Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

AVIATION-RATED MANPOWER POSITIONS AT U.S. SPACE COMMAND AND U.S. AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND

Report Number 92-057

March 4, 1992

Department of Defense

The following acronyms are used in this report.

AB.....Air Base
AFB.....Air Force Base
AFR.....Air Force Regulation
AFSC.....Air Force Specialty Code
AFSPACECOM.....Air Force Space Command
CINC.....Commander in Chief
NORAD.....North American Aerospace Defense Command
RPI.....Rated Position Identifier
USSPACECOM.....U.S. Space Command

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

March 4, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. SPACE COMMAND
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Aviation-Rated Manpower Positions at U.S. Space Command and U.S. Air Force Space Command (Report No. 92-057)

This is our final audit report for your review and comments. It addresses the use of Air Force aviation-rated billets in the U.S. Space Command and Air Force Space Command. We made the audit at the direction of the House Committee on Appropriations.

A draft of this report was provided to the addressees for comment on February 4, 1992. Replies were received from the U.S. Space Command and the U.S. Air Force Space Command on February 18, 1992, and from the Air Staff on February 20, 1992. The timely action on the part of the respondents to the draft report, to facilitate compliance with the Congressional tasking, is appreciated.

The replies from the U.S. Space Command and the U.S. Air Force Space Command concurred with the conditions and the recommendations addressed to those activities. The reply from the Air Staff "concurred in part" with the condition and nonconcurred with Recommendation 2. For the reasons provided in the Audit Response section in Part II of the report, we believe that corrective action is still warranted, and the recommendation should be implemented.

DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all audit recommendations be resolved promptly. The Status of Recommendations section provided at the end of Part II identifies the unresolved recommendations and the specific requirements to be addressed in your comments on this final report. Recommendations are subject to resolution in accordance with DoD Directive 7650.3 in the event of nonconcurrence or failure to comment. Your comments are requested within 60 days of the date of this report.

The courtesies extended to the audit staff are appreciated. If you have any questions on this audit, please contact

Mr. John A. Gannon at (703) 693-0163 (DSN 223-0163) or Mr. Richard A. Brown at (703) 693-0318 (DSN 223-0318). The distribution of this report is listed in Appendix E.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

cc:
Secretary of the Air Force

Office of the Inspector General

AUDIT REPORT NO. 92-057 March 4, 1992
(Project No. 2RA-5005)

AVIATION-RATED MANPOWER POSITIONS AT U.S. SPACE COMMAND AND U.S. AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction. Air Force policy requires that commanders use aviation-rated personnel only when the duties of the billet clearly require the aviation skills specified by an aviation-rated Air Force Specialty Code.

Objectives. The House Committee on Appropriations directed that an audit be performed to evaluate the use of Air Force aviation-rated billets at U.S. Space Command and U.S. Air Force Space Command (the Commands).

Audit Results. We reviewed the documentation and duties for 76 aviator billets and determined that 11 of the billets did not support a requirement for aviation-rated incumbents at the Commands. The audit also showed that the required documentation (Air Force Forms 480) for 44 of the 76 billets did not properly reflect the duties performed or the Air Force Specialty Code required. As a result, the eligibility of personnel for assignment to these billets has been unnecessarily restrictive.

Internal Controls. Because of the nature of this audit, internal controls were not evaluated.

Potential Benefits of Audit. There are no potential monetary benefits associated with this report. However, implementation of the recommendations will afford management the flexibility required to effectively manage the assignment of officers within the Commands (see Appendix C).

Summary of Recommendations. We recommended that the requirement for aviation-rated officers be removed from identified billets at the Commands; that all Forms 480, "Rated AFSC Justifications," be reviewed annually and updated as changes occur; and that an Air Force regulation be revised.

Management Comments. The Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command, fully concurred with Recommendation 1.a. However, the Commander did not provide the specific planned action or the estimated date of completion. The Commander in Chief concurred with Recommendations 1.b. through 1.d. and took responsive, corrective actions. The Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command, concurred with Recommendations 1.a. through 1.d. and took responsive,

corrective actions. The Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, U.S. Air Force, concurred in part with the finding and nonconcurred with Recommendation 2. Details on managements' comments are in Part II of this report, and the texts of managements' comments are in Part IV. Copies of revised Air Force Forms 480 and changes to related manning documents submitted by the Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command, evidencing implementation of Recommendations 1.b. and 1.c. were provided to the auditors. Those documents will be provided to the Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Analysis and Followup for use in the audit followup and tracking process and recordation in the official case file. The addressees are requested to provide comments on the unresolved issues within 60 days of the date of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PART I - INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Objective	1
Scope	2
Prior Audits and Other Reviews	3
Other Matters of Interest	3
PART II - FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
Requirements for Aviation-Rated Officers	5
PART III - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	15
APPENDIX A - Congressional Tasking on Air Force Space Related Positions	17
APPENDIX B - Billets Identified for Removal of Rated Requirement	21
APPENDIX C - Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting from Audit	23
APPENDIX D - Activities Visited or Contacted	25
APPENDIX E - Report Distribution	27
PART IV - MANAGEMENT COMMENTS	29
U.S. Space Command	31
U.S. Air Force Space Command	33
Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, U.S. Air Force	35

This report was prepared by the Readiness and Operational Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, Department of Defense. Copies of this report can be obtained through the Information Officer, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate (703) 693-0340 (DSN 223-0340).

PART I - INTRODUCTION

Background

U.S. Space Command. The U.S. Space Command (USSPACECOM), activated on September 23, 1985, is a DoD unified command headquartered at Peterson Air Force Base (AFB), Colorado. USSPACECOM is responsible for military space operations, integrated threat warning and attack assessment, and ballistic missile defense planning. The space operations mission of the USSPACECOM includes space control and space support and increasing the effectiveness of forces by the application of space systems. As of August 1991, USSPACECOM's FY 1992 staff authorization totaled 723 of which 324 are Air Force personnel.

The USSPACECOM's warning mission includes supporting the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) by providing missile warning and space surveillance. NORAD was established in September 1957, as a binational, multi-Service command. The NORAD Agreement, signed by the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States, provides: cooperative air defense of the North American continent, including surveillance and control of the airspace of Canada and the United States; missile warning and assessment of an aerospace attack; and appropriate response against air attack. NORAD gains its air defense forces from its component commands: Canadian Forces Fighter Group, Tactical Air Command, and Pacific Air Force.

The Commander in Chief (CINC) of USSPACECOM is also the CINC, NORAD.

U.S. Air Force Space Command. The U.S. Air Force Space Command (AFSPACECOM), a major command of the Air Force, serves as the Air Force component command of USSPACECOM. AFSPACECOM was established on September 1, 1982, at Peterson AFB, Colorado, to organize, train, equip, and administer missile warning and space operations resources provided to the USSPACECOM. The AFSPACECOM operates USSPACECOM facilities, defines operational concepts, and develops contingency and wartime plans. As of FY 1992, AFSPACECOM was authorized 16,039 personnel.

Objective

This audit was performed at the direction of the House Committee on Appropriations to evaluate the use of Air Force aviation-rated billets at USSPACECOM and the AFSPACECOM. In Report No. 102-95, "Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 1992," June 4, 1991, the Committee expressed concern that some Air Force billets in

space-related programs require aviation-rated personnel without a proper justification. An extract from the Committee report pertaining to this tasking is provided in Appendix A.

Scope

As directed in the congressional tasking, the audit evaluated the justifications and requirements for rated [1/] Air Force personnel assigned to the USSPACECOM and AFSPACECOM. We evaluated whether there was a continued need for a requirement for rated officers rather than the implementation of established policy; therefore, an evaluation of internal controls was excluded. Justifications for rated officers at the two commands were analyzed for compliance with pertinent Air Force regulations. Also, interviews were conducted with the personnel that occupied the billets and their supervisors. Audit work was performed at Headquarters, USSPACECOM, and Headquarters, AFSPACECOM, collocated at Peterson AFB, Colorado; at Patrick AFB, Florida; and at the Astronaut Office, Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas.

Positions not reviewed. There were 85 billets within the two commands that required rated officers and were subject to our review. Of those 85 billets, 9 were excluded from review. Six of the nine billets were excluded because, before the audit started, they were identified by the Air Force for elimination. Details are provided in the Other Matters of Interest section of this report. Two billets located at Vandenberg AFB, California, and one billet at Thule Air Base (AB), Greenland, were excluded based on resource considerations.

Dual-authority personnel. The scope of our review included two positions at USSPACECOM that were filled by individuals that also filled rated billets in the NORAD command structure. In accordance with the congressional tasking and because of the additional time required to gain access to records of the binational command, our review was limited to the rating justification for the billets at USSPACECOM. Decisions concerning the requirements of these billets would require coordination with the Canadian government and conformance with the NORAD Agreement. Details on this matter are provided in the Discussion of Details section in Part II of this report.

Period of audit. This economy and efficiency audit was made from November 12, 1991, through January 3, 1992, in accordance

---

[1/] For the purpose of this report, "rated" denotes aviation-rated.

with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. The activities visited or contacted are listed in Appendix D.

Prior Audits and Other Reviews

There has been no prior audit coverage of rated billets in the two commands during the past 5 years.

Other Matters of Interest

Command initiated personnel reductions. Before our audit began, Headquarters, AFSPACECOM, identified six rated billets to be eliminated in FYs 1992 and 1993. The following table identifies the billets and the fiscal years in which they are projected to be eliminated.

Command Initiated Billets to be Eliminated

Billet Number	Position Title	Activity	Rank	Fiscal Year
02021	Space Operations Officer, HQ, AFSPACECOM	Peterson AFB	Captain	1992
10339	Plans Director, HQ, AFSPACECOM	Peterson AFB	Major	1992
08773	TENCAP [1/] Project Officer HQ, AFSPACECOM	Peterson AFB	Lieutenant Colonel	1993
17683	Commander, 1015 ABS [2/]	Sondrestrom AB	Lieutenant Colonel	1992
05678	Director of Operations, 1015 ABS [2/]	Sondrestrom AB	Captain	1992
21265	Chief, Base Safety, 45th Space Wing	Patrick AFB	Major	1993

[1/] Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities.
[2/] Air Base Squadron.

PART II - FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

REQUIREMENTS FOR AVIATION-RATED OFFICERS

The Air Force classified as aviation-rated at least 11 (14 percent) of the 76 officer billets reviewed at the USSPACECOM and the AFSPACECOM for which the documentation and duties did not support the classification. The need to reclassify two of those billets had been identified by AFSPACECOM before the audit. Additionally, about 58 percent of the required documentation (Air Force Forms 480) for aviation-rated billets did not properly reflect the duties performed or the Air Force Specialty Code required. This condition occurred because the two commands did not comply with Air Force Regulation (AFR) 26-1, "Manpower Policies and Procedures Determining Manpower Requirements," April 13, 1990, in reviewing requirements and in updating justifications for rated officers. As a result of this condition, the eligibility of personnel for assignment to those billets has been unnecessarily restrictive.

DISCUSSION OF DETAILS

Background

AFR 26-1 defines policies and procedures for determining, programming, and using Air Force manpower resources. The AFR states:

> Commanders must be sure that Air Force policy for authorizing rated positions is adhered to in manpower documents. Specifically, use rated AFSCs [Air Force Specialty Codes] only when the duties of the incumbent clearly require the skills described in AFR 36-1, "Officer Classification," September 15, 1990, for a rated AFSC.

Chapter 4, of the regulation requires that Air Force Form 480, "Rated AFSC Justification," be used to document requirements for rated staff billets grades O-6 (Colonel) and below not covered by determinants. The determinants include: all billets for officers of grade O-7 (Brigadier General) or higher; billets covered by an Air Force or command manpower standard; and billets with an assigned Rated Position Identifier of Code 1 (pilot, cockpit) or Code 2 (navigator, cockpit).

AFR 26-1 also provides detailed instructions on completing Form 480 and requires an accurate description of the duties of the billets, including specific reasons why rated skills and

experience are necessary to do the job. The regulation also requires that all commands review Forms 480 annually and update them as changes occur.

Results of Audit

Reviewing and updating Forms 480. Neither USSPACECOM nor AFSPACECOM reviewed or updated the Forms 480 for aviation-rated billets. Our analyses of the Forms 480 and the corresponding interviews with the incumbents and their supervisors showed that these procedures were not performed. As a result, the Air Force Form 480 for rated officers did not properly reflect either the duties of or the required AFSC for 44 billets.

Form 480 justifications did not exist for two rated billets (Colonels): the USSPACECOM Inspector General at Peterson AFB, Colorado, and the Director, DoD Manager for Space Transportation System Contingency Support, at Patrick AFB, Florida. In addition, the billets were not included in an existing manpower standard, in accordance with AFR 26-1.

Two rated billets at Cheyenne Mountain AFB, Colorado, were not correctly classified by billet titles on the Form 480. Additionally, the billet descriptions did not accurately reflect actual duties for the billets. Further, Forms 480 for 11 positions located in the Office of the DoD Manager for Space Transportation System Contingency Support at Patrick AFB, Florida, were not up-to-date as required by AFR 26-1.

At the Astronaut Office, Johnson Space Center, Houston, Texas, none of the 29 Air Force Astronaut billets at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had a Form 480 requiring a rated individual in accordance with AFR 26-1. Additionally, one billet was miscoded into an AFSC requiring a pilot. AFR 36-1, "Officer Classification," September 15, 1990, will require revision to accurately reflect the duties and responsibilities of officers assigned to Air Force Specialty-Astronaut (AFSC 2066).

These conditions were brought to the attention of management officials at USSPACECOM and AFSPACECOM during the audit, and corrective actions for reclassifying the billets were promptly initiated. Revision of AFR 36-1 was initiated during the audit and was in process as of the time a draft of this report was issued. Therefore, we are not making recommendations to address those administrative matters.

USSPACECOM rating requirements. We reviewed 23 of 27 billets within USSPACECOM that are occupied by rated Air Force

officers. Based on a review of current duties and responsibilities, we determined that the two billets identified in the following table do not require rated officers.

Billets Identified for Removal of Rated Requirement

Billet No.	Title	Rank	Location
00001	Commander in Chief	General	Peterson AFB
00672	Inspector General	Colonel	Peterson AFB

Although desirable, aviation skills and experience are not needed for the two billets. The positions of CINC and Inspector General are authorized in the Joint Manpower Program at USSPACECOM. Incumbents in those billets also serve as CINC NORAD and Inspector General, NORAD, respectively. Based on our review of the duties and responsibilities of the CINC and Inspector General, USSPACECOM, separate and distinct from the duties at NORAD, the billet requirements for rated operational experience in air combat training, exercises, techniques, and related areas are not mandatory.

Concerning the dual assignment of the incumbents to those two positions at USSPACECOM and to the NORAD billets, we were informed that rated individuals were required to perform their NORAD responsibilities. In support of the rating requirement, USSPACECOM officials stated that:

> The CINC USSPACECOM also serves as CINC NORAD, a binational combatant command position. The NORAD Agreement establishes the position of CINC NORAD and outlines command of air defense forces as well as aerospace assets. Any discussion of removing the rated officer requirement for CINC NORAD must be coordinated with the Canadian government. Therefore, unless the dual position of CINC USSPACECOM and CINC NORAD is separated, Canadian government approval must be considered when selecting individuals to serve as CINC USSPACECOM.
>
> The 550+ aircraft assigned to CINC NORAD for the wartime defense of North America include U.S. and Canadian fighter, tanker, transport, and AWACS aircraft. NORAD peacetime responsibility includes air sovereignty/counterdrug operations encompassing 56 binational alert

fighters, E-3 AWACS aircraft, and seven air defense command and control centers. Therefore, as long as CINC USSPACE is dual-hatted as CINC NORAD, the incumbent must be rated. The NORAD Inspector General is responsible to CINC NORAD for assessing the peacetime/wartime capability of these assigned air defense units.

For the reasons stated in the Scope section in Part I of this report, we did not review the support and justification for NORAD rated billets. We did not examine the NORAD equivalent to the Air Force Forms 480 that supported the USSPACECOM billets. Therefore, we did not validate the NORAD requirements.

AFSPACECOM rating requirements. Within AFSPACECOM, we reviewed 33 of 49 billets that are occupied by rated officers. We determined that the seven billets in the following table did not require rated personnel.

Billets at AFSPACECOM Identified for Removal of Rated Requirement

Billet Number	Title	AFSPACECOM Rank	Activity
00020	Commander	Lt. General	Headquarters
00370	Director of Operations	Brig. General	Headquarters
00175	Director of Plans	Brig. General	Headquarters
00202	Chief, Bases and Units Division *	Lt. Colonel	Headquarters
00212	Director of Requirements *	Lt. Colonel	Headquarters
16225	Total Quality Management *	Lt. Colonel	Headquarters
07608	Satellite Operations Plans Officer	Captain	2d Space Wing

* Position is in the Directorate of Plans, Headquarters, AFSPACECOM.

We based our conclusion on interviews with the incumbents and their supervisors and through analyses of the Forms 480. Three of those billets were occupied by general officers, specifically, the Commander, the Director of Operations, and the Director of Plans.[2/] During meetings with the Commander and the

[2/] As of January 13, 1992, we were notified that these three billets were reclassified as nonrated billets.

Vice Commander of AFSPACECOM, it was agreed that these positions did not require rated officers. AFR 60-1, "Flight Management," May 20, 1991, identifies those general officer billets within the various Air Force major commands that are authorized "operational flying positions." The Commander, Vice Commander, and the Director of Operations billets are authorized by AFR 60-1 to be "operational flying positions." At the time of the audit, these three billets and the Director of Plans billet were occupied by nonrated personnel with no degradation of AFSPACECOM's mission. AFR 60-1 should be revised to remove the authorization for "operational flying positions" for the billets of CINC, USSPACECOM; and Commander, Vice Commander, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, AFSPACECOM.

Based on an analysis of duties and responsibilities, we determined that the Director of Requirements billet within the Directorate of Plans also did not require a rated officer. The supervisor of the Director of Requirements agreed and stated that the designated replacement officer for the billet is not rated. Additionally, based on an analysis of the duties of the Chief, Bases and Units Division, Directorate of Plans, we concluded that that billet did not require a rated officer. The supervisor for the billet concurred with our assessment and stated that, although a rated officer was desirable, the requirement was not mandatory to perform the duties and responsibilities of the billet.

The Total Quality Management billet in the Directorate of Plans did not require the skills and experience of a rated officer. This billet had been established as a result of a command reorganization in June 1991 and had previously been assigned to the International Affairs Policy Division. Before the audit began, this billet had been identified by the command for elimination in the fourth quarter of FY 1993. This billet should be reclassified to remove the rated requirement, and the associated manpower documents should be revised.

The billet for the Satellite Operations Plans Officer at the 2d Space Wing, Falcon AFB, Colorado, did not require a rated officer. This billet was identified as part of the Crossflow Program [3/], requiring a rated officer because the incumbent was

---

[3/] The Crossflow Program involves assigning officers from the various major commands of the Air Force to space-related duties on a direct one-for-one exchange between commands. The Program's goal is to increase space operations awareness throughout the Air Force and to increase the war-fighting perspective within the Air Force space community.

rated. When an officer is assigned to a billet under the Crossflow Program, the particular AFSC of that officer then becomes the AFSC for that position. This billet should be reclassified to remove the rated requirement, and the associated manpower documents should be revised.

45th Space Wing initiated manpower actions. Before our visit, the 45th Space Wing, Patrick AFB, Florida, had identified and initiated actions on two billets, identified in the table below, that no longer required rated personnel.

Billets in 45th Space Wing Identified for Removal of Rated Requirement

Billet Number	Position Title	Location	Rank
20785	Commander	45th Range Squadron	Lt. Colonel
19691	Chief, Range Control	Space Operations Systems Development Missile Systems	Major

Appropriate administrative actions had been completed to remove the rated officer requirement for one of the billets, and the Wing was awaiting adjudication on the removal of the rated requirement for the other billet.

Conclusion

There were 11 of 76 billets at USSPACECOM and AFSPACECOM for which the continued application of aviation-rated classifications is not warranted based on the duties and responsibilities of the positions. In addition, documentation describing the duties and responsibilities of positions authorized at the USSPACECOM and AFSPACECOM was not current in nearly 60 percent of the 76 billets reviewed. This condition unnecessarily restricted the eligibility of personnel for assignment to those positions.

RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT COMMENTS, AND AUDIT RESPONSE

1. We recommend that the Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command, and the Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command:

a. Reclassify the billets identified in Appendix B to delete the aviation-rated requirements.

Management comments. The Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command, concurred that the duties and responsibilities of the Commander in Chief and the Inspector General of the USSPACECOM, separate and distinct from their associated duties and responsibilities as Commander in Chief and Inspector General of NORAD, do not require rated officers.

The Commander, AFSPACECOM concurred with the recommendation, stating that corrective actions had been taken on three of the seven positions identified during the audit. A review is being performed to evaluate the rated officer requirement for the remaining four positions.

Audit response. Although the Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, concurred with the recommendation he did not identify the proposed actions to remove the requirement for rated officers. Therefore, in response to the final report, we request that he describe the corrective actions taken or planned, the completion dates for actions already taken, and the estimated dates for completion of planned actions.

b. Update the corresponding Forms 480, "Rated AFSC Justification," to reflect the duties and Air Force Specialty Code required for those billets.

Management comments. The Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, and the Commander, AFSPACECOM, concurred with the recommendation.

c. Revise the associated manning documents accordingly.

Management comments. The Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM and the Commander, AFSPACECOM, concurred with the recommendation.

d. Review all Forms 480, "Rated AFSC Justification," annually and update them as changes occur for billets requiring aviation-rated officers in compliance with Air Force Regulation 26-1, "Manpower Policies and Procedures Determining Manpower Requirements," April 13, 1990.

Management comments. The Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, concurred with the recommendation. However in response to the finding discussion, the Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, disagreed that the USSPACECOM had neither reviewed nor updated the Forms 480 for rated billets. He stated that all USSPACECOM "Air Force Forms 480 were reviewed and updated in October 91. The DoD/IG auditors were provided with a copy of all USSPACECOM AF [Air Force] Forms 480 dated October 91 at the time of their inbrief."

The Commander, AFSPACECOM, concurred with the recommendation.

Audit response. We agree that copies of all USSPACECOM Forms 480 dated October 1991 were provided at the time of our inbrief. However, as identified in the audit report, the Forms 480 contained inaccuracies between job duty titles and position descriptions. AFR 26-1 requires that all commands review the Forms 480 annually and update them as changes to the position or incumbent occur.

2. We recommend that the Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, revise Air Force Regulation 60-1, "Flight Management," May 20, 1991, to remove the "operational flying positions" authorization for the billet for Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command, and the billets for Commander, Vice Commander, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, U.S. Air Force Space Command.

Management comments. The Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, nonconcurred with the recommendation. He stated:

> Space capabilities are now designed into or as a supporting function for every weapon system, communications capability, navigational system, and intelligence function. To completely eliminate operational expertise at the senior decision making level of AFSPACECOM/USSPACECOM would disrupt this successful and "combat tested" program.

Audit response. We agree with the Deputy Chief of Staff, that space capabilities are designed into or support every weapon system, communications capability, navigational system, and intelligence function. However, the positions of Commander, Vice Commander, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, AFSPACECOM, were all occupied by nonrated officers. During the initial buildup of forces and throughout the commencement of operations and the prosecution of the war in the Persian Gulf, those officers successfully executed the duties of their offices with no degradation of the support provided or disruption of the successful and "combat tested" program. Only the Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, was a rated officer.

AFR 60-1 states that only those rated positions where active flying is essential should be designated as Rated Position Identifier (RPI) 6 or 8. At the time of our audit, the positions of Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM; and Commander and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, AFSPACECOM, were all designated as RPI 8 positions, requiring the incumbents to actively fly as part of their duties and responsibilities. Despite this designation, only the Commander in Chief, USSPACECOM, was a rated officer, and he stated that his duties and responsibilities could be executed by a nonrated officer with no degradation of mission. In discussions with the Commander and Vice Commander of AFSPACECOM, we were advised that their respective positions were not adversely affected by having nonrated officers in these positions. Therefore, we maintain that the recommendation is

warranted. We request that the Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force reconsider his position in response to the final report.

STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Number	Addressee	Response to Final Should Include		
		Reconsideration of Position	Proposed Action	Implementation Date
1.a.	CINC, USSPACECOM		X	X
2.	Deputy Chief of Staff, plans and operation	X	X	X

PART III - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

APPENDIX A - Congressional Tasking on Air Force Space Related Positions

APPENDIX B - Billets Identified for Removal of Rated Requirement

APPENDIX C - Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting from Audit

APPENDIX D - Activities Visited or Contacted

APPENDIX E - Report Distribution

APPENDIX A: CONGRESSIONAL TASKING ON AIR FORCE SPACE RELATED POSITIONS

102D CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
102-95

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1992

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[To accompany H R 2521]

JUNE 4, 1991.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
43-885 WASHINGTON : 1991

NATIONAL LAUNCH SYSTEM (NLS)

The National Launch System (NLS), as proposed in the fiscal year 1992 budget, is an attempt to reduce launch costs for expendable vehicles With a goal of ultimately providing a very heavy lift capability, the first launch would occur in 1999 with a NASA payload

There are two primary reasons for pursuing such an ambitious project as NLS The first reason is to respond to projected requirements for specific payloads that need the additional lift capability or rapid turnaround time that a successful NLS program might offer In response to Committee inquiries, there is apparently no specific DOD, SDIO, or classified payload projected to require the additional lift capability of the NLS, now or beyond the year 2000 Moreover, the NASA requirement to support the space station is no longer relevant since the Committee has recommended in the appropriate bill to terminate the space station.

The second possible reason for pursuing the NLS is to spur research and development leading to technological improvements and cost reductions in both launch hardware and in the accompanying manufacturing processes. While the Committee annually recommends research and development funding for many such programs, they typically can be considered "level of effort" endeavors; that is, they proceed at whatever pace there are funds made available to support.

The fiscal year 1992 budget includes a total of $347 million for the NLS divided between the Air Force, SDIO, and NASA as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year —	
	1991 appropriation	1992 request
NASA	$13 4	$1[illegible]
Air Force	25 0	147 0
SDI	15 0	25 0
Total	53 4	347 [illegible]

It is projected that an additional $11 billion, none of which is yet budgeted and which will be split between DOD and NASA, will be required to meet the first launch date at the turn of the century

The Committee is, therefore, recommending deletion of the entire Air Force request of $147,000,000, but providing the requested $25,000,000 within the SDIO However, the Committee stipulates that the funds being provided to the SDIO are to be applied solely to increasing the performance of the existing TITAN IV launch vehicle by applying the basic principles behind the NLS, that is, recommending improvements to the manufacturing process as well as the vehicle itself.

CINCSPACE WINGS

It is traditional in the Air Force for many positions to be occupied by an individual who is a trained pilot. In some cases this is

necessary and in others it may be desirable However, the Committee is concerned that some Air Force positions in space related programs require wings without a proper basis. Over the past 30 years the Air Force has built an outstanding cadre of talented career space professionals The Committee believes that it is no longer necessary to be "rated" for such positions, specifically including the U.S CINCSPACE position. Consequently, it is directed that the DOD Inspector General conduct a review of all Air Force space related positions, determine those for which pilot training is specifically required, and provide a written report to the Committee by January 1, 1992 identifying those specific positions which will no longer continue to require wings.

SPACE JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL

Two years ago the Committee directed that the Department submit consolidated budget justification books on space and space related programs. The material submitted is late and far from complete. The Committee is again directing that such justification material be submitted for fiscal year 1993, but that it include *all* space and related programs and be submitted no later than March 1, 1992.

ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY

The Committee has added $10,000,000 above the request for continued funding of important research in thermionics.

INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE RELATED ACTIVITIES

The Committee reviews the intelligence and intelligence related activities budgets with the same intensity and completeness as is afforded other portions of the Department of Defense (DOD) budget. In pursuing its oversight function in the intelligence and intelligence related activities areas, the Committee held numerous separate hearings and briefings which resulted in several thousand pages of transcript and written responses.

Because of the highly sensitive nature of these activities, the results of the Committee's budget review are published in a separate, detailed and comprehensive classified annex to this report The intelligence community, Department of Defense and other organizations are expected to comply fully with the recommendations and directives in the classified annex accompanying the fiscal year 1992 DOD Appropriations Act.

NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

The National Foreign Intelligence Program consists of those intelligence activities of the Government which provide the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and the Congress with national foreign intelligence on broad strategic concerns bearing on U.S. national security. These concerns are stated by the National Security Council in the form of long-range and short-range requirements for the principal users of intelligence, and include political trends, military balance trends, economic trends, treaty monitoring and support to military theater commanders.

APPENDIX B: BILLETS IDENTIFIED FOR REMOVAL OF RATED REQUIREMENT

Billet Number	Title	Rank	Location
00001	Commander in Chief	General	USSPACECOM
00672	Inspector General	Colonel	USSPACECOM
00020	Commander	Lieutenant General	AFSPACECOM
00370	Director of Operations	Brigadier General	AFSPACECOM
00175	Director of Plans	Brigadier General	AFSPACECOM
00202	Chief, Bases and Units Division	Lieutenant Colonel	AFSPACECOM
00212	Director of Requirements	Lieutenant Colonel	AFSPACECOM
16225	Total Quality Management	Lieutenant Colonel	AFSPACECOM
07608	Satellite Operations Plans Officer	Captain	AFSPACECOM

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL BENEFITS RESULTING FROM AUDIT

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Type of Benefit
1.a., b., and c.	Economy and Efficiency. The reclassification of positions to remove the rated officer requirement enhances opportunities for other qualified candidates.	Nonmonetary
1.d.	Compliance. Implementation of the review and updating procedures for aviation-rated billets, as set forth in AFR 26-1, will ensure that those billets clearly require the skills of aviation-rated officers.	Nonmonetary
2.	Compliance. Revision of AFR 60-1 affords the Air Force greater flexibility in the assignment of general officers.	Nonmonetary

APPENDIX D: ACTIVITIES VISITED OR CONTACTED

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel), Washington, DC
Joint Staff, Washington, DC

Unified and Specified Commands

Headquarters, U.S. Space Command, Colorado Springs, CO
  Cheyenne Mountain AFB, Colorado Springs, CO

Department of the Air Force

Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Readiness Support), Washington, DC
Directorate of Manpower and Organization, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, Washington, DC
Headquarters, U.S. AFSPACECOM, Colorado Springs, CO
  45th Space Wing, Patrick, AFB, Cocoa Beach, FL
  2d Space Wing, Falcon AFB, Colorado Springs, CO
  Astronaut Office, Johnson Space Center, Houston, TX

Other Defense Activities

Office of the DoD Manager for Space Transportation System Contingency Support Operations, Colorado Springs, CO

APPENDIX E: REPORT DISTRIBUTION

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
Director, Joint Staff

Unified Command

Commander in Chief, U.S. Space Command

Department of the Army

Secretary of the Army
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management)
Auditor General, U.S. Army Audit Agency

Department of the Navy

Secretary of the Navy
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management)
Auditor General, Naval Audit Service

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Readiness Support)
Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command
Air Force Audit Agency

Other Defense Activities

DoD Manager for Space Transportation System Contingency Support Operations, U.S. Space Command
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Non-DoD Activities

Office of Management and Budget
U.S. General Accounting Office,
NSIAD Technical Information Center

Congressional Committees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations

APPENDIX E: REPORT DISTRIBUTION (CONT.)

Congressional Committees: (Cont.)
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
Senate Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Armed Services
Senate Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Armed Services
House Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation
House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications
House Committee on Government Operations
House Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security,
Committee on Government Operations

PART IV - MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

U.S. Space Command

U.S. Air Force Space Command

Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations, U.S. Air Force

Comments from U. S. Space Command

NORTH AMERICAN AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND
AND
UNITED STATES SPACE COMMAND
PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO 80914-5003

IG 18 February 1992

SUBJECT: Project No. 2RA-5005 Draft Audit Report on Aviation-Rated Manpower Positions at US Space Command and US Air Force Space Command

TO: Readiness and Operational Support Directorate
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

The US Space Command/NORAD Inspector General has sent your draft audit to the Commander in Chief, US Space Command and to the US Space staff for comment. The consolidated reply is in two sections: Section I is our answer to the Recommendations for Corrective Action (page 17); Section II contains additional comments on Part II, Results of Audit (page 9).

Section I.

Recommendation 1a. Reclassify the Commander in Chief and Inspector General billets to delete the aviation-rated requirements.

Concur. Fully agree with the conclusion that the current duties and responsibilities of the CINC and IG, USSPACECOM, separate and distinct from the duties at NORAD, do not require rated officers. However, it should be noted that these specific positions are, and have been, "dual-hatted" or dual-authority positions in North American Aerospace Defense Command and USSPACECOM. NORAD, a binational command of Canadian and US forces, is a combatant command, charged with the air defense of the North American continent. In addition to reporting to the US Secretary of Defense through the Chairman, JS, CINCNORAD also reports to the Canadian Chief of the Defence Staff and the Canadian Minister of Defence, in carrying out his air sovereignty and air defense mission. The NORAD Joint Table of Distribution (JTD) states CINCNORAD is "dual-hatted from USSPACECOM." Therefore, when considering candidates for the position of CINCNORAD/USCINCSPACE, Canadian concurrence is mandatory. The NORAD CINC does require aviation-rated expertise—and always has. The NORAD IG must also be rated to properly evaluate assigned US and Canadian forces to assure they can effectively perform their peacetime and wartime air sovereignty and air defense mission responsibilities.

Recommendation 1b. Concur. Corrective action has been completed. See Attachment 1 (N/SPJ1 ltr, 3 Jan 92, NORAD, USSPACECOM and DDMS Rated Requirements to HQ USAF/MOR with updated AF Forms 480).

Final Report Reference

Recommendation 1c. Concur. Corrective action has been completed. See Attachment 2 (USSPACECOM/SPJ1M 031705ZJAN92 and 031710ZJAN92). See Attachment 3 (Joint Staff/J1 221458ZJAN92).

Recommendation 1d. Concur. Review of all USSPACECOM AF Forms 480 has become an annual scheduled item in compliance with AFR 26-1.

Section II - Results of Audit.

The following comments are made for clarification purposes:

6 a. **Comment - Page 9.** Reviewing and updating Forms 480. "Neither USSPACECOM nor AFSPACECOM reviewed or updated the Forms 480 for aviation-rated billets."

Answer: Disagree. Responding for USSPACECOM only, all AF Forms 480 were reviewed and updated in Oct 91. The DoD/IG auditors were provided with a copy of all USSPACECOM AF Forms 480 dated Oct 91 at the time of their inbrief.

6 b. **Page 9, 14th line.** Change "Deputy Director, DoD Manager for Space . . ." to read "Director, DoD Manager for Space . . ."

JOHN M. CREMIN, JR., Colonel, USAF
Inspector General

3 Atch
1. N/SPJ1 ltr, 3 Jan 92
2. SPJ1M 031705ZJAN92 and 031710ZJAN92
3. Joint Staff 221458ZJAN92

Comments from U. S. Air Force Space Command

Final Report Reference

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND
PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO 80914-5001

REPLY TO ATTN OF: CS

18 FEB 1992

SUBJECT: DoD(IG) Draft Report of Audit, Aviation-Rated Manpower Positions at United States Space Command and Air Force Space Command (Project No. 2RA-5005)

TO: DoD(IG) Audit

1. We have reviewed the subject audit. The following comments address specific findings and associated recommendations concerning AFSPACECOM.

2. Comments on the Results of Audit:

a. Reviewing and Updating AF Forms 480. Neither USSPACECOM nor AFSPACECOM reviewed or updated the AF Forms 480, Rated Air Force Speciality Code (AFSC) Justification, for aviation-rated billets. CONCUR.

1.d. (1) Recommendation 1. Review all AF Forms 480 annually and update them as changes occur for billets requiring aviation-rated officers in compliance with Air Force Regulation (AFR) 26-1, Manpower Policies and Procedures Determining Manpower Requirements, 13 Apr 90.

(2) Management Comment. CONCUR. We are presently performing a review to validate all AF Forms 480 currently on file. Reviews of AF Forms 480 will be conducted annually in October and as changes occur. Estimated Completion Date (ECD): 30 Apr 92.

b. None of the 29 Air Force Astronaut billets at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had an AF Form 480 requiring a rated individual in accordance with AFR 26-1. CONCUR.

1.b. (1) Recommendation 2. Update the corresponding AF Forms 480 to reflect the duties and AFSCs required for those billets.

(2) Management Comment. CONCUR. All AF Forms 480 are being updated as required. ECD: 30 Apr 92

c. AFSPACECOM Rating Requirements. Seven billets were identified not requiring rated personnel. CONCUR.

1.a. (1) Recommendation 3. Reclassify the billets identified in Appendix B to delete the aviation-rated requirements.

(2) Management Comment. CONCUR. Positions 0000020, 0000370, and 0000175 have been reclassified and the Rated Position Identifier codes removed. The remaining four positions for AFSPACECOM are being reviewed for possible reclassification. ECD: 30 Apr 92.

GUARDIANS OF THE HIGH FRONTIER

Final Report Reference

d. 45th Space Wing Initiated Manpower Actions. The 45th Space Wing, Patrick AFB FL, had identified and initiated actions on two billets no longer requiring rated personnel. CONCUR.

1.c.

(1) Recommendation 4. Revise the associated manning documents accordingly.

(2) Management Comment. CONCUR. As the aviation requirements change, the associated manning documents are being updated. ECD: 30 Apr 92.

3. If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact Col Richard J. Cervi, XPM, DSN 692-3056.

JOHN E. SCHMIDT
Colonel, USAF
Chief of Staff

COMMENTS FROM DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PLANS AND OPERATIONS, U. S. AIR FORCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC

20 FEB 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAF/FMP

SUBJECT: Review of DoD(IG) Report, "Aviation-Rated Manpower Positions at USSPACECOM (Your Memo, 5 Feb 92)

We have reviewed the subject DoD IG report and concur in part. While we concur with the recommendation to drop the rated officer requirement in many of the AFSPACECOM staff positions, there remains a requirement for rated expertise in AFSPACECOM/USSPACECOM's senior leadership positions.

DESERT STORM proved the value of a strong tie between space and operations. As the Air Force integrates and normalizes space operations, the need to keep solid ties with operations is a must. Space capabilities are now designed into or as a supporting function for every weapon system, communications capability, navigational system, and intelligence function. To completely eliminate operational expertise at the senior decision making level of AFSPACECOM/USSPACECOM would disrupt this successful and "combat tested" program.

With a rated officer presence in these positions, AFR 60-1 will continue to allow operational flying when the incumbent is a rated officer.

cc: AF/MO
AF/DPG
SAF/MIX

Marvin S. Ervin

MARVIN S. ERVIN, Maj Gen, USAF
Director of Operations
DCS, Plans and Operations

LIST OF AUDIT TEAM MEMBERS

William F. Thomas, Director, Readiness and Operational Support Directorate
John A. Gannon, Program Director, Readiness and Operational Support Directorate
Richard A. Brown, Project Manager
Donald A. Bloomer, Team Leader
Kenneth Feldman, Team Leader
Juana R. Smith, Auditor
Kathryn C. Franks, Auditor
Nancy Cipolla, Editor