

**BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**



AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 65-509

19 SEPTEMBER 2008

**Certified Current, 19 SEPTEMBER 2011
Financial Management**

BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at www.e-Publishing.af.mil (will convert to www.af.mil/e-publishing on AF Link)

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: SAF/FMCEE

Certified by: SAF/FMC (Mr. Richard Hartley)

Pages: 13

This is the first publication of Air Force guidance of the requirements for Business Case Analysis (BCA). This instruction implements the business case analysis (BCA) provisions of OMB Circular A-11, *Preparation and Submission, and Execution of the Budget*, DoD 7000.14R, Volume 2B, Chapter 18, *DoD Financial Management Regulation*, and AFD 65-5, *Cost and Economics*. It gives policy guidance and procedures for preparation of BCAs for Air Force command, management, and financial decisions throughout the Air Force (AF). It applies to individuals at all levels who prepare, manage, review, certify, or approve BCAs including Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) and Air National Guard (ANG) units, except where noted otherwise. This AFI may be supplemented at any level, but all supplements must be routed to SAF/FMCE and AF/A9 coordination prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Information Management Tool (IMT) 847, Recommendation for Change of Publication; route AF IMT 847s from the field through Major Command (MAJCOM) publications/forms managers. Ensure records created due to processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://afrims.amc.af.mil/>. The use of the name or mark of any specific manufacturer, commercial product, commodity, or service in this publication does not imply Air Force endorsement.

Chapter 1

BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS

1.1. Definition. A business case analysis (BCA), also referred to as a business case or business plan, is a decision support document that identifies alternatives and presents business, economic, risk, and technical arguments for selecting an alternative to achieve organizational or functional missions or goals. BCAs do not replace the judgment of the decision maker, but rather aid that judgment by considering possible alternatives, their costs, benefits, and risks, and the degree to which they meet program objectives, or are either within budget constraints or require additional funding. A BCA can vary in size and scope depending on the requirements of the decision maker or reviewing organization. The purpose of this instruction is to illustrate what a BCA is by comparing it to other analytical products, explain when BCAs are required in the Air Force, advise on when they may be completed even if not strictly required, state the responsibilities of offices involved in completing a BCA, and refer individuals to additional, detailed guidance on how to accomplish BCAs.

1.2. Relationship to Economic Analysis (EA), Analysis of Alternatives (AoA), and Evaluation of Alternatives (EoA). There are many definitions of BCA in the private sector and the government. These range in scope from a simple capital investment decision (e.g., lease versus purchase of equipment) to a bottom up, enterprise-wide analysis of a business operation. The majority of references to BCA speak of the more comprehensive, enterprise-wide perspective on business operations, which is the best practice in the private sector. This broader sense of BCA is the definition the Air Force uses. The term “enterprise-wide” should typically be understood to mean a cross cutting practice that will affect the entire Air Force or an entire MAJCOM. An example would be changing logistics procedures or how a support service is delivered. A BCA would only be applicable to an installation level issue if it affected the entire base at large such an Enhanced Use Leasing Study. Also, “business operations” should be interpreted to mean both the business domain of the Air Force (support functions) and the operational domain of military force projection. A commander may require a BCA to assist with a decision affecting operations, though operational decisions are not made primarily from a financial perspective, but rather from the perspective of accomplishing the mission. In either situation, the focus should be on obtaining the best operational result for the funds expended. All of these analyses (EA, AoA, EoA, BCA), by definition, infer there are multiple ways to obtain a desired end state.

1.2.1. A BCA focuses on value to the organization from an enterprise-wide perspective; it seeks alignment with organizational goals and has a strategic focus. The most common example is the transformation of customer service delivery within comptroller squadrons at base level. Originally, military and civilian pay actions were initiated when a customer submitted paperwork to technicians in the comptroller’s squadron. The current method is for customers to submit many of their requests straight to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) via an interactive internet site called “myPay”. The change has increased the speed with which actions are handled while reducing the number of financial management personnel needed at base level. Thus, a BCA is broad in scope and considers the far reaching implications of organizational change from a corporate perspective. The goal is to optimize variables from an enterprise-wide perspective. Paragraphs 1.2.1.1. through 1.2.1.3. distinguish between a BCA and other types of analysis such as EAs, AoAs, and EoAs. The purpose here is merely to contrast these analyses with BCAs, since each of these analyses have their specific guidance elsewhere.

1.2.1.1. An EA tends to focus on value to the unit or installation, and tends to be more limited in scope, usually dealing with a small number of alternatives. An EA tends to optimize variables at the local level, which could result in sub-optimization at the enterprise-wide level. The goal of a BCA is to optimize investment decision outcomes from an enterprise-wide perspective, trading resources to achieve the best possible solution set. As an example, an EA may look at renovating an old enlisted dormitory versus building a new one. On the other hand, a BCA may look at why the Air Force is in the housing business and would examine operating our own dormitories versus outsourcing their construction and management versus paying all enlistees a housing allowance across the service.

1.2.1.2. As the term BCA is used in this instruction, it goes beyond requirements for EAs in AFI 65-501, *Economic Analysis*. Consult that AFI for a definition of EAs. Typically, an EA is performed for decisions involving a limited scope such as construction of a new dormitory versus modernizing an existing dormitory at base level. However, what is considered strategic or organization wide may differ depending upon the nature of the decision and the level of command. In some cases, a base level decision may have complicated political or economic consequences requiring a more thorough analysis containing elements not seen in an EA such as a stakeholder analysis, training plan, or communication plan. For this reason, if an EA is required due to the thresholds in AFI 65-501, paragraphs 1.2.1.1. and 1.2.1.2., a BCA may be performed in lieu of an EA if the agency responsible for EA preparation feels the larger, more comprehensive BCA document is needed instead of an EA. This substitution of a BCA for an EA does not apply when an EA is specifically required due to legislation such as in the case of MILCON, family housing, or privatization programs.

1.2.1.3. An AoA focuses on the value of a particular system solution, based on the costs and capabilities of that system. It identifies a small set of alternatives of system platform mixtures to meet the capability requirement needed, and analyzes operational effectiveness relative to cost for the various alternatives. The requirement for AoAs is in AF/A5R's AFPD 10-6, *Capabilities-Based Planning & Requirements Development*, paragraph 5. Additional guidance on AoA responsibilities is in AFI 10-601, *Capabilities Based Requirements Development*.

1.2.1.4. An EoA is an analysis required by OSD Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (ATL) for selected joint programs. At this time, the EoA concept is still in exploratory mode and the guidance contained in this AFI is based upon policy memos and data from the pilot programs using the concept. The EoA concept is to bring considerations of capabilities and affordability (costs relative to capabilities) earlier into the acquisition decision making process (Milestone A compared to Milestone B, where fuller program cost estimates are developed). OSD has issued EoA guidance for some specific joint acquisition programs to be "pilot cases" for the EoA concept. Based on the experience from pilot projects OSD may later issue general EoA guidance. An EoA has some of the features of an AoA but emphasizes affordability, risk, and capabilities. An EoA is similar to a BCA in that an EoA evaluates various alternatives against one another for costs, benefits and risks, but it is different in that an EoA typically occurs during a joint planning decision. An EoA is directed by OSD ATL on some joint programs when a gap is realized between a potential strategic threat and the joint capabilities for countering the threat. An EoA considers solutions that can be material (procure a new system, procure additional copies of an existing system, modify an existing system), non-material (change in doctrine or strategy), and divestiture (have different organization take responsibility). Each alternative is evaluated for its specific costs, benefits, risks, and how well it fills the original capability gap that generated the study. As an example, a joint com-

mander may realize that there is not enough logistics capability in theater. The gap can potentially be met by either purchasing more airlift assets, purchasing more sealift assets, modifying existing assets, or prepositioning stock in theater. The quantitative measure of each alternative to bridge the gap would be evaluated against its costs, other benefits, and inherent risks.

1.2.2. This AFI (65-509) determines basic requirements and responsibilities for BCAs. Consult AFMAN 65-510, *Business Case Analysis Procedures*, for additional guidance on how to accomplish a BCA. If OMB, OSD, or specific Congressional legislation provides guidance on a particular BCA format, then such guidance takes precedence over the procedures in AFMAN 65-510.

1.3. Requirements.

1.3.1. The Air Force develops a BCA when:

1.3.1.1. Required by OMB Circular A-11, Preparation and Submission of Budget Estimates, Part 7. OMB makes these requirements known through their annual call for submission of the Air Force budget, for which SAF/FMB is OPR. (Circular A-11 is frequently revised; check the OMB web site at www.omb.gov to make sure you have the most recent edition.) Federal agencies subject to Executive Branch review that have major capital acquisitions submit a Capital Asset Plan and Business Case (called Exhibit 300) with their budget requests. Exhibit 300 does not, in and of itself, form a consolidated business case for an agency's investments. This is due to the fact that it does not offer alternatives for a decision maker to decide upon; it is the result of a compilation of decisions, some of which may be based on business case analyses. The corporate agency Exhibit 300 is supported by individual major acquisition program business cases which OMB may request for review. As such, a decision described in the exhibit 300 may require a supporting BCA. OSD provides the Air Force annual guidance on which systems will be included in DoD's annual Exhibit 300. Circular A-11 states that Exhibit 300 is designed to coordinate OMB's collection of agency information for its reports to the Congress required by the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA Title V) and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996; to ensure business cases for investments are well established and tied to mission statements, long-term goals and objectives, and annual performance plans developed pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). For Information Technology (IT), exhibit 300s are designed to be used as one-stop documents for many IT management issues such as business cases for investments, IT security reporting, Clinger Cohen Act implementation, E-Gov Act implementation, Government Paperwork Elimination Act implementation, agency's modernization efforts, and overall project (investment) management.

1.3.1.2. Required by major acquisition programs as directed by SAF/AQ, SAF/XC, Air Force policy, or DoD policy to support lifecycle management decisions. DoD Financial Management Regulation, Volume 2B, Chapter 18, further codifies OSD financial requirements for business cases supporting major IT acquisitions. Defense Acquisition University's Defense Acquisition Guidebook <http://akss.dau.mil/dag/>, Section 5.5.4, contains guidance and a template for business cases supporting acquisition programs, whether weapon systems or IT.

1.3.1.3. Required by OSD AT&L for Performance-Based Logistics (PBL) programs. Guidance on PBL BCA requirements is found in AFI 63-107, *Integrated Product Support Planning and Assessment* (until AFI 63-107 is superseded by AFI 63-101, Acquisition and Sustainment Life Cycle Management). As required by the roles and responsibilities section of this AFI, as well as AFI

65-501, SAF/FM develops BCA policy, procedures, and guidance. SAF/FM also coordinates with AF/A4/7 on any BCA issues supporting PBL.

1.3.1.4. A Program Objective Memorandum (POM) initiative, disconnect, or offset is presented to the Air Force Corporate Structure (AFCS: Group, Board, or Council) exceeding \$500 million over the FYDP. The BCA requirement is waived if the initiative has a cost estimate or non-advocate cost assessment (NACA) that complies with Air Force cost estimating policy and guidance. See AFPD 65-5 for the definition of a NACA.

1.3.1.5. Directed by Headquarters Air Force (HAF), defined as any Secretariat or Air Staff functional office, or a commander of field units. Functional OPRs must coordinate any new requirement for a BCA or recurring BCAs with SAF/FMC.

1.3.1.6. Requested by senior Air Force leadership, defined for this purpose as a general officer or senior executive service member. This requirement is from the HQ USAF perspective, MAJCOMs may determine additional requirements. Note: the AFCS threshold (exceeding \$500 million over the FYDP, para 1.3.1.4.) is a minimum from a HQ USAF perspective. Senior leadership may request a BCA whenever they believe it will help with decision making. MAJCOMs and installations are encouraged to set their own thresholds for their situation if, in their judgment, such thresholds would improve decision making. Field organizations preparing BCAs not required by this AFI do not have to include all the elements of a BCA found in AFMAN 65-510, but should consider the guidance in AFMAN 65-510 in the preparation process. MAJCOMs send copies of implementing guidance to SAF/FMCE.

1.3.2. A BCA is not required if:

1.3.2.1. The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Congress, or the President directs a new or modified program and specifies how to implement the program such that there are no alternative means of accomplishment that need to be considered in executing the program. Congressional inserts in the Air Force budget process that specify the alternative that must be taken do not require a BCA.

1.3.2.2. Legislation specifically exempts a project from a BCA.

1.3.3. When an activity does not conduct a BCA for reasons in 1.3.2., the exemption from the normal requirement should be documented. OPRs for programs prepare a memo for the record (MFR) and coordinate with functional OCRs and the OPR's servicing comptroller organization. Program OPRs must retain the coordinated MFR on file until the project has been completed. See paragraph 2.1. for information about other exceptions and waivers.

1.4. Responsibilities:

1.4.1. SAF/FMC, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Cost and Economics), and AF/A9, Studies & Analyses, Assessments, and Lessons Learned, are co-OPRs for providing overall guidance on Air Force BCAs. These offices jointly:

1.4.1.1. Provide Air Force-wide guidance on BCA policy and procedures.

1.4.1.2. Coordinate on supplementary guidance for specific BCAs developed by HAF functional offices. Since each Air Force line of business or operations is unique, functional OPRs are responsible for any supplementary guidance they believe necessary to accomplish a BCA in their func-

tional area. However, supplemental guidance is not required if functional managers believe the guidance in AFMAN 65-510 is sufficient.

1.4.1.3. SAF/FMC specifically reviews and coordinates on BCAs for weapons systems that require Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) or Air Force Review Board (AFRB) approval. AF/A9 specifically reviews and coordinates on BCAs that focus primarily on operations or operational measures of effectiveness.

1.4.1.4. Review and coordinate on all BCAs forwarded to the “Top 4,” i.e., SECAF, USECAF, CSAF, or VCSAF for reasonableness and compliance with this instruction and AFMAN 65-510.

1.4.1.5. Review and coordinate on all BCAs forwarded outside the Air Force, whether to OSD, Congress or their staff members, OMB, other federal agencies, and any other external organization.

1.4.1.6. Review BCAs in any functional area when requested by senior HQ USAF functional leadership or senior leadership of MAJCOMs or other field units.

1.4.1.7. Review and coordinate on requests for waivers from BCA requirements forwarded from HAF and program offices.

1.4.1.8. Review and coordinate on BCAs in their functional area forwarded by MAJCOMs.

1.4.1.9. Review and coordinate on MAJCOM requests for a waiver from BCA requirements.

1.4.2. Other HAF Functional Offices. Offices serving as functional OPRs for programs:

1.4.2.1. Decide if a BCA is required or advisable for program approval or management.

1.4.2.2. Issue special supplementary BCA guidance, as needed for their specific functional area, coordinated with SAF/FMC as demonstrated in para 1.3.1.2. If guidance impacts specifically on operational effectiveness measures, AF/A9 will coordinate as well.

1.4.2.3. Serve as the OPR for development of a BCA in their functional area, whether the BCA is developed at HQ USAF or at field units. Functional OPRs may request assistance with BCA preparation, and review of BCA drafts, from SAF/FMC and AF/A9.

1.4.2.3.1. SAF/AQ is OPR for issues and policies particular to BCAs supporting weapon system acquisition. SAF/AQ delegates preparation of BCAs supporting acquisition programs to the Program Manager (PM) and approves weapon system BCAs going forward to OSD and Congress.

1.4.2.3.2. SAF/FMC specifically reviews and coordinates on BCAs supporting information technology requirements requiring AF Chief Information Officer (CIO) approval or Information Technology Acquisition Board (ITAB) approval. SAF/FMC also coordinates with AF/A4/7 on any BCA issues supporting PBL.

1.4.2.3.3. SAF/XC is OPR for specific functional aspect issues and policies particular to BCAs supporting IT investments. In this regard, SAF/XC provides added, specific guidance on IT investment issues within BCAs.

1.4.2.3.4. AF/A4 is OPR for specific functional aspect issues and policies particular to BCAs dealing with performance-based logistics (PBL) or other logistics or maintenance efforts. Their role is similar to SAF/XC as shown in the previous paragraph. Depending on the nature

of the program, the Air Force Acquisition Executive may be the final approval for the BCA in question.

1.4.2.3.5. AF/A9 is OPR for BCAs supporting operational considerations, and either performs, sponsors, reviews, or coordinates on BCAs analyzing military operations. Note: In para [1.4.1.](#) above, AF/A9 is co-OPR with SAF/FMC for general BCA guidance.

1.4.2.3.6. The Air Force Services Agency (AFSVA) is OPR for providing guidance on BCAs for NAFI (nonappropriated fund instrumentalities) memorandum of agreements (MOAs). These BCAs follow special guidance not found in AFMAN 65-510. The reason for this is that their operations involve self-generated profits in addition to funds provided by Congress. Contact the Air Force Services Agency for specific formats in these BCAs.

1.4.3. MAJCOM/FM.

1.4.3.1. The MAJCOM/FM is responsible for reviewing and coordination of all BCAs and BCA waivers MAJCOM functional offices forward to MAJCOM/CC or HAF.

1.4.3.2. The MAJCOM/FM acts as OCR for preparation of BCAs initiated at the MAJCOM level. The MAJCOM/FM may request assistance from the Center of Expertise (AFCAA/CoE) with BCAs on installation operations and support issues. Note: CoE assistance does not apply to BCAs supporting acquisition programs, IT programs, PBL BCAs, or any BCAs not related to installation operations and support issues.

1.4.3.3. BCAs involving acquisition programs will be reviewed and coordinated by SAF/FMC and the Acquisition Decision Authority per para [2.2.2.](#), [1.4.1.3.](#), [1.4.2.3.1.](#), and [1.4.2.3.2.](#)

1.4.4. MAJCOM Functional Offices :

1.4.4.1. Review and coordinate on BCAs from command installations involving their functional area.

1.4.4.2. Serve as OPR for the development of BCAs initiated at MAJCOM level involving their functional area. MAJCOM Functional offices should confer with their HAF counterpart and SAF/FMC to ensure the issue being examined truly requires a MAJCOM-initiated BCA.

1.4.4.3. Forward the BCA to their counterparts at HAF, after coordination by the MAJCOM/FM, when BCAs require forwarding to HQ USAF.

1.4.4.4. Serve as OPR for waivers from BCA requirements in their functional area and forward the request, after coordination with MAJCOM/FM and all affected MAJCOM functional offices, to HAF counterparts.

1.4.5. Installation Functional Offices. Base or wing level functional offices:

1.4.5.1. Serve as OPR for preparing BCAs required based on criteria in paragraph [1.3.](#)

1.4.5.2. Request assistance from the unit comptroller office in writing when a BCA is required.

1.4.5.3. Coordinate final BCAs with their installation FM office and any installation functional offices involved in the analysis or any stakeholders in the outcome of the proposed action or decision.

1.4.5.4. When a waiver from a BCA requirement is requested, forwards the waiver request, coordinated with installation FM and all affected installation functional offices, through MAJCOM counterparts to the Air Force BCA OPR in paragraphs 1.4.1. and 1.4.2.

1.4.6. Installation FM Offices. Base or wing level FM offices:

1.4.6.1. Are OCR for preparing BCAs developed at their installation. Unit comptroller offices may request assistance from the Center of Expertise (AFCAA/CoE) with BCAs on installation operations and support issues. Note: CoE assistance does not apply to BCAs supporting acquisition programs, IT programs, PBL BCAs, or any BCAs not related to installation operations and support issues.

1.4.6.2. With the requesting functional office, determine as BCA OCRs those offices necessary to formulate alternatives, make assumptions, act as stakeholders, provide operational or cost data, or participate in a training or change management plan.

1.4.6.3. Coordinate on completed BCAs or any request for a waiver from a BCA requirement.

1.5. Documentation Requirements:

1.5.1. Thoroughly document your BCA so reviewers can replicate it. Reviewers must be able to trace costs to the most basic inputs and units of measure. Cite sources and dates for rates, factors, and estimates, including publications, memos, and letters. For estimates based on expert opinion, include the individual's office symbol, email address, and phone number.

1.5.2. If an alternative in a BCA uses innovative methods, include in the BCA an explanation of the method and the rationale for using it.

1.5.3. Clearly identify any funding or budget constraints. Keep in mind the funding requirement for a project may not be the same as the costs contained in the supporting BCA. Make sure the responsible budget analyst is aware of funding requirements.

1.5.4. Follow BCA guidance and formats in AFMAN 65-510 for BCA documentation. This AFMAN contains the financial measures of merit to be used in Air Force BCAs.

1.5.5. Be sure that you document data so well that the analysis can bear very close scrutiny by independent authority. To facilitate review, number all pages in a BCA, including attachments.

1.5.6. Significantly Different Alternatives. If the BCA compares contractor and government performance, the analysis should, if applicable:

1.5.6.1. Explain why the government's response to a functional specification significantly differs from the contractor's proposed method of construction or operation (for example, using coal instead of nuclear power for an energy plant).

1.5.6.2. Explain any significant differences between the government's and the contractor's costs. Briefly explain in the executive summary and elaborate in the body of the BCA.

Chapter 2

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1. Waivers/Exemptions:

2.1.1. Authority to grant waivers from BCA requirements lies with the Air Force OPR for the program (see paragraphs 1.4.1. and 1.4.2.). Since BCA requirements often result from OSD, OMB, or Congress, the Air Force OPR would have to obtain the approval of the federal organization that generates the BCA requirement.

2.1.2. OPRs documenting exceptions from the BCA requirements based on the criteria in paragraph 1.3.2. are discussed in paragraph 1.3.3.

2.2. Reporting and Review Procedures. BCAs sent to HAF are forwarded to program OPRs.

2.2.1. When functional offices request SAF/FM or AF/A9 coordination, they must provide comments from their functional perspective along with the request.

2.2.2. When functional offices must send a BCA to high levels (e.g., Congress, OSD, or senior Air Force officials) and the SAF/FM or AF/A9 review leads to a need for revisions to the BCA, SAF/FMCE or AF/A9 sends comments through the functional offices requesting the review. In cases of tight deadlines, SAF/FMCE or AF/A9 may, in consultation with HAF functional offices, request revisions to BCAs directly from MAJCOM functional or financial analysis offices.

2.3. FM Coordination. Coordination by comptroller personnel means that a BCA has been prepared according to this instruction and that the financial aspects of the analysis have been properly prepared. FM coordination does not mean that the comptroller organization endorses the recommendation contained in the BCA. Only responsible functional officials can judge whether the recommendation is appropriate. Coordination by comptroller personnel attests to the proper use of economic principles in the analysis and to the adequacy of documentation such that the BCA is a stand-alone document. Coordination by functional personnel indicates that the assumptions, reasoning and cost-benefit assessments in the BCA are consistent with their area of technical expertise. Functional managers and reviewers at each stage of the review process must coordinate on the BCA. BCAs forwarded to HAF must give evidence of MAJCOM coordination.

2.3.1. Coordinating officials include the comptroller and the program office equivalent at base level and MAJCOM levels. Other base level or MAJCOM offices that have provided significant inputs to, or are key stakeholders in the business process, must also coordinate. Examples include the Air National Guard and union.

2.3.2. Do not forward a BCA outside the Air Force without MAJCOM coordination and coordination with the Air Staff BCA OPR in paragraphs 1.4.1. and 1.4.2.

2.4. Guidance for Specific Functional BCAs

2.4.1. Additional BCA guidance on logistics BCAs can be found in the OSD's "Business Case Model for the DoD Logistics Community: A Guide to Business Case Development;" and Defense Acquisition University's "Performance Based Logistics: A Program Manager's Product Support Guide."

2.4.2. While AFMAN 65-510 provides general Air Force procedures for BCAs, when specific OSD or Air Force guidance exists for particular programs such as PBL, the specific guidance takes priority over the general procedures in AFMAN 65-510, unless the OSD or Air Force OPR has agreed to allow the different procedures.

Chapter 3

INFORMATION COLLECTION, RECORDS, AND FORMS

3.1. Information Collections: No information collections are created by this publication.

3.2. Records: The program records created as a result of the processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 37-123 (will convert to AFMAN 33-363) and disposed of in accordance with the AFRIMS RDS located at https://afrims.amc.af.mil/rds_series.cfm.

3.3. Forms (Adopted and Prescribed).

3.3.1. Adopted Forms: AF Information Management Tool (IMT) 847, **Recommendation for Change of Publication.**

3.3.2. Prescribed Forms: No prescribed forms are implemented in this publication.

JOHN H. GIBSON, II,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force
(Financial Management and Comptroller)

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFPD 10-6, *Capabilities-Based Planning & Requirements Development*, 31 May 2006

AFI 10-601, *Capabilities Based Requirements Development*, 31 July 2006

AFI 63-107, *Integrated Product Support Planning and Assessment*, 10 November 2004

AFPD 65-5, *Cost and Economics*, 17 May 1993

AFI 65-501, *Economic Analysis*, 10 November 2004

AFMAN 65-510, *Business Case Analysis Procedures*, 7 December 2007

AFMAN 37-123, *Management of Records* (will become AFMAN 33-363), 31 August 1994

AFRIMS RDS, https://afrims.amc.af.mil/rds_series.cfm

40 USC 1401(3), *Clinger-Cohen Act – Information Technology Management Reform Act*, 1996

DoD Regulation 7000.14R, *DoD Financial Management Regulation, Volume 2B, Chapter 8, Leases: non-excess property of military departments (10 U.S.C. 2667)*, June 2007

OMB Circular A-11, *Preparation and Submission, and Execution of the Budget*, 2 July 2007

OMB Circular A-94, *Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal Programs*, 29 Oct 1992

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACAT—Acquisition Category

AFAE—Air Force Acquisition Executive

AFCAA—Air Force Cost Analysis Agency

AFCS—Air Force Corporate Structure

AF FM CoE—Air Force Financial Management Center of Expertise

AFRB—Air Force Requirements Board

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRPA—Air Force Real Property Agency

AFSVA—Air Force Services Agency

ANG—Air National Guard

AoA—Analysis of Alternatives

ATL—Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

BCA—Business Case Analysis

CIO—Chief Information Officer

EA—Economic Analysis

EoA—Evaluation of Alternatives

EUL—Enhanced Use Lease

HAF—Headquarters Air Force

IT—Information Technology

ITAB—Information Technology Acquisition Board

MOA—Memorandum of Agreement

NACA—Non Advocate Cost Assessment

OMB—Office of Management and Budget

OSD—Office of the Secretary of Defense

PBL—Performance Based Logistics

POM—Program Objective Memorandum