

**BY ORDER OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT**



**HQ UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
ACADEMY INSTRUCTION 10-601**

14 NOVEMBER 2018
Certified Current 19 July 2022
Operations

**USAFA CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS
DEVELOPMENT**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications are available for downloading or ordering on the e-Publishing website at www.e-Publishing.af.mil.

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication

OPR: HQ USAFA/A5/8

Certified by: HQ USAFA/A5R
(Mr. James Imlay)

Pages: 15

This new instruction implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 10-6, *Capability Requirements Development*, and establishes the framework used by Commanders and Mission Elements (ME) to identify and mitigate gaps in capabilities required to support the USAFA mission, and develop and validate the solutions analysis and resource recommendations to address requirements for entry into the Academy corporate process. To the extent its directions are inconsistent with other USAFA publications; the information herein prevails, in accordance with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. This instruction also supports implementation of AFI 63-138, *Acquisition of Services* and Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 63-144, *Business Capability Requirements, Compliance, and System Acquisition*. MEs or commanders responsible for implementing this instruction cannot issue supplements. Do not use local operating instructions to implement guidance in this instruction. Supplements will be used to establish organization-specific guidance. Commanders or MEs will send proposed supplements to HQ USAFA/A5R for review and coordination prior to publishing. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*.

The authorities to waive requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier 3 (T-3) number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority. The waiver authority for non-tiered requirements in this publication is the (USAFA/A8). Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this

publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS).

1. USAFA CAPABILITY GAPS AND REQUIREMENTS

1.1. Overview.

1.1.1. USAFA requirements processes identify, define, and implement capabilities supporting USAFA needs. They are an integral part of USAFA's input to the Air Force Strategy, Planning, and Programming Process (SP3).

1.1.2. In order to compete for USAFA resources, whether in execution year or as a USAFA Program Objective Memorandum (POM) submission, all initiatives must have a validated requirement. For purposes of this instruction, a validated requirement is defined as a course of action or solution approved by the formal USAFA Requirement Capabilities Development Process (RCDP). Specific requirement approval processes and validation authorities vary with requirement type and scope, but as a minimum will include a completed Requirement Capability Development Survey (RCDS). The RCDS ([Attachment 2](#)) will be coordinated by HQ USAFA/A5R, Requirements Division, and the Requirements Oversight Committee (ROC) before USAFA Group or USAFA Board consideration. Specific approval processes will be followed as outlined below:

1.1.2.1. Services Acquisitions. In accordance with established services acquisitions processes and AFI 63138, *Acquisition of Services*, all services acquisitions must have a Requirements Approval Document (RAD) signed by the appropriate requirements approval authority.

1.1.2.2. New Capabilities (including significant mission enhancements). New capability gaps with an estimated cost of \$250K/year or \$1M/FYDP require USAFA Group or Board approval.

1.1.2.3. Basis of Issue items (e.g., personal equipment). For basis of issue items that are not operationally related or do not add new capabilities, requirement validation may occur concurrently with resource validation via the USAFA Corporate Structure.

1.1.3. Upon ROC validation, the requirement owner may submit the validated requirement(s) for resourcing via Execution Year (EY) or POM Planning Choices in accordance with (IAW) applicable HQ USAFA/FM, Comptroller, or HQ USAFA/A5/8, Plans, Programs and Requirements directorate, planning guidance, respectively.

1.1.4. The USAFA RCDP objectives are to be:

1.1.4.1. Synergistic. The process is designed to help USAFA requirement owners as they define near-term (1-5 years), mid-term (6- 10 years), and long-term (11-30 years) capability gaps by integrating requirements and solutions across mission areas, thereby minimizing the number of unique or redundant solutions.

1.1.4.2. Adaptable. The process recognizes that capability gaps are dynamic and unpredictable in terms of both timing and form. Therefore, A5R may modify the process in a coordinated and expeditious manner, when warranted by mission needs, and employ continuous process improvement principles to refine the process over time.

1.1.4.3. Responsive. The process is designed to be responsive to mission owners in two critical ways. First, it values Airmen's time by requiring only the minimal documentation necessary for the USAFA Corporate Structure to make an informed resourcing decision. Second, A5R assists the requirement owner as they define, develop, and shepherd the requirement through the analysis and resourcing phases.

1.1.5. HQ USAFA Requirements Division (A5R) goals are to:

1.1.5.1. Improve the level of support provided to requirement owners as they develop capability requirements and associated solution/resource proposals.

1.1.5.2. Establish a linking mechanism between the POM and EY resource allocation processes.

1.1.5.3. Foster integration of USAFA capabilities and requirements, improve interoperability, and preclude duplication of effort across lines of operation.

1.1.6. Requirement Capabilities Development Process (RCDP) Overview:

1.1.6.1. Step 1 - Capability-Based Proposal: Requirement owners submit a potential capability based need or gap to the HQ USAFA Requirements Division (A5R) where a Lead Integrator performs an initial DOTmLPF-P (Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities and Policy) assessment in preparation for Step 2.

1.1.6.2. Step 2 - Capability Gap Assessment: The requirement owner presents a capability based need (gap) Requirement Capability Development Survey ([Attachment 2](#)) and Requirements Analysis Worksheet ([Attachment 3](#)) to the A5R who reviews the assessment and provides feedback to further refine the gap into a requirement. The requirement owner resubmits a revised/refined capability based need if necessary.

1.1.6.3. Step 3 - Analysis of Alternatives (AoA): The requirement owner conducts a detailed DOTmLPF-P analysis and an analytical comparison of the operational effectiveness, risks, and estimated life-cycle cost (or total ownership cost, if applicable) of alternatives that satisfy established capability requirement(s). **Note:** An alternative will only be deemed "non-viable" where it cannot meet a "critical attribute" threshold (e.g., risk and life-cycle cost will not be used to determine an alternative to be "non-viable").

1.1.6.4. Step 4 - Requirement Validation/Approval: Upon ROC coordination (not approval), the requirement owner provides a course of action recommendation to the USAFA Group. The USAFA Group voting members validate AoA rigor and approve or disapprove the requirement owner's recommendation. An approved course of action is a validated requirement that can then compete for resources via the Corporate Structure.

1.1.6.5. RCDP Memorandum (RCDPM): Issued by the A5R Director following a Step 4 decision or requirement off-ramp. The RCDPM conveys the vote or direction of the Group, provides instruction for the requirement to exit, off-ramp, or continue in the RCDP process. It also provides follow-on recommendations and defines expectation and deliverables.

1.2. Roles and Responsibilities.

1.2.1. Requirement Owner.

1.2.1.1. A requirement can originate from any USAFA mission area and is typically a Mission Element, Wing or Group commander (or deputy/vice), or a HQ USAFA Director or Division Chief who identifies a capability gap impairing the ability of one or more USAFA units to accomplish its assigned mission.

1.2.1.2. The requirement owner is responsible for estimating required resources and provide the documentation necessary to complete the processes described in this guidance, in coordination with the USAFA Requirements Division (A5R) and the ROC.

1.2.1.3. With exception of accepting anticipated risk, during an A5R off-ramped decision, the Requirement Owners will designate a SME to act on their behalf through the RCDP process.

1.2.2. USAFA ROC membership:

1.2.2.1. ROC Voting Members include USAFA A-Staff (Manpower and Personnel (A1), Operations and Analyses (A3/9), Installations (A4), Plans, Programs and Requirements (A5/8), Communications and Information (A6)) Deputy Directors or their designated representative as well as designated Mission Element representatives. Voting members validate capability gaps, validate the requirement owner's AoA, and approve recommended courses of action (requirements) or corrective measures if necessary prior to USAFA Group consideration.

1.2.2.2. Advisory Members include other members of the headquarters and ME staffs who participate in RCDP discussions and serve as advisors for initiatives that may affect or be affected by their mission areas. Advisors are not included in voting decisions. At a minimum, the following are standing USAFA advisory or guest members: Staff Judge Advocate (JA), Directorate of Contracting (PK), and Admissions (RR), ME representatives (Athletic Department (AD), Commandant of Cadets (CW), Dean of the Faculty (DF), Preparatory School (PL), 10th Air Base Wing (10 ABW), 10th Mission Support Squadron Deputy Director (10 MSG/DD), 10th Contracting Squadron (10 CONS), and 306 Flight Training Group (306 FTG). Other members will be included as needed.

1.2.3. Requirements Working Group (RWG).

1.2.3.1. For each capability gap for which the Group has established an RWG, the RWG is responsible for conducting the required analysis and developing a requirement proposal to fill the validated capability gap. This includes, but may not be limited to, developing a DOTmLPP-P analysis, AoA, and a fiscally-informed resource strategy.

1.2.3.2. Mission Elements requirement owners will provide:

1.2.3.2.1. Subject matter experts (SMEs) to support the processes described in this guidance.

1.2.3.2.2. Personnel with appropriate grade and/or expertise to support requirement working groups and ad hoc requests for additional SMEs or information.

1.2.3.2.3. Support to functional requirements processes (e.g., information technology technical solution and costing) and options to the RWG within requested timeframes.

1.2.3.2.4. The best available alternatives with appropriate caveats detailing the additional analysis that should be conducted where specified timeframes preclude the functional community's preferred depth of analysis.

1.2.4. USAFA Requirements Division (HQ USAFA/A5R).

1.2.4.1. Functions as the office of primary responsibility for the USAFA Requirement Capability Development Process (RCDP).

1.2.4.2. Coordinates with external organizations (e.g., MAJCOMs, Headquarters Air Force [HAF], System Program Offices [SPOs]) to resolve requirements issues.

1.2.4.3. Chairs the USAFA ROC.

1.2.4.4. Facilitates the RWG process by assigning USAFA Lead Integrators to help requirement owners determine the appropriate membership and facilitate the activities of the working group.

1.2.4.5. Formally requests USAFA Directors to assign appropriate RWG SMEs.

1.2.4.6. Establishes and maintains knowledge management processes necessary to support USAFA requirements processes.

1.2.5. HQ USAFA/A8P is the AF Strategy, Planning, and Programming Process (SP3) OPR.

1.2.6. HQ USAFA/FM is the execution-year resource allocation OPR (initial distribution, mid-year and end-of-year), and defines the specific business processes associated with those processes. All initiatives must have a validated requirement, IAW [para 1.1.2.](#) of this instruction, before entering the resource allocation process.

1.2.7. A Program Element Monitor (PEM) or Resource Advisor (RA) serves as an advocate for requirements within their respective Program Element (PE). It is an inherent responsibility of the requirement owner to work with their PEM/RA during the capability based assessment development and subsequent RWG meetings. Establishing a foundational relationship ensures the broad PE perspective is considered in the requirement process and the PEM or RA gains sufficient understanding to serve as an effective advocate for the requirement through the POM process.

1.2.8. Program initiatives are defined as new starts or changes to existing programs due to program content or growth. Before the Corporate Structure approves new initiative resources, the requirement(s) must be validated by a formal requirements process (RCDP) and approved by the Superintendent or their representative at the USAFA Board.

1.2.9. HQ USAFA/A1M, Manpower division, is the manpower requirement determination process OPR.

2. DEVELOPING A CAPABILITY

2.1. Requirement Capabilities Development Process (RCDP).

2.1.1. Entry. There are several different on-ramps into the RCDP. Typically, capability gaps enter the RCDP process at Step 1 if any of the following apply:

2.1.1.1. Cost thresholds exceeded:

2.1.1.2. Investments exceeding \$250K (appropriations 3010 Aircraft Procurement, 3600 Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, and 3080 Other Procurement) in any single fiscal year, or over \$1M/FYDP to include the impact of Manpower, or

2.1.1.3. Operations and Maintenance (O&M, appropriation 3400) costs over \$250K annually.

2.1.1.4. Initiatives that are “cross-cutting” that may affect more than one mission area, have manpower considerations, etc.

2.1.1.5. Requirement(s) that must be routed through HAF or MAJCOM coordination or have higher-level requirements processes (e.g., Electronic Air Force Requirements Oversight Council [e-AFROC], Capability Development Working Group, Capability Development Council, Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System [JCIDS], Service Development and Delivery Process [SDDP]).

2.1.1.6. At the request of the requirement owner to assist in fully defining a requirement before entering the resourcing and acquisition processes.

2.1.1.7. On a case-by-case basis, A5R may approve entry to the RCDP process at a later step based on gap maturity or previously completed efforts such as Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) events.

2.1.2. The USAFA Group/Board will establish periodic requirement reviews as outlined in US Air Force Academy Instruction (USAFI) 16501, *Corporate Process and Governance*.

2.1.3. RWGs are led by requirement owners who set the battle rhythm for advancement through the RCDP process.

2.1.4. The HQ USAFA/A5/8 Director or USAFA Group Chair may direct forming an Executive Tiger Team on an ad hoc basis to assist senior leader decision making.

2.1.5. Exit or off-ramp from the USAFA RCDP. A requirement or initiative normally exits the RCDP after Step 4. However, a requirement owner can request to exit the RCDP at any point.

2.1.5.1. A5R will issue a RCDPM annotating the circumstance of the off-ramp/exit, for any capability gap that has progressed beyond Step 1.

2.2. Step 1 - Capability Based Assessment. Requirement owners identify a capability gap directly to the USAFA Requirements Division (HQ USAFA/A5R) through the applicable ME or HQ Directorate.

2.2.1. To initiate the RCDP, contact A5R via email: USAFA/A5R.workflow@usafa.edu.

2.2.2. A5R Lead Integrators work with the requirement owner to conduct an initial DOTmLPF-P assessment, refine the capability gap definition, identify potential opportunities to integrate or share solutions across lines of operation, and identify stakeholders and additional requirement owners. **Note:** The work in this step is

documented in a completed Requirements Analysis Worksheet (**Attachment 3**) as a means of clearly defining the capability gap.

2.2.3. All RCDP documents are available in the ROC Guidebook located on the ROC SharePoint web page at <https://sharepoint.usafa.edu/HQ/A58/A5R/rqmts/default.aspx>.

2.2.4. The requirement owner is responsible for working with their PEM/RA during the initial capability based assessment development and RWG in Step 3. If a PEM is not assigned or available, at a minimum, the RA within the requirement owner's organization will provide resource programming advocacy and capability expertise.

2.2.5. Following the completion of an initial assessment, the integrator assists the requirement owner in the development of a RCDP Step 4 package.

2.2.5.1. The requirement owner identifies linkage(s) to the USAFA Strategic Plan or supporting annexes should be identified during the initial assessment and development of the Step 4 brief.

2.3. Step 2 - Capability Gap Validation. A5R serves as the gatekeeper and recommends thoroughly assessed capability gaps for review by the USAFA ROC.

2.3.1. The requirement owner or ROC Chair provides a validated requirement from Step 4 identifying the capability gap for USAFA Group or Board consideration.

2.3.2. The USAFA ROC determines whether gap assessment sufficiency warrants further consideration and the formation of an RWG. The Group also assigns a requirements champion.

2.3.3. At a minimum, the Step 4 RCDP contains:

2.3.3.1. An A5R capability gap assessment.

2.3.3.2. The requirement owner's input identifying background, problem statement, capability gap(s), linkage between the Goals/Objectives/Focus Areas of the USAFA Strategic Plan and supporting plans or annexes, and proposed stakeholders.

2.3.3.3. An A5R recommendation (if appropriate) identifying proposed deliverables, assumptions and a target requirement Initial Operational Capability (IOC).

2.3.4. A successful ROC review results in the ROC issuing a RCDPM substantiating the capability gap and authorizing RWG formation (if warranted). The RCDPM also provides expectation management for the RWG and senior leaders.

2.3.5. If A5R, thru the RCDP, determines the requirement owner has not sufficiently substantiated the gap or not clearly defined the problem statement, A5R can request the requirement owner (and others as necessary), redefine the gap and present the new material for reconsideration at a later date. The requirement owner is not obligated to redefine the gap, however it will be noted that A5R does not agree with the requirement gap as substantiated.

2.4. Step 3 - Analysis of Alternatives (AoA).

2.4.1. A RCDPM, issued at the completion of Step 4, provides the authority and expectation management for the RWG.

2.4.2. The requirement owner leads the RWG, with the USAFA Lead Integrator as the facilitator, to conduct a more complete DOTmLPF-P analysis and develop Mission Tasks (MTs), Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs), Measures of Performance (MOPs), and identify potential gap mitigation alternatives.

2.4.3. While the RWG analyzes possible alternatives to address the capability gap, requirement owners should formulate an informed resource strategy in coordination with their applicable PEM or RA.

2.4.4. Once the RWG completes the analysis and develops recommendations, the requirement owner presents the outcome of the AoA to the ROC as a Step 4 briefing or staff package.

2.5. Step 4 - Requirement Validation/Approval.

2.5.1. The requirement owner presents the AoA results to the ROC as a Step 4 package which contains:

2.5.1.1. A short recap on the capability gap validated in Step 2.

2.5.1.2. The outcome of the DOTmLPF-P analysis.

2.5.1.3. The alternative courses of action developed.

2.5.1.4. The criteria used to analyze the alternatives.

2.5.1.5. Risk(s) and cost(s) analysis for each alternative.

2.5.1.6. The recommendation of the RWG should address:

2.5.1.6.1. How well the selected alternative fits the gap.

2.5.1.6.2. The DOTmLPF-P items that must be addressed and associated risk(s).

2.5.1.6.3. For material alternatives, define a fiscally-informed resource strategy for procurement.

2.5.2. The A5R ensures the RWG provides due diligence in thoroughly assessing a non-material approach to mitigate the capability gap.

2.5.3. The A5R determines whether the RWG has provided the appropriate level of rigor to address the capability gap.

2.5.4. The process is complete when A5R issues an RCDPM formally validating the sufficiency of the AoA/technology review and the recommended course of action/requirement in accordance with this instruction. Upon requirement validation, the requirement owner may compete for resources within the programming process IAW applicable planning guidance published by HQ USAFA/FM and/or A5/8.

WILL CLARK, Col, USAF
Director, Plans, Programs and Requirements

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

AFPD10-6, *Capability Requirements Development*, 06 Nov 13

AFI33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 01 Dec 15

AFI63-138, *Acquisition of Services*, 11 May 17

AFMAN63-144, *Business Capability Requirements, Compliance, and System Acquisition*, 25 Jul 18

AFMAN33-363, *Management of Records*, 01 Mar 08

USAFAI16-501, *Corporate Process and Governance*, 08 Jun 17

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AD—Active Duty

AF—Air Force

AFR—Air Force Reserve

AFRIMS—AF Records Information Management System

ANG—Air National Guard

AoA—Analysis of Alternatives

DAF—Department of the Air Force

DOTmLFP-P—Doctrine, Organization, Training, materiel, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy

EOY—End of Year

IAW—In accordance with

ICBA—Initial Capabilities Based Assessment

JCIDS—Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

PEM—Program Element Monitor

PE—Program Element

POM—Program Objective Memorandum

RAS—Requirement Assessment Summary

RCDPM—Requirement Capabilities Development Process Memorandum

RCDP—Requirement Capabilities Development Process

RDS—Records Disposition Schedule
ROCM—ROC Memorandum
ROC—Requirements Oversight Committee
RWG—Requirement Working Group
SDDP—Service Development and Delivery Process
SME—Subject matter experts
SP3—Strategy, planning and programming process
USAFA—United States Air Force Academy

Terms

Analysis of Alternatives (AoA)—An analytical comparison of the operational effectiveness, suitability, and life-cycle cost (or total ownership cost, if applicable) of alternatives that satisfy established capability needs. Used in the USAFA ROC to determine if a viable alternative to an identified capability gap exists – not associated with source selection.

Capability—For the purpose of this instruction, a capability is the ability to execute all or part of an assigned mission. The ability to achieve a desired effect under specified standards and conditions through combinations of means and ways across the full spectrum of DOTmLPF-P to perform a set of tasks to execute a specified course of action.

Capability Gap—For the purpose of this instruction, a capability gap is the inability to execute all or part of an assigned mission. The gap may be the result of no existing capability, lack of proficiency or sufficiency in an existing capability solution, or the need to replace an existing capability solution to prevent a future gap.

Champion—The champion serves as the headquarters advocate for the requirement owner. In many cases, he/she helps facilitate coordination, and in some cases removes impediments in the RWG progress, essentially allowing RWGs the freedom to focus on the problem.

Corporate Structure—The USAFA corporate structure embodies the Academy's corporate review process. It is designed to increase management effectiveness and improve cross-functional decision-making by providing a forum where senior USAFA leaders can apply their collective judgment and experience to affect major programs, objectives, and issues with resourcing and/or policy decisions requiring the experience/expertise of the staff as a whole or decisions impacting the majority of the Command and/or its missions (ref USAFAI16-501).

Cross-Cutting Initiatives—Initiatives applying to multiple mission areas.

DOTmLPF-P—The DoD acronym that pertains to the eight possible non-materiel elements involved in solving warfighting capability gaps

- Doctrine: the way we fight (fundamental principles by which the air force guide their actions in support of national objectives)
- Organization: how we organize to fight (Air Force, MAJCOM, Numbered AF, Wing, Group, Squadron, Flight, Section, and Airman)
- Training: how we prepare to fight tactically (basic training to advanced individual training, unit training, joint exercises, etc.).

- Materiel: all the “stuff” necessary to equip our forces that DOES NOT require a new development effort (weapons, spares, test sets, etc. that are “off the shelf” both commercially and within the government)
- Leadership: how we prepare our leaders to lead the fight (professional development for Airmen of all ranks)
- Personnel: availability of qualified people for peacetime, wartime, and various contingency operations
- Facilities: real property, installations, and industrial facilities (aircraft hangers, maintenance facilities, government owned ammunition production facilities)
- Policy: DoD, interagency, or international policy that impacts the other seven non-materiel elements.

Initial Capabilities Based Assessment. The ICBA identifies capability gaps. Results of the ICBA inform recommendations to pursue a materiel or non-materiel solution.

Gatekeeper—a process manager who controls the flow of information.

Lead Integrators—Provide command perspective by identifying, assessing, incorporating, and communicating potential holistic requirements and capabilities to capture effective and efficient planning for recruiting, training, and education mission needs.

Off-ramp—When a gap or requirement is evaluated and a DOTmLPF-P solution or some other existing, resource-neutral solution is identified to close the gap, thus terminating the RCDP action.

Resource Strategy—A fiscally informed, realistic plan that addresses manpower and funding required to implement an initiative.

Requirement Owner—The senior officer or civilian who identifies the requirement that expends or impacts USAFA resources to meet mission need.

Requirement Working Group—Ad hoc cross-functional team established by USAFAI 16-501, USAFA Corporate Structure, to develop a DOTmLPF-P analysis and resource recommendation to address a specific capability gap. Working groups are short-term in nature, therefore each requirement working group remains active only for the time required to address the specified requirement.

Validated Capability Gap—For the purposes of this instruction, a validated capability gap is the formal identification, by a formal requirements process (e.g., Requirements Oversight Committee) of the inability to execute all or part of an assigned mission. The gap may be the result of no existing capability, lack of proficiency or sufficiency in an existing capability solution, or the need to replace an existing capability solution to prevent a future gap.

Validated Requirement (or capability requirement)—For purposes of this instruction, a validated requirement is defined as a course of action or solution that has been approved by a formal requirements process (e.g., Requirements Oversight Committee) to fill or mitigate a capability gap.

Attachment 2**USAFA REQUIREMENT CAPABILITIES DEVELOPMENT SURVEY**

See A5R requirements .EDU SharePoint site for latest template:

<https://sharepoint.usafa.edu/hq/a589/Requirements/SitePages/Home.aspx>

This survey serves as a checklist to further validate new and/or emerging requirements that necessitate additional funding (more than \$250K) or manpower to implement the requirement. It is imperative that all applicable checklist items be addressed and presented to A5R for review prior to presentation to the USAFA Group or Board.

1. Who is the sponsor for the requirement?
2. Who is the beneficiary of the requirement?
3. Describe the capabilities gap(s) the requirement fills?
4. Describe how this capabilities gap enhance or improve the USAFA Cadet experience?
5. Provide a full description of development, implementation and sustainment costs to include manpower to maintain/sustain the new capability.
6. Describe the analysis that was performed to arrive at the initial cost of the requirement?
7. What alternative of analysis study was performed and results?
8. What will be used within your Mission Element as a set-aside, to include dollar amounts and manpower, and what effect will the set-aside have on overall program/mission?
9. What is the implementation timeline? What appropriations are necessary (type and year)?
10. What is the long-term (life cycle) maintenance and or personnel impact?
11. What organization is proposed to absorb the costs?
12. If realized, how long do you expect this capability to be relevant? What, if anything could make this capability obsolete and when?
- 13. What is the priority of this requirement for your organization or ME?**

Attachment 3

USAFA REQUIREMENTS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (ROC) REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS WORKSHEET (RAW)

See A5R requirements .EDU SharePoint site for latest template:

<https://sharepoint.usafa.edu/hq/a589/Requirements/SitePages/Home.aspx>

The USAFA requirements process is used to identify gaps in capabilities required to support the USAFA mission. USAFA ROC validates the capability gap is accurately defined; integrates like-requirements across USAFA lines of operation; forms a requirements working group (RWG) to develop and evaluate proposed courses of action; validates the level of rigor used in the analysis of the alternatives ensuring the DOTmLPF-P solution was evaluated equally - before entering into the USAFA Corporate Structure resourcing process, and recommending requirement prioritization.					
Section 1- Capabilities Based Assessment (CBA) [Step 1]					
Originator		Office		Date of request	
Background					
Problem Statement					
Capability Requirement					
Current Capability					
Gap					
What caused the gap					
How long has gap existed?		Current mitigation employed			
Impact if gap is not closed					
Rationale / Justification					
Key Stakeholders			Note: Key stakeholders are identified. Identify additional members as required.		
Section 2- ROC Requirements Validation [Step 2]					
A5R ASSESSMENT					

Does capability exist						
Value to others			Potential DoD impact			
ROC REQUIREMENT VALIDATION DECISION						
Requirement Validated	<input type="checkbox"/>					
RWG Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/>	ITSP WG.				
Recommended Additional RWG Stakeholders	Request to forgo traditional RWG and move requirement directly to ITSP WG.					
ROC Chair						

SECTION 3-ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES [STEP 3]				
DOTmLPF-P (Non-Materiel Analysis)		Mitigation	Feasibility	Risk
Doctrine				
Organization				
Training				
Materiel				
Leadership & Education				
Personnel				
Facilities				
Policy				
Materiel Solutions (COAs)		Effectiveness	Risk	Cost
COA 1				
COA 2				

COA 3				
RECOMMENDATION				
COA				
INTEGRATION ASSESSMENT				
Does capability exist				
Value to others				
SECTION 4-ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES VALIDATION [STEP 4]				
AoA Validated	<input type="checkbox"/>			
ITSP Tech Review	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Corporate Structure	<input type="checkbox"/>			