.

8. Facility Project Development and Management.

8.1. Purpose. This paragraph describes the UK specific procedures for developing, approving, and managing EEIC 52X facility projects on USF occupied MOD stations.

8.2. Concept. The BCE ensures that DE-USF, as the contracting agency, satisfies the requirements of both the USF and the UK government while it administers design and construction contracts support-

ing USF requirements. DE-USF is accountable to UK auditors for funds management and expenditures. USF and DE-USF project managers should understand each other's policies to facilitate project execution.

8.3. Terminology:

8.3.1. The USF PM is the USF person at a base or HQ USAFE/CEW delegated to oversee and manage projects. This person is responsible for the DI, project strategy, funding, oversight and final project acceptance.

8.3.2. The DE-USF Project Manager is responsible for the execution of assigned projects, liaison with USF project managers, appointment of the Project Support Consultant (PSC) for each project, design instruction clarification, scheduling, contract strategy and oversight of contractual and financial requirements.

8.3.3. The PSC is the non-MOD construction professional selected by DE-USF to manage the design and construction of a project (formerly the Commercial Project Manager. The PSC works under the direct control of the project manager.

8.3.4. Fixed-Price Contracts are generally used for clearly defined jobs over the maximum order value of the FSC. DE-USF uses two types of fixed-price contracts:

8.3.4.1. Contractor Design. The PSC defines project quality requirements for the construction contractor who performs the design. This is the preferred DE-USF approach.

8.3.4.2. Authority Design. The PSC performs the design in accordance with the DI and a construction contractor builds the project. This is a non-standard contract strategy and requires approval by the DE-USF Manager.

8.4. Requirements Identification. The following are the primary methods by which project requirements are identified:

8.4.1. Facility inspections by Maintenance Engineering, DE-USF/TST, or contract inspectors.

8.4.2. Work requirements identified on an AF Form 332.

8.4.3. Mission taskings and higher-headquarters directed programs.

8.4.4. Emergencies created by natural disaster or accident.

8.5. Preparing Project Documentation. Documents are developed by the BCE in accordance with AFI 32-1021, *Planning and Programming of Facility Construction Projects* and AFI 32-1022 *Planning and Programming Non-appropriated Fund Facility Construction Projects* as supplemented by HQ USAFE/CE. When preparing cost estimates, programmers may consult with DE-USF personnel who can advise on specialist work, local conditions, and cost trends.

8.5.1. Order of Precedence. Tender documents are referred to in the following order when a conflict between them is found after they are put out to tender:

8.5.1.1. Conditions of contract

8.5.1.2. Specifications

8.5.1.3. Drawings

8.5.1.4. Generic documents (building regulations, base standards etc.)

8.5.2. If a counter offer is accepted; the elements that differ from the tender take precedence.

8.6. Project Approval and Prioritization. Projects are approved in accordance with AFI 32-1021 and AFI 32-1022. Delegated project approval limits from HQ USAFE should be followed. The Facilities Board does prioritization of projects.

8.7. US Air Force and DE-USF Responsibilities for Design:

8.7.1. US Air Force Responsibilities. The USF PM prepares a complete and detailed DI in conjunction with the user, a communications systems PM, and any other appropriate service providers. This is a firm statement of the scope and technical (functional) requirements for the project. It incorporates all mission essential elements and identifies the flexibility available to the designer. The impact on MOD personnel should be determined in coordination with the MODPO. Evaluation of the applicability of TUPE is a part of this process. Later changes to the DI should be minimized to prevent design delay and cost overruns.

8.7.2. DE-USF Design Responsibilities. Provide design services to meet USF mission requirements. Design management includes, but is not limited to, the following activities:

8.7.2.1. Providing site investigations, surveys, and mapping.

8.7.2.2. Obtaining UK approvals and permits.

8.7.2.3. Preparing contract documents.

8.7.2.4. Certifying project costs.

8.7.2.5. Administering consultants and contractors responsible for design services.

8.7.2.6. Completing a detailed 100-percent design approved by the BCE, USF PM and the user.

8.8. Non-Design Related Actions. The USF may request actions by DE-USF outside those identified in paragraph 8.7.2. In such cases, the USF pays contractor invoice costs plus 7.5 percent Departmental Expenses. Examples of non-design services include:

8.8.1. Preparing engineering analyses and feasibility studies to develop technical design parameters.

8.8.2. Preparing environmental impact analyses, base comprehensive plans and site surveys.

8.8.3. Defining the requirement for a project and comprehensive interior design.

8.8.4. Verifying USF consideration of TUPE regulations.

8.8.5. Value engineering studies and options studies.

8.9. Project Planning:

8.9.1. To best satisfy mission requirements, the BCE should provide an integrated planning and design priority list to DE-USF. It should be updated quarterly or as needed. DE-USF manages planning for projects requiring contracted construction.

8.9.2. Planning begins after the BCE provides the following items to DE-USF:

8.9.2.1. USAFE Form 100, funding the design

8.9.2.2. DI, adequately describing the intended project

8.10. Design Instruction. The DI provides a clear description of the proposed project. It provides sufficient information (detailed requirements, cost limits and schedule) for DE-USF to determine the appropriate design strategy and proceed with the selection of a designer. The DI includes a copy of the DD Form 1391 and DD Form 1391-C, **FY___ Military Construction Project Data (Continuation)**, prepared as directed in AFI 32-1032, USAFE Supplement 1.

8.11. Design Stages. There are specific stages during design, from a pre-design meeting and charrettes to the 95 percent review. The DE-USF Project Guide includes flowcharts and details of the DE-USF design process.

8.11.1. Project Definition Meeting. The USF PM clarifies requirements for the DE-USF PM.

8.11.2. Pre-Design Meeting. Purpose of the meeting is to provide all relevant technical and managerial information necessary to produce an accurate design brief to the designer or PSC. Information available at the pre-design meeting should include:

8.11.2.1. Amplification of DI describing user requirements to assist the design contractor.

8.11.2.2. Special conditions such as access and scheduling restrictions.

8.11.2.3. Urgency conditions requiring unusual contract actions.

8.11.2.4. The need for a charrette process should be discussed at this time.

8.11.3. Reviews. Formal reviews and charrettes may be held at viability and RTA depending on project complexity. The USF PM should announce required reviews at the pre-design meeting. The BCE or USF PM provides functional design and maintainability review comments. As applicable, the charrette or viability review time is set during the strategy review meeting. The designer should answer review comments and questions from the USF.

8.12. Siting Clearances. The USF obtains siting clearances for MOD or RAF explosive safety and the RAF siting board, and local authority planning consent notification to meet UK requirements.

8.12.1. RAF Siting Board. The USF PM identifies a proposed project to the RAF commander who schedules and chairs the siting board. Siting clearances are obtained prior to inviting firms to tender. A formal RAF siting board is required for new construction, major alterations to existing facilities or a significant change in the use of existing facilities.

8.12.2. Local Planning Authority. DE-USF is responsible for obtaining planning consent from the local governmental authorities for all construction, maintenance, and repair projects.

8.13. Bid Reporting. The DE-USF PM provides a flash bid report to the USF PM within 1 business day of bid opening. The report should include high and low bids, with justification for recommending a bid other than the lowest one, if applicable. This information is subsequently reported to HQ USAFE via message, fax, or email.

8.13.1. Projects Under Term Contracts. The accepted bid is reported when the authorization and work orders are raised by DE-USF and accepted by the contractor. The estimated cost of the work order is the accepted bid.

8.13.2. Lump Sum Tenders. Reporting of the acceptable bid is made after the bid has been evaluated by DE-USF.

8.14. Funding and Paying for Projects. The "normal" procedure for O&M projects following receipt of an acceptable bid:

- 8.14.1. Request the estimated project funds, the remaining 1.5 percent of DEs for SIOH (EEIC 52X), and any adjustments to design funds.
 - 8.14.2. Upon receipt of funds, the BCE issues a revised USAFE Form 100.
 - 8.14.3. As work progresses DE-USF sends invoices for contract costs plus 1.5 percent DEs.
 - 8.14.4. The CERF verifies the invoices and authorizes payment by the DFAS-EU.
 - 8.14.5. The invoices are sent to the DFAS-EU for payment.
- 8.15. Project Execution:
- 8.15.1. Contract Management. The PSC provides the resources required for control and execution of a project. The scope of actions include:
 - 8.15.1.1. Contractor coordination, where more than one contractor is involved.
 - 8.15.1.2. On-site contract management.
 - 8.15.1.3. Convening progress meetings with the contractor and providing minutes.
 - 8.15.1.4. Ensuring schedule, cost and quality standards are met in accordance with the plans and specifications.
 - 8.15.1.5. Providing work status information.
 - 8.15.1.6. Coordinating utility outages and road closures.
 - 8.15.2. The DE-USF PM advises the USF PM of unexpected contract issues, user or contractor requests or impending cost overruns. No change is executed until approved by the USF PM in accordance with the agreed change order procedure.
 - 8.15.3. US Air Force Monitoring. The USF PM monitors progress of the contract. Control of contractors is a DE-USF responsibility. Base safety and bioenvironmental personnel regularly inspect project sites.
- 8.16. Cost Accounting for Multiple Projects in a Single Contract. DE-USF cost accounting procedures should maintain a verifiable separation of costs for all projects. For projects with more than one class of work, a separate and distinct accounting of costs is required for each class. The BCE provides a USAFE Form 100 for each separate project and class of work. For major projects, the USF PM provides a USAFE Form 11.
- 8.17. Final Inspection and Acceptance. Representatives from engineering, operations, fire protection, the user, and DE-USF should participate in a meeting to review the final acceptance testing of a new or modified facility and its systems (if any).
- 8.18. Physical Completion. DE-USF provides a Physical Completion Certificate to the BCE or USF PM for acceptance of new construction. Completion dates are set for any items remaining on the snagging or punch list. Dates for systems responsibility handover and commencing occupancy are also set. Warrantee start and end dates are established. All relevant as-built drawings and documents are turned over to the BCE or USF PM.
- 8.19. Changes to the Scope of Work or Design. Changes in scope of work or design or several smaller changes may force the reaccomplishment of work already done. Reductions in scope at a late date or during construction due to budget constraints, mission changes, or cost overrun has the effect of

reducing Departmental Expenses payment by USF while increasing contractor and management expenses to DE-USF. A significant change in scope may force DE-USF to consider the action to be a project abort and institution of a new one requiring payment of aborted project costs and restarting Departmental Expenses. Close consultation and project management is required to prevent undesirable mission and project impact and unreasonable costs to DE-USF.

8.20. Project Cancellation (Ref: CSA paragraph 4[2]):

8.20.1. No Costs Incurred. DE-USF advises the BCE who issues a revised USAFE Form 100 withdrawing funds.

8.20.2. Costs Incurred. When the BCE cancels or aborts a project that has incurred costs by consultants or contractors, DE-USF should provide a final invoice reflecting project costs at the time of cancellation within 120 days of receipt of notice to abort. An assessment of expected residual costs should be provided to the BCE if a final invoice couldn't be submitted in that time. In accordance with the CSA, the BCE reimburses DE-USF for the total actual contracted costs when projects are canceled or aborted. The BCE verifies the cost, and issues a revised USAFE Form 100. No charge is made for Departmental Expenses by DE-USF.

8.20.3. Third Party Claims. Canceling or aborting a project that has incurred costs to British citizens may result in claims for recovery and legal action. The USG may be responsible for the claim and reimbursing HMG for all costs associated with the clearance of such claims in accordance with the CSA paragraph 4(3).

8.21. NATO Minor Works and Restoration Projects. The BCE issues DIs and monitors construction for NATO minor works and restoration projects. HQ USAFE/CEWN monitors NATO funding and assists base program manager with project execution as required.

8.22. Transfer of NATO Facilities:

8.22.1. Transfer of NATO-funded facilities to the NATO Inventory and to the user is done with the Joint Formal Acceptance Inspection (JFAI) report (NATO AC/4(PP) FA/...series) and the document stating final acceptance of the JFAI report by NATO Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Committee can also perform formal acceptance on behalf of the user nation.

8.22.2. DD Form 1354, **Transfer and Acceptance of Military Real Property**, is used to transfer NATO-funded facilities to the AF real property records. As NATO funds the facilities, they remain NATO facilities. The host nation and user nations agree on who is to provide maintenance and upkeep.

8.22.3. Normally, the JFAI report is not prepared until well after the facilities have been completed and transferred by DE-USF to the BCE. Thus the official NATO documents are not available for Air Force real property accounting purposes at the time of transfer. As a consequence, the JFAI report is not a practical means of entering NATO-funded facilities in the USAFE real property inventory in a timely manner. To resolve this problem in the UK, DE-USF, Defense Secretariat (AIR) and HQ USAFE have agreed to the following procedures:

8.22.3.1. For NATO-funded facilities, the USF uses handover documentation as described in the DE-USF Project Guide. The physical completion certificate, together with a handover certificate from the DEM (normally executed at the same time) serves as interim transfer documentation for establishing USF real property accountability.

8.22.3.2. The NATO-funded portion of facilities is transferred as above, supplemented with a DD Form 1354. A separate DD Form 1354 transfers the US-funded portion.

8.22.3.3. US-prefinanced NATO facilities are transferred from US to NATO in the USF real property accountable records.

8.22.4. The JFAI report prepared by the NATO international staff serves as transfer documentation. The real property voucher for the final NATO documents is cross-referenced to the original real property voucher prepared for the interim transfer documentation.

The above procedures ensure NATO-funded facilities are included in the command real property inventory at the time of project completion. They apply to the transfer of all completed NATO-funded facilities at 3 AF installations and geographically separated units (GSU).

9. Deployed Unit Employment--“Troop Labor”:

9.1. Purpose. To summarize procedures for accomplishing deployed unit employment through maintenance, repair, and construction projects performed by US Air Force, Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units. The governing directive for accomplishment of this type of work is USAFE Regulation 85-5, *Management of Projects Performed by Troop Labor*.

9.2. Concept. Deployed unit projects and work are identified by the BCE for accomplishment, focusing on those projects that enhance the deploying unit's specialized capabilities and meet mission priorities. The DEM is notified of work and projects identified by the BCE, providing guidance on UK statutory standards. HQ Air Force Reserve and the National Guard Board approve and select projects that fulfill valid deployed unit training requirements during an annual call. **Attachment 1** to USAFE Regulation 85-5 outlines the project selection process and establishes time lines to meet deployment schedules.

9.3. Responsibilities. The BCE is responsible for the overall management of projects performed by deployed units, including funds accountability for all expenditures associated with the projects. The BCE should appoint a coordinator to manage the project.

9.3.1. The DEM provides support as requested by the BCE, e.g. purchase of materials, authorized persons for specialized systems or installation testing and certification). Departmental Expenses are paid to DE-USF based upon work performed by DE-USF and contracted personnel. Departmental Expenses are not paid for materials procured by the BCE for deployed unit project use or the value of work performed by deployed personnel.

9.3.2. Deploying units are responsible for completing tasks identified on the DD Form 1391 and providing status to the BCE.

9.4. Authorization. Projects identified for accomplishment during the annual troop labor call are approved by the BCE. Planning and programming documents are forwarded to HQ USAFE/CE Programming Division (CEP) for review. Projects are only considered candidates until approval is granted by CEP. The appropriate headquarters then contacts the deploying units to coordinate capabilities and team availability.

9.5. Considerations. In addition to performing projects, deployed units are looking for contingency training opportunities such as chemical warfare, small arms, rapid runway repair, vehicle driving and any contingency related actions that are available. Deploying units should be incorporated into base exercises whenever their mission readiness could be enhanced by their participation. Care should be

exercised to incorporate deployed units into functional positions. Where the deployed unit cannot be a significant participant in an exercise, schedule their projects and asset requirements around the exercise to minimize shortfalls and asset tasking.

9.5.1. Project selection for Reserve and Guard units should be based on unit beddown, readiness, upgrade of work place and quality of life. Guidelines suggest:

9.5.1.1. Paving and earth-moving projects, structural work and utility installation.

9.5.1.2. "Standalone" projects are preferred over facility additions (construct vice addition/repair).

9.5.1.3. Broad scope, multi-craft projects that match unit capabilities and provide contingency training.

9.5.1.4. Small scope projects, as deployments are usually 12-15 days. Second units and sub-units can be used.

9.5.2. Base beautification projects such as laying paving stones, building gazebos, or installing playground equipment; and projects requiring uncommon technical experience such as installing security alarm systems or carpeting are not considered appropriate and may hamper approval.

9.6. Scheduling. Specialized training requirements unique to the UK such as vehicle operations should be built into the work schedule for the deployed units as early as possible. Where a class is necessary either before or during the deployment, the deployed unit should be provided with a handout on the subject and advised of the timing and personnel requirements. If the unit cannot meet the requirement, the employing unit should designate supporting personnel for the deployment. Care should be taken to ensure that personnel involved in planning for the action are on duty (not on leave or temporary duty (TDY) for the duration of the unit's presence.

9.7. Design. All project designs comply with UK building standards and regulations. If contracted design or materials procurement is provided by DE-USF, Departmental Expenses are paid as follows:

9.7.1. 6.0 percent of the fees charged by the contractor.

9.7.2. 1.5 percent of cost of materials procured.

9.7.3. Procedures governing design review meetings should be followed. Final designs are submitted to the BCE for review of functional adequacy and signature.

9.8. Material Ordering and Receipt. The bill of materials, required tools, and supplies developed by design engineers (in-house or consultant) are submitted to the MAE for ordering. Upon receipt or designation, the MAE should mark project materials, tools and supplies and place them in a secure holding area. These materials should not be redirected to other projects without the BCE's express approval. Construction should begin when the deploying unit arrives. Care should be exercised to ensure all project requirements are met before that date.

JOHN E. WATKINS, Colonel, USAF
Vice Commander

Attachment 1**GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****References***

Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 32-10, *Installations and Facilities*, and USAFE Supplement 1

AFPD 32-90, *Real Property Management*

Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-1001, *Operations Management*

Air Force Pamphlet (AFPAM) 32-1004, Volume 2, *Working in the Operations Flight Maintenance Engineering*

AFI 32-1021, *Planning and Programming of Facility Construction Projects*

AFI 32-1022, *Planning and Programming Non-appropriated Fund Facility Construction Projects*

AFI 32-1032, *Planning and Programming Real Property Maintenance Projects using Appropriated Funds*, and USAFE Supplement 1

AFI 32-1061, *Providing Utilities to US Air Force Installations*

AFPAM 32-1098, *Base Civil Engineer Self-Help Guide*, and USAFE Supplement 1

Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-322, *Records Disposition Schedule*

AFI 32-7006, *Environmental Program in Foreign Countries*

AFI 36-2817, *Civil Engineer Awards Program*

AFI 36-2831, *Commander-in-Chief's (CINC) Annual Awards for Installation Excellence*

AFI 65-601, *Budget Guidance and Procedures*

MOD Safe Systems--Defines work within confined spaces

USAFE Instruction 65-105, *Order for Construction, Supplies and Services from British Government Agencies*

USAFE Regulation 85-5, *Management of Projects Performed by Troop Labor*

USAFE Mission Directive 38, Detachment 1, *USAFE Civil Engineer Squadron*

AFMC Infrastructure Condition Standard, April 1994

1978 US Air ForceE/MOD Arrangement for the Employment of MOD Civil Servants

1976 USAFE/MOD Agreement for Accommodation (Utilities) Services to the US Air Force in the UK

1973 US/UK Cost Sharing Arrangement (CSA)

1951 NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA)

1989 US/UK Agreement concerning the Health and Safety at Work Act of 1974

US DOD Environmental Final Governing Standards for the United Kingdom (FGS)

STC/1/5/AOA, Directive to the Royal Air Force Commander

CP, DE-USF Code of Practice

DE-USF Project Guide, January 1998

Abbreviations and Acronyms

3 AF—Third Air Force

3 AF/A47—Third Air Force Civil Engineer

3 AF/IR—Third Air Force International Relations Division

AFMC—Air Force Materiel Command

AE—European Area

AP—Authorized Person

APO—Air Post Office

AOS/CAT—USAFE Crisis Action Team

BCE—**Base Civil Engineer**

BFMA—Base Facility Maintenance Agreement

CE—Civil Engineering

CELF—MOD Civil Engineer Labor Force

CERF—Civil Engineer Resources Flight

CEP—Programming Division

CP—DE-USF Code of Practice

CPM—Commercial Project Manager

CSA—973 Cost Sharing Arrangement

CWE—Current Work Estimate

DBA—Defence Bills Agency

Des—Departmental Expenses

DEM—Defence Estates Manager (formerly known as the Associate Civil Engineer [ACE])

DE-USF—Defence Estates-United States Forces

DFAS-EU—Defense Finance and Accounting Service-Europe

DI—Design Instruction

DoD—Department of Defense

EEIC—Element of Expense Investment Code

FGS—Final Governing Standards

FM—Financial Management

FSC—Facilities Support Contract

FSO—Financial Services Office
GSU—Geographically Separated Unit
HQ USAFE/CER—Former designation of the USAFE Regional Civil Engineer, UK
HQ USAFE/CEW—Regional Civil Engineer (Waterbeach), UK; Det 1, HQ USAFE/CE
H&S—Health and Safety
HMG—Her Majesty’s Government
HQ—Headquarters
IR—International Relations
JA—Judge Advocate
JFAI—Joint Formal Acceptance Inspection
MAE—Materiel Acquisition Element
MILCON—Military Construction
MOD—Ministry of Defence
MODPO—Ministry of Defence Personnel Office
NAF—Non-Appropriated Fund
NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NAU—NATO accounting unit (approx. \$3.5-varies)
O&M—Operations and Maintenance
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PM—Program manager (USF), project manager (DE-USF)
PSC—Project Support Consultant (formerly known as the commercial project manager)
PTC—Personnel and Training Command, RAF
RAF—Royal Air Force
RED HORSE—Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational Repair Squadron, Engineers
RAFLO/ARM—RAF Liaison Officer for Armaments
RPIE—Real Property Installed Equipment
RTA—Ready to Advertise
SABER—Simplified Acquisition of Base Engineering Resources
STC—Specialist Term Contract
SIOH—Supervision, Inspection, Overhead and Handling
SOFA—1951 NATO Status of Forces Agreement
SP—Skilled Person

SSSI—Sites of Special Scientific Interest

STC—Specialist Term Contract

TDY—Temporary Duty

TST—Technical Support Team

TUPE—Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment) Regulation

UK—United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

USAFE—US Air Forces in Europe

HQ USAFE/CE—US Air Forces in Europe/Civil Engineer

USF—United States Forces

USG—US Government

Terms

Charrete—A meeting at which project planning actions are completed

£—British pound sterling (approximately \$1.50)

P713—Military family housing improvement

SRP—DE-USF safe systems of work, Safety Rules and Procedures

Upfund—Additional project funding required to meet unplanned costs