## CLEARED For Open Publication

Apr 12, 2022

Department of Defense
OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW

# HH-60W JOLLY GREEN II (HH-60W)

Selected Acquisition Report (SAR)



AS OF THE FY 2023 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET U.S. AIR FORCE

# Contents

| Program Manager  | 2  |
|--|----|
| Mission and Description  | 2  |
| Executive Summary  | 3  |
| Program Highlights since Last Report                               | 3  |
| History of Significant Developments since Program Initiation       | 5  |
| Schedule   | 7  |
| Schedule Events  | 7  |
| Significant Schedule Risks   | 7  |
| Performance  | 8  |
| Requirements Source:   | 9  |
| Total Acquisition Cost   | 10 |
| Budget Note  | 10 |
| Cost Deviations Explanations                                       | 10 |
| APB Unit Cost Deviations Explanations                              | 11 |
| Total End Item Quantity  | 11 |
| Quantity Notes   | 11 |
| Unit Costs   | 12 |
| Current Baseline Compared with Current Estimate                    | 12 |
| Original Baseline Compared with Current Estimtae                   | 12 |
| Unit Cost Notes:   | 12 |
| Technologies and Systems Engineering                               | 13 |
| Significant Technical Risks  | 13 |
| Contracts  | 14 |
| Deliveries and Expenditures  | 16 |
| Deliveries   | 16 |
| Expended and Appropriated (TY\$)                                   | 16 |
| OPERATING and SUPPORT COSTS  | 17 |
| Operating and Support Cost Estimate:                               | 17 |
| Operating and Support Estimate Compared with the Current Baseline: | 17 |

## Program Manager

Name: Tracy L. Patrick

Date Assigned: February 13, 2022

Address: 2240 B Street, Bldg 11, WPAFB, OH 45433

Phone: 937-713-0392

## Mission and Description

The HH-60W system will provide Personnel Recovery (PR) forces with a vertical takeoff and landing aircraft that is quickly deployableand capable of main base and austere location operations for worldwide PR missions. HH-60W system activities may be required during any phase of a service/joint/coalition operation, across the full range of military operations, in any land or sea location, within the areas covered by the relevant defense planning scenarios.

The United States Air Force (USAF) has 12 Core Functions that address its unique capabilities in support of the Joint Functional Capabilities (JFC) across the full spectrum of political and military operations in all environments. The USAF has demonstrated its commitment to the Joint Force by making PR one of the 12 USAF Core Functions. The Air Force recognizes the inherent interdependence of PR, although established as an individual Core Function, with the other Core Functions as well as with the JFCs.

The HH-60W shall be capable of employment day or night, in adverse weather, and in a variety of threat spectrums from terrorist attacks to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. A single pilot must be able to fly and operate all electronic/sensor weapons systems including countermeasures, leaving the second pilot to navigate, communicate, and manage mission execution. Onboard defensive capabilities will permit the HH-60W system to operate in an increased threat environment. An in-flight air refuelingcapability will provide an airborne alert capability and extend its combat mission range. The HH-60W system may conduct combat search and rescue airborne mission commander duties. The aircraft will be self-supporting to the maximum extent practical.

The HH-60W system may also conduct other collateral missions inherent in their capabilities to conduct PR, such as nonconventional assisted recovery, national emergency operations, civil search and rescue, international aid, emergency aeromedical evacuation, disaster and humanitarian relief, counter drug activities, support for National Aeronautics and Space Administration flight operations, and insertion/extraction of combat forces.

A single 15 year contract was awarded to Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (SAC) on June 26, 2014. The Program is on contract to buy up to 113 aircraft, designated as the HH-60W. In addition to purchasing the aircraft, the contract includes development and fielding of the aircrew and maintenance training systems along with product support. The product support strategy consists of a 2-level maintenance concept (organizational and depot). During pre-operational support, the contractor will provide all levels of maintenance and material support. Field Service Representative will assist the USAF in transitioning to organic organizational maintenance. Spares and support equipment will be delivered 60 days prior to HH-60W fielding. The training system consists of training devices, courseware, technical data, spares and support equipment necessary to meet aircrew and maintenance training system requirements. The HH-60W will ensure combat capability we develop, acquire, and deliver to the warfighter is affordable and supportable throughout its lifecycle.

## **Executive Summary**

#### Program Highlights since Last Report

The HH-60W program is tracking to or ahead of Acquisition Program Baseline (APB) milestones. Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP) is progressing with eight aircraft delivered. Initial Operational Test & Evaluation (IOT&E) began in March 2022 although 46% of Operational Testing is completed to date. Challenges include Gatling AUtocannon (GAU)-18 deficiency Developmental Testing (DT), significant Nunn-McCurdy breach driven by a quantity change in the FY 2023 President's Budget (PB), and Military Construction (MILCON) threshold breach driven by FY 2023 PB.

#### Significant Accomplishments:

January 5, 2021 - Gun testing, previously halted in early December 2020 due to a COVID case on the test team and the holidays, has resumed.

January 5, 2021 - The Air Force accepted delivery of HH-60W Engineering and Manufacturing Development aircraft two Engineering Manufacturing and Development (EMD 2). This aircraft will ferry to Moody Air Force Base (AFB) to support aircrew seasoning prior to IO&TE.

January 6, 2021 - The projected Required Assets Available (RAA) date was moved to April 30, 2021 to enable joint defensive systems electronic warfare testing. The move was precipitated by a recent 30-day delay of China Lake Test Range availability (higher Department of Defense [DoD] priorities). The Program Office and 413<sup>th</sup> Flight Test Squadron (FTS) are working internal to the program and with Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake to optimize use of available range access time. Threshold RAA APB date is October 2021.

February 26, 2021 - Overall the DT program has flown over 1097 hours. The Sikorsky and USAF team completed defensive systems testing at China Lake, CA. The 413<sup>th</sup> FTS is now executing government development test and evaluation, scheduled thru mid-April 2021.

April 01, 2021 - Overall the DT program has flown over 1,100 hours. The 413<sup>th</sup> FTS completed government Development Test and Evaluation (DT&E). Integrated gun testing continues with the GAU-2 and GAU-21 completing this month.

April 01, 2021 - Aircraft W4 completed its portion of government DT and is undergoing instrumentation removal before returning to Kirtland AFB the first week in May 2021.

April 30, 2021 - The Program Office declared RAA. The requirement for this APB milestone included delivery of eight aircraft plus spares/support equipment and logistical field support.

May 05, 2021 - The HH-60Ws successfully completed Red Flag Combat Search and Rescue Task Force scenarios 7-21 at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ. Units from the USAF, Marine Corps, Army and allied partners from around the globe collaborated for the two-week exercise. While at Red Flag, HH-60W operational pilots also completed the first HH-60W operational Air to Air Refueling with Air Force Operation, Test & Evaluation Center (AFOTEC) collecting 29 percent of IOT&E test plan data points during these exercises.

May 18, 2021 - Sikorsky hosted a small first LRIP Delivery Ceremony in Stratford, CT, to recognize this significant milestone.

June 08, 2021 - Sikorsky delivered the first LRIP HH-60W aircraft to the USAF.

November 10, 2021 - Integrated test team completed Radar Warning Receiver (RWR) Flight Testing at China Lake, CA.

December 01, 2021 - GAU-18 DT was performed to compare weapon configurations. Additional ground testing will be performed in January 2022, followed by flight test in February 2022 to validate technical fixes to the Externally Mounted Gun System.

December 07, 2021 – An Authorization to Operate (ATO) was granted for the HH-60W Weapon System Trainer (WST) and Operational Flight Trainer (OFT) Training System.

December 08, 2021 – Operational Flight Trainer (OFT) was delivered under CLIN 0012.

December 28, 2021 – WST was delivered under CLIN 0011.

#### Significant Issues:

Software version A.3, which contains the mission planning system, RWR ring of fire, Cat 1 Deficiency Report Fixes and Electro Optic/Infrared (EO/IR) symbology upgrades, started DT in July 2021. The version A.3 EO/IR characterization flight testing was completed in December 2021, pending data review. The results of this test will inform potential fielding and future follow-on development. The A.2.3 software will be the baseline for dedicated IOT&E. This software version contains the RWR and guns improvements expected by AFOTEC and Air Combat Command.

Link 16 capability will not be available to test during the scheduled HH-60W IOT&E period March 2022 - June 2022. Due to limited Navy Marine Corps Spectrum Center and Collins Aerospace resources and USAF test priorities, the HH-60W modernization upgrade will be delayed until a certified TacNet radio is available from Collins Aerospace in CY 2022.

Negotiations on Technical Data Package (TDP) deliveries and data rights continue to be a challenge. USAF and SAC met with the Smart Intellectual Property (IP) cadre on December 15, 2021 to discuss Rules of Engagement for a to-be-scheduled meeting with all parties in February 2022. The goal of the meeting will be to gain feedback and ideas from the AF's IP experts on the final areas of impasse within the TDP. USAF and SAC plan to meet several times prior to the Smart IP cadre meeting in February 2022 to firm up a plan and continue working these issues.

The Program Office has identified two breaches, a significant Nunn-McCurdy Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) breach due to the reduction in air vehicle quantities from 113 to 75 in the FY 2023 PB and a MILCON threshold breach due to higher proposal estimates and additional square footage in the FY 2023 PB. The Program Office will continue to work with Secretary of Air Force for Acquisition (SAF/AQ) and Air Force Cost Analysis Agency (AFCAA) on the notification process and cost estimates. The Program Deviation Report (PDR) is being updated with latest PB data and will be submitted on April 18, 2022.

# History of Significant Developments since Program Initiation

| Date                | Significant Development  Description  |
|---------------------|---|
| March 2012          | Program initiation was approved in the Material Development Decision Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) signed by the Acting USD (AT&L), USD (A&S) on March 2, 2012.                     |
| October 2012        | A Pre-EMD ADM was signed October 19, 2012, approving final Request For Proposal release.  |
| June 2014           | A Milestone (MS) B ADM was signed on June 18, 2014, authorizing the CRH contract awardand entrance into the EMD phase.  |
| June 2014           | A Fixed-Price Incentive Firm (FPIF) at Firm Fixed Price contract for EMD was awarded to SAC on June 26, 2014.   |
| December 2014       | Integrated Baseline Review conducted; action item completion and Performance Measurement Baseline established July 31, 2015.  |
| 3rd Quarter FY 2015 | Air Vehicle System and Training Systems Requirements Review / System Functional Review (SRR/SFR) was conducted.   |
| April 2016          | Air Vehicle Preliminary Design Review (PDR) was conducted.  |
| May 2016            | USD (AT&L) ADM dated May 10, 2016, designated the HH-60W program an ACAT 1C.  |
| August 2016         | Training Systems PDR was conducted.   |
| December 2016       | The In-Process Review Air Force Review Board ADM was signed December 7, 2016 and approved purchase of five System Demonstration Test Article aircraft.                                      |
| May 2017            | Air Vehicle Critical Design Review (CDR) was conducted.   |
| September 2017      | Training Systems CDR was conducted.   |
| October 2017        | Product Support Business Case Analysis was approved.  |
| 1st Quarter FY 2019 | EMD 1 and 2 test aircraft shipped to the Sikorsky West Palm Beach, FL facility.   |
| May 2019            | EMD aircraft 2 achieved first flight and CRH began flight test.   |
| September 2019      | MS C Air Force Review Board with the MS Decision Authority authorized entry into<br>Production and Deployment phase and procurement of up to 61 LRIP aircraft over four<br>production lots. |
| February 2020       | The Secretary of the Air Force revealed the new name for the HH-60W, at the Air Force Association's Air Warfare Symposium – "Jolly Green II".   |
| March 2020          | Major assembly of LRIP-1 aircraft began with the first aircraft delivery in May 2021.   |
| April 2020          | Initiated delivery and installation of the weapon system trainer by Sikorsky and their subcontractor, Flight Safety International to Kirtland AFB, NM.                                      |
| June 2020           | The first HH-60W operational flight trainer arrived at Moody AFB, GA.   |
| October 2020        | Air Force accepted delivery of DD250 HH-60W aircraft.   |
| October 2020        | Completion of Live Fire and Evaluation Testing.   |
| November 2020       | The Air Force accepted delivery of two additional HH-60W aircraft.  |
| January 2021        | The Air Force accepted delivery of HH-60W EMD 2. This aircraft will ferry to Moody AFB, GA to support aircrew seasoning prior to IO&TE.   |
| April 2021          | The Program Office declared RAA. The requirement for this APB MS included delivery of eight aircraft plus spares/support equipment and logistical field support.                            |

| May 2021      | The HH-60Ws successfully completed Red Flag Combat Search and Rescue Task Force scenarios 7-21 at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ. Units from the USAF, Marine Corps, Army and allied partners from around the globe collaborated for the two-week exercise. While at Red Flag, HH-60W operational pilots also completed the first HH-60W operational Air to Air Refueling |
|---------------|--|
| June 2021     | Sikorsky delivered the first LRIP HH-60W aircraft to the Air Force.  |
| December 2021 | WST was delivered to Kirkland AFB, NM  |

# Schedule

# Schedule Events

| Event Title (or Header) | Current Objective | Current Threshold | Current Estimate/Actual<br>Date | Deviation?<br>Y/N |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Milestone B             | Jun 2014          | Dec 2014          | June, 26 2014                   |                   |
| PDR                     | Apr 2016          | Oct 2016          | April 22, 2016                  |                   |
| CDR                     | Jul 2017          | Jan 2018          | May 1, 2017                     |                   |
| DT&E Start              | Sept 2018         | Mar 2019          | September 28, 2018              |                   |
| Milestone C             | Oct 2019          | Apr 2020          | September 24, 2019              |                   |
| RAA                     | Apr 2021          | Apr 2021          | April 30, 2021                  |                   |
| IOT&E Start             | Feb 2022          | Mar 2022          | April 1, 2022                   |                   |
| FRP Decision            | Oct 2022          | Nov 2022          | Oct 2022                        |                   |
| FOC                     | Jan 2027          | Jan 2029          | Jan 2027                        |                   |

# Significant Schedule Risks

| Significant Schedule and Technical Risks            |  |
|---|--|
| Current Estimate (December 2021)                    |  |
| . There are no risk with this program at this time. |  |

# Performance

|   |   | Performance Ch  | aracteristics  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Initial<br>Production<br>APB  | Prod  | nt APB<br>uction<br>/Threshold  | Demonstrated<br>Performance  | Current Estimate or<br>Actual   |
| Hover Performance   |   |   |  |   |
| A combat configured HH-60 Recap with SCL shall have an OGE hover capability at mid-mission gross weights at 6,000' PA, 35°C.  | A combat<br>configured HH-60<br>Recap with SCL<br>shall have an OGE<br>hover capability at<br>mid-mission gross<br>weights at 6,000'<br>PA, 35°C.   | A combat<br>configured HH-60<br>Recap with SCL<br>shall have an OGE<br>hover capability at<br>mid-mission gross<br>weights at 4,000'<br>PA, 35°C.   | The HH-60W capability to hover at mid-mission gross weight at 4000', 35 Celsius meets the Hover Performance Requirement.   | A combat configured HH-<br>60 Recap with SCL shall<br>have an OGE hover<br>capability at mid-mission<br>gross weights at 4,000' PA,<br>35°C.  |
| Survivability   |   |   |  |   |
| (Objective= Threshold) HH-60 Recap aircraft shall provide vulnerability reduction at least equal to existing HH-60G vulnerability reduction features - protection for the pilot, copilot and all flight critical components or subsystems against ground- fired 7.62 mm armor piercing projectiles at 100 Meters. | (Objective= Threshold) HH-60 Recap aircraft shall provide vulnerability reduction at least equal to existing HH-60G vulnerability reduction features - protection for the pilot, copilot and all flight critical components or subsystems against ground- fired 7.62 mm armor piercing projectiles at 100 Meters. | HH-60 Recap aircraft shall provide vulnerability reduction at least equal to existing HH-60G vulnerability reduction features - protection for the pilot, copilot and all flight critical components or subsystems against ground-fired 7.62 mm armor piercing projectiles at 100 Meters. |  | HH-60 Recap aircraft shall provide vulnerability reduction at least equal to existing HH-60G vulnerability reduction features - protection for the pilot, copilot and all flight critical components or subsystems against ground-fired 7.62 mm armor piercing projectiles at 100 meters. |
| Force Protection  | Weters.   |   |  |   |
| Pilot and copilot seating to 14.5 mm AP projectiles At 500 meters. Walls around the primary cabin crew member positions and the entire cabin floor to 14.5 mm AP at 500 meters.   | Pilot and copilot<br>seating to 14.5<br>mm AP projectiles<br>At 500 meters.<br>Walls around the<br>primary cabin<br>crew member<br>positions and the<br>entire cabin floor to<br>14.5 mm AP at<br>500 meters.   | Pilot and copilot seating will incorporate ballistic hardening to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 meters. The cabin walls around the primary cabin crew member positions and the entire cabin floor will have the capability to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 Meters.         | Pilot and copilot seating will incorporate ballistic hardening to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 Meters. The cabin walls around the primary cabin crew member positions and the entire cabin floor will have the capability to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 meters | Pilot and copilot seating will incorporate ballistic hardening to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 Meters. The cabin walls around the primary cabin crew member positions and the entire cabin floor will have the capability to defeat 7.62 mm AP projectiles at 100 meters          |

| Net Ready   | garage market   | 120  | 22.7 | 7-7  |
|---|---|--|------|--|
| Execution of all operational activities and information exchanges identified and information assurance requirements including availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality, and non-repudiation, and issuance of an ATO by the DAA. | Execution of all operational activities and information exchanges identified and information assurance requirements Including availability, integrity, authentication, confidentiality, and non-repudiation, and issuance of an ATO by the DAA. | The capability, system, and/or service shall fully support execution of joint critical operational activities and information exchanges identified in the DoD Enterprise Architecture and solution architectures based on integrated DoDAF content, and shall satisfy the technical requirements for transition to Net-Centric military Operations. Issuance of an IATO Or ATO by the DAA. | TBD  | The capability, system, and/or service shall fully support execution of joint critical operational activities and information exchanges identified in the DoD Enterprise Architecture and solution architectures based on integrated DoDAF content, and shall satisfy the technical requirements for transition to Net-Centric military Operations. Issuance of an IATO or ATO by the DAA. |
| Sustainment (MC Ra  | te)   |  |      |  |
| (Objective=<br>Threshold) MC<br>rate of 83 percent<br>at IOC  | (Objective=<br>Threshold) MC<br>rate of 83 percent<br>at IOC  | MC rate of 83<br>percent at IOC  | TBD  | 83%  |
| System Training Pro   | cess  |  |      |  |
| (Objective=<br>Threshold) HH-60<br>Recap shall<br>provide operations<br>and maintenance<br>training systems   | (Objective=<br>Threshold) HH-60<br>Recap shall<br>provide operations<br>and maintenance<br>training systems   | HH-60 Recap shall<br>provide operations<br>and maintenance<br>training systems   | TBD  | Training systems shall provide an operational availability rate of 95% for 16 hours a day, 5 days a week and 50 weeks a year for the operating life.   |

## Requirements Source:

Capability Developmental Documents (CDD) for HH-60W Recapitalization Aircraft dated July 6, 2010 CDD Supplement for HH-60 Recapitalization Aircraft dated July 20, 2012.

#### ACQUISITION BUDGET ESTIMATE

## **Total Acquisition Cost**

|                    | Original APB June 2014 (MS B) | Septem              | nt APB<br>ber 2019<br>S C) | Bu       | dget Estimat<br>PB FY 2023 | e         |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Category           | Objective<br>(BY\$)           | Objective<br>(BY\$) | Threshold<br>(BY\$)        | BY\$     | TY\$                       | Deviation |
| RDT&E              | 1,958.8                       | 2,211.9             | 2,433.1                    | 2,287.0  | 2,318.2                    |           |
| Procurement        | 6,108.4                       | 6,974.7             | 7,672.2                    | 4,946.0  | 5,680.4                    |           |
| MILCON             | 23.7                          | 68.8                | 75.7                       | 79.4     | 90.7                       | Yes       |
| Total Acq. Cost    | 8,090.9                       | 9,255.4             | N/A                        | 7,312.4  | 8,089.3                    |           |
| O&S                | 0.0                           | 26,512.7            | 29,164.0                   | 14,864.5 | 21,664.4                   |           |
| PAUC               | 77.1                          | 81.9                | 90.1                       | 97.5     | 107.9                      | Yes       |
| APUC               | 64.3                          | 67.7                | 74.5                       | 76.1     | 87.4                       | Yes       |
| Development<br>Qty | 10                            | 10                  |                            | 10       |                            |           |
| Production<br>Qty  | 95                            | 103                 |                            | 65       |                            |           |
| Total              | 105                           | 113                 |                            | 75       |                            |           |

#### **Budget Note**

The following are Congressional marks for FY 2022 funding:

#### RDT&E:

\$4.1M mark due to contract award delays.

#### Procurement:

- Mark in the amount of \$48.3M is due to a \$35.3M adjustment in Airframe Unit Cost and a \$13.0M adjustment in Other Flyaway Cost.
- Mark in the amount of \$61.2M for early to need Capability Upgrades.
- Mark in the amount of \$1.8M in initial spares due to the termination of the Degraded Visual Environment upgrade.

The following are FY 2022 rescissions:

Rescind \$18.2M of FY 2020 and \$17.6M of FY 2021 funds.

#### Cost Deviations Explanations

There is a MILCON Threshold Breach. The Increasing cost is largely due to higher proposal estimates for training facilities due in part to COVID-19 and parts supply issues. In addition, an increase in the square footage for future

projects based on new total facilities guidance from Lockheed Martin/Sikorsky (additional 2,109 sq. feet per project) is also adding to projected cost.

#### APB Unit Cost Deviations Explanations

The Unit Cost deviations are driven by the FY 2023 PB reduction in the total air vehicle quantities from 113 to 75.

## Total End Item Quantity

|             | Current APB Quantity | Current Estimate Quantity<br>FY 2023 PB |
|-------------|----------------------|---|
| Development | 10                   | 10                                      |
| Production  | 103                  | 65                                      |

## **Quantity Notes**

The Program of Record is 113. The FY 2023 PB production quantity profile is FY 2019 - 10, FY 2020 - 12, FY 2021 - 19, FY 2022 - 14, FY 2023 - 10 for a total production quantity of 65.

## **Unit Costs**

## Current Baseline Compared with Current Estimate

| Category (\$M) Base Year: 2019 | Current Baseline (BY\$) | FY 2023 PB(BY\$) | % Change | Breach      |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------|
| Program Acquisition Unit Cost  |                         |                  |          |             |
| Acquisition Cost               | 9,255.4                 | 7,312.4          |          |             |
| Program Quantity               | 113                     | 75               |          |             |
| PAUC                           | 81.9                    | 97.5             | 19.04%   | Significant |
| Average Procurement Unit Cost  |                         |                  |          |             |
| Procurement Cost               | 6,974.7                 | 4,946.0          |          |             |
| Production Quantity            | 103                     | 65               |          |             |
| APUC                           | 67.7                    | 76.1             | 12.37%   |             |

## Original Baseline Compared with Current Estimtae

| Category (\$M) Base Year: 2014      | Original Baseline | FY 2023 PB (BY\$) | % Change | Breach |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|--------|
| Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC | )                 |                   |          |        |
| Acquisition Cost                    | 8090.9            | 6748.2            |          |        |
| Program Quantity                    | 105               | 75                |          |        |
| PAUC                                | 77.1              | 90.0              | 16.77%   |        |
| Average Procurement Unit Cost (APL  | IC)               |                   |          |        |
| Procurement Cost                    | 6108.4            | 4564.4            |          |        |
| Production Quantity                 | 95                | 65                |          |        |
| APUC                                | 64.3              | 70.2              | 9.21%    |        |

#### Unit Cost Notes:

Current Baseline PAUC NMC Breach Explanation: The increase in the current estimate results in an objective PAUC of \$97.5M (BY 2019). This updated PAUC exceeds the Current APB PAUC objective of \$81.9M (BY 2019) by 19.04%, which resulted in a breach of the 15% Nunn-McCurdy significant unit cost threshold. The updated PAUC of \$90.0 (BY 2014) is 16.77% above the Original APB objective of \$77.1M (BY 2014), which does not breach the 30% Nunn-McCurdy significant unit cost threshold. The overall PAUC change is due to the reduction in total air vehicle quantities from 113 to 75.

Current Baseline APUC NMC Breach Explanation: There is no APUC breach to the Nunn-McCurdy cost threshold.

# Technologies and Systems Engineering

# Significant Technical Risks

Significant Technical Risks

Current Estimate (December 2021)

1. There are no technical risks with this program at this time.

## Contracts

|   | Contract Data (\$TYM)                   |                    |  |
|---|---|--------------------|--|
| Contract Number   | FA8629-14-C-2403                        |                    |  |
| Effort Number   |   |                    |  |
| Modification Number   |   |                    |  |
| Contract Type   | FPIF                                    |                    |  |
| Award Date  | 6/26/2014                               |                    |  |
| Definitization Date   |   |                    |  |
| Order Number  |   |                    |  |
| CAGE Code/CAGE Legal Name   | Lockheed Martin Rotary                  | and Mission        |  |
| Contract Title  | EMD                                     |                    |  |
| Contract Address  | Stratford, CT                           |                    |  |
| Initial Target Price<br>1,261.2   | Current Target Price<br>1,522.7         |                    |  |
| C. Carriera de La Carriera de |   |                    |  |
| VINCENE.  | 1 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1 |                    |  |
| Initial Ceiling Price<br>1,363.6  | Current Ceiling Price                   |                    |  |
| 1,505.0   | 1,645.2                                 |                    |  |
| C   | DAM FAC                                 |                    |  |
| Contract's EAC  | PM's EAC                                |                    |  |
| 1,617.3   | 1,617.1                                 | Tan ia iii         |  |
| 1,617.3<br>Initial Quantity   | 1,617.1<br>Current Quantity             | Delivered Quantity |  |
| 1,617.3<br>Initial Quantity<br>4  | 1,617.1<br>Current Quantity<br>10       | 10                 |  |
| 1,617.3<br>Initial Quantity<br>4<br>BAC   | 1,617.1 Current Quantity 10 BCWP        | 10<br>ACWP         |  |
| 1,617.3<br>Initial Quantity<br>4<br>BAC   | 1,617.1<br>Current Quantity<br>10       | 10                 |  |
| 1,617.3<br>Initial Quantity   | 1,617.1 Current Quantity 10 BCWP        | 10<br>ACWP         |  |

#### Cost Variance:

The unfavorable Cost Variance is due to the following primary cost drivers: G&A rates, Operations' Aircraft Build and Operations' Sustaining Engineering.

#### Schedule Variance:

The unfavorable Schedule Variance is due to the remaining Development work that is late to schedule. This includes TDP deliveries, Training Device deliveries, RFT completion, Courseware Deliveries, System Verification Review (SVR) and Physical Configuration Audit / Functional Configuration Audit.

|                           | Contract Data (\$TYM)                                  |                    |  |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Contract Number           | FA8629-14-C-2403/2                                     |                    |  |
| Effort Number             |  |                    |  |
| Modification Number       |  |                    |  |
| Contract Type             | FPIF   |                    |  |
| Award Date                | 6/26/2014  |                    |  |
| Definitization Date       |  |                    |  |
| Order Number              |  |                    |  |
| CAGE Code/CAGE Legal Name | Lockheed Martin Rotary and Mission                     |                    |  |
| Contract Title            | LRIP   |                    |  |
| Contract Address          | Stratford, CT  |                    |  |
| Contracts/Effc            | ort Price, Quantity, and Perform  Current Target Price | ance (\$M)         |  |
| 472.6                     | 1,120.7  |                    |  |
| Initial Ceiling Price     | Current Ceiling Price                                  |                    |  |
| 510.9                     | 1,360.1  |                    |  |
| Contract's EAC            | PM's EAC   |                    |  |
| 1,094.8                   | 1,120.7  |                    |  |
| Initial Quantity          | Current Quantity                                       | Delivered Quantity |  |
| 8                         | 22   | 7                  |  |
| BAC                       | BCWP   | ACWP               |  |
| 1,188.1                   | 572.5  | 531.7              |  |
| BCWS                      | Cost Variance  | Schedule Variance  |  |
| 685.2                     | 40.7   | -127.7             |  |

#### Cost Variance:

The favorable cost variance is due to Air Vehicle Integration, Assembly, Test, & Checkout, Integrated Logistical Support (ILS) Management, and Technical Publications.

#### Schedule Variance:

The unfavorable schedule variance is due to Assembly, Test, & Checkout, Lot 2 FSI Operational Flight Trainer (OFT) #2 LRIP, and LRIP Lot 2 Air Vehicle Sustaining Engineering.

# **Deliveries and Expenditures**

## **Deliveries**

| Deliveries                          |                 |                |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Delivered to Date                   | Planned to Date | Actual to Date | Total<br>Quantity | Percent Delivered |  |  |  |  |
| Development                         | 10              | 10             | 10                | 100.00%           |  |  |  |  |
| Production                          | 10              | 8              | 65                | 10.77%            |  |  |  |  |
| Total Program Quantity<br>Delivered | 20              | 17             | 75                | 22.67%            |  |  |  |  |

# Expended and Appropriated (TY\$)

Total Acquisition Cost: 8,202.9 Expended to Date: 4,332.1 Percent Expended: 53% Total Funding Years: 19 Years Appropriated: 10

Percent Years Appropriated: 56.23% Appropriate to Date: 602.7

Percent Appropriated: 7%

#### LRIP

There is no LRIP for this program.

# **OPERATING and SUPPORT COSTS**

# Operating and Support Cost Estimate:

| Category                      | Base Year: 2019 | HH-60W<br>Cost Estimate |  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Unit-Level Manpower           |                 | 6,109.1                 |  |
| Unit Operations               |                 | 922.1                   |  |
| Maintenance                   |                 | 2,788.8                 |  |
| Sustaining Support            |                 | 1,596.3                 |  |
| Continued System Improvements |                 | 807.0                   |  |
| Indirect Support              |                 | 2,641.2                 |  |
| Other                         |                 |                         |  |
| Total O&S                     |                 | 14,864.50               |  |

# Operating and Support Estimate Compared with the Current Baseline:

| Operating and Support Estimate Compared with Baseline |                 |                     |                     | Cost Estimate |              |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Category (\$M)  | Base Year: 2019 | Base Year Objective | Base Year Threshold | Base Year     | Then<br>Year |
| Total O&S   |                 | 26,512.7            | 29,164.0            | 14,864.5      | 21,664.4     |