

Air Force Institute of Technology

AFIT Scholar

Theses and Dissertations

Student Graduate Works

3-1997

Linking Procurement Dollars to an Alternative Force Structures' Combat Capability Using Response Surface Methodology

James B. Grier

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.afit.edu/etd>




Part of the [Operational Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Grier, James B., "Linking Procurement Dollars to an Alternative Force Structures' Combat Capability Using Response Surface Methodology" (1997). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5954.
<https://scholar.afit.edu/etd/5954>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Graduate Works at AFIT Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of AFIT Scholar. For more information, please contact AFIT.ENWL.Repository@us.af.mil.



LINKING PROCUREMENT DOLLARS TO AN
ALTERNATIVE FORCE STRUCTURES'
COMBAT CAPABILITY
USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY

THESIS

James B. Grier, Major, USAF

AFIT/GOA/ENS/97M-07

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

19970429 225

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

DTC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

AFIT/GOA/ENS/97M-07

**LINKING PROCUREMENT DOLLARS TO AN
ALTERNATIVE FORCE STRUCTURES'
COMBAT CAPABILITY
USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY**

THESIS

James B. Grier, Major, USAF

AFIT/GOA/ENS/97M-07

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited

THESIS APPROVAL



STUDENT: Maj James B. Grier

CLASS: GOA-97M


THESIS TITLE: Linking Procurement Dollars to an Alternative Force Structures' Combat Capability using Response Surface Methodology

DEFENSE DATE: 13 March 1997

COMMITTEE:

	NAME/DEPARTMENT	SIGNATURE
Advisor:	Lt Col Jack Jackson Assistant Professor of Operations Research Department of Operational Sciences, AFIT/ENS	
Reader:	Lt Col Glenn Bailey Assistant Professor of Operations Research Department of Operational Sciences, AFIT/ENS	

SIGNATURE



AFIT/GOA/ENS/97M-07

LINKING PROCUREMENT DOLLARS TO AN
ALTERNATIVE FORCE STRUCTURES'
COMBAT CAPABILITY
USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Engineering

of the Air force Institute of Technology

Air University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in Operations Research

James B. Grier, B.G.S.

Major, USAF

MARCH, 1997

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Behind every man there is a great woman—I am blessed with four such women. To my lovely wife Terri, and my daughters Kristyn, Jessica and Rebecca, thank you for your sacrifice and understanding, and most importantly for your encouraging words each time you picked me up off the ground and dusted me off. Most importantly, I thank my Lord and Savior for orchestrating the events that brought me to AFIT.

A number of people have assisted me with this thesis effort, and without their help this product would not be possible. I first want to thank Lt Colonel Jack Jackson, my advisor, for his superb instruction and enduring patience throughout the program, along with his spiritual encouragement and guidance. I would also like to warmly thank my reader, Lt Colonel Glenn Bailey, for his excellent instruction and insight into experimental designs. The incredibly professional assistance I received from Mr Kelly Dalton, Mr Tim Ewart, and Ms Tammy Logan at ASC/XR, was pivotal to the completion of this thesis. I can't thank you enough for building a THUNDER database from scratch to meet my requirements, and the countless hours troubleshooting problems. I would also like to thank Maj Brian Griggs and Maj Donald Kimminau of HQ USAF/XPY, who provided this thesis topic to AFIT, along with guiding the research efforts.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	vii
Abstract	viii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS)	1
1.1.1.1 Planning Phase	2
1.1.1.2 Programming Phase	2
1.1.1.3 Budgeting Phase	3
1.1.2 PPBS Impact to USAF/XPY	3
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Scope	4
1.4 Limitations	5
1.5 Thesis Overview	5
2. Literature Review	6
2.1 Why Simulation?	6
2.2 THUNDER Overview	6
2.2.1 Introduction	6
2.2.2 Statistical Implications	7
2.2.3 Air War	7
2.3 Multiple Regression	8
2.3.1 Mean Square Error	8
2.3.2 Coefficient of Multiple Determination	8
2.3.3 Linear Regression Model	9
2.4 Response Surface Methodology	10
2.4.1 Factorial Designs	11
2.4.1.1 Fractional Factorial Designs	13
2.4.1.2 Plackett-Burman Designs	14
2.4.2 Mixture Designs	15
2.5 Multivariate Analysis	15
2.5.1 Principle Component Analysis	16
2.5.2 Factor Analysis	17
2.6 Metamodels	18
2.6.1 Developing a Metamodel	19
2.6.2 Experimental Design Selection	20
2.6.3 Variance Reduction Techniques	21

3. Methodology	23
3.1 Objectives	23
3.1.1 Develop Measures of Outcome (MOO)	23
3.1.2 Multivariate Analysis	24
3.1.3 Identify Significant Input Variables	24
3.1.4 Develop a Response Surface	24
3.2 Input / Output Variables	25
3.2.1 Input Variables	26
3.2.2 Output Variables	27
3.3 Experimental Design	29
3.4 Multivariate Techniques	31
3.5 Derivation of Combat Indices	31
3.6 Constructing Response Surface	33
4. Results	35
4.1 Plackett-Burman Design	35
4.1.1 Factor Analysis Results	36
4.1.1.1 Halt Invading Armies Factor	37
4.1.1.2 Evict Invading Armies Factor	38
4.1.1.3 Gain and Maintain Air Superiority Factor (AirSup)	39
4.1.1.4 Gain and Maintain Information Dominance Factor (C3)	39
4.1.1.5 Deny Possession and Use of WMD Factor (OCA)	40
4.1.1.6 Suppress National Capacity to Wage War (Interdict)	41
4.1.1.7 Summary	42
4.1.2 Constructing Combat Indices	42
4.1.3 Stepwise Linear Regression Results	44
4.2 2_{IV}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial (FF) Design	47
4.2.1 Fractional Factorial Design	48
4.2.2 Factor Analysis Results	48
4.2.2.1 Halt Invading Armies Factor	49
4.2.2.2 Evict Invading Armies Factor	50
4.2.2.3 Gain and Maintain Air Superiority Factor	50
4.2.2.4 Gain and Maintain Information Dominance (C3)	51
4.2.2.5 Suppress National Capacity to Wage War	51
4.2.3 Deriving Combat Indices	52
4.2.4 Stepwise Linear Regression	53
4.3 Analysis of Results	56
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	58
5.1 Summary	58
5.2 Lessons Learned	61
5.3 Recommendations for Further Study	63
5.3.1 Database	63
5.3.2 Advanced Topics	64
Appendix A. Variable Definitions	65
Appendix B. THUNDER Data Files	69
Appendix C. Shell Scripts	106

Appendix D. Campaign Objectives	109
Appendix E. Experimental Designs	120
Appendix F. THUNDER Output	122
Appendix G. Factor Scores	130
Appendix H. Regression Results	132
Appendix I. Regression Plots	144
Appendix J. AFI 65-503	157
Bibliography	164
Vita	166

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1	Methodology of Thesis Effort	25
2	Selecting Experimental Design	29
3	Factor Analysis	31
4	Indices in Matrix Form	32
5	Constructing Response Surface	33
6	THUNDER Output.	35
7	Factor Analysis	36
8	Derive Combat Indices	43
9	Stepwise Linear Regression	44
10	Response vs. Predicted Response (Total Combat Index)	46
11	Residual vs. Predicted Response (Total Combat Index)	47
12	FF Design Selection	48
13	Factor Analysis (FF Design)	49
14	Derive Combat Indices	52
15	Stepwise Linear Regression	53
16	Response vs. Predicted Response (Total Combat Index)	55
17	Residual vs. Predicted Response (Total Combat Index)	55
18	Methodology Overview	58
19	Projected Combat Health through 2015 (Example)	59

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Factorial Design, 2³	12
2	Input Variable Levels	27
3	Ability to measure Campaign Objectives	28
4	Significant Factor Loadings (Halt)	37
5	Significant Factor Loadings (Evict)	38
6	Significant Factor Loadings (AirSup)	39
7	Significant Factor Loadings (C3)	40
8	Significant Factor Loadings (OCA).....	41
9	Significant Factor Loadings (Interdiction).....	41
10	Individual Combat Indices.....	44
11	Stepwise Linear Regression Results	45
12	Significant Factor Loadings (Halt)	49
13	Significant Factor Loadings (Evict)	50
14	Significant Factor Loadings (AirSup)	50
15	Significant Factor Loadings (C3)	51
16	Significant Factor Loadings (Interdiction).....	51
17	Combat Indices	52
18	Stepwise Linear Regression Results	54

ABSTRACT

A General Officer Steering Group, chaired by HQ USAF/XOM tasked action to develop and implement evaluation and analysis support to 'lead turn' the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and Joint Warfare Capability Assessment (JWCA) process. This evaluation process should be designed to supply measures of the "health" of the Air Force program in light of the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) and the Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA).

The Air Force needs to be able to quickly evaluate various alternative force structures with regards to it's combat capability, measured in terms of theater level campaign objectives (CO). HQ USAF/XOM tasked HQ USAF/XPY to develop a "quick turn" tool to perform iterative "exercises" , allowing for comparison of alternative force structures within 24 to 48 hours.

Using Factor Analysis and Response Surface Methodology, this thesis successfully developed a "quick turn" tool designed to capture the cost and capabilities of alternative force structures, linking dollars spent to campaign level measures of outcome.

**LINKING PROCUREMENT DOLLARS TO AN
ALTERNATIVE FORCE STRUCTURES'
COMBAT CAPABILITY
USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

While the operations tempo through out the world continues to increase for the U.S. Armed Forces, the Department of Defense (DoD) budget continues to shrink. In addition, efforts to balance the budget deficit may result in further downsizing of the military. How the United States Air Force (USAF) meets these challenges is a major focus of senior leadership.

A General Officer Steering Group, chaired by HQ USAF/XOM tasked action to develop and implement evaluation and analysis support to "lead turn" the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and Joint Warfare Capability Assessment (JWCA) process. This evaluation process should be designed to supply measures of the "health" of the Air Force program in light of the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) and the Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA) (Griggs, 1996).

1.1.1. Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS)

The PPBS is the DoD Resources Management System controlled by the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) and used to establish, maintain, and revise the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) and the DoD portion of the President's budget. Secretary of Defense McNamara implemented the PPBS concept to provide a clearer relationship between defense plans and defense dollars (ACSC Vol.5, 1991: 20-9,21)

As the name implies, there are three major phases of the PPBS: Planning, Programming, and Budgeting phases.

1.1.1.1 Planning Phase

The objective of the planning phase is to identify the threat to U.S. national security, develop the strategy necessary to meet national objectives, and determine the forces required to carry out the strategy. One of the key results of this phase is a planning document entitled the Defense Planning guidance (DPG). The DPG furnishes the SecDef's planning guidance and fiscal constraints to the military department for developing their program. Issuance of the DPG to the services in October marks the end of the planning phase (ACSC Vol. 5, 1991: 20-22).

1.1.1.2. Programming Phase

The purpose of the programming phase is to structure resources (e.g. forces and personnel) by mission to achieve the objectives established in the DPG. The process of determining forces and personnel for given programs involves the preparation of alternative force structures called "exercises". The proper number of forces, munitions, training and support must be determined to ensure proposed programs support and conform to the SecDef's guidance. Successive iterations of the exercises continue until the service arrives at its final position as reflected in the Program Objective Memorandum (POM).

The POM proposes total program requirements for the next six years and includes rationale for planned changes from the current approved FYDP baseline within the fiscal year. The POM also contains an assessment of the risk associated with current proposed forces and support programs. The services usually complete their POMs by the middle of May and submit them simultaneously to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS)

The Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA) provides the CJCS's assessment of the composite POM to assist the SecDef in making decisions on the defense program. The CJCS provides his "big picture" views on the balance and capabilities of the aggregate force represented by all the POMs. The end result of the programming phase is the Program Decision Memorandum (PDM) which is the SecDef's approval of service and defense agency

programs (POMs) as modified by specific decisions (ACSC Vol. 5, 1991: 20-24)

1.1.1.3. Budgeting Phase

The final phase is the Budgeting phase. Based on the POM and PDM, the services prepare and forward to OSD their Budget Estimate Submission (BES). Once the SecDef is satisfied with the BES, he then submits the final defense budget to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for inclusion in the President's budget. From there, the budget becomes a part of the Appropriations Bill to be passed by the U.S. Congress. The Appropriations and Armed Services Committees from both the House and Senate must approve the budget before it reaches the House and Senate floor respectively for a final vote (ACSC Vol. 5, 1991, 20-25).

1.1.2. PPBS Impact to USAF/XPY

Clearly, there are a number of "wickets" the USAF PPBS must pass through: CSAF, CJCS, SecDef, the President, and finally Congress. Opinions differ, and in light of current and future budget cuts many "what if" questions are asked. The result is *constant revision of the PPBS* on the part of HQ USAF/XPY.

To compound the problem further, the PPBS process described above is for a single biennial cycle. Unfortunately, they do not evolve in isolation. Several cycles progress simultaneously. At any given point in time, four fiscal programs are being managed. For example, while the current FY96 budget is being executed, the FY97 budget is being defended on Capital Hill, the FY98 budget is being submitted to OMB, and the FY99 budget is in the planning phase (ACSC Vol. 5; 20-27). The Air Staff makes many of its budget decisions involving force structure based on the recommendations from panels comprised of experts from each major functional area. The time available to develop these recommendation can be as little as 15 minutes in

extreme cases, which precludes conducting extensive analysis. The result is "back of the envelope" or "gut instinct" recommendations.

1.2 Problem Statement

The Air Force needs to be able to quickly evaluate various alternative force structures with regards to its combat capability as measured in terms of theater level campaign objectives (CO). HQ USAF/XOM has tasked HQ USAF/XPY to develop a "quick turn" tool to perform iterative "exercises", allowing for comparison of alternative force structures within 24 to 48 hours. *This thesis will examine methods to capture the cost and capabilities of alternative force structures, linking dollars spent to campaign level measures of outcome.*

1.3 Scope

USAF/XPY directed that THUNDER, a theater level combat model, be used in developing this quick turn tool. The database used by the simulation was a Southwest Asia (SWA) scenario developed by HQ ASC/XR personnel for the express purpose of this thesis. All USAF assets were used in a joint context with U.S. Navy (USN) aviation, while other coalition forces were excluded from the model. In order to keep this thesis effort UNCLASSIFIED, notional data was used for probability of kill (pk), aircraft utilization (UTE) rates, sortie generation, aircraft performance, etc.; hence, the focus must remain on the methodology and not the quantitative results.

1.4 Limitations

The number of THUNDER data files modified to establish a single design point, and the associated time required to do so, given manpower and time limitation, clearly impacted the type of experimental designs considered. Additionally, a single UltraSPARC workstation was available to conduct simulations, also influencing the selection of experimental designs used in this thesis.

1.5 Thesis Overview

Chapter II is a literature review of relevant OR techniques and methodologies needed to develop this thesis. Chapter III begins by outlining the desired objectives, followed by a chronological progression of the methods used, and the decision logic associated with each step. Chapter IV provides the analysis results and Chapter V provides conclusions and recommendations.

Appendix B lists the THUNDER files modified during this thesis. Appendix D outlines the Campaign Objectives identified by USAF/XPY. Appendix E includes the experimental designs used and Appendix F lists the THUNDER out metrics in tabular form. The multivariate results are located in Appendix G while the statistical results of this thesis are located in Appendix H and I.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter we will review relevant literature on simulation, the combat model THUNDER, and OR methods and applications needed to develop this thesis.

2.1 Why Simulation?

A simulation is the imitation of the operation of a real-world process or system over time. The behavior of a system as it evolves over time is studied by developing a simulation model (Banks et al., 1995:3).

The purpose of most simulation is to develop an understanding of system behavior, with the goal of using that understanding to make decisions involving the system (Seila, 1992 : 190) . By changing simulation inputs and observing the resulting outputs, valuable insight may be obtained into which variables are most important and how variables interact (Banks, 1995 : 4). From this analysis, informed decisions can be made. However, the disadvantages must also be considered. Simulation can be very time consuming and expensive, with the results obtained possibly difficult to interpret.

2.2 THUNDER Overview

2.2.1. Introduction

THUNDER is a theater-level warfare simulation model. It is a two-sided, stochastic computer simulation of conventional air, land and naval warfare, which is used to evaluate force structure, Cost and Operational Effective Analysis (COEA), strategic and tactical development, war-gaming, and senior staff training.

Thunder is written in SIMSCRIPT II.5, and is used by a large number of U.S. and allied defense organizations and contractors. It is operational on various

workstation platforms and on personal computer platforms under the WINDOWS NT operating system environment.

2.2.2 Statistical Implications

Because THUNDER is stochastic in nature, multiple runs are necessary to achieve desired levels of confidence in outputs. Acceptable levels of confidence in highly aggregate outputs are achieved by performing 10 to 30 replications. For a more complete discussion on model variability and sensitivity to input parameters within THUNDER see Webb (1994).

2.2.3 Air War

THUNDER simulates 22 different air missions and automatically generates Air Tasking Orders (ATOs), based on theater-level apportionment and targeting priorities. The air missions include (THUNDER Analyst's Manual, Vol 1, 1995: 23)

- Airborne Refueling (AAR)
- Airborne Early Warning (AEW)
- Air -to-Air Escort (AIRESC)
- Battlefield Air Interdiction (BAI)
- Barrier Combat Air Patrol (BARCAP)
- Close Air Support (CAS)
- Close-In Non-Lethal Air Defense Jamming (CJAM)
- Close-In Lethal Air Defense Suppression (CSUP)
- Defensive Counter-Air (DCA)
- Lethal Direct Air Defense Suppression (DSEAD)
- Escort Non-Lethal Air Defense Jamming (EJAM)
- Escort Lethal Air Defense Suppression (ESUP)
- Fighter Sweep (FSWP)
- High Value Asset Attack (HVAA)
- Long Range Air Interdiction (INT)
- Offensive Counter Air (OCA)
- Over FLOT Defensive Counter Air (ODCA)
- Reconnaissance (RECCE)
- Standoff Non-Lethal Air Defense Jamming (SJAM)
- Standoff Reconnaissance (SREC)
- Standoff Lethal Air Defense (SSUP)
- Strategic Target Interdiction (STI)

2.3 Multiple Regression

Regression analysis is a statistical technique that utilizes the relation between two or more quantitative variables so that one variable can be predicted from the other(s) (Neter et al., 1996 : 3). This methodology seeks to relate a *response*, or *output variable*, to the levels of a number of *predictors*, or input variables that affect it (Box & Draper, 1987 : 1).

This thesis will use multiple linear regression techniques to construct a response surface of a “combat index” derived from THUNDER output. There are a number of ways to determine the “goodness of fit” of a model. The primary methods used in this thesis are mean square error and coefficient of multiple determination.

2.3.1 Mean Square Error

The Mean Square Error (MS_E) is an estimate of the variance of the model. It is calculated by dividing the Sum of Squares of Error by the Degrees of Freedom (DF). The square root of MS_E is an estimate of the standard deviation of the error in the model. Therefore, the smaller the MS_E , the better.

2.3.2 Coefficient of Multiple Determination

The coefficient of multiple determination, R^2 , is defined as the measure of the amount of reduction in the variability of y obtained by using the regressor variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k in the model. It can be expressed as

$$R^2 = \frac{SS_R}{S_{yy}} = 1 - \frac{SS_E}{S_{yy}} \quad (2.1)$$

where SS_R is the sum of squares of residual, SS_E is the sum of squares of error, and S_{yy} is the total sum of squares. A large value of R^2 does not necessarily imply a good fit. Adding a variable to a model will *always* increase R^2 , regardless of whether the variable added is statistically significant or not. Thus it is possible for models to have a large R^2 , yet yield poor predictions of the estimated response. If we take into account the degrees of freedom, then the *adjusted* R^2 would be:

$$R^2_{adj} = 1 - \left[\frac{SS_E / (n-p)}{S_{yy} / (n-1)} \right] = 1 - \frac{(n-1)}{(n-p)} (1 - R^2) \quad (2.2)$$

where the R^2_{adj} statistic will not always increase as variables are added to the model. In fact, if unnecessary terms are added, the value of R^2_{adj} will often decrease (Banks et al., 1995 : 31).

2.3.3. Linear Regression Model

A multiple linear regression model with k independent variables (also referred to as regressor variables), would yield the following equation

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \dots + \beta_k x_k + \varepsilon \quad (2.3)$$

where: y = response, or dependent variable
 β_j = regression coefficients, $j = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$
 x_j = regressor, or independent variable
 ε = some random variable

This model describes a hyper plane in k -dimensional space of the regressor variables. The parameter β_i , represents the expected change in response y per unit change in x_i when all the remaining independent variables x_i ($i \neq j$), are held constant. (Myers & Montgomery, 1995 : 17). The most popular technique used to estimate the regression coefficient is called the method of least squares. The method of least squares chooses the β 's so as to minimize the sum of squares of the error ε . The least squares normal equations can be written in matrix form as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \quad (2.4)$$

where \mathbf{y} is an $(n \times 1)$ vector of the observations. \mathbf{X} is an $(n \times p)$ matrix of the levels of the independent variables, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $(p \times 1)$ vector of the regression coefficients, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is an $(n \times 1)$ vector of random error. From this it can be shown that the least square estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, denoted \mathbf{b} , is

$$\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y} \quad (2.5)$$

2.4 Response Surface Methodology

Response Surface Methodology (RSM) compares a group of statistical techniques for empirical model building and model exploitation (Box & Draper, 1987 :

1). These techniques are very useful for developing, improving, and optimizing

processes (Myers & Montgomery, 1995 : 1). The primary purpose for using RSM in this thesis is to map a response surface (e.g. overall combat capability index) over a particular region of interest (e.g. alternative force structures). From the regression results that follow, we can then determine which inputs variables were significant players on the battlefield.

A specially selected pattern of points chosen to investigate a response function relationship is called an *experimental design* (Box & Draper, 1987 : 17). Three designs were considered in this thesis: Fractional Factorial, Plackett-Burman and Mixture designs.

2.4.1 Factorial Designs

Factorial designs are widely used in experiments involving several factors where it is necessary to investigate the joint effects of the factors on a response variable. By joint factor effects, we typically mean main effects and their interaction. (Myers & Montgomery, 1995 : 79). Designs where the input variables can only take on a high or low value are called *2^k factorial designs*, since there are 2^k possible design levels (given k variables). This type design is very useful for identifying significant input variables early in the study, as well as fitting first-order response surfaces.

Since we have mentioned input variables that take either a high or low value, a discussion of *coded variables* is appropriate. If we are working with input variables that have different units of measure, analyzing results can be very difficult. However, by coding (or standardizing) the variables between -1 and +1, interpreting results of linear regression becomes more meaningful. Values for the estimator of the regression coefficient, **b** (see equation 2.5), show a relative magnitude of importance. For

example, using coded variables, if $b_1 = 10$ and $b_2 = 40$, the input variable x_2 has 4 times greater impact on the response y than x_1 . To code a variable

$$x_i = \frac{\xi_i - [\max(\xi_i) + \min(\xi_i)]/2}{[\max(\xi_i) - \min(\xi_i)]/2} \quad (2.6)$$

where ξ_i is the actual variable value.

Since input variables in a factorial design take on either a high or low value, the coded variables are simply -1 and +1 respectively. Adding center points to measure pure error gives a coded value of 0.

A factorial design involving $k = 3$ input variables would consist of $2^3 = 8$ possible combinations of input variable values:

Table 1. Factorial Design, 2^3

Run	X_1	X_2	X_3
1	1	1	1
2	1	1	-1
3	1	-1	1
4	1	-1	-1
5	-1	1	1
6	-1	1	-1
7	-1	-1	1
8	-1	-1	-1

However, as the number of factors in a 2^k factorial design increases, the number of runs required for a complete replicate of the design can rapidly outgrow the resources available (Myers & Montgomery, 1995: 134). Consider a design involving 10 input variables. A full factorial design would have 1024 design points, the majority of which are required to determine three-factor and higher interaction effects. If the

experimenter can reasonably assume that certain high-order interactions are negligible, then information on the main effects and low-order interactions may be obtained by running only a fraction of the complete factorial design (Myers & Montgomery, 1995, 134). Two such designs, used as screening experiments, are the Fractional Factorial and Plackett-Burman designs.

2.4.1.1 Fractional Factorial Designs

One of the basic reasons for using a fractional factorial design is to take advantage of the Sparsity-of-Effect principle. When there are several variables, the system is *likely* to be driven primarily by some of the main effects and low-order interactions (Myers & Montgomery, 1995: 134). The general form of the fractional factorial design is

$$2^{k-p} \quad (2.7)$$

where k is the number of input variables and p is the number of independent design generators. A full theoretical development of the construction, and alias relationships of a fractional factorial design is beyond the scope of this review (see Myers and Montgomery, 1995). However, one very important concept to understand when selecting a fractional factorial design is *resolution*.

When it becomes impossible to distinguish the individual contributions of two effects to a response, we say the effects are confounded, or *aliased*. How the effects are aliased determines the resolution of a given design.

Resolution III Designs: No main effects are aliased (or confused) with any other main effect, but main effects are aliased with two-factor interactions and two-factor interactions may be aliased with each other.

Resolution IV Designs: No main effects are aliased with any other main effects or with any two-factor interactions, however, two-factor interactions are aliased with each other.

Resolution V Designs: No main effects are aliased with any other main effect or with any two- or three-factor interactions: Two-factor interactions are aliased with three-factor or higher interactions.

Resolution III designs are the minimum resolution needed to fit first-order models, and are denoted 2_{III}^{k-P} . A Resolution IV design is better for fitting first-order models since it allows us to check for two-factor interactions. Resolution V designs are useful for fitting second-order models, provided three-factor interactions or higher are not significant.

2.4.1.2 Plackett-Burman Designs

The Plackett-Burman design is a special case of a fractional factorial design. It is a Resolution III design used to determine the effects of $k = N - 1$ main effects in N runs, where N is a multiple of 4 and *not* a power of 2 (e.g. $N = 12, 20, 28, 36, \dots$). (Myers and Montgomery, 1995;169)

2.4.2. Mixture Designs

In the designs discussed thus far, the levels chosen for input variables in the experimental design have been independent of each other. In contrast, a mixture design is a special type of response surface experiment in which the input variables are a component of a mixture, and the response is a function of the proportions of each variable (Dillion and Goldstein, 1984: 535) In equation form

$$\sum_{i=1}^p x_i = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + \dots + x_p = 1 \quad (2.8)$$

In our case, the mixture is dependent on the amount of dollars available to procure additional aircraft and weapons. Hence, the summation of aircraft and weapon variables added to each lower bound, in terms of unit cost, must not exceed the total procurement budget. Therefore our design would be

$$\sum_{i=1}^{23} c_i x_i = c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 + c_3 x_3 + \dots + c_{23} x_{23} = TotalBudget \quad (2.9)$$

where c_i is the unit cost of the aircraft or weapon and x_i is the number purchased.

2.5 Multivariate Analysis

Multivariate analysis is defined as the application of methods that deal with reasonably large numbers of measurements (i.e. variables) made on each object in one or more samples *simultaneously* (Dillion and Goldstein, 1984: 1-2). It is a collection of techniques and statistical methods designed to elicit information from data characterized by observations on many different variables. The choice of technique is dictated by the objective of the study or endeavor. Reasonable objectives include (1) Data Reduction, (2) Sorting and Grouping, (3) Investigating Dependence, (4)

Prediction, and (5) Hypothesis Testing (Johnson, 1982: 4). Two multivariate techniques which are applicable for this research are: Principle Component Analysis (PCA) and Factor Analysis (FA).

2.5.1 Principle Component Analysis (PCA)

A principle component analysis is concerned with explaining the variance-covariance structure through a few *linear* combinations of the original variables. Its general objectives are (1) data reduction, and (2) interpretation. Although p components are required to reproduce the total system variability, often much of this variability can be accounted for by a small number, k , of the principle components. The k principle components can then replace the initial p variables, and the original data set, consisting of n measurements of p variables, is reduced to n measurements on k principle components (Johnson, 1982: 3).

The nature of the data set will determine how the principle components are computed. If the unit of measurement is the same for all variables in the data set, then using a covariance matrix is appropriate. However, when the variables under consideration are measured in grossly different units, scale effects can influence the composition of the derived components. In such cases, the data are standardized and the correlation matrix is used (Dillion and Goldstein, 1984: 36).

The components are extracted from the sample covariance matrix, or sample correlation matrix, by determining the eigenvalues and eigenvectors from the matrix (Webb, 1994: 3.12). The components are ordered according to their eigenvalue (λ), from largest to smallest. To determine the percentage of variance explained by the component(s)

$$\text{Percent of variance} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i} \quad (2.10)$$

There are two popular techniques used to determine the number of components, k , to retain; Kaiser's Criterion, and Cattell's Scree test.

Kaiser's criterion is the most widely used rule, retaining only those components corresponding to eigenvalues of the correlation matrix that are greater than unity (Tatsuoka, 1971:147) The rationale for Kaiser's rule is that each component selected should have a variance larger than any single variable.

Cattell's Scree test is a graphical method, plotting the entire set of p eigenvalues against their ordinal number. Such a plot shows a steep initial descent, followed by a nearly straight line with gradual downward slope, known as a scree line (Tatsuoka, 1971: 147). Cattell's test calls for using those components that form the "cliff" and discarding those components that form the "rubble" at the foot of the cliff. One limitation of this method is that sometimes the "break" between cliff and rubble is not distinguishable.

2.5.2 Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis (FA) attempts to simplify complex and diverse relationships that exist among a set of observed variables by uncovering common dimensions or factors that link together the seemingly unrelated variables (Dillion and Goldstein, 1984: 53). This multivariate method has as its aim the explanation of relationships among several difficult-to-interpret, correlated variables in terms of a few conceptually meaningful,

independent factors (Kleinbaum and Kupper, 1978: 376). The big difference between FA and PCA is

- (1) FA uses *common variance* between variables versus,
- (2) PCA , which uses *total variance*.

One advantage of FA is the ability to rotate the factors to get a cleaner breakout of loadings. The most popular method of rotation is the varimax rotation, which attempts to maximize variation of squared factor loadings within a factor (Dillion and Goldstein, 1984: 91).

2.6 Metamodels

A metamodel is a statistical model of the response from a simulation model. In other words, it is a model of a model (Kleijnen, 1987; 147). The simulation community has used metamodels to study the behavior of computer simulation for over twenty-five years. The most popular techniques have been based on parametric polynomial response surface approximations (Barton, 1994; 235).

Thinking of the simulation logic and action as being a transformation of inputs into outputs, the notion arises that a simulation is just a function, albeit a complicated one. But it might be possible to approximate what the simulation does with a function, particularly when there are a large number of input variables and it takes a long time to run the simulation. A common practice is to fit a regression model to the simulation model, with the dependent variables being the simulation output and the independent variables being the input parameters for the simulation (Kelton, 1994; 67).

2.6.1 Developing a Metamodel

Donohue addresses a number of important issues unique to experimentation in a simulation environment. His statistical approach to the design and analysis of experiments include the following steps (Donohue, 1994; 200):

1. State the problem requiring experimentation and state the objective of the study (e.g.; prediction, optimization, sensitivity analysis).
2. Choose the *factors* (controllable input variables).
3. Select the *response* variable (output variables).
4. Determine the *operability region* (range of values for each factor within which the system can operate).
5. Specify the *region of interest* (a subregion of the operability region with which you want to perform the current experiment).
6. Choose a statistical model (e.g.; ANOVA, regression, spatial correlation).
7. Select a criteria for choosing an experimental design (e.g.; minimize generalized variance, minimize mean squared error).
8. Choose an appropriate experimental design class (e.g.; factorial, Latin square, central composite).
9. Select the levels of the factors for each *design point* (experimental run).
10. Perform the experiments and collect data.
11. Analyze and summarize the data; check for adequacy of the statistical model.
12. Draw inferences and conclusions.

Furthermore, there are a number of tactical and strategic experimental design issues to consider:

Tactical Issues

- whether to perform a terminating or steady-state simulation,
- estimating the distributions of stochastic model components,
- selecting the initial conditions or the duration of the warm-up period,
- choosing the final conditions such as run time or number of events completed, and
- deciding on an appropriate balance between run length and the number of replications (or batches).

Strategic Issues

- choosing a method for the assignment of random number streams to design points, and
- deciding whether to use an appropriate variance reduction technique.

2.6.2 Experimental Design Selection

Two level experimental designs are of importance for a number of reasons: (1) they can indicate major trends and so determine a promising direction for further experimentation; (2) they form the basis for two-level fractional factorial designs; (3) these designs and the corresponding fractional designs may be used as a building block for more complex problems; and (4) the interpretation of the result is easy (Lin et al., 1994; 845). In large scale computer simulation models it is often necessary to perform a screening experiment to reduce the number of factors to be examined in subsequent analysis. A very popular 2 level screening design is the Plackett-Burman

design. It is a Resolution III design that can identify the significant main effects in a minimum number of runs (Van Groenendaal et al., 1994; 1435). Webb and Bauer successfully used a Plackett-Burman design to reduce the number of input variables in THUNDER (Webb and Bauer, 1994; 311).

Numerous textbooks outline the advantages of using fractional factorial designs to minimize the number of simulation runs while capturing main and second-order interaction effects. Several include Naylor (1969), Law and Kelton (1991), Box and Draper (1987), and Myers & Montgomery (1995).

2.6.3 Variance Reduction Techniques

One objective of variance reductions is to reduce the amount of noise, ϵ (see equation 2.4), in the simulation output.

Such variance-reduction techniques often proceed by exploiting your ability to control the random-number generator driving the simulation, and re-use random numbers to induce helpful correlations that reduce the noise in the output. Whatever differences in performance you observe are due to system differences (alternate force structures in this case) rather than to "environmental" differences. This strategy, known as common random numbers, is often used by starting the runs for all alternatives with the same random-number streams and seeds (Kelton, 1994; 66)

Recent research has focused on the estimation of the vector parameter, β , in simulation linear metamodels of 2^k design. By minimizing the variation of β , the approximating function, \mathbf{Y} (see equation 2.4), becomes less sensitive to the random noise ϵ (Barton, 1994; 238). See Song and Su (1996, 511-519) for a more detailed discussion. For other sophisticated variance-reduction

techniques, refer to Fishman (1978), Law and Kelton (1991), and Nelson
(1992).

3. METHODOLOGY

Chapter III begins by outlining the desired objectives, followed by a chronological progression of the methods used, and the decision logic associated with each step.

3.1 Objectives

To successfully build a "quick turn" tool which meets the requirements specified by USAF/XOM, we must accomplish the following:

1. develop Measures of Outcome (MOO), based on THUNDER metrics, that accurately represent or measure each of the theater level Campaign Objective (CO);
2. using multivariate techniques, reduce the THUNDER output data set to a set of "factors" that closely represent the Campaign Objectives;
3. identify those input variables that are statistically significant in terms of their contribution to the outcome on the battlefield, by using Response Surface Methodology (RSM);
4. using multiple linear regression techniques, develop a *response surface* that quickly estimates an alternative force structure's combat capability, constrained by budgetary requirements.

To accomplish these four objectives, the following progression will be used.

3.1.1. Develop Measures of Outcome (MOO)

- Identify major goals of theater commanders (i.e. Campaign Objectives) to be measured.

- Identify the Operational Objectives (OO) and Operational Tasks (OT) required to obtain the Campaign Objectives.
- Identify the metrics that are measured in THUNDER which closely represent the OOs and OTs that USAF/XPY has outlined.

3.1.2. Multivariate Analysis

- Perform factor analysis to reduce the number of output variables to a set of factors that closely represent the Campaign Objectives.
- Take a linear combination of the factor scores to obtain an overall combat index for each alternative force structure.

3.1.3 Identify Significant Input Variables

- Using a Plackett-Burman screening design, reduce the number of input variables based on their statistical significance.
- Use a level IV Fractional Factorial design to identify significant main and second order interaction effects.

3.1.4 Develop a Response Surface

- Perform multiple regression to obtain a mathematical equation, or response surface, that represents our combat index in n-factor space.

Figure 1 is a flow diagram of the methodology described above to obtain the metamodel. Once the variables were identified and a model selected and run, the

output data was collected in matrix form, where Factor Analysis was performed. From these factors, indices are derived and used as the dependent response in stepwise linear regression. The resulting response surface then becomes the objective function in a linear program, where the constraints link dollars to combat capability in terms of the Campaign level measures identified by USAF/XPY. The significant variables from the Plackett-Burman design can be identified and the process repeated for the fractional factorial design.




Figure 1. Methodology of Thesis Effort

3.2 Input / Output Variables

Recall from Chapter I, the scenario used to develop this metamodel was based on a Major Regional Conflict (MRC) in Southwest Asia (SWA). The UNCLASSIFIED database was representative of a "real world" database with respect to the number and type of aircraft and munitions modeled. However, the target array was very limited in scope. Consequently, the 34 output metrics (i.e. number of tanks destroyed, number of

Red Air-to-Air losses, etc.) directly impacted which campaign objectives could be measured. For a detailed description of both the input variables and output metrics, see Appendix A.

3.2.1 Input Variables

In most practical experiments, the decision maker can select the appropriate levels of independent variables, based on historical data and experience. The historical approach was used in this thesis to establish the lower bound of each aircraft variable. The number of squadrons was representative of the actual number that deployed and fought in the Persian Gulf War. With few exceptions a typical squadron was assigned 24 primary aircraft (PAA) (e.g. F-16s at Incirlik, EF-111s, F117s, JSTARS, and AWACS). For a complete breakout of PAA, refer to the *squadron.dat* file in Appendix B. To establish the upper bound, the following assumption was made: the greatest single increase of PAA approved by Congress in a given year would be a 50 percent increase.

To establish the lower bound on munitions available in theater, the following steps were taken. All aircraft input variables were set at the lower bound and the THUNDER default values set for the number of weapons in a squadron aircraft service kit (see *acserv.dat*, Appendix B). The simulation was run 30 times and the average number of munitions expended was obtained (see *munexp.dat*, Appendix B). The lower bound for each munition variable was then set at 80 percent of this average number expended. The same logic was used (i.e. 50 percent Congressional increase) to establish the upper bound. Center point values, used to measure pure error, were calculated for each variable as well. Table 2 lists the lower, center, and upper values for all 23 variables.

Table 2. Input Variable Levels

Aircraft	Lower	Center	Upper	Munitions	Lower	Center	Upper
F-15C	120	150	180	AIM-120	4,250	5,312	6,375
F-15E	48	60	72	AIM-9	6,600	7,500	8,400
F-16	228	282	336	20 MM	3,250	4,062	4,875
A-10	144	180	216	MK-82	87,275	109,094	130,912
F-111	96	120	144	AGM-65	8,707	10,883	13,060
EF-111	18	21	24	ARM-88	567	708	850
F-4G	72	90	108	B-DELAY	375	468	562
F117	12	15	18	B-LETHAL	1,644	2,060	2,476
Tomahawk	120	150	180	CBU-87	1,300	1,631	1,962
JSTAR	6	9	12	CBU-97	23,895	28,373	32,852
AWACS	12	15	18	LGB	2,930	3,632	4,335
				GPS LGB	60	75	90

THUNDER allows for the modeling of pre-positioned munitions and intra-theater re-supply. This feature was disabled (see *ab.dat* and *critres.dat*, Appendix B). All munitions were in place at the commencement of hostilities.

Given the number of input variables, modifying the *squadron.dat* and *acserv.dat* files for each design point would have been extremely tedious and time consuming. Therefore, UNIX shell scripts were written, for both center point and upper bound values of each input variable, and used to overwrite lower bound values. For several examples see Appendix C.

3.2.2 OUTPUT VARIABLES

The Air and Space Power Validation Group (ASPVG), HQ USAF, performed a detailed evaluation of THUNDER (Ver 6.3), in 1995 (ASPVG, 1995). The evaluation identifies the Operational Objectives (OO), and Operational Tasks (OT) that THUNDER is capable of measuring with regards to Campaign Objectives (CO) (given a classified

database). Below are the nine Campaign Objectives USAF/XPY wanted evaluated with regards to each alternative force structure.

- CO # 1: Halt Invading Armies
- CO # 2: Marshall and Sustain In-Theater Assets
- CO # 3: Evict halted Armies from Friendly Territory
- CO # 4: Gain and Maintain Air Superiority
- CO # 5: Gain and Maintain Sea Control
- CO # 6: Gain and Maintain Space Control
- CO # 7: Gain and Maintain Information Dominance
- CO # 8: Deny Possession and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)
- CO # 9: Suppress National Capacity to Wage War

Appendix D provides a detailed breakdown of all nine COs, to include the Operational Objectives (OO), and Operational Tasks (OT), associated with each CO, and their metrics. Most of the metrics needed to evaluate the COs are available in CLASSIFIED Databases. However, the UNCLASSIFIED Database used in this thesis had limitations on the number of metrics available. Table 3 reflects the capability to measure COs using THUNDER:

Table 3. Ability to Measure Campaign Objectives

Database	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
CLASSIFIED	1 3 4 5, 8, 9	2 7 6	
UNCLASSIFIED	1 3 4	7 8 9	2, 5, 6

Even so, enough output was available to demonstrate the methodology, using an UNCLASSIFIED Database. This thesis will attempt to measure COs 1,3,4,7,8,and 9.

3.3 Experimental Design Selection

In selecting the experimental designs, two objectives were kept in mind: (1) reducing the number of input variables based on their statistical significance; and (2) analyzing main and second order interaction effects.




Figure 2. Selecting Experimental Design

To reduce the number of variables, a Resolution III Plackett-Burman design was selected (see Appendix E). Two center point runs were added to allow for better measurement of pure error within the model. Thirty replications were performed at each design point, and the aggregate (i.e. average) number of each output variable "killed or destroyed" was calculated. An additional 30 replications were performed with a different random seed value, and the output aggregated for a second independent observation.

In this thesis effort, a senior decision maker wanted to know if a synergistic effect existed among a set of input variables. A 2_{IV}^{4-1} fractional factorial design was used to measure these main effects and second order interactions (see Appendix E). Again, center point observations were added. Third order and higher interaction effects were considered negligible. For example, the four-factor interaction of an F15C (air superiority fighter), JSTARS (a ground surveillance aircraft), LGB (laser guided bomb) and MK82 (unguided bomb) is not likely to be a major contributor to the outcome of the war, since neither the F15C or JSTARS aircraft drop bombs, and the aircraft do not interact directly in combat. However, consider the two-factor interaction of the A10 ground attack aircraft and the AGM-65 Maverick missile, designed specifically for killing armored vehicles. Since the AGM-65 missile is the A10 pilots' weapons of choice when it comes to killing armored vehicles, determining if a synergistic effect exists is important, especially if you are the theater commander responsible for bringing the right "mix" of weapons to the war.

3.4 Multivariate Techniques




Figure 3. Factor Analysis

The THUNDER output was converted to matrix form for each "aggregate observation" (see Output, Appendix F). A factor analysis was performed (with varimax rotation) on the first set of observations. Multiple iterations were performed to determine which number of factors best represented the underlying relationships among the output variables. The set of factors that most closely represented the COs was selected and named (see Appendix G).

3.5 Derivation of Combat Indices

Recall from above, indices are derived and used as the dependent response in stepwise linear regression. The resulting response surface then becomes the objective function in a linear program, where the constraints link dollars to combat capability of alternative force structures in terms of campaign objectives identified by USAF/XPY.

Matrix multiplication was performed using the second aggregate observation and the factor matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{THUNDER} \\ \text{OUTPUT:} \\ \text{2nd Aggregate} \\ \text{Observation} \\ (26 \times 34) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Factor} \\ \text{Matrix} \\ (34 \times 7) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Indices} \\ \text{Matrix} \\ (26 \times 7) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

deriving a set of indices for each Campaign Objective of the following form:

	HALT	OCA	EVICT	AIR SUP	CS	AIR SUP	INTER
Run 1	$Y_{1,1}$	$Y_{2,1}$	$Y_{3,1}$.	.	.	$Y_{7,1}$
Run 2	$Y_{1,2}$	$Y_{2,2}$	$Y_{3,2}$.	.	.	$Y_{7,2}$
Run 3	$Y_{1,3}$	$Y_{2,3}$	$Y_{3,3}$.	.	.	$Y_{7,3}$
.
.
Run 26	$Y_{1,26}$	$Y_{2,26}$	$Y_{3,26}$.	.	.	$Y_{7,26}$

Figure 4. Indices in Matrix Form

For example, $Y_{1,1}$ is an index score that represents Run 1's ability to Halt Invading Armies (CO #1). To represent the overall combat capability of a given force structure, an equally weighted linear combination of the indices was calculated for each design point:

$$\text{Total Combat Index } \hat{Y}_i = Y_{1,i} + Y_{2,i} + Y_{3,i} + Y_{4,i} + Y_{5,i} + Y_{6,i} + Y_{7,i} \quad (3.2)$$

3.6 Constructing Response Surfaces




Figure 5. Constructing Response Surface

Stepwise linear regression was performed using each of the indices as the dependent variable (Y) to create response surfaces for each campaign objective. The regression results for the total combat index were analyzed to determine which input variables were the most significant (i.e. greatest contributors) on the battlefield. Each response surface can be used as an objective function, bound by fiscal constraints.

The entire process was repeated using a 2^{4-1}_{IV} fractional factorial design to identify the main effects and some second-order. The resultant expression from multiple linear regression

$$\hat{Y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \dots + \beta_{23} x_{23} \quad (3.3)$$

can be used as an objective function in a linear programming problem.

This feasible region (in 23-dimensional space), expressed in the form of equation (3.3), can then be constrained by the total procurement dollars available in a given year

$$C_1X_1 + C_2X_2 + C_3X_3 + \dots + C_{23}X_{23} \leq \text{Total Procurement \$ for FY} \quad (3.4)$$

where c_i is the unit fly-away cost in current year dollars, and x_i is the number of units purchased in that FY. The coefficient of cost for each type aircraft and weapons system in the USAF inventory is published annually in AFI 65-503, Table 10-1, and 11-1 (see Appendix J). Additional constraints, such as operational and maintenance costs for each weapons system, and the maximum number of aircraft that can be produced in a one year period of time, can also be modeled.

4. RESULTS

This chapter takes a detailed look at the results of Factor Analysis (FA) and Stepwise Linear Regression for both the Plackett-Burman (PB) and 2^{4-1} Fractional Factorial designs. While the results from the PB design provide excellent insight, the statistical results from the 2^{4-1} design were less useful.

4.1 Plackett-Burman Design

The THUNDER output metrics for the Plackett-Burman design are located in Appendix E. These results reflect the aggregate values for each output variable over 30 replications of a fifteen day war.




Figure 6. THUNDER Output

For example, the average number of tanks destroyed while Blue forces are on the defensive for Observation 1, Run 1 was 9774 (see Appendix F).

4.1.1 Factor Analysis Results

Once the output data was obtained, Factor Analysis (FA) was performed to identify underlying relationships in an effort to reduce the number of output variables to




Figure 7. Factor Analysis

a set of “factors” that closely represent the Campaign Objectives identified by USAF/XPY. The output data for Observation 1 was arranged in matrix format and FA performed using the correlation matrix with varimax rotation (see Appendix G). Calculating seven factors resulted in six distinct, definable factor loadings (two of the loadings measured Air Superiority). These six factors could be easily defined in terms of the Campaign Objectives (CO) outlined by USAF/XPY and ASPVG:

- CO 1: Halt Invading Armies (Halt)
- CO 3: Evict Invading Armies (Evict)
- CO 4: Gain and Maintain Air Superiority (Air Sup)
- CO 7: Gain and Maintain Information Dominance (C3)
- CO 8: Deny Possession and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (OCA)
- CO 9: Suppress National Capacity to Wage War (Interdiction)

4.1.1.1 Halt Invading Armies Factor

Recall from previous discussion in Chapter 3 that metrics were identified to measure each CO by means of Operational Objectives (OO) and Operational Tasks (OT) (see Appendix D). The associated metrics that were measurable in this UNCLASSIFIED database for Halting Invading Armies (CO 1) included

- Number of Tanks killed
- Number of APCs killed
- Time to stop Red advancement
- Distance FLOT moved
- Number of Rail Bridges destroyed
- Number of Transshipment Points destroyed
- Number of Logistics sites destroyed
- Number of Bridges destroyed
- Number of Artillery killed (Self-propelled (SP), Towed, and Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS))

When FA was performed on the output data, the third factor "Halt" (see Appendix G) loaded significantly on the THUNDER output metrics listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Significant Factor Loadings (Halt)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loading
Tanks(d)	.96
APC(d)	.96
Inf(d)	.95
Arty(d)	.42
ADTels	.64

This set of loadings is clearly representative of the metrics needed to measure CO 1, hence, the factor (i.e. new variable) was named *Halt*.

4.1.1.2 Evict Invading Armies Factor

Similarly, the metrics identified to measure Evict Invading Armies (CO 3) include

- Tanks killed in defensive positions
- APCs killed in defensive positions
- Number of Infantry killed in defensive positions
- Number of Rail Bridges destroyed
- Number of Transshipment points destroyed while offensive
- Number of Logistics sites destroyed
- Number of Bridges destroyed
- Number of Artillery killed (SP, Towed, and MLRS)

The first “factor” (see Appendix G) loaded significantly on the THUNDER output metrics listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Significant Factor Loadings (Evict)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loadings
Tanks(o)	.86
APCs(o)	.90
Inf(o)	.72
Arty(o)	.96
Halt(days)	.94
ADTels	.69
ADRadar	.53

The first four loadings in Table 5 are clearly representative of the metrics needed to measure CO 3. Furthermore, it can be argued that suppressing enemy air defenses directly impacts our ability to evict invading forces with airpower. Pilots engaged in CAS missions can better concentrate on destroying ground forces in a “low threat” environment. Therefore, this new variable was named *Evict*.

4.1.1.3 Gain and Maintain Air Superiority Factor (AirSup)

The metrics identified to measure CO 4 (Gain and Maintain Air Superiority) include

- RED aircraft lost due to BLUE air
- Total number of BLUE aircraft destroyed on the ground
- Number of RED aircraft destroyed in the open
- Number of TELS killed
- Number of ACQ radars killed
- Number of Fire Control radars killed
- Total number of BLUE aircraft lost to enemy surface-to-air threats

The fourth and sixth factors (see Appendix G) loaded on air superiority metrics; therefore, a linear combination was formed to represent the factor. Table 6 reflects the significant loadings for the combined factor.

Table 6. Significant Factor Loadings (AirSup)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loadings
RedAALosses	.86
RedSALosses	.78
RedAGLosses	.68
ACinOpen	.66
BlueAALosses	.90
BlueSALosses	.80
BlueAGLosses	.50
ADRadars	.60

Again, clearly these represent the metrics identified above for measuring CO 4; hence, the new variable was named AirSup.

4.1.1.4 Gain and Maintain Information Dominance Factor (C3)

The metrics identified in Appendix D to measure the OOs and OTs for CO 7 include

- Percent of Command Bunkers destroyed
- Number of C3 Antennas killed
- Number of C3 Vans killed
- Number of Mainstay aircraft killed

The significant loadings from the fifth factor (see Appendix G) are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Significant Factor Loadings (C3)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loadings
CmdBunkers	.46
C3Ant	.83
C3Van	.87
TmpRdBrid	.56
TSPT	.60

These outputs are representative of the metrics identified above for measuring CO 7; hence, the new factor was named C3.

4.1.1.5 Deny Possession and Use of WMD Factor (OCA)

The metrics available in the UNCLASSIFIED database to measure CO 8 include (see Appendix G)

- Percent of WMD storage facilities destroyed
- RED aircraft lost due to BLUE air
- Number of RED aircraft shot down
- Number of BLUE aircraft destroyed on the ground
- Percent of RED airfields operable
- Number of RED aircraft killed in open
- Percent of RED support facilities destroyed by BLUE air
- Percent of RED FARPs destroyed by BLUE air

The significant loadings associated with the second factor (see Appendix G) are listed in Table 8.

Table 8. Significant Factor Loadings (OCA)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loadings
Runways	.84
AB Ammo(H)	.91
AB Maint(S)	.91
AB Spares(S)	.87
Red SA Losses	.41
Red AG Losses	.31
NBC Facil	.34

Once again, these clearly represent the metrics identified above for measuring CO 8; therefore, the new variable was named OCA.

4.1.1.6 Suppress National Capacity to Wage War Factor (Interdict)

The last CO identified as being measurable with the THUNDER output obtained from the PB design is Suppress National Capacity to Wage War (CO 9). The metrics needed to measure this CO include (see Appendix D)

- Number of Transshipment points killed
- Number of C2 nodes killed
- Number of Bridges destroyed
- Number of Defense related plants destroyed

The significant loadings found in the seventh factor (see Appendix G) are listed in Table 9.

Table 9. Significant Factor Loadings (Interdiction)

THUNDER Output Metric	Loadings
TSPT	.56
CmdBunker	.68
Mainstay	.68
StoneBldg	.62
NBCFacil	.80

The Mainstay aircraft and command bunker do represent C2 capability while the stone building and NBC facility represent defense related plants. Therefore, these metrics represent the ability to suppress national capacity to wage war, and was named Interdiction for brevity purposes.

4.1.1.7 Summary

The results of Factor Analysis using THUNDER output from the Plackett-Burman experimental design were excellent. The underlying relationships were easily identified, successfully reducing the number of output variables from 34 to six. More importantly, these six newly derived output "factors" *clearly* represent six of the Campaign Objectives identified by HQ USAF/XPY:

- Halt Invading Armies
- Evict Invading Armies
- Gain and Maintain Air Superiority
- Gain and Maintain Information Dominance
- Deny Possession and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction
- Suppress National Capacity to Wage War

4.1.2 Constructing Combat Indices

Once the results of FA were obtained, the next step was to create combat indices for each of the new output factors (see Figure 8). These indices served as the




Figure 8. Derive Combat Indices

dependent variable in stepwise linear regression. Equation 3.1 was used to obtain these indices

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{THUNDER} \\ \text{OUTPUT:} \\ \text{2nd Aggregate} \\ \text{Observation} \\ (26 \times 34) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Factor} \\ \text{Matrix} \\ (34 \times 7) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Indices} \\ \text{Matrix} \\ (26 \times 7) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

Matrix multiplication of the data obtained from the second aggregate observation (i.e. independent observation) and the newly derived set of factors resulted in the index scores listed in Table 10 (the two air superiority indices were combined to simplify the table, e.g. 26 x 6 matrix). The Total Combat Index (TCI) is simply an equally weighted linear combination of the six individual indices (see equation 3.2).

Table 10. Combat Indices

	Half	Evict	Air Sup	C3	OCA	Interdict	Response
Run 1	27326.6	26237.6	10454.5	5875.3	1344.5	2282.6	73521.2
Run 2	22092.6	21506.5	8741.2	4867.6	1180.4	1723.4	60111.6
Run 3	24369.7	26852.8	10208.4	5447.5	1440.9	2250.1	70569.5
Run 4	28419.9	20755.1	8924.9	5199.9	826.4	1833.8	65960.0
Run 5	25555.6	24918.6	9623.2	5260.6	1172.8	2144.7	68675.5
Run 6	23549.1	26547.7	9936.6	5258.0	1328.5	2254.3	68874.2
Run 7	21863.5	20693.9	8118.6	4500.8	1001.2	1787.8	57965.9
Run 8	21912.7	21295.5	8381.8	4661.9	1052.9	1809.0	59113.9
Run 9	21970.4	22013.3	8550.2	4691.9	1137.9	1766.1	60129.8
Run 10	24026.4	18797.5	8401.8	4823.4	876.2	1560.7	58486.1
Run 11	23893.6	19023.7	8180.4	4630.4	876.0	1516.7	58120.8
Run 12	28276.2	20180.6	8800.2	5191.4	806.6	1835.2	65090.3
Run 13	23762.7	19803.9	8575.1	4880.8	940.0	1617.6	59580.2
Run 14	26224.2	25253.8	9897.0	5448.8	1167.7	2230.2	70221.5
Run 15	24037.2	19354.9	8413.6	4754.9	926.0	1545.2	59031.9
Run 16	19878.4	22725.8	8546.1	4544.8	1286.9	1762.0	58744.1
Run 17	23886.3	26984.8	10254.9	5505.2	1368.3	2245.1	70244.7
Run 18	26911.8	22301.0	9243.2	5264.8	931.5	2000.1	66652.3
Run 19	23708.5	18865.7	8325.1	4747.2	957.0	1563.0	58166.4
Run 20	23280.9	17605.4	8025.8	4630.6	829.0	1535.7	55907.3
Run 21	28152.0	19755.2	8715.5	5136.4	746.9	1820.7	64326.6
Run 22	26071.4	25610.2	10091.9	5593.2	1267.6	2132.5	70766.7
Run 23	23154.1	21855.6	8722.6	4905.4	1099.8	1917.1	61654.6
Run 24	24977.1	28259.5	10737.6	5810.8	1552.4	2374.5	73711.8
Run 25	24063.1	18163.4	7434.9	4265.6	664.8	1717.8	56309.8
Run 26	23370.4	20384.1	7927.9	4387.7	832.4	1861.0	58763.5

4.1.3 Stepwise Linear Regression Results




Figure 9. Stepwise Linear Regression

Once the individual and TCIs are calculated, the next step in developing the quick turn tool is stepwise linear regression (see Figure 9). Stepwise linear regression was performed using each of the individual indices, including the TCI, as the dependent variables (see Table 10). The independent variables were the coded input variables of the Plackett-Burman design (see Appendix E).

Outstanding results were obtained for each of the indices used from Table 10.

Table 11 provides a summary of the results. The R_{adj}^2 (i.e. percent of variance explained) ranged from 50 percent for OCA and AirSup to 91 percent for the Total Combat index regression equation.

Table 11. Stepwise Linear Regression Results

Index	Adj R ²	Response Surface
Halt	.9527	$Y = 24412.82 + 263.93X_{F15E} + 234.54X_{F111} + 1672.46X_{A10} + 233.55X_{EF111} - 654.18X_{F117} - 181.84X_{AWACS} - 293.28X_{JSTARS} + 500.48X_{AIM120} + 298.55X_{AIM9} + 656.23X_{MK82} - 306.12X_{ARM88} - 430.68X_{DELAY} + 296.72X_{CBU97} + 364.66X_{LGB} + 232.79X_{GPS}$
Evict	.7336	$Y = 22144.03 + 576.01X_{F16} + 2088.13X_{A10} + 1042.72X_{F117} + 520.02X_{TOM} - 496.47X_{AIM120} - 646.88X_{MK82} + 554.38X_{AGM65} + 648.13X_{ARM88} + 748.66X_{DELAY} - 661.47X_{CBU97} - 458.18X_{LGB} - 508.84X_{GPS}$
AirSup	.5077	$Y = 7215.75 + 138.51X_{F15C} + 192.17X_{F16} + 527.75X_{A10} + 168.84X_{F117} - 140.37X_{MK82} + 196.70X_{DELAY}$
C3	.6617	$Y = 5010.90 + 120.98X_{F16} + 63.75X_{F15E} + 347.99X_{A10}$
OCA	.5070	$Y = 1062.06 + 45.98X_{F16} + 74.62X_{A10} + 97.91X_{F117} + 43.13X_{TOM} - 50.37X_{AIM120} - 69.11X_{MK82} + 41.03X_{AGM65} + 53.08X_{ARM88} + 67.82X_{DELAY} - 57.19X_{CBU97} - 43.79X_{LGB} - 46.87X_{GPS}$
Interdict	.8972	$Y = 1887.92 + 29.19X_{F15C} + 56.20X_{F16} - 29.62X_{F111} + 220.81X_{A10} + 96.42X_{F117} + 23.80X_{JSTARS} + 31.43X_{TOM} - 22.00X_{MK82} + 21.75X_{AGM65} + 42.72X_{ARM88} + 36.90X_{DELAY} - 43.95X_{CBU97} - 32.45X_{LGB} - 28.59X_{GPS}$
TOTAL	.9090	$Y = 62020.34 + 566.15X_{F15C} + 989.35X_{F16} + 706.15X_{F15E} + 4931.75X_{A10} + 774.70X_{F117} + 649.00X_{TOM} + 771.50X_{AGM65} + 584.18X_{ARM88} + 659.49X_{DELAY} - 583.31X_{CBU97} - 497.09X_{GPS}$

For a more complete statistical analysis of the results of stepwise regression , including the step history and an input variable's contribution to R_{adj}^2 , see Appendix H. Least squares regression was then performed with just those variables identified during stepwise regression. Figure 10 shows the Response v. Predicted Response plot for the TCI.




Figure 10. Response vs. Predicted Response (Total Combat Index)

The two outer lines in Figure 10 represent a 95 percent confidence interval, while the center line is the linear approximation of the predicted response value. All of the predicted response values fell within the 95 percent confidence interval, representing an outstanding fit. The Residual vs. Predicted Response plot is shown in Figure 11, which indicates no residual patterns, thus another indicator of a good fit. Plots of Response vs. Predicted Response as well as Residual vs. Predicted Response for

each of the individual indices can be found in Appendix I. In all cases the residual plots indicated normal distribution of error.




Figure 11. Residual vs. Predicted Response

4.2 2_{IV}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial (FF) Design

The first step in constructing the fractional factorial design was to determine the input variables to focus on. We could have used the significant variables identified in the PB results. However, a senior decision maker was interested in finding out if there existed a synergistic effect among the following input variables: *A10*, *F15E*, *MK 82* and *AGM65*.

4.2.1 Fractional Factorial Design (FF)




Figure 12. FF Design Selection

A 2_{IV}^{4-1} design was selected to model the main and some second-order interaction terms (see Appendix E). With two center point runs added to measure pure error, a total of 10 design points were constructed. The same range of values were used for the four variables. Two independent observations of thirty replications each were collected, just as with the PB design (see Appendix F).

4.2.2 Factor Analysis Results

The same methodology outlined in 4.1.1 was used to obtain factor scores for the fractional factorial design. The output data for Observation 1 was arranged in matrix format and FA performed using the correlation matrix with varimax rotation (see Appendix G).




Figure 13. Factor Analysis (FF Design)

This time calculating seven factors resulted in 5 distinct indices (see Appendix G):

- CO 1: Halt Invading Armies (Halt)
- CO 3: Evict Invading Armies (Evict)
- CO 4: Gain and Maintain Air Superiority (Air Sup)
- CO 7: Gain and Maintain Information Dominance (C3)
- CO 8: Deny Possession and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (Interdiction)

Three of the 7 factors loadings related to Air Superiority. Again, a linear combination of the indices formed the Total Combat Index.

4.2.2.1 Halt Invading Armies Factor

Table 12. Significant Factor Loadings (Halt)

THUNDER Output Metrics	Loadings
Tanks(d)	.97
APCs(d)	.98
Inf(d)	.95
Arty(d)	.97
Halt(dist)	.84
Push	.69
ADTel	.92
ADRadar	.91

When FA was performed on the FF output data, the first "factor" (see Appendix G) loaded significantly on the THUNDER output metrics listed in Table 12 above. Using the same criteria as with the PB design, this factor clearly represents CO1, Halting Invading Armies.

4.2.2.2 Evict Invading Armies Factor

Table 13. Significant Factor Loadings (Evict)

THUNDER Output Metrics	Loadings
Tanks(o)	.51
APC(o)	.83
Inf(o)	.70
Arty(o)	.69
Halt(days)	.89
Restore(days)	.83

The third factor (see Appendix G) loaded significantly on the output metrics listed in Table 13 above. These variables clearly define CO 3, Evict Invading Armies.

4.2.2.3 Gain and Maintain Air Superiority Factor

Table 14. Significant Factor Loadings (Air Sup)

THUNDER Output Metrics	Loadings
RedAALosses	.73
RedSALosses	.68
RedAGLosses	.85
BlueAALosses	.63
BlueSALosses	.77
BlueAGLosses	.90
Runways	.75
ACinOpen	.66
ABMaint(S)	.81
ABSpares(S)	.94
CmdBunker	.74
Mainstay	.83
Helo	.92

The second, fourth, and seventh factors (see Appendix G) loaded on air superiority metrics; therefore, a linear combination was formed to represent the factor. Table 14 reflects the significant loadings for the combined factor. These represent the metrics identified above for measuring CO 4; hence, the new variable was named AirSup.

4.2.2.4 Gain and Maintain Information Dominance (C3)

The fifth factor (see Appendix G) clearly loaded on metrics used to measure CO 7, Gain and Maintain Information Dominance; hence, the new variable was named C3.

Table 15. Significant Factor Loadings (C3)

THUNDER Output Metrics	Loadings
C3Ant	.85
C3Van	.91

4.2.2.5 Suppress National Capacity to Wage War Factor

The sixth factor was somewhat difficult to interpret. Only four output variables loaded significantly with this factor: Push, TmpRdBrid, ABAMmo(H), and StoneBldg. Two of these metrics are used to define CO 9: Ability to Suppress National Capacity to Wage War.

Table 16. Significant Factor Loadings (Interdiction)

THUNDER Output Metrics	Loadings
Push	.63
TmpRdBrid	.69
ABAMmo(H)	.82
StoneBldg	.85

4.2.3 Deriving Combat Indices




Figure 14. Derive Combat Indices

The same procedures as outlined in section 4.1.2 above were used to obtain the combat indices listed in Table 17.

Table 17. Combat Indices (FF)

	Halt	Evict	Air Sup	C3	Interdict	Total
Run 1	24807.6	13503.9	3228.6	786.2	6294.2	48620.3
Run 2	23627.7	12750.0	3285.6	743.0	5981.7	46388.0
Run 3	24358.4	12607.9	3340.4	699.7	5937.4	46943.9
Run 4	24302.9	12865.5	3391.4	730.5	6049.8	47340.2
Run 5	27851.4	14628.9	3573.8	859.9	6857.1	53771.0
Run 6	29938.8	13753.6	4236.9	931.2	6818.1	55678.6
Run 7	27605.4	14586.2	3611.7	824.2	6823.2	53450.7
Run 8	29687.1	13586.9	4252.3	868.2	6703.2	55097.7
Run 9	24668.1	10759.9	3681.9	795.4	5507.5	45412.8
Run 10	27371.3	13214.7	3834.9	831.4	6424.5	51676.8

4.2.4 Stepwise Linear Regression




Figure 15. Stepwise Linear Regression

In order to perform stepwise linear regression for the fractional factorial design, new variables were defined.

Main Effects

- $X_1 = A10$
- $X_2 = F15E$
- $X_3 = AGM65$
- $X_4 = MK82$

Second Order Interaction Effects

- $X_5 = A10*AGM65$
- $X_6 = A10*MK82$
- $X_7 = F15E*AGM65$
- $X_8 = F15E*MK82$
- $X_9 = A10*F15E$
- $X_{10} = AGM65*MK82$

Detailed results of the stepwise linear regression for the fractional factorial design can be found in Appendix H. A summary of the results and associated response surface is listed in Table 18 below. While the adjusted R^2 value for Evict was disappointing, the remaining values explained anywhere from 50 percent (Interdiction) to 94 percent (C3) of the variance within THUNDER.

Table 18. Stepwise Linear Regression Results

Index	Adj R^2	Response Surface
Halt	.8655	$Y = 26421.80 + 2248.13X_{A10} + 366.88X_{AGM65} + 675.63X_{A10*AGM65}$
Evict	.1697	$Y = 13225.90 + 603.50X_{A10}$
Air Sup	.7020	$Y = 9544.90 + 498.13X_{A10} + 356.13X_{AGM65}$
C3	.9488	$Y = -806.90 - 65.38X_{A10} + 24.63X_{F15E} - 12.88X_{AGM65} + 12.63X_{MK82} - 15.88X_{A10*AGM65}$
Interdiction	.5012	$Y = 6339.50 + 367.25X_{A10}$
TOTAL	.6674	$Y = 54725.20 + 3651.63X_{A10}$

Furthermore, the Response vs. Predicted Response plot (see Figure 16) and Residual vs. Predict Response (see Figure 17) also support the claim that the total combat response surface is a good linear approximation and the residuals are normally distributed. Plots for all of the response surfaces are located in Appendix I.




Figure 16. Response vs. Predicted Response (Total)




Figure 17. Residual vs. Predicted Response (Total)

4.3 Analysis of Results

The following four variables were significant in the PB design at the 95 percent confidence interval: A10, F16, F117, and AGM65. By examining the magnitudes of the parameter estimates, as well as the Sums of Squares, the A10 was clearly *the dominant input variable* when all 23 variables were considered. Furthermore, the A10 was the only contributing input variable common among all PB metamodels. The fractional factorial design was able to identify some synergistic effects between the A10 and AGM65 maverick missile. Surprisingly, no other second-order effects were observed to be significant statistically.

Dominance of the A10 in both the PB and FF designs can be explained in part by the scenario developed by ASC/XR. Greater than 75 percent of the targets in the data base created by ASC/XR were located in the first 40 miles of enemy territory. They consisted mostly of CAS and BAI targets (i.e. Tanks, APCs, Mobile SAM, bridges, etc.). This, along with the nature of the terrain in SWA, greatly influenced the dominance of the A10 aircraft, well suited for the desert environment. The same holds for the AGM65 maverick missile.

The number of OCA and strategic targets loaded in the data base was limited, down playing the importance for precision guided weapons delivery. The lack of importance of air-to-air assets can be attributed to the abilities of the Iraqi Air Force. During the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi Air Force was literally non existent after the first 24 hours of hostilities. Therefore, the absence of significant air-to-air input variables in the indices is consistent with military judgment and combat experience.

Given the results obtained from both metamodels, the Plackett-Burman design was clearly the best choice for linking procurement dollars to combat capability as measured in terms of Campaign Objectives . Using the TCI, the PB design explained

90.9 percent of the variance, modeling all 23 input variables, while the fractional factorial design captured 66 percent of the variance and was limited in scope.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

As a result of this thesis effort, a methodology for constructing a "quick turn" tool capable of relating procurement dollars to combat capability was successfully developed. THUNDER input variables were selected along with their range of values.




Figure 18. Methodology Overview

Output metrics were identified to measure Campaign Objectives as outlined by HQ USAF/XPY and the ASPVG. Constructing a Plackett-Burman Resolution III experimental design enabled us to successfully reduce the number of input variables from 23 to 4, and identifying the significant variables. Furthermore, the synergistic effects of a set of input variables, selected by a senior decision maker, were identified using a 2_{IV}^{4-1} fractional factorial design.

A significant accomplishment was the ability to identify underlying relationships between output variables using Factor Analysis. These relationships were expressed

by factors that clearly represented the combat capability of each alternative force structure in terms of the Campaign Objectives outlined by HQ USAF/XPY.

Response Surface Methodology, using the total combat indices generated from Factor Analysis, provided a first order linear metamodel that accounted for 90.9 percent of the variation within the model THUNDER. Using these response surfaces in a computer spreadsheet, comparisons between alternative force structures in terms of campaign objective can be made in a matter of minutes. Figure 16 is a notional example of how this "quick turn" tool could generate graphical representations of current and future combat capability. Here the left most column represents the current, or baseline, force structure. Future years are expressed in terms of a percentage of our current capability.




Figure 19. Projected Combat Health through 2015 (Notional)

Additionally, these response surfaces can be used as an objective function in a integer programming problem. As stated before, we are interested in determining how to spend our procurement dollars in order to get the "biggest bang for our buck" on the battle field. We can use the response surface derived from the total combat index as our objective function. We then bound the feasible region by identifying a number of fiscal, production, and "political" constraints. These constraints might include

- Procurement dollars available,
- Operation & Maintenance dollars available,
- Production limitations for each weapons system,
- Treaty limits on number of aircraft types,
- Integer values for input variables.

However, In order to use the regression results (i.e. equations) listed in Table 11 and Table 18, a transformation must be performed. These regression equations were derived using coded input variables (i.e. -1 to 1) to gain insight into the significance of each variable based on the magnitude of their respective parameter estimate. The simplest approach is to transform the regression equations back into uncoded form by using values listed in Table 2 as the independent variables in stepwise linear regression.

The resulting integer programming problem would then have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Obj Funct: } Y = & 14799.04 + 18.87X_{F15C} + 18.32X_{F16} + 58.85X_{F15E} \\ & + 136.99X_{A10} + 258.23X_{F117} + 21.63X_{TOM} \\ & + 0.35X_{AGM65} + 4.13X_{ARM88} + 7.07X_{DELAY} \\ & - 0.13X_{CBU97} - 33.17X_{GPS} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Subject to: } \sum_i C_i X_i \leq \text{Total Procurement Budget}$$

$$\sum_i O_i X_i \leq \text{Operational Budget}$$

$$\sum_i M_i X_i \leq \text{Maintenance Budget}$$

$$\sum_i X_i \leq \text{Treaty Limits}$$

$$X_i \leq \text{Production Limitation}_i$$

$$X_i \in (\text{INTEGER}) \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where C_i is the unit cost, O_i is the operational costs, and M_i is the maintenance cost for each type aircraft or munition. These fiscal constraints are the key to linking dollars to combat capability as measured by Campaign Objectives.

However, solving this problem in integer form may take an enormous amount of time to find a solution (if one can be found). However, if we relax the integer constraint and solve the problem as a linear programming problem, a solution can be found quickly. By rounding each of the input variable solutions down to the next nearest integer value, we can very closely approximate the optimal integer solution.

5.2 Lessons Learned

The importance of using shell scripts (or some other front end application) to modify THUNDER data files can not be overstated. Given the number of input variables, and the nature of THUNDER data files, modifying the files for each design

point by hand would have been too time consuming for a team of analysts. The time spent writing scripts was an order of magnitude less than would have been required to modify each file by hand.

Prior to the start of this thesis, the author had very little simulation experience, and no previous experience running THUNDER. Air Force Studies and Analysis (USAF/SAA) officially owns the model. CACI is the civilian defense contractor who maintains and provides version updates of THUNDER on behalf of USAF/SAA. Attending the week long training seminar offered by CACI would be extremely beneficial for anyone interested in furthering this study. An important capability of THUNDER was not discovered until very late in the research. As stated in Chapter III, the output data was an aggregated result of 30 replications. This is the standard format provided by THUNDER when using the *ttrep* function. However, through a series of advanced commands, the data from each individual replication could have been extracted in the same format as the aggregated report. This would have been a much better approach to use from a statistical perspective, allowing for greater degrees of freedom. Unfortunately, the data from the Plackett-Burman design was deleted in order to make enough disk space available to run the fractional factorial design. Had this data been backed up to a tape drive or CD-rom, the individual replications could have been recovered.

The time required to run one replication of THUNDER using a CLASSIFIED database is approximately 45 minutes to an hour, assuming a 30 day scenario. The computational capability of an organization will greatly influence which experimental designs are feasible. Had a CLASSIFIED database been used for this thesis effort, the time to collect THUNDER output data would have taken 90+ days of continuous CPU

time. Therefore, parallel processing capability should be seriously considered for any organization interested in using this metamodel approach.

5.3 Recommendation for Further Study

While the results of this thesis effort are insightful and provide a beginning reference point for USAF/XPY, additional study should be accomplished in the following areas.

5.3.1 Database

An UNCLASSIFIED data base was used to develop this metamodel. A similar effort should be made using a CLASSIFIED database to ensure feasibility. Furthermore, there are a significant number of input variables used in this thesis that have been recently removed, or reduced in numbers, from the USAF inventory. For example, all F-111 Varks, EF-111 Ravens, and F-4G Wild Weasels airframes have been "mothballed," and the number of A-10s have been dramatically cut since the Persian Gulf War. A database that incorporates many of the newer weapons systems, such as the B-1, B-2, and F-22, should be used to validate this metamodel approach. Efforts have been made in recent months to integrate THUNDER with a mobility model called GAMMs. Constructing a metamodel that captures the mobility impact on theater level combat would be of great interest.

The CLASSIFIED database would also provide a significant increase in available THUNDER output metrics. This would clearly have an impact on the multivariate analysis results. Determining the underlying relationships between output variables is essential to constructing a metamodel that can measure theater level

outcomes. Deriving factors that *clearly* represent these campaign objectives may become difficult with the increased number of output variables.

5.3.2 Advanced Topics

In this thesis, a linear combination of indices was used to compute the overall combat index for each alternative force structure. Future research could consider ways of weighting the indices. One possible approach could use the eigenvalues (λ) associated with each factor.

The second area of interest is the use of variance reduction techniques to more accurately model the stochastic nature of the parameter estimates (β). This technique could greatly improve the fidelity of the metamodel constructed.

Appendix A

The following is a list of definitions for the independent variables modeled in the scenario.

Aircraft

- F-15C:** Primary air superiority fighter for the USAF, with all weather ,by day or night capability, able to engage Beyond Visual Range (BVR).
- F-15E:** Dual role F15 variant, capable of long range deep interdiction, day or night, in adverse weather while retaining air-to-air capabilities of the F-15C
- F-16:** Multi-role ground attack and air superiority fighter, by day or night, and in adverse weather condition. BVR capable.
- F-111:** Swing wing tactical fighter bomber, capable of deep interdiction and precision guided weapons delivery, by day or night, and adverse wx.
- EF-111:** Non-Lethal electronic warfare aircraft, designed to provide tactical jamming of EW, GCI, and surface-to-air acquisition radars, day or night, in adverse weather conditions.
- F-4G:** Lethal Suppression of Enemy Air Defense systems.
- A10:** USAF's primary ground attack aircraft, designed specifically for the Close Air Support (CAS) mission.
- F117:** Precision attack aircraft with stealth elements, optimized for radar energy dispersion and low IR emissions.
- AWACS:** Airborne Early warning and control aircraft. Detect and orchestrate intercept of enemy aircraft.
- JSTARS:** Long range radar reconnaissance aircraft. Detect stationary and moving objects, such as trucks and armored vehicles.
- TOMAHAWK:** Long range, inertial-guided, cruise missile. Modeled as a "one-way" aircraft in THUNDER.

Munitions

- AIM-120:** AMRAAM Missile. An all weather, all aspect, active radar-guided air-to-air missile.
- AIM-9:** Sidewinder Missile. An all aspect, short range IR guided air-to-air missile.
- 20MM:** GE M61A1 Vulcan, multi-barrel Gatling type cannon for air-to-air and air-to-ground attacks.
- MK-82:** 500 lb, free-fall general purpose bomb.
- AGM-65:** Maverick Missile. Short- and medium range TV-, IIR- and laser guided, air to surface missile. Designed for use against tanks and hardened targets.
- ARM-88:** Harm Missile. Medium-range, anti-radar, air-to-surface missile. Designed for use against frequency agile radar emitter.
- CBU-87:** Multi-purpose cluster bomb, which opens prior to impact, releasing 202 anti-tank and -personnel bomblets that have a shaped warhead for improved penetration.
- CBU-97:** Similar to CBU-87, but carries 10 specially developed sub-munitions, which in turn house 4 "smart" anti-armor warheads that use IR sensors to detect armored targets.
- B-DELAY:** Approximates CBU-89. Anti-tank and area denial cluster bomb. Airborne delivered anti-tank and -personnel mine field.
- B-LETHAL:** Generic cluster munition. Similar to CBU-58/71. Releases baseball size anti-armor and anti-personnel bomblets. Fragmentation type sub-munition.
- LGB:** Laser guided nose assembly and steerable tail fin assembly bolted on to a general purpose bomb for precision attack.
- GPS:** Approximation of GBU 29/30 JDAM munition. A mk-84 (2000lb bomb) guided by an inertial navigation unit housed in the tail assembly, and augmented with a GPS satellite receiver.

THUNDER Output Metrics

Tank(d)	Number of Red tanks destroyed while Blue forces are on the defensive.
Tank(o)	Number of Red tanks destroyed while Blue forces are on the offensive.
APC(d)	Number of Red Armored Personnel Carriers (APC) destroyed while Blue forces are on the defensive.
APC(o)	Number of Red Armored Personnel Carriers (APC) destroyed while Blue forces are on the offensive.
Inf(d)	Number of Red Infantrymen Killed while Blue forces are on the defensive.
Inf(o)	Number of Red Infantrymen Killed while Blue forces are on the offensive.
Arty(d)	Number of Red Artillery pieces destroyed while Blue forces are on the defensive.
Arty(o)	Number of Red Artillery pieces destroyed while Blue forces are on the offensive.
Halt(days)	Number of days to halt Red advancement.
Halt(dist)	Distance in Km to halt Red advancement.
Restore(days)	Number of days to restore original border, from the start of hostilities.
Push	Distance Blue forces moved into Red territory.
TmpRdBrid	Temporary Road Bridge.
TSPT	Transshipment Point. Port or Logistics site.
RedAALosses	Number of Red aircraft shot down by Blue aircraft.
RedSALosses	Number of Red aircraft shot down by Blue SAMs and AAA.
RedAGLosses	Number of Red aircraft destroyed by Blue forces while sitting on the ground.
BlueAALosses	Number of Blue aircraft shot down by Red aircraft.

BlueSALosses	Number of Blue aircraft shot down by Red SAMs and AAA.
BlueAGLosses	Number of Blue aircraft destroyed by Red forces while sitting on the ground.
Runways	Number of Red runways destroyed.
ACinOpen	Number of Red Aircraft destroyed on the ground while in the open.
AB Ammo(H)	Number of Red Hardened Air Base Ammo storage sites destroyed
ABMaint(S)	Number of Red Soft Air Base Maintenance facilities destroyed.
ABSpares(S)	Number of Red Soft Air Base Spares facilities destroyed
C3Ant	Number of Red C3 communications antennas destroyed.
C3Van	Number of Red C3 control vehicles destroyed.
ADTel	Number of Red Air Defense TELs destroyed.
ADRadar	Number of Red Air Defense Radar Control Vans destroyed.
CmdBunker	Number of Red Command Bunkers destroyed.
Mainstay	Number of Mainstay aircraft destroyed.
Helo	Number of Red Helicopters destroyed on the ground.
StoneBldg	Number of Red stone buildings destroyed.
NBCFacil	Number of Red NBC facilities destroyed

Appendix B

The following are the THUNDER data files modified to establish the two-level factorial designs. The values **highlighted** reflect the values for each input variable at the lower bound. These are the values overwritten by the shell scripts.

squadron.dat

SQUADRONS .305

NUMBER.OF.MISSION.CLASSES: 10

AIR.SUPERIORITY
DEEP.STRIKE
GROUND.SUPPORT
JAMMER
MULTI.ROLE
RECCE
WEASEL
AWACS
TOMAHAWK
JSTARS

NUMBER.OF.SORTIE.PROFILES: 23

1010 "A-10"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 4.00 5.00

END.PROFILE

1099 "TOMAHAWK"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 1.00 1.00

END.PROFILE

1016 "F-16"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 3.60 4.50
6.00 2.50 3.50

END.PROFILE

1004 "F-4G"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 2.50 3.00
6.00 1.50 2.00

END.PROFILE

1011 "F-111"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 2.00 2.50
6.00 1.20 1.50

END.PROFILE

1015 "F-15C"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 3.00 3.50
6.00 2.20 2.50

END.PROFILE

1215 "F-15E"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 3.00 3.50
6.00 2.20 2.50

END.PROFILE

1017 "F-117A"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 3.00 3.50
6.00 2.20 2.50

END.PROFILE

1052 "B-52"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 1.00 1.00

END.PROFILE

1008 "AV-8B"

DAY.IN.THEATER..AUTH.QTY.SORT/DAY..AC.MAX.SORT/DAY
1.00 4.00 5.00
6.00 3.00 4.00

END.PROFILE

1018 "F/A-18"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 3.60 4.00
 6.00 2.50 3.50
 END. PROFILE
 1006 "A-6E"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 2.20 2.50
 6.00 1.20 1.50
 END. PROFILE
 1026 "EA-6B"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 2.00 2.50
 6.00 1.20 1.50
 END. PROFILE
 1007 "A-7E"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 2.00 2.50
 6.00 1.20 1.50
 END. PROFILE
 1014 "F-14"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 3.00 3.50
 6.00 2.20 2.50
 END. PROFILE
 1003 "AWACS_E-3"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 .67 1.50
 END. PROFILE
 1098 "JSTARS_E-8"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 .67 1.50
 END. PROFILE
 2023 "MIG-23"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 3.00 3.00
 END. PROFILE
 2001 "MIRAGE_F-1"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 4.00 4.00
 END. PROFILE
 2021 "MIG-21"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 3.00 3.00
 END. PROFILE
 2029 "MIG-29"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 4.00 4.00
 END. PROFILE
 2025 "SU-25"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 2.20 2.20
 END. PROFILE
 2006 "MAINSTAY"
 DAY. IN. THEATER. .AUTH.QTY. SORT/DAY. .AC. MAX. SORT/DAY
 1.00 .67 1.50
 END. PROFILE

NUMBER OF SQUADRONS: 105
 @ NAVAL AOB SOURCE:
 @ "CONDUCT OF PERSIAN GULF WAR" FINAL REPORT TO CONGRESS (UNCLASSIFIED SOURCE)
 @ PAGE 110
 @
 @ RED SEA BATTLE FORCE
 @ USS KENNEDY

11401 "F-14 KENNEDY"
 SIDE. .SUP. CMD. ID. .TYPE. AC. ID. .AUTH. QTY. .AR. PRIORITY
 1 1101 1014 20 0
 MOB. ID. .DISP. AB. ID. .SERV. KIT. ID. .SORT. PROF. ID. .MISSION. CLASS
 1014 1015 1014 1014 AIR. SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAI...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS

END.ORDERS

10701 "A-7E_KENNEDY"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1007 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1014 1015 1007 1007 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

10601 "A-6E_KENNEDY"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1006 13 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1014 1015 1006 1006 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

10261 "EA-6B_KENNEDY"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1026 5 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1014 1015 1026 1026 JAMMER
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

19901 "TOMAHAWK_KENNEDY"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1099 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1014 1015 1099 1099 TOMAHAWK
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

@ USS SARATOGA

11402 "F-14_SARATOGA"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1014 12 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1015 1014 1014 1014 AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

11801 "F/A-18_SARATOGA"

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1101 1018 12 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1015 1014 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS

2.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

10602 "A-6E SARATOGA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1101 1006 10 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1015 1014 1006 1006 GROUND.SUPPORT
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
 70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 2.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

10262 "EA-6B SARATOGA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1101 1026 4 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1015 1014 1026 1026 JAMMER
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 2.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

19902 "TOMAHAWK SARATOGA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1101 1099 4 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1015 1014 1099 1099 TOMAHAWK
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 2.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

@ PERSIAN GULF BATTLE FORCE
 @ USS AMERICA

11403 "F-14 AMERICA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1014 12 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1019 1017 1014 1014 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 7.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

11802 "F/A-18 AMERICA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1018 12 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1019 1017 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 7.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

10603 "A-6E AMERICA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1006 10 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS

1019 1017 1006 1006 GROUND SUPPORT
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 7.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

10263 "EA-6B AMERICA"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1026 4 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1019 1017 1026 1026 JAMMER
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 7.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

19903 "TOMAHAWK AMERICA"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1099 4 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1019 1017 1099 1099 TOMAHAWK
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 7.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

@ USS MIDWAY

11803 "F/A-18 MIDWAY"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1018 12 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1016 1010 1018 1018 MULTI ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

10604 "A-6E MIDWAY"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1006 10 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1016 1010 1006 1006 GROUND SUPPORT
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

10264 "EA-6B MIDWAY"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1102 1026 4 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1016 1017 1026 1026 JAMMER
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

19904 "TOMAHAWK MIDWAY"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY

```

1      1102      1099      *      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1016      1017      1099      1099      TOMAHAWK
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      100      10      10      90      90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
100      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

```

@ USS RANGER

11404 "F-14_RANGER"

```

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1102      1014      12      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1017      1016      1014      1014      AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
100      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

10605 "A-6E_RANGER"

```

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1102      1006      10      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1017      1016      1006      1006      GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      70      100      100      100      70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
70      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

10265 "EA-6B_RANGER"

```

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1102      1026      4      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1017      1016      1026      1026      JAMMER
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
0      0      0      0      100      100      100      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

19905 "TOMAHAWK_RANGER"

```

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1102      1099      *      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1017      1016      1099      1099      TOMAHAWK
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      100      10      10      90      90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
100      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

@ USS ROOSEVELT

11405 "F-14_ROOSEVELT"

```

SIDE..SUP_CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1102      1014      12      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1018      1010      1014      1014      AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR..STI..CAS..BAI..INT..OCA
100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100      100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC..AEW..AAR..RESV
100      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100

```

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

11804 "F/A-18 ROOSEVELT"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1102 1018 12 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1016 1010 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

10606 "A-6E ROOSEVELT"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1102 1006 10 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1018 1010 1006 1006 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

10266 "EA-6B ROOSEVELT"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1102 1026 4 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1018 1010 1026 1026 JAMMER
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

19906 "TOMAHAWK ROOSEVELT"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1102 1099 2 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1018 1010 1099 1099 TOMAHAWK
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

@ US AOB --LAND BASED FIXED WING
@ CONDUCT OF PERSIAN GULF WAR - FINAL REPORT TO CONGRESS PAGE 106
@ RAF FAIRFORD

15201 "B-52 FAIRFORD"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1052 22 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1001 1002 1052 1052 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 90 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

@ MORON
15202 "B-52 MORON"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY

1 1200 1052 22 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1002 1001 1052 1052 GROUND.SUPPORT
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 90 100 100 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

@ INCIRLIK

11601 "F-16_INCIRLIK"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1016 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1003 1011 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

11501 "F-15C_INCIRLIK"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1015 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1003 1002 1015 1015 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

11101 "F-111_INCIRLIK"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1011 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1003 1002 1011 1011 DEEP.STRIKE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 90 10 10 90 100
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

10401 "F-4G_INCIRLIK"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1004 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1003 1002 1004 1004 WEASEL
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 10 10 90 10
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 70 70 90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

@ TABUK

11502 "F-15C_TABUK"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1015 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1004 1003 1015 1015 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 2.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

@ KING ABDUL AZIZ NAVAL BASE

10801 "AV-8B KING AZIZ"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1103      1008      24      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1005   1006   1008   1008   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  0      0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS
```

10802 "AV-8B KING AZIZ"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1103      1008      24      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1005   1006   1008   1008   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  0      0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
2.0 MERGE 10801
END.ORDERS
```

10803 "AV-8B KING AZIZ"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1103      1008      12      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1005   1006   1008   1008   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  0      0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
3.0 MERGE 10801
END.ORDERS
```

10804 "AV-8B KING AZIZ"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1103      1008      12      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1005   1006   1008   1008   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  0      0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
4.0 MERGE 10801
END.ORDERS
```

@ KING FAHD

11001 "A10 KING FAHD1"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1200      1010      0      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006   1009   1010   1010   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  100  70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50     0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS
```

11002 "A10 KING FAHD2"

```
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1      1200      1010      0      0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006   1009   1010   1010   GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0      0      0      0      0      0      0      100  100  100  70
```

.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
2.0 MERGE 11001
END.ORDERS

11003 "A10 KING FAHD3"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1010 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006 1009 1010 1010 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
3.0 MERGE 11001
END.ORDERS

11004 "A10 KING FAHD4"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1010 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006 1009 1010 1010 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
4.0 MERGE 11001
END.ORDERS

11005 "A10 KING FAHD5"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1010 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006 1009 1010 1010 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
5.0 MERGE 11001
END.ORDERS

11006 "A10 KING FAHD6"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1010 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1006 1009 1010 1010 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
6.0 ARRIVE
6.0 MERGE 11001
END.ORDERS

@ AL-KHARJ

11503 "F-15C AL-KHARJ"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1015 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1007 1008 1015 1015 AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS

3.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

12151 "F-15E_AL-KHARJ1"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1215 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1007 1008 1215 1215 DEEP.STRIKE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

12152 "F-15E_AL-KHARJ2"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1215 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1007 1008 1215 1215 DEEP.STRIKE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 10 10 90 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
2.0 MERGE 12151
END.ORDERS

11602 "F-16A_AL-KHARJ"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1016 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1007 1008 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

11603 "F-16A_AL-KHARJ"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1016 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1007 1008 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
3.0 MERGE 11602
END.ORDERS

@ AT-TAIF

12111 "EF-111_AT-TAIF"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1211 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1008 1011 1211 1011 JAMMER
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

11102 "F-111_AT-TAIF1"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1011 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1008 1011 1011 1011 DEEP.STRIKE

```

..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0    0    0    0    0    0    90    10    10    90    100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
90   0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    100

```

```

ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

11103 "F-111 AT-TAIF2"

```

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1    1200    1011    *  0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1008    1011    1011    1011    DEEP.STRIKE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0    0    0    0    0    0    90    10    10    90    100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
90   0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    100

```

```

ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
3.0 MERGE 11102
END.ORDERS

```

11104 "F-111 AT-TAIF3"

```

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1    1200    1011    *  0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1008    1011    1011    1011    DEEP.STRIKE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0    0    0    0    0    0    90    10    10    90    100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
90   0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    100

```

```

ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
4.0 MERGE 11102
END.ORDERS

```

@ DHAHRAN

11504 "F-15C DHAHRAN1"

```

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1    1200    1015    *  0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1009    1011    1015    1015    AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70   100    100    100    100    100    0    0    0    0    0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    100

```

```

ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

```

11505 "F-15C DHAHRAN2"

```

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1    1200    1015    *  0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1009    1011    1015    1015    AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70   100    100    100    100    100    0    0    0    0    0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    100

```

```

ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
5.0 MERGE 11504
END.ORDERS

```

@ SHAIKH ISA

11805 "F/A-18 SHAIKH ISA1"

```

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1    1103    1018    24    0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010    1011    1018    1018    MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100    100    100    100    100    100    100    100    100    100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV

```

100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

11806 "F/A-18 SHAIKH ISA2"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1103 1018 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010 1011 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
2.0 ARRIVE
2.0 MERGE 11805
END.ORDERS

11807 "F/A-18 SHAIKH ISA3"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1103 1018 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010 1011 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
3.0 MERGE 11805
END.ORDERS

11808 "F/A-18 SHAIKH ISA4"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1103 1018 12 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010 1011 1018 1018 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
4.0 MERGE 11805
END.ORDERS

10607 "A-6E SHAIKH ISA"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1103 1006 12 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010 1011 1006 1006 GROUND.SUPPORT
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 70 100 100 100 70
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
70 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

10402 "F-4G SHAIKH ISA1"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1004 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1010 1011 1004 1004 WEASEL
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 10 10 10 90 10
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 70 70 90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

10403 "F-4G SHAIKH ISA2"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1004 0 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS

1010 1011 1004 1004 WEASEL
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 10 10 90 10
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 70 70 90 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 2.0 ARRIVE
 @ 2.0 MERGE 10402
 END.ORDERS

10267 "EA-6B_SHAIKH_ISA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1103 1026 12 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1018 1011 1026 1026 JAMMER
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

@ DOHA
 11604 "F-16_DOHA"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1016 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1011 1013 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 70 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 4.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

@ AL-MINHAD
 11605 "F-16_AL-MINHAD1"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1016 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1012 1013 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 5.0 ARRIVE
 END.ORDERS

11606 "F-16_AL-MINHAD2"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1016 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1012 1013 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 6.0 ARRIVE
 6.0 MERGE 11605
 END.ORDERS

11607 "F-16_AL-MINHAD3"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1016 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1012 1013 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
7.0 ARRIVE
7.0 MERGE 11605
END.ORDERS

@ AL-DHAFRA

11608 "F-16 AL-DHAFRA1"
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1016 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1013 1012 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
4.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

11609 "F-16 AL-DHAFRA2"
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1016 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1013 1012 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
5.0 ARRIVE
5.0 MERGE 11608
END.ORDERS

11610 "F-16 AL-DHAFRA3"
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1016 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1013 1012 1016 1016 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 70 70 70 70 70 50 100 100 100 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
6.0 ARRIVE
6.0 MERGE 11608
END.ORDERS

@ NOTE: QUANTITY OF F-117 AIRCRAFT AND BEDDOWN LOCATION ARE ARBITRARY

11701 "F-117A RIYADH"
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1017 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1020 1029 1017 1017 DEEP.STRIKE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 100 0 0 95 95
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
ORDERS
3.0 ARRIVE
END.ORDERS

10301 "AWACS"
SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
1 1200 1003 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
1029 1020 1003 1003 AWACS
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 0 100
ORDERS
END.ORDERS

10981 "JSTARS"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 1 1200 1098 * 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 1029 1020 1098 1098 JSTARS
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

@ RED
 @ UNCLASSIFIED SOURCE: "STORM OVER IRAQ" BY HALLION
 @ 750 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT OVER 20 AIRBASES
 @ ALL 5 FIGHTER TYPES IN THIS DATABASE ARE UTILIZED
 @ BEDDOWN IS PURELY ARBITRARY
 @
 @ 750 AIRCRAFT/ 24 AIRCRAFT PER SQUADRON = 31.25 SQUADRONS
 @ THUS, 6.25 SQUADRONS OF EACH TYPE OF AIRCRAFT

22901 "MIG29 1"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2006 2007 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22902 "MIG29 2"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2007 2006 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22903 "MIG29 3"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2008 2007 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22904 "MIG29 4"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2008 2007 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22903
 END.ORDERS

22905 "MIG29 5"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2006 2007 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA

100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22901
 END.ORDERS

22906 "MIG29 6"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2029 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2007 2006 2029 2029 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 100 100 100 100 100 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22902
 END.ORDERS

22101 "MIG21 1"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2021 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2013 2028 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 90 0 0 90 90 90 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22102 "MIG21 2"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2021 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2028 2013 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 90 0 0 90 90 90 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22103 "MIG21 3"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2021 24 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2031 2013 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 90 0 0 90 90 90 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22104 "MIG21 4"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2021 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2013 2028 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 90 0 0 90 90 90 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22101
 END.ORDERS

22105 "MIG21 5"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2021 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2028 2013 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA

90 0 0 90 90 90 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
1.0 MERGE 22102
END.ORDERS

22106 "MIG21 6"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2021 25 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2031 2013 2021 2021 AIR.SUPERIORITY
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
90 0 0 90 90 0 0 0 0 0 0
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
1.0 MERGE 22103
END.ORDERS

20101 "MIRAGE F1 1"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2001 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2028 2003 2001 2001 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70 70 0 70 70 0 90 90 90 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

20102 "MIRAGE F1 2"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2001 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2011 2004 2001 2001 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70 70 0 70 70 0 90 90 90 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

20103 "MIRAGE F1 3"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2001 24 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2003 2004 2001 2001 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70 70 0 70 70 0 90 90 90 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

20104 "MIRAGE F1 4"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2001 25 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2011 2004 2001 2001 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
70 70 0 70 70 0 90 90 90 90 90
.DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100

ORDERS
1.0 MERGE 20102
END.ORDERS

20105 "MIRAGE F1 5"

SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
2 2101 2001 25 0
MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
2003 2004 2001 2001 MULTI.ROLE
..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA

70	70	0	70	70	0	90	90	90	90	90	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
1.0 MERGE 20103
END.ORDERS

20106 "MIRAGE F1 6"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2001	25	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2004	2003	2001	2001	MULTI.ROLE							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
70	70	0	70	70	0	90	90	90	90	90	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

22501 "SU25 1"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2025	24	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2028	2027	2025	2025	GROUND.SUPPORT							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	0	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

22502 "SU25 2"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2025	24	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2026	2028	2025	2025	GROUND.SUPPORT							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	0	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

22503 "SU25 3"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2025	24	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2027	2028	2025	2025	GROUND.SUPPORT							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	0	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

22504 "SU25 4"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2025	25	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2028	2026	2025	2025	GROUND.SUPPORT							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	0	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

ORDERS
END.ORDERS

22505 "SU25 5"

SIDE..	SUP.CMD.ID..	TYPE.AC.ID..	AUTH.QTY..	AR.PRIORITY							
2	2101	2025	25	0							
MOB.ID..	DISP.AB.ID..	SERV.KIT.ID..	SORT.PROF.ID..	MISSION.CLASS							
2026	2028	2025	2025	GROUND.SUPPORT							
..DCA..	ODCA..	HVAA..	BARC..	FSWP..	EAIR..	STI..	CAS..	BAI..	INT..	OCA	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	100	0	
.DSED..	SSUP..	CSUP..	ESUP..	SJAM..	CJAM..	EJAM..	RECC..	SREC..	AEW..	AAR..	RESV

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22502
 END.ORDERS

22506 "SU25 6"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2025 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2027 2028 2025 2025 GROUND.SUPPORT
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22503
 END.ORDERS

22301 "MIG23 1"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2005 2004 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22302 "MIG23 2"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2004 2005 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22303 "MIG23 3"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2030 2005 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22304 "MIG23 4"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2030 2005 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 1.0 MERGE 22303
 END.ORDERS

22305 "MIG23 5"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2009 2005 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

22306 "MIG23 6"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2023 25 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2026 2004 2023 2023 MULTI.ROLE
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 10 0 0 10 10 10 90 90 90 90
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

20000 "MAINSTAY"
 SIDE..SUP.CMD.ID..TYPE.AC.ID..AUTH.QTY..AR.PRIORITY
 2 2101 2006 2 0
 MOB.ID..DISP.AB.ID..SERV.KIT.ID..SORT.PROF.ID..MISSION.CLASS
 2014 2013 2006 2006 AWACS
 ..DCA..ODCA..HVAA..BARC..FSWP..EAIR...STI...CAS...BAI...INT...OCA
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 .DSED..SSUP..CSUP..ESUP..SJAM..CJAM..EJAM..RECC..SREC...AEW...AAR..RESV
 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 0 100
 ORDERS
 END.ORDERS

acserv.dat

SERVICE.KITS.304

BLUE.PCT.NONCRITICAL.MUNT.AT.DB 99
 RED.PCT.NONCRITICAL.MUNT.AT.DB 99
 BLUE.PCT.AIRCRAFT.THAT.DISPERSE 99
 RED.PCT.AIRCRAFT.THAT.DISPERSE 99

NUMBER.OF.SERVICE.KITS: 24

1010 "A-10 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 24
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1103 100
 1105 12
 1106 300
 1107 10
 1109 10
 1110 10
 1111 10
 1112 2700
 REPAIR.RESOURCE..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1099 "TOMAHAWK KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 50
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1105 100
 REPAIR.RESOURCE..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1016 "F-16 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
1102 100
1103 200
1104 100
1105 2400
1106 256
1107 10
1108 1000
1109 10
1110 32
1111 10
1112 250

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1004 "F-4G KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

1 **

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

1107 **
1108 2000

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1011 "F-111 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

1 **

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

1105 250
1108 500
1109 10
1110 275
1111 10
1112 75
1113 175
1114 10

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1015 "F-15C KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

1 **

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

1102 200
1103 200
1104 100

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1215 "F-15E KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

1 **

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

1102 100
1103 200
1104 100
1105 930
1108 1000

1109 10
 1110 10
 1111 10
 1112 10
 1113 445
 1114 10
 REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1017 "F-117 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 12
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1113 330
 REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1052 "B-52 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 22
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1105 284
 1111 405
 REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1008 "AV-8 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 24
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1105 1000
 1106 290
 REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1018 "FA-18 KIT"
 SIDE..NUM.AC
 1 24
 MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
 1102 100
 1103 200
 1104 100
 1105 1500
 1106 100
 1107 10
 1108 1000
 1109 10
 1110 10
 1111 10
 1112 450
 REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
 1 17
 2 12
 3 7
 INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
 END.KIT

1006 "A-6 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC
1 10
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
1105 1500
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1026 "EA-6B KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
1 24
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
1107 10
1108 1000
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1007 "A-7 KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
1 24
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
1105 1000
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1211 "EF-111 KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
1 24
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1014 "F-14 KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
1 12
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
1102 200
1103 100
1104 100
1105 1500
1106 10
1107 10
1108 1000
1109 10
1110 10
1111 10
1112 10
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
1 17
2 12
3 7
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1003 "AWACS KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
1 24
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

1098 "JSTARS KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

1 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 17
2 12
3 7

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2023 "MIG-23 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

2 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

2201 500
2202 500
2204 2000
2208 500

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 24
2 12
3 2

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2001 "F-1 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

2 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

2202 500
2203 500
2204 1500
2205 1500
2206 500
2207 1000
2208 1000

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 24
2 12
3 2

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2021 "MIG-21 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

2 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

2201 500
2202 500
2204 1500

REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM

1 24
2 12
3 2

INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2029 "MIG-29 KIT"

SIDE..NUM.AC

2 24

MUNITIONS..ID..NUM

2202 1000
2203 1000
2204 2500
2205 2500
2206 500
2207 1000
2208 1000

```

2209 1000
2210 1000
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
  1 24
  2 12
  3 2
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2025 "SU-25 KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
  2 24
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
  2204 1500
  2205 2000
  2211 2000
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
  1 24
  2 12
  3 2
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

2006 "MAINSTAY KIT"
SIDE..NUM.AC
  2 4
MUNITIONS..ID..NUM
REPAIR.RESOURCES..ID..NUM
  1 4
  2 2
  3 2
INT.LEVEL.MAINTENANCE.FACS
END.KIT

END.SERVICE.KITS

```

Below is an example of the *munexp.sum* file used to determine the low and high levels of munitions and the resultant apportionment for each aircraft type. This is an example and not the actual data used.

munexp.sum

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
ALL EXPENDITURES

AIRCRAFT	MUNITION	MISSION	TARGET	EXPENDED
F-16	AMRAAM	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	.3
F-16	AMRAAM	STI	AIRCRAFT	247.9
F-16	AMRAAM	INT	AIRCRAFT	19.9
F-16	AMRAAM	OCA	AIRCRAFT	21.9
F-16	AMRAAM	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	1.9
F-15C	AMRAAM	DCA	AIRCRAFT	16.5
F-15C	AMRAAM	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	325.1
F-15C	AMRAAM	FSWP	AIRCRAFT	78.0
F-15C	AMRAAM	STI	AIRCRAFT	121.6
F-15C	AMRAAM	INT	AIRCRAFT	9.1
F-15C	AMRAAM	OCA	AIRCRAFT	11.3
F-15C	AMRAAM	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	2.5
F/A-18	AMRAAM	DCA	AIRCRAFT	2.5
F/A-18	AMRAAM	INT	AIRCRAFT	.5
F-14	AMRAAM	DCA	AIRCRAFT	90.2
F-14	AMRAAM	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	120.2
F-14	AMRAAM	FSWP	AIRCRAFT	65.3
F-14	AMRAAM	INT	AIRCRAFT	11.4
F-14	AMRAAM	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	1.2
F-16	AIM-9	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	.3

F-16	AIM-9	STI	AIRCRAFT	247.9
F-16	AIM-9	INT	AIRCRAFT	19.9
F-16	AIM-9	OCA	AIRCRAFT	21.9
F-16	AIM-9	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	1.9
F-4G	AIM-9	STI	AIRCRAFT	288.7
F-4G	AIM-9	BAI	AIRCRAFT	32.7
F-4G	AIM-9	INT	AIRCRAFT	145.7
F-4G	AIM-9	OCA	AIRCRAFT	21.7
F-4G	AIM-9	SSUP	AIRCRAFT	69.5
F-15C	AIM-9	DCA	AIRCRAFT	16.5
F-15C	AIM-9	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	325.1
F-15C	AIM-9	FSWP	AIRCRAFT	78.0
F-15C	AIM-9	STI	AIRCRAFT	121.6
F-15C	AIM-9	INT	AIRCRAFT	9.1
F-15C	AIM-9	OCA	AIRCRAFT	11.3
F-15C	AIM-9	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	2.5
F/A-18	AIM-9	DCA	AIRCRAFT	2.5
F/A-18	AIM-9	INT	AIRCRAFT	.5
F-14	AIM-9	DCA	AIRCRAFT	48.4
F-14	AIM-9	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	104.5
F-14	AIM-9	FSWP	AIRCRAFT	48.1
F-14	AIM-9	INT	AIRCRAFT	7.6
F-14	AIM-9	DSEAD	AIRCRAFT	.8
F-4G	20MM CANNON	STI	AIRCRAFT	26.2
F-4G	20MM CANNON	BAI	AIRCRAFT	.7
F-4G	20MM CANNON	INT	AIRCRAFT	8.3
F-4G	20MM CANNON	OCA	AIRCRAFT	.6
F-4G	20MM CANNON	SSUP	AIRCRAFT	1.3
F-14	20MM CANNON	DCA	AIRCRAFT	1.8
F-14	20MM CANNON	BARCAP	AIRCRAFT	25.8
F-14	20MM CANNON	FSWP	AIRCRAFT	4.4
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	STI	STRAT TGT	276.0
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	INT	AD TEL	1.6
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	149.4
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	133.0
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	OCA	RUNWAY	6.4
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	OCA	AIR MUNITION	2.4
TOMAHAWK	MK-82	DSEAD	AD TEL	122.4
F-16	MK-82	STI	STRAT TGT	10572.2
F-16	MK-82	BAI	EQUIPMENT	4106.2
F-16	MK-82	INT	AD TEL	1.2
F-16	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	2648.4
F-16	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	2196.6
F-16	MK-82	INT	ISSUE CAP	22.8
F-16	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	1529.4
F-16	MK-82	DSEAD	AD TEL	1630.0
F-111	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	1802.4
F-111	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	608.8
F-111	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	3.2
F-111	MK-82	DSEAD	AD TEL	8333.6
F-15E	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	324.8
F-15E	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	62.4
F-15E	MK-82	DSEAD	AD TEL	3317.6
B-52	MK-82	CAS	EQUIPMENT	24.0
B-52	MK-82	BAI	EQUIPMENT	436.8
AV-8B	MK-82	CAS	EQUIPMENT	225.6
AV-8B	MK-82	BAI	EQUIPMENT	5.2
F/A-18	MK-82	BAI	EQUIPMENT	11219.2
F/A-18	MK-82	INT	AD TEL	6.4
F/A-18	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	1016.4
F/A-18	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	1378.4
F/A-18	MK-82	INT	ISSUE CAP	12.8
F/A-18	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	467.2
F/A-18	MK-82	DSEAD	AD TEL	7174.8
A-6E	MK-82	CAS	EQUIPMENT	5724.4
A-6E	MK-82	BAI	CHKPNT ARC	3.2
A-6E	MK-82	BAI	EQUIPMENT	7612.0
A-6E	MK-82	INT	AD TEL	1.6
A-6E	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	1039.2
A-6E	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	536.8
A-6E	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	599.2
A-7E	MK-82	CAS	EQUIPMENT	2533.2
F-14	MK-82	INT	SUPPLY TRN	240.0
F-14	MK-82	INT	CHKPNT ARC	57.2
F-14	MK-82	INT	EQUIPMENT	89.6

F-14	MK-82	OCA	MAINTENANCE	60.8
F-14	MK-82	OCA	AIR MUNITION	29.6
F-14	MK-82	OCA	SPARES	2.4
A-10	AGM-65	BAI	EQUIPMENT	3236.5
F-16	AGM-65	BAI	EQUIPMENT	1368.3
F-16	AGM-65	INT	SUPPLY TRN	851.7
F-16	AGM-65	INT	EQUIPMENT	486.3
AV-8B	AGM-65	CAS	EQUIPMENT	2273.5
AV-8B	AGM-65	BAI	EQUIPMENT	459.6
F/A-18	AGM-65	BAI	EQUIPMENT	1869.9
F/A-18	AGM-65	INT	SUPPLY TRN	161.9
F/A-18	AGM-65	INT	EQUIPMENT	77.9
F-14	AGM-65	INT	SUPPLY TRN	39.5
F-14	AGM-65	INT	EQUIPMENT	14.9
F-16	ARM-88	STI	AD RADAR	20.1
F-16	ARM-88	INT	AD RADAR	.6
F-16	ARM-88	DSEAD	AD RADAR	20.6
F-4G	ARM-88	STI	AD RADAR	483.2
F-4G	ARM-88	BAI	AD RADAR	39.5
F-4G	ARM-88	INT	AD RADAR	39.6
F-4G	ARM-88	OCA	AD RADAR	51.4
F-4G	ARM-88	SSUP	AD RADAR	93.4
F/A-18	ARM-88	DSEAD	AD RADAR	75.3
F-14	ARM-88	INT	AD RADAR	.1
F-14	ARM-88	OCA	AD RADAR	.2
F-16	SPW-45	STI	AD RADAR	78.3
F-16	SPW-45	INT	AD RADAR	8.2
F-16	SPW-45	DSEAD	AD RADAR	122.8
F-4G	SPW-45	STI	AD RADAR	1160.5
F-4G	SPW-45	BAI	AD RADAR	538.9
F-4G	SPW-45	INT	AD RADAR	582.7
F-4G	SPW-45	OCA	AD RADAR	220.0
F-4G	SPW-45	SSUP	AD RADAR	151.7
F-111	SPW-45	DSEAD	AD RADAR	799.1
F-15E	SPW-45	DSEAD	AD RADAR	231.9
F/A-18	SPW-45	INT	AD RADAR	1.6
F/A-18	SPW-45	DSEAD	AD RADAR	588.7
F-14	SPW-45	INT	AD RADAR	.9
F-14	SPW-45	OCA	AD RADAR	.3
F-16	B-DELAY MINE	INT	CHKPNT ARC	.3
F/A-18	B-DELAY MINE	INT	CHKPNT ARC	.1
F-16	B-LETHAL MINE	INT	CHKPNT ARC	442.1
F-111	B-LETHAL MINE	OCA	RUNWAY	953.9
F-111	B-LETHAL MINE	OCA	AB AVAIL	943.9
F/A-18	B-LETHAL MINE	INT	CHKPNT ARC	5.5
A-10	CBU-87 CEM	BAI	EQUIPMENT	204.3
F-16	CBU-87 CEM	CAS	EQUIPMENT	.3
F-16	CBU-87 CEM	BAI	EQUIPMENT	104.3
F-16	CBU-87 CEM	INT	EQUIPMENT	48.5
B-52	CBU-87 CEM	CAS	EQUIPMENT	76.8
B-52	CBU-87 CEM	BAI	EQUIPMENT	3652.0
F/A-18	CBU-87 CEM	CAS	EQUIPMENT	14.1
F/A-18	CBU-87 CEM	BAI	EQUIPMENT	70.7
F/A-18	CBU-87 CEM	INT	EQUIPMENT	19.2
F-14	CBU-87 CEM	INT	EQUIPMENT	.3
A-10	CBU-97 SFW	CAS	EQUIPMENT	32939.6
A-10	CBU-97 SFW	BAI	EQUIPMENT	1812.2
F-16	CBU-97 SFW	CAS	EQUIPMENT	.8
F-16	CBU-97 SFW	BAI	EQUIPMENT	1382.0
F-16	CBU-97 SFW	INT	EQUIPMENT	4107.6
F-111	CBU-97 SFW	INT	EQUIPMENT	434.8
F-15E	CBU-97 SFW	INT	EQUIPMENT	6.8
F/A-18	CBU-97 SFW	CAS	EQUIPMENT	6032.8
F/A-18	CBU-97 SFW	BAI	EQUIPMENT	352.8
F/A-18	CBU-97 SFW	INT	EQUIPMENT	503.2
F-14	CBU-97 SFW	INT	EQUIPMENT	28.0
F-111	LGB GBU	STI	STRAT TGT	20.1
F-111	LGB GBU	INT	AD TEL	2.7
F-111	LGB GBU	INT	CHKPNT ARC	78.7
F-111	LGB GBU	INT	ISSUE CAP	1.1
F-111	LGB GBU	INT	TRANSHIP POINT	.5
F-111	LGB GBU	INT	EQUIPMENT	279.9
F-111	LGB GBU	OCA	MAINTENANCE	527.2
F-111	LGB GBU	OCA	AIR MUNITION	108.9
F-111	LGB GBU	OCA	SPARES	84.5

F-15E	LGB GBU	STI	STRAT TGT	3512.0
F-15E	LGB GBU	INT	AD TEL	.8
F-15E	LGB GBU	INT	EQUIPMENT	20.5
F-117A	LGB GBU	STI	STRAT TGT	644.1
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	SUPPLY TRN	5.2
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	CHKPNT ARC	2.7
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	EQUIPMENT	10.5

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	AIM-7	AMRAAM	AIM-9	20MM CANNON
1.0000	0.	74.8	107.1	7.1
2.0000	0.	137.5	190.3	10.8
3.0000	0.	86.9	142.0	7.2
4.0000	0.	123.2	183.7	5.1
5.0000	0.	123.2	177.2	5.4
6.0000	0.	120.7	161.6	8.7
7.0000	0.	90.2	133.1	5.7
8.0000	0.	91.0	126.2	6.7
9.0000	0.	73.3	105.0	5.8
10.0000	0.	53.3	78.9	2.7
11.0000	0.	51.6	69.8	1.6
12.0000	0.	45.0	56.5	.6
13.0000	0.	33.4	40.4	.7
14.0000	0.	24.0	30.0	.5
15.0000	0.	19.2	25.0	.5
Totals	0.	1147.3	1626.8	69.0

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	MK-82	AGM-65	ARM-88	SPW-45
1.0000	3058.6	247.1	28.7	223.4
2.0000	4542.0	535.3	62.1	321.4
3.0000	5015.0	966.9	49.0	323.1
4.0000	5582.0	1157.6	54.6	345.5
5.0000	6496.2	1158.8	57.6	353.1
6.0000	5939.0	1207.8	64.7	339.1
7.0000	6571.8	1084.3	70.4	360.0
8.0000	6326.8	1040.0	61.2	328.1
9.0000	6306.2	965.3	52.3	302.2
10.0000	6238.8	799.7	49.3	276.2
11.0000	5507.0	563.3	57.6	264.7
12.0000	4869.2	443.1	61.5	275.4
13.0000	4399.8	337.9	52.5	264.9
14.0000	4024.2	216.0	54.8	260.0
15.0000	3470.2	117.1	47.4	248.6
Totals	78346.8	10840.0	823.9	4485.6

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	B-DELAY MINE	B-LETHAL MINE	CBU-87 CEM	CBU-97 SFW
1.0000	0.	125.5	561.6	918.8
2.0000	.3	204.1	576.0	1630.2
3.0000	0.	208.4	311.2	2484.2
4.0000	0.	194.0	238.7	3385.4
5.0000	0.	213.8	219.2	3934.8
6.0000	0.	185.3	227.2	4815.2
7.0000	0.	174.1	215.2	4655.8
8.0000	0.	156.1	209.1	3817.6
9.0000	0.	134.0	216.1	3405.8
10.0000	0.	143.6	217.3	3163.0
11.0000	.1	131.7	233.9	3064.8
12.0000	0.	112.1	222.0	3022.8
13.0000	0.	116.3	223.5	3020.0
14.0000	0.	120.3	239.2	3130.8

F-15E	LGB GBU	STI	STRAT TGT	3512.0
F-15E	LGB GBU	INT	AD TEL	.8
F-15E	LGB GBU	INT	EQUIPMENT	20.5
F-117A	LGB GBU	STI	STRAT TGT	644.1
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	SUPPLY TRN	5.2
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	CHKPNT ARC	2.7
F-117A	LGB GBU	INT	EQUIPMENT	10.5

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	AIM-7	AMRAAM	AIM-9	20MM CANNON
1.0000	0.	74.8	107.1	7.1
2.0000	0.	137.5	190.3	10.8
3.0000	0.	86.9	142.0	7.2
4.0000	0.	123.2	183.7	5.1
5.0000	0.	123.2	177.2	5.4
6.0000	0.	120.7	161.6	8.7
7.0000	0.	90.2	133.1	5.7
8.0000	0.	91.0	126.2	6.7
9.0000	0.	73.3	105.0	5.8
10.0000	0.	53.3	78.9	2.7
11.0000	0.	51.6	69.8	1.6
12.0000	0.	45.0	56.5	.6
13.0000	0.	33.4	40.4	.7
14.0000	0.	24.0	30.0	.5
15.0000	0.	19.2	25.0	.5
Totals	0.	1147.3	1626.8	69.0

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	MK-82	AGM-65	ARM-88	SPW-45
1.0000	3058.6	247.1	28.7	223.4
2.0000	4542.0	535.3	62.1	321.4
3.0000	5015.0	966.9	49.0	323.1
4.0000	5582.0	1157.6	54.6	345.5
5.0000	6496.2	1158.8	57.6	353.1
6.0000	5939.0	1207.8	64.7	339.1
7.0000	6571.8	1084.3	70.4	360.0
8.0000	6326.8	1040.0	61.2	328.1
9.0000	6306.2	965.3	52.3	302.2
10.0000	6238.8	799.7	49.3	276.2
11.0000	5507.0	563.3	57.6	264.7
12.0000	4869.2	443.1	61.5	275.4
13.0000	4399.8	337.9	52.5	264.9
14.0000	4024.2	216.0	54.8	260.0
15.0000	3470.2	117.1	47.4	248.6
Totals	78346.8	10840.0	823.9	4485.6

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	B-DELAY MINE	B-LETHAL MINE	CBU-87 CEM	CBU-97 SFW
1.0000	0.	125.5	561.6	918.8
2.0000	.3	204.1	576.0	1630.2
3.0000	0.	208.4	311.2	2484.2
4.0000	0.	194.0	238.7	3385.4
5.0000	0.	213.8	219.2	3934.8
6.0000	0.	185.3	227.2	4815.2
7.0000	0.	174.1	215.2	4655.8
8.0000	0.	156.1	209.1	3817.6
9.0000	0.	134.0	216.1	3405.8
10.0000	0.	143.6	217.3	3163.0
11.0000	.1	131.7	233.9	3064.8
12.0000	0.	112.1	222.0	3022.8
13.0000	0.	116.3	223.5	3020.0
14.0000	0.	120.3	239.2	3130.8

15.0000	0.	126.1	280.3	3151.4
Totals	.4	2345.3	4190.4	47600.6

BLUE MUNITIONS EXPENDED
SUMMARY

Days	LGB GBU	GPS ALL WX GBU	DECOY	Totals
1.0000	290.5	0.	0.	5643.2
2.0000	483.3	0.	0.	8693.3
3.0000	444.2	0.	0.	10038.1
4.0000	475.8	0.	0.	11745.6
5.0000	455.5	0.	0.	13194.8
6.0000	420.8	0.	0.	13490.1
7.0000	345.8	0.	0.	13706.3
8.0000	318.6	0.	0.	12481.4
9.0000	283.4	0.	0.	11849.3
10.0000	285.4	0.	0.	11308.2
11.0000	298.4	0.	0.	10244.4
12.0000	304.2	0.	0.	9412.3
13.0000	294.5	0.	0.	8783.8
14.0000	297.3	0.	0.	8397.2
15.0000	301.7	0.	0.	7787.5
Totals	5299.5	0.	0.	156775.7

The airbase data file that follows has all pre-positioned munitions removed for blue forces.

airbase.dat.

```

AIRBASE.303
NUMBER.OF.AIR.BASE.TAKEOFF.&.LANDING.ATTRITION.CLASSES:      3
  10001 "NO THREAT"
  10002 "LOW THREAT"
  10003 "HIGH THREAT"
END.AIR.BASE.TAKEOFF.&.LANDING.ATTRITION.CLASSES

NUMBER.OF.AIR.BASE.MINE.EFFECTS.CLASSES      4
  1901 "ONE AREA"
  1902 "TWO AREAS"
  1903 "THREE AREAS"
  1904 "MORE THAN THREE AREAS"
END.AIR.BASE.MINE.EFFECTS.CLASSES

BEGIN.AIRBASE.TGT.ELEMENT.REPAIR.FUNCTIONS
  10001 "Instant, .15 percent repairable"
    MAX.REPAIRS      9999999
    PROB.REPAIRABLE  .15
    REPAIR.TIME.FN(HRS)  UNIF  0.0  0.0
  10002 "Instant"
    MAX.REPAIRS      9999999
    PROB.REPAIRABLE  1.0
    REPAIR.TIME.FN(HRS)  UNIF  0.0  0.0
  10003 "Exponential, 16.64 repair time"
    MAX.REPAIRS      9999999
    PROB.REPAIRABLE  1.0
    REPAIR.TIME.FN(HRS)  EXP 16.64  0.0
END.AIRBASE.TGT.ELEMENT.REPAIR.FUNCTIONS

```

```

BEGIN.AIRBASE.TGT.SEPARATION.FUNCTIONS
20001 "31 UNIFORM WITH RADIUS 707"
  TGT.X:Y.RATIO 1.0
  TGT.X.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 318.3 318.3
  TGT.Y.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 318.3 318.3
20002 "1 UNIFORM WITH RADIUS 707"
  TGT.X:Y.RATIO 1.0
  TGT.X.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 1772.2 1772.2
  TGT.Y.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 1772.2 1772.2
20003 "13 UNIFORM WITH RADIUS 447"
  TGT.X:Y.RATIO 1.0
  TGT.X.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 310.8 310.8
  TGT.Y.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 310.8 310.8
20004 "116 UNIFORM WITH RADIUS 1358"
  TGT.X:Y.RATIO 1.0
  TGT.X.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 316.1 316.1
  TGT.Y.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 316.1 316.1
20005 "46 UNIFORM WITH RADIUS 859"
  TGT.X:Y.RATIO 1.0
  TGT.X.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 317.5 317.5
  TGT.Y.SEP.FN(M) UNIF 317.5 317.5
END.AIRBASE.TGT.SEPARATION.FUNCTIONS

```

```

BEGIN.AIRCRAFT.IN.OPEN.TARGETS
30001 "Aircraft in open #1"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10025
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20001
30002 "Aircraft in open #2"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10025
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20004
END.AIRCRAFT.IN.OPEN.TARGETS

```

```

BEGIN.SHELTER.TARGETS
40001 "Shelter #1"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10026
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20002
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10001
  RED.REPAIR.FN 10001
END.SHELTER.TARGETS

```

```

BEGIN.REVETMENT.TARGETS
END.REVETMENT.TARGETS

```

```

BEGIN.MAINTENANCE.TARGETS
60001 "Maintenance facility #1"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10031
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20003
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10003
  RED.REPAIR.FN 10003
60002 "Maintenance facility #2"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10031
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20005
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10003
  RED.REPAIR.FN 10003
END.MAINTENANCE.TARGETS

```

```

BEGIN.MUNITION.STORAGE.TARGETS
70001 "Ammo storage facility #1"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10028
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20003
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002
  RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
70002 "Ammo storage facility #2"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10028
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20005
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002
  RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
END.MUNITION.STORAGE.TARGETS

```

```

BEGIN.SPARES.STORAGE.TARGETS
80001 "Spares storage facility #1"
  STD.TARGET.ID 10033
  TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20003
  BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002

```


RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
 80002 "Spares storage facility #2"
 STD.TARGET.ID 10033
 TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20005
 BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002
 RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
 END.SPARES.STORAGE.TARGETS

BEGIN.POL.STORAGE.TARGETS
 90001 "POL storage facility #1"
 STD.TARGET.ID 10034
 TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20003
 BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002
 RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
 90002 "POL storage facility #2"
 STD.TARGET.ID 10034
 TGT.SEPARATION.FN 20005
 BLUE.REPAIR.FN 10002
 RED.REPAIR.FN 10002
 END.POL.STORAGE.TARGETS

NUMBER.OF.AIRBASES 83

@ AIRBASES NOT IN THEATER

ID.LIST...LATITUDE...LONGITUDE...AIR.CMD..FLYDIRECT..LOSABLE..NAME
 1001 52D46.0M-N 1D51.0M-W 1200 1 2 "RAF FAIRFORD"
 1002 32D10.0M-N 5D36.9M-W 1200 1 2 "MORON (SPAIN)"
 1003 37D00.1M-N 35D25.5M-E 1200 1 2 "INCIRLIK"
 SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..MIN.CEILING (M) ..MIN.VIS (M) ..CRATER.CREWS..T&L.ATTR.CLASS
 1 1901 300 100 10 1001

AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY
 REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY
 1 2
 2 1
 3 1

INT.LEVEL.MX.FACS

AIR MUNITIONS ID FULL LOAD ON HAND

RUNWAY..LENGTH (M) ..WIDTH..MIN.WTH..CUTS.TO.CLOSE..TGT.ID
 2658 72 24 10 10024
 2743 73 25 10 10024
 3230 73 25 10 10024

POL..CAPACITY..ON.HAND (STONS)
 30000 30000

AC.IN.OPEN.TGTS..ID
 30001

SHELTER.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
 40001 75

REVTMT.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS

MX.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 60001 13 1.0

AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 70001 13 1.0

SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 80001 13 1.0

POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 90001 13 1.0

END.AIRBASE

@ MAIN OPERATING BASES (BLUE)

ID.LIST...LATITUDE...LONGITUDE...AIR.CMD..FLYDIRECT..LOSABLE..NAME
 1004 28D22.3M-N 36D37.2M-E 1200 2 1 "TABUK"
 1005 26D56.4M-N 49D42.2M-E 1103 2 1
 "KING ABDUL AZIZ NAVAL BASE"
 1006 26D28.2M-N 49D47.8M-E 1200 2 1 "KING FAHD"
 1007 24D04.5M-N 47D26.6M-E 1200 2 1 "AL KHARJ"
 1008 21D29.3M-N 40D32.6M-E 1200 2 1 "AT-TAIF"
 1009 26D15.8M-N 50D09.5M-E 1200 2 1 "DHAHRAN"
 1010 25D55.0M-N 50D35.0M-E 1103 2 1 "SHAIKH ISA"
 1011 25D15.5M-N 51D33.9M-E 1200 2 1 "DOHA INTL"
 1012 25D01.7M-N 55D22.2M-E 1200 2 1 "AL-MINHAD"
 1013 24D14.5M-N 54D33.1M-E 1200 2 1 "AL-DHAFRA"
 SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..MIN.CEILING (M) ..MIN.VIS (M) ..CRATER.CREWS..T&L.ATTR.CLASS
 1 1901 300 100 10 1001

AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY
 1001 2

```

1002 1
REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY
1 2
2 1
3 1
INT.LEVEL.MX.FACS
AIR MUNITIONS ID FULL LOAD ON HAND
RUNWAY..LENGTH(M)..WIDTH..MIN.WTH..CUTS.TO.CLOSE..TGT.ID
2658 72 24 10 10024
2743 73 25 10 10024
3230 73 25 10 10024
POL..CAPACITY..ON.HAND(STONS)
30000 30000
AC.IN.OPEN.TGTS..ID
30001
SHELTER.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
40001 75
REVETMT.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
MX.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
60001 13 1.0
AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
70001 13 1.0
SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
80001 13 1.0
POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
90001 13 1.0
END.AIRBASE

```

@ CARRIER BATTLE GROUPS (CVGs) RED SEA BATTLE FORCE

```

ID.LIST...LATITUDE...LONGITUDE...AIR.CMD..FLYDIRECT..LOSABLE..NAME
1014 26D47.6M-N 35D05.9M-E 1101 1 2 "CV67_KENNEDY"
1015 25D33.8M-N 35D53.6M-E 1101 1 2 "CV60_SARATOGA"
SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..MIN.CEILING(M)..MIN.VIS(M)..CRATER.CREWS..T&L.ATTR.CLASS
1 1902 90 1600 4 10001
AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY
1001 4
1002 4
REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY
1 2
2 1
3 1

```

```

INT.LEVEL.MX.FACS
AIR MUNITIONS ID FULL LOAD ON HAND
RUNWAY..LENGTH(M)..WIDTH..MIN.WTH..CUTS.TO.CLOSE..TGT.ID
2745 45 20 6 10024
POL..CAPACITY..ON.HAND(STONS)
30000 30000
AC.IN.OPEN.TGTS..ID
30002
SHELTER.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
REVETMT.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
MX.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
60002 46 1.0
AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
70002 46 1.0
SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
80002 46 1.0
POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
90002 46 1.0
END.AIRBASE

```

@ CARRIER BATTLE GROUPS (CVGs) PERSIAN GULF BATTLE FORCE

```

ID.LIST...LATITUDE...LONGITUDE...AIR.CMD..FLYDIRECT..LOSABLE..NAME
1016 26D47.5M-N 52D19.4M-E 1102 2 1 "CV41_MIDWAY"
1017 26D14.1M-N 52D18.3M-E 1102 2 1 "CV61_RANGER"
1018 26D13.2M-N 52D52.9M-E 1102 2 1 "CV71_ROOSEVELT"
1019 27D13.6M-N 50D47.8M-E 1102 2 1 "CV66_AMERICA"
SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..MIN.CEILING(M)..MIN.VIS(M)..CRATER.CREWS..T&L.ATTR.CLASS
1 1902 90 1600 4 10001
AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY
1001 4
1002 4
REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY
1 2

```

```

          2   1
          3   1
INT. LEVEL. MX. FACS
AIR. MUNITIONS. ID. FULL. LOAD. ON. HAND
RUNWAY. LENGTH (M) . . WIDTH . . MIN. WTH. . CUTS. TO. CLOSE. . TGT. ID
          2745   45   20   6   10024
POL. . CAPACITY. . ON. HAND (STONS)
          30000   30000
AC. IN. OPEN. TGTS. . ID
          30002
SHELTER. TGTS. . ID. . NUM. ELTS
REVTMT. TGTS. . ID. . NUM. ELTS
MX. TGTS. . . . . ID. . NUM. ELTS. . FRAC. CAP
          60002   46   1.0
AIR. MUNT. TGTS. ID. . NUM. ELTS. . FRAC. CAP
          70002   46   1.0
SPARES. TGTS. . . ID. . NUM. ELTS. . FRAC. CAP
          80002   46   1.0
POL. TGTS. . . . . ID. . NUM. ELTS. . FRAC. CAP
          90002   46   1.0
END. AIRBASE

```

@ SECONDARY OR DISPERSAL AIRBASES (BLUE)

```

ID. LIST. . . . . LATITUDE. . . . . LONGITUDE. . . . . AIR. CMD. . . . . FLYDIRECT. . . . . LOSABLE. . . . . NAME
1020 24D42.6M-N 46D43.7M-E 1200 2 1 "RIYADH"
1021 21D30.0M-N 39D13.0M-E 1200 2 1 "JIDDAH"
1022 24D33.0M-N 39D41.0M-E 1200 2 1 "MEDINA"
1023 29D47.3M-N 40D06.2M-E 1200 2 1 "AL_JAWF"
1025 28D20.0M-N 46D07.0M-E 1200 2 1 "AL_QAYSUMAN"
1027 25D15.1M-N 55D21.9M-E 1200 2 1 "DUBAI"
1028 27D53.8M-N 45D31.6M-E 1200 2 1 "KING KHALID MIL_CITY"
1029 26D16.1M-N 50D38.0M-E 1200 2 1 "BAHRAIN_INTL"
1030 25D17.1M-N 49D29.1M-E 1200 2 1 "AL_AHSA"
1031 24D57.7M-N 46D42.5M-E 1200 2 1 "KING KHALID_INTL"
1032 25D09.8M-N 46D33.0M-E 1200 2 1 "THUMAMAH"
1033 27D57.0M-N 45D34.0M-E 1200 2 1 "HAFR_AL_BATIN"
1034 26D18.1M-N 43D46.2M-E 1200 2 1 "GASSIM"
1035 28D05.3M-N 48D36.6M-E 1200 2 1 "RAS MISHAB"
1036 27D26.5M-N 41D41.2M-E 1200 2 1 "HAIL"
1037 24D08.6M-N 38D03.8M-E 1200 2 1 "YENBO"
1038 26D11.9M-N 36D28.5M-E 1200 2 1 "WEJH"
1039 28D22.3M-N 36D37.5M-E 1200 2 1 "KING FAISAL_AB"
1040 28D53.0M-N 36D10.0M-E 1200 2 1 "AL_BIR"
1042 31D24.8M-N 37D16.6M-E 1200 2 1 "GURIAT"
1043 16D54.3M-N 42D34.9M-E 1200 2 1 "GIZAN"
1044 17D25.0M-N 47D05.0M-E 1200 2 1 "SHARURAH"
1045 18D14.3M-N 42D49.3M-E 1200 2 1 "ABHA"
1046 18D12.9M-N 42D47.4M-E 1200 2 1 "KHAMIS_MUSHAIT"
1047 19D58.8M-N 42D37.6M-E 1200 2 1 "BISHA"
1048 20D27.8M-N 45D37.2M-E 1200 2 1 "SULAYEL"
1049 29D21.0M-N 47D32.0M-E 1200 2 1 "ALI_AL_SALEM"
1050 29D13.7M-N 47D58.6M-E 1200 2 1 "KUWAIT_INTL"
1051 28D56.0M-N 47D48.0M-E 1200 2 1 "AHMED_AL_JABER"

```

```

SIDE. . MINE. EFF. CLASS. . MIN. CEILING (M) . . MIN. VIS (M) . . CRATER. CREWS. . T&L. ATTR. CLASS
1 1901 300 100 10 10001

```

```

AD. SITES. . TYPE. ID. . . . QTY
REPAIR. RESRCS. . ID. . . . QTY
          1 2
          2 1
          3 1

```

INT. LEVEL. MX. FACS

```

AIR. MUNITIONS. ID. FULL. LOAD. ON. HAND
RUNWAY. LENGTH (M) . . WIDTH . . MIN. WTH. . CUTS. TO. CLOSE. . TGT. ID
          2658   72   24   10   10024
          2743   73   25   10   10024
          3230   73   25   10   10024
POL. . CAPACITY. . ON. HAND (STONS)
          30000   30000
AC. IN. OPEN. TGTS. . ID
          30001
SHELTER. TGTS. . ID. . NUM. ELTS
          40001   75
REVTMT. TGTS. . ID. . NUM. ELTS
MX. TGTS. . . . . ID. . NUM. ELTS. . FRAC. CAP
          60001   13   1.0

```

AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 70001 13 1.0
 SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 80001 13 1.0
 POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
 90001 13 1.0
 END.AIRBASE

@ RED MAIN OPERATING BASES

ID..LIST...	LATITUDE...	LONGITUDE...	AIR.CMD..	FLYDIRECT..	LOSABLE..	NAME
2001	30D32.0M-N	46D35.0M-E	2101	2	1	"JALIBAH SE"
2002	30D32.7M-N	47D39.9M-E	2101	2	1	"BASRAH WEST"
2003	32D54.0M-N	44D38.0M-E	2101	2	1	"SHAYKA MAZHAR"
2004	33D15.0M-N	44D14.0M-E	2101	2	1	"BAGHDAD INTL"
2005	33D17.0M-N	44D30.0M-E	2101	2	1	"BAGHDAD RASHEED"
2006	33D57.0M-N	44D22.0M-E	2101	2	1	"BALAD SE"
2007	33D47.0M-N	42D27.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AL ASAD"
2008	33D21.0M-N	40D36.0M-E	2101	2	1	"H2"
2009	32D56.0M-N	39D46.0M-E	2101	2	1	"H3"
2010	33D05.0M-N	39D36.0M-E	2101	2	1	"H3_NW"
2011	32D46.0M-N	39D37.0M-E	2101	2	1	"H3_SW"
2012	32D52.0M-N	39D20.0M-E	2101	2	1	"H3_HWY"
2013	33D20.0M-N	43D36.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AL TAQADDUM"
2014	34D36.0M-N	43D47.0M-E	2101	2	1	"TIKRIT EAST"
2015	34D33.0M-N	43D41.0M-E	2101	2	1	"TIKRIT SOUTH"
2016	34D55.0M-N	43D24.0M-E	2101	2	1	"K2"
2017	35D28.0M-N	44D21.0M-E	2101	2	1	"KIRKUK"
2018	36D18.0M-N	43D09.0M-E	2101	2	1	"MOSUL"
2020	35D46.0M-N	43D07.0M-E	2101	2	1	"QAYYARAH"
SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..	MIN.CEILING(M)..	MIN.VIS(M)..	CRATER.CREWS..	T&L.ATTR.CLASS		
2	1901	300	100	3		10001

AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY

2003 1
 2004 1
 2002 1

REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY

1 2
 2 1
 3 1

INT.LEVEL.MX.FACS

AIR.MUNITIONS..ID..FULL.LOAD..ON.HAND

2202 500 500
 2203 500 500
 2208 500 500

RUNWAY..LENGTH(M)..WIDTH..MIN.WTH..CUTS.TO.CLOSE..TGT.ID

3353 73 25 10 10024
 3658 67 25 10 10024

POL..CAPACITY..ON.HAND(STONS)

30000 30000

AC.IN.OPEN.TGTS..ID

30001

SHELTER.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS

40001 100

REVEI.MT.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS

MX.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP

60001 50 1.0

AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP

70001 50 1.0

SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP

80001 50 1.0

POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP

90001 50 1.0

END.AIRBASE

@ RED DISPERSAL AIRBASES

ID..LIST...	LATITUDE...	LONGITUDE...	AIR.CMD..	FLYDIRECT..	LOSABLE..	NAME
2021	30D08.0M-N	47D40.0M-E	2101	2	1	"SAFWAN"
2022	30D22.0M-N	47D06.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AR RUMAYLAH_SW"
2023	30D14.0M-N	47D27.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AL MUFRASH"
2024	30D55.0M-N	46D06.0M-E	2101	2	1	"TALLID"
2025	31D27.0M-N	47D17.0M-E	2101	2	1	"QALAT SALIH"
2026	31D49.0M-N	47D05.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AMARA NEW"
2027	31D59.0M-N	44D25.0M-E	2101	2	1	"NEJEF NEW"
2028	32D30.0M-N	45D45.0M-E	2101	2	1	"UBAYDAH"
2029	32D57.0M-N	44D16.0M-E	2101	2	1	"AL IKANDARIYAH"

```

2030 33D26.0M-N 42D54.0M-E 2101 2 1 "AL_MUHUMMADI"
2031 32D25.0M-N 41D58.0M-E 2101 2 1 "MUDAYSIS"
2032 34D41.0M-N 43D33.0M-E 2101 2 1 "AL_SAHRA"
2033 35D08.0M-N 43D43.0M-E 2101 2 1 "AL_FATHAH"
2034 36D13.0M-N 43D58.0M-E 2101 2 1 "IRBIL"
2035 36D16.0M-N 42D24.0M-E 2101 2 1 "TALL_A FAR"
2038 31D26.0M-N 47D40.0M-E 2101 2 1 "SHAIBAH"
SIDE..MINE.EFF.CLASS..MIN.CEILING(M)..MIN.VIS(M)..CRATER.CREWS..T&L.ATTR.CLASS
2 1901 300 100 3 10001
AD.SITES..TYPE.ID...QTY
2003 1
2004 1
2002 1
REPAIR.RESRCS..ID...QTY
1 2
2 1
3 1
INT.LEVEL.MX.FACS
AIR.MUNITIONS..ID..FULL.LOAD..ON.HAND
2202 300 300
2203 300 300
2208 300 300
RUNWAY..LENGTH(M)..WIDTH..MIN.WTH..CUTS.TO.CLOSE..TGT.ID
3353 73 25 10 10024
3658 67 25 10 10024
POL..CAPACITY..ON.HAND(STONS)
30000 30000
AC.IN.OPEN.TGTS..ID
30001
SHELTER.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
40001 100
REVTMT.TGTS..ID..NUM.ELTS
MX.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
60001 50 1.0
AIR.MUNT.TGTS.ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
70001 50 1.0
SPARES.TGTS...ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
80001 50 1.0
POL.TGTS.....ID..NUM.ELTS..FRAC.CAP
90001 50 1.0
END.AIRBASE
END.AIRBASES

```

To disable munitions re-supply at Blue airbases, the following lines of code in the *critres.dat* file were zeroed out.

critres.dat

CRITICAL.RESOURCES.380

NUMBER.OF.CRITICAL.RESOURCES 31

```

1101 AIM-7
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT, 2=SA.MUNT, 3=EQUIP) 1
URGENCY.CURVE 1
LOW RES INITIAL STOCK 0
LOW RES RESUPPLY START TIME (DEC. DAYS) NUMBER/DAY
HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID..NUMBER
1006 250
HI RES RESUPPLY TIME (DAYS) NUMBER TARGET TYPE ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

```

```

1102 AAMRAM
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT, 2=SA.MUNT, 3=EQUIP) 1
URGENCY.CURVE 1
LOW RES INITIAL STOCK 0
LOW RES RESUPPLY START TIME (DEC. DAYS) NUMBER/DAY

```

```

HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID...NUMBER
                                1006      250
HI.RES.RESUPPLY...TIME(DAYS)...NUMBER...TARGET TYPE...ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

1103   AIM-9
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT,2=SA.MUNT,3=EQUIP)           1
URGENCY.CURVE                                     1
LOW.RES.INITIAL.STOCK                             0
LOW.RES.RESUPPLY...START TIME(DEC.DAYS)...NUMBER/DAY
HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID...NUMBER
                                1006      250
HI.RES.RESUPPLY...TIME(DAYS)...NUMBER...TARGET TYPE...ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

1106   AGM-65
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT,2=SA.MUNT,3=EQUIP)           1
URGENCY.CURVE                                     1
LOW.RES.INITIAL.STOCK                             0
LOW.RES.RESUPPLY...START TIME(DEC.DAYS)...NUMBER/DAY
HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID...NUMBER
                                1006      250
HI.RES.RESUPPLY...TIME(DAYS)...NUMBER...TARGET TYPE...ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

1107   ARM-88
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT,2=SA.MUNT,3=EQUIP)           1
URGENCY.CURVE                                     1
LOW.RES.INITIAL.STOCK                             0
LOW.RES.RESUPPLY...START TIME(DEC.DAYS)...NUMBER/DAY
HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID...NUMBER
                                1006      250
HI.RES.RESUPPLY...TIME(DAYS)...NUMBER...TARGET TYPE...ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

1108   SPW-45
TYPE... (1=AIR.MUNT,2=SA.MUNT,3=EQUIP)           1
URGENCY.CURVE                                     1
LOW.RES.INITIAL.STOCK                             0
LOW.RES.RESUPPLY...START TIME(DEC.DAYS)...NUMBER/DAY
HI.RES.INITIAL.STOCKS.....LOG.FAC.ID...NUMBER
                                1006      250
HI.RES.RESUPPLY...TIME(DAYS)...NUMBER...TARGET TYPE...ID LIST
END.RESOURCE

```

Appendix C

The following files are examples of code used to overwrite the THUNDER data files on a UNIX UltraSPARC workstation using Solaris 2.0 environment.

The file F16.ex is the executable file:

F16.ex

```
cat /usr/home/students/jgrier/scripts/sqF16 |ex -s ./squadron.dat
cat /usr/home/students/jgrier/scripts/acF16 |ex -s ./acserv.dat
```

which uses the following files to search and overwrite existing text. In this example, it scrolls through the squadron.dat file until it locates "F-16_INCIRLIK". It then searches for the first entry of value 36 (in the next 3 line) and replaces it with a value of 48. The wq command at the end saves the changes (write command in UNIX) and quits the sqF16 script.

sqF16

```
/11601 "F-16_INCIRLIK"
s/36/48/3
/11602 "F-16A_AL-KHARJ"
s/24/36/3
/11604 "F-16_DOHA"
s/24/36/3
/11605 "F-16_AL-MINHAD1"
s/24/36/3
/11606 "F-16_AL-MINHAD2"
s/24/36/3
/11607 "F-16_AL-MINHAD3"
s/24/36/3
/11608 "F-16_AL-DHAFRA1"
s/24/36/3
/11609 "F-16_AL-DHAFRA2"
s/24/36/3
/11610 "F-16_AL-DHAFRA3"
s/24/36/3
wq
```

The same logic follows for the acF16 script:

acF16

```
/1016 "F-16 KIT"
s/24/36/3
wq
```

The munitions levels were set using the same type of shell scripts. The following code was used to set the AGM-65 levels:

AGM65.ex

```
cat /usr/home/students/jgrier/scripts/AGM65 |ex -s ./acserv.dat
```

AGM65

```
/1010 "A-10 KIT"
s/1106 390/1106 585/10
/1016 "F-16 KIT"
s/1106 266/1106 399/10
/1008 "AV-8 KIT"
s/1106 290/1106 435/10
/1018 "FA-18 KIT"
s/1106 160/1106 240/10
/1014 "F-14 KIT"
s/1106 10/1106 15/10
wq
```

Note: These files were written with the intent to overwrite the *squadron.dat* and *acserv.dat* files in the current working directory. The shell scripts were located in my scripts subdirectory, with the appropriate path set in the *.cshrc* file.

THUNDER generates a report called *ttgraph.rpt*, which contains all of the metrics collected (in the macro file). To convert this file to a comma delimited file that MS Excel recognizes, the shell script *ttgraph.nawk* was used:

ttgraph.nawk

```
## Convert ttgraph.rpt to a comma separated file (csv)
##
## Search for lines beginning with double quotes
/^"/ {
    title = $0                # Get the title of chart
    getline                  # Skip two lines
    getline
    lablen = length($0)      # Determine the length of the variable labels
    xlabel = substr($0, 2, 18) # Get the x-axis label of chart
    xstart = 21              # Define the starting position for variables
    icnt = 0                 # Initialize variable counter
    do {
        icnt ++              # Increment variable counter
        ylabel[icnt] = substr($0, xstart, 10)
        xstart = xstart + 10 # Prepare for next variable
    } while (lablen > xstart) # Loop through each variable

    ##
    ## Write out titles and labels
    ##
    printf ("%s\n", title)
    printf ("%s", xlabel)
    for (i=1; i<=icnt; i++)
        printf (",%s", ylabel[i])
    printf ("\n")

    ##
    ## Read the data
    ##
    ##
    getline                  # Skip a line
    do {
        getline              # Read a line of data
        if (length($0) > 0) { # Make sure it it really data
            printf ("%s", $1)
            for (i=2; i<=icnt+1; i++)
                printf(",%s", $i)
        }
    }
}
```



```
        printf ("\n")
    }
} while (length($0) > 0)
#
# Print a separating line
#
printf ("\n")
}
```

Appendix D

Below are the nine Campaign Objectives (CO) identified by XPY and ASPVG, their respective Operational Objectives (OO) and Operational Tasks (OT), as well as the metrics needed to measure each. **The highlighted metrics could be measured by the UNCLASSIFIED database.** **Bold type face indicates metrics a CLASSIFIED database can measure.** *Items in italics can not be measured by THUNDER.*

CO #1: HALT INVADING ARMIES

OO #01: Delay/destroy/disrupt lead elements of armored advance

OT #01: Destroy/damage advancing armored vehicles

Metric: **Percent of Tanks Killed**
Percent APCs Killed
Time to stop RED advancement
Distance FLOT moved

OT #02: Destroy/damage accompanying support vehicles

Metric: **Percent Trucks Killed**

OT #03: Mine/cut key attack routes

Metric: **Number of choke points killed**
Number of choke points repaired
Percent potential RED attack routes closed

OO #02: Delay/damage reinforcing forces and supplies in the rear

OT #04: Mine/cut roads and railbeds

Metric: **Number of choke points killed**
Number of rail bridges killed
Number of trans shipment points killed

OT #05: Destroy/damage armored and other vehicles in convoys or on trains

Metric: **Total number of moving Tanks Killed**
Total number of moving APCs Killed
Total number of re-supply Tanks killed
Total number of re-supply APCs killed

OT #06: Disrupt field logistics sites, transportation nodes, assembly areas

Metric: **Number of Logistics sites destroyed**
Number of assembly nodes killed

OT #07: Drop bridges, block tunnels and other choke points

Metric: **Number of bridges destroyed**
Number of Tunnels destroyed

OO # 03: Provide fire support to forces in close contact with enemy forces

OT # 08: Destroy/disable/pin armored vehicles near line of contact

**Metric: Percent of Tanks near line of contact disabled/killed
Percent of APCs near line of contact disabled/killed**

OT # 09: Disable/pin dismounted troops near line of contact

**Metric: Percent of Infantry near line of contact Killed
Percent of Infantry near line of contact wounded in action**

OT # 10: Destroy/suppress artillery and MLRS

**Metric: Percent of self-propelled artillery killed
Percent of Towed artillery killed
Percent of MLRS killed**

CO # 02: MARSHALL AND SUSTAIN IN-THEATER ASSETS

OO # 04: Airlift personnel and materiel into and within distant theaters

OT # 11: Airlift forces and critical support into distant theater

Metric: Percent TPFDD arrived in theater on time

OT # 12: Airlift forces and critical support within theater

**Metric: Total troops moved in theater
Total cargo moved in theater**

OT # 13: Airdrop troops and equipment covertly in hostile territory

Metric: Percent of SOF missions successfully inserted

OO # 05: Refuel aircraft in flight

OT # 14: Refuel aircraft flying to and from distant theaters

**Metrics: Total number of aircraft refueled
Percent of total scheduled receivers refueled**

OT # 15: Refuel aircraft moving to attack enemy forces

**Metric: Total number of aircraft refueled
Percent of total scheduled receivers refueled**

OT # 16: Refuel aircraft on station or CAP

**Metric: Total number of CAP aircraft refueled
Percent of total scheduled CAP receivers refueled
Average time to refuel once on station**

OO # 06: Recover personnel in distress

OT # 17: Rescue downed aircrews and other personnel in hostile territory

**Metric: Percent of downed aircrew recovered
Success rate of recovering special ops teams**

OT# 18: Medevac wounded personnel to medical facilities

Metric: Total number of patients medevaced

OO # 07 Train and maintain in-theater forces elements

OT # 19: Maintain equipment for high intensity operations (generate sorties)

**Metric: BLUE mean repair time (MRT) by platform
BLUE aircraft battle damage repair time (ABDR)
Average BLUE mission preparation time
Average weapon upload/checkout time
Total sorties generated by BLUE
Total number of mission aborts for maintenance**

OT # 20: Train and exercise personnel

Metric:

OT # 21: Provide for the morale and welfare of personnel

Metric:

OO # 08: Secure bases

OT # 22: Secure base perimeters

Metric:

OT # 23: Defeat attacks by special ops forces

Metric:

CO # 03: EVICT HALTED ARMIES FROM FRIENDLY TERRITORY

OO # 09: Degrade and overrun defensive positions

OT # 24: Destroy/damage armored and other vehicles in defensive positions

**Metric: Number of Tanks in defensive positions killed
Number of APCs in defensive positions killed**

OT # 25: Disable dismantled troops

**Metric: Number of Infantry in defensive positions killed
Number of Infantry in defensive positions wounded in action**

OT # 26: Neutralize obstacles (mines, fortifications)

Metric:

OT # 27: Mine/cut key routes of retreat

Metric: Percentage of key routes of retreat blocked

OO # 02: Delay/damage reinforcing forces and supplies in the rear

OT # 04: Mine/cut roads and railbeds

Metric: Number of choke points killed
Number of rail bridges killed
Number of trans shipment points killed

OT # 05: Destroy/damage armored and other vehicles in convoys or on trains

Metric: Total number of moving Tanks Killed
Total number of moving APCs Killed
Total number of re-supply Tanks killed
Total number of re-supply APCs killed

OT # 06: Disrupt field logistics sites, transportation nodes, assembly areas

Metric: Number of Logistics sites destroyed
Number of assembly nodes killed

OT # 07: Drop bridges, block tunnels and other choke points

Metric: Number of bridges destroyed
Number of Tunnels destroyed

OO # 03: Provide fire support to forces in close contact with enemy forces

OT # 08: Destroy/disable/pin armored vehicles near line of contact

Metric: Percent of Tanks near line of contact disabled/killed
Percent of APCs near line of contact disabled/killed

OT # 09: Disable/pin dismounted troops near line of contact

Metric: Percent of Infantry near line of contact Killed
Percent of Infantry near line of contact wounded in action

OT # 10: Destroy/suppress artillery and MLRS

Metric: Percent of Self-propelled artillery killed
Percent of Towed artillery killed
Percent of MLRS killed

CO # 04: GAIN, MAINTAIN AIR SUPERIORITY

OO # 10: Defeat air attacks

OT # 28: Destroy/disrupt aircraft and helicopters in flight

Metric: RED aircraft lost due to BLUE air
Percent of RED aircraft shot down
RED/BLUE exchange ratio

OT # 29: Destroy/disrupt cruise missiles in flight

Metric: Percent of cruise missile intercepted in flight

OT # 30: Disrupt sensors on aircraft and weapons

Metric: Losses with EW assets / Losses without EW assets ratio

OT # 31: Execute passive defensive measures in threatened areas

Metric: Total number of BLUE aircraft destroyed on the ground

OO # 11: Suppress generation of air sorties

OT# 32: Crater/mine/damage airfield runways and taxiways

Metric: Percent of RED airfields operable
Percent time RED airfield is operable

OT # 33: Destroy/damage aircraft in the open or in revetments

Metric: Number of RED aircraft destroyed in the open
Number of RED aircraft destroyed in revetments
Ground kills per total kills

OT # 34: Destroy/damage aircraft in hardened shelters

Metric: Number of RED aircraft destroyed in hardened shelters
Number of RED hardened shelters destroyed

OT # 35: Destroy/damage airbase support facilities

Metric: Percent of RED support facilities destroyed by BLUE air

OT # 36: Deny attack helicopter forward area refuel/replenishment points

Metric: Percentage of RED FARPS destroyed by BLUE air

OO # 12: Suppress surface-based air defense

OT # 37: Destroy/damage fixed SAM launchers

Metric: Number of TELs killed
Number of ACO radars killed
Number of Fire control radars killed
Total number of BLUE aircraft lost to enemy SAMs

OT # 38: Destroy/damage mobile SAM launchers and AAA

Metric: Number of TELARs killed
Number of mobile ACO radars killed
Number of mobile Fire control radars killed
Total number of BLUE aircraft lost to enemy SAMs

OT # 39: Destroy/disrupt tracking and engagement radars

Metric: Percent of EW/GCI sites operable

OO # 13: Defeat attacking ballistic missiles (BM)

OT # 40: Destroy ballistic missiles in flight (active defense)

Metric: Percent of BMs intercepted by BLUE air

OT # 41: Execute passive defense measures in threatened areas

Metric: Total number of BLUE losses due to BM attack

OO # 14: Suppress the generation of ballistic missile launches

OT # 42: Destroy/damage TELs in the field and disrupt operations

Metric: Percent of BM TELs in field operable

OT # 43: Destroy/damage TELs in garrisons and assembly areas

Metric: Percent of TELs in garrison & assembly areas operable

OT # 44: Destroy/damage fixed TBM launchers

Metric: Percent of TBMs operable

OT # 45: Destroy Tactical Ballistic Missile (TBM) storage areas

Metric: Total number of TBM storage areas destroyed

CO # 05: GAIN, MAINTAIN SEA CONTROL

OO # 15: Sink/disable surface combatants and disrupt their operations

OT # 46: Sink/disable ships at sea and in port

Metric: Percent of surface combatants killed

OT # 47: Mine ports, choke points, and anchorages

Metric: Percent of port processing capacity remaining overall

OT # 48: Disrupt shipborne sensors

Metric:

CO # 06: GAIN, MAINTAIN SPACE CONTROL

OO # 16: Sustain operations of friendly space-based assets

OT # 49: Re-deploy space assets as needed and sustain constellations on orbit

Metric:

OT # 50: Launch satellites on a timely basis

Metric: Average delay of BLUE satellite launches

OO # 17: Protect friendly space-based assets in the face of enemy attack

OT # 51: Destroy/disrupt ASATs in flight

Metric: Percent of RED ASATs destroyed in flight

OT # 52: Evade ASATs

Metric: Percent of BLUE satellites operable

OO # 18: Suppress enemy space based capabilities

OT # 53: Destroy/damage satellites in orbit

Metric: Percent of satellites operable

OT # 54: Destroy/damage launch facilities, tracking stations, and other fixed sites

Metric: Percent of launch facilities, tracking stations and fixed sites operable

OT # 55: Destroy/damage mobile space surveillance and tracking radars

Metric: Percent of mobile space surveillance and tracking radars operable

OT # 56: Disrupt links.

Metric: Percent of Links operable

CO # 7: GAIN, MAINTAIN INFORMATION DOMINANCE

OO # 19: Provide "eyes, ears, and voice of commanders

OT # 57: Provide timely, accurate information on enemy activities, force disposition

Metric:

OT # 58: Provide timely, accurate assessment of battle results

Metric:

OT # 59: Provide timely, accurate reports on friendly force disposition

Metric:

OT # 60: Provide timely, accurate reports on the weather

Metric:

OT # 61: Provide timely, accurate dissemination of commanders' intent

Metric:

OO # 20: Degrade command and control of enemy forces

OT # 62: Destroy/damage command bunkers

Metric: Percent of command bunkers operable
Data transmission rate

OT # 63: Destroy/damage mobile command posts

Metric: Number of C3 Antennas killed
Number of C3 Vane killed
Data transmission rate

OT # 64: Disrupt enemy communications

Metric: Average communication data transmission rate

OT # 65: Destroy/disrupt airborne command, control, and surveillance platforms

Metric: Number of Mainstay killed
Average time Mainstay is on station

OT # 66: Destroy/disrupt ground-based radars and other sensors

Metric: Percent of EW/CGI sites operable

OO # 21: Sow confusion in enemy situational awareness

OT # 67: Effect deceptions/false targets to mask friendly deployments and assets

Metric: Number of decoys killed

OT # 68: Disseminate dis-information to enemy commanders and forces

Metric:

CO # 8: DENY POSSESSION AND USE OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD)

OO # 22: Damage/deny facilities for producing and storing WMD

OT # 69: Destroy production plants

Metric: Percent of production plant destroyed

OT # 70: Destroy weapon storage sites or deny access

Metric: Percent of WMD storage facilities destroyed

OO # 13: Defeat attacking ballistic missiles (BM)

OT # 40: Destroy ballistic missiles in flight (active defense)

Metric: Percent of BMs intercepted by BLUE air

OT # 41: Execute passive defense measures in threatened areas

Metric: Total number of BLUE losses due to BM attack

OO # 14: Suppress the generation of ballistic missile launches

OT # 42: Destroy/damage TELs in the field and disrupt operations

Metric: Percent of BM TELs in field operable

OT # 43: Destroy/damage TELs in garrisons and assembly areas

Metric: Percent of TELs in garrison & assembly areas operable

OT # 44: Destroy/damage fixed TBM launchers

Metric: Percent of TBMs operable

OT # 45: Destroy Tactical Ballistic Missile (TBM) storage areas

Metric: Total number of TBM storage areas destroyed

OO # 10: Defeat air attacks

OT # 28: Destroy/disrupt aircraft and helicopters in flight

Metric: RED aircraft lost due to BLUE air
Percent of RED aircraft shot down
RED/BLUE exchange ratio

OT # 29: Destroy/disrupt cruise missiles in flight

Metric: Percent of cruise missile intercepted in flight

OT # 30: Disrupt sensors on aircraft and weapons

Metric: Losses with EW assets / Losses without EW assets ratio

OT # 31: Execute passive defensive measures in threatened areas

Metric: Total number of BLUE aircraft destroyed on the ground

OO # 11: Suppress generation of air sorties

OT# 32: Crater/mine/damage airfield runways and taxiways

Metric: Percent of RED airfields operable
Percent time RED airfield is operable

OT # 33: Destroy/damage aircraft in the open or in revetments

Metric: Number of RED aircraft destroyed in the open
Number of RED aircraft destroyed in revetments
Ground kills per total kills

OT # 34: Destroy/damage aircraft in hardened shelters

Metric: Number of RED aircraft destroyed in hardened shelters
Number of RED hardened shelters destroyed

OT # 35: Destroy/damage airbase support facilities

Metric: Percent of RED support facilities destroyed by BLUE air

OT # 36: Deny attack helicopter forward area refuel/replenishment points

Metric: Percentage of RED FARPS destroyed by BLUE air

CO # 9: SUPPRESS NATIONAL CAPACITY TO WAGE WAR

OO # 23: Disrupt national POL system

OT# 71: Disrupt/Damage POL refineries and storage facilities

Metric: POL production rate
Percent POL storage facilities destroyed

OT # 72: Sever key petroleum pipelines

Metric: POL transfer rate
Percent pipelines destroyed

OT # 73: Disrupt off-load sites at ports and transshipment points

Metric: Percentage of RED transshipment points operable

OT # 74: Disrupt/damage POL control facilities

Metric: Percent POL control facilities operable

OO # 24: Disrupt national power generation

OT # 75: Disrupt/disable power plants and hydroelectric facilities

Metric: Percent of power plants/hydroelectric facilities operable
Average total power output

OT # 76: Disrupt/disable substations and transformers

Metric: Number of substations killed
Number of Trans shipment points killed

OT # 77: Sever power lines

Metric: Number of Power lines destroyed

OT # 78: Disable/destroy alternative stand alone" power sources

Metric: Number of stand alone power sources

OT # 79: Disrupt/disable grid control facilities

Metric: Number of grid control facilities killed

OO # 25: Disrupt national communications system

OT # 80: Disrupt/disable key telephone switching centers

Metric: Number of key telephone switching centers killed

OT# 81: Sever land lines

Metric: Number of land lines killed

OT # 82: Disrupt/damage key communication nodes

Metric: Number of fixed C2 nodes killed
Number of mobile C2 nodes killed

OO # 26: Disrupt national transportation system.

OT # 83: Disrupt airports, seaports, and transshipment points

Metric: Percent of airports, seaports and transshipment points operable

OT # 84: Disrupt railroad marshaling yards

Metric: Percent of Marshaling yards destroyed

OT # 85: Mine/cut roads, railroads, and waterways

Metric: Number of roads cut
Number of waterways destroyed
Number of railroads destroyed

OT # 86: Drop bridges and block choke points

Metric: Percent of bridges destroyed
Percent of choke points open

OT # 87: Disrupt/damage network control and navigation facilities

Metric: Number of network control facilities destroyed
Number of navigation facilities destroyed

OO # 27: Damage/disrupt war-supporting industry

OT # 88: Destroy defense-related plants and equipment

Metric: ~~Percent of defense related plants operable~~
Percent reduction in farm production
Percent reduction in vehicle production
Percent reduction in metal production
Percent of research learning centers destroyed

OT # 89: Disrupt flow of war-supporting imports

Metric: **Percent of inventory destroyed**

OO # 28: Disrupt political direction of enemy society, economy, war effort

OT # 90: Destroy/damage key directing organs and leadership cadres

Metric: **Number of offices destroyed**

OT # 91: Destroy leadership and internal security facilities

Metric: **Number of internal security facilities killed**
Number of leaders killed

OT # 92: Disseminate dis-information among leadership and population

Metric:

OO # 29: Reduce motivation of enemy troops to resist friendly action

OT # 93: Disseminate disinformation, warning of impending attacks

Metric:

OT # 94: Create belief that operating combat equipment will bring certain harm

Metric:

OT # 95: Create belief that reinforcements and supplies not forthcoming

Metric:

Appendix E

The chart below represents the Plackett-Burman experimental design used to reduce the number of input variables. Variables are in coded form.

Plackett-Burman Design

Run	x ₁	x ₂	x ₃	x ₄	x ₅	x ₆	x ₇	x ₈	x ₉	x ₁₀	x ₁₁	x ₁₂	x ₁₃	x ₁₄	x ₁₅	x ₁₆	x ₁₇	x ₁₈	x ₁₉	x ₂₀	x ₂₁	x ₂₂	x ₂₃	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
3	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
4	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
5	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
6	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
7	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
8	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
9	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
10	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
11	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
12	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
13	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
14	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1
15	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1
16	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1
17	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1
18	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1
23	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1
24	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- Where
- x₁ = F15C
 - x₂ = F16
 - x₃ = F15E
 - x₄ = F111
 - x₅ = F4G
 - x₇ = EF111
 - x₈ = F117
 - x₉ = AWACS
 - x₁₀ = JSTARS
 - x₁₁ = TOMAHAWK
 - x₁₃ = AIM9
 - x₁₄ = 20MM
 - x₁₅ = MK82
 - x₁₆ = AGM65
 - x₁₇ = ARM88
 - x₁₉ = B-LETHAL
 - x₂₀ = CBU87
 - x₂₁ = CBU97
 - x₂₂ = LGB
 - x₂₃ = GPS

The following table represents the 2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design used to model the main and some second-order interaction effects. Variables are in coded form.

Run	A10	F15E	AGM65	MK82
1	-1	-1	-1	-1
2	-1	-1	1	1
3	-1	1	-1	1
4	-1	1	1	-1
5	1	-1	-1	1
6	1	-1	1	-1
7	1	1	-1	-1
8	1	1	1	1
9	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0

Appendix F THUNDER Output

The following three tables lists the aggregate values for the output collected from the first independent observation of the Plackett-Burman experimental design.

Thunder Output Plackett-Burman Design Observation 1

Run	Tank(id)	Tank(co)	APC(d)	APC(po)	Inf(d)	Inf(po)	Arty(d)	Arty(po)	Haik(days)	Haik(dist)	Restore(days)	Push	TempRdBrnd	TSPT
Run 01-1	9774.0	8665.6	8482.2	9853.3	1247.1	3044.5	2730.0	1949.5	5.5	-22.7	7.15	9.2	8.8	4.1
Run 02-1	7805.8	7587.4	6143.6	8450.7	941.6	2322.6	2075.2	1952.0	5.5	-22.4	7.34	85.1	10.2	1.9
Run 03-1	6744.7	8429.2	7674.0	9700.3	1085.9	3021.7	2423.3	2073.1	5.0	-22.6	7.17	90.0	7.7	1.6
Run 04-1	8513.3	9206.8	7458.1	9731.7	1004.0	3082.0	2337.1	2094.2	5.0	-23.0	7.20	91.9	7.6	0.5
Run 05-1	9473.0	8660.6	8301.5	9174.3	1216.9	2746.5	2654.0	1867.8	5.5	-23.0	7.15	91.3	7.0	0.7
Run 06-1	9348.4	7857.6	8211.9	9187.9	1198.5	2819.7	2830.8	1886.8	5.5	-23.2	7.15	92.0	6.6	1.4
Run 07-1	7674.1	7577.6	6264.6	8381.9	925.3	2508.6	2087.7	1966.7	5.5	-22.4	7.29	86.7	6.9	2.7
Run 08-1	8817.7	7432.5	7015.5	8239.8	1080.1	2321.5	2993.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.7	7.26	89.4	9.4	1.2
Run 09-1	8471.4	7311.7	6953.0	7633.8	1087.1	2325.7	2993.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.7	7.35	89.6	7.7	0.3
Run 10-1	8618.5	6727.6	6964.1	8097.4	1052.2	2557.5	2983.8	1502.5	6.0	-22.5	7.27	91.2	9.4	1.1
Run 11-1	8688.4	7608.0	7114.0	7494.5	1080.2	2132.2	2983.8	1502.5	6.0	-24.0	7.40	85.1	7.3	0.7
Run 12-1	9473.4	7811.7	8363.4	9134.5	1187.8	2820.3	2837.9	1865.5	5.5	-23.1	7.15	91.1	7.5	0.4
Run 13-1	8732.2	7405.4	7025.4	8087.3	1059.4	2413.7	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.3	7.37	87.8	9.3	4.6
Run 14-1	9688.9	8476.5	8510.6	9590.7	1194.1	2980.5	2693.8	1913.5	5.5	-22.9	7.18	90.4	8.7	2.8
Run 15-1	8467.7	7891.2	6825.2	7818.6	1053.0	2182.0	2993.6	1602.5	6.0	-23.0	7.30	92.6	8.9	0.0
Run 16-1	8462.0	7361.2	6935.1	7726.2	1055.7	2387.4	2993.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.1	7.29	91.3	7.9	2.5
Run 17-1	8880.6	8720.3	7630.8	10500.8	1048.7	3203.9	2414.7	2219.3	5.0	-23.0	7.18	90.3	9.8	1.4
Run 18-1	9565.6	7812.0	8298.0	9553.0	1205.7	2980.4	2858.9	1918.0	5.5	-23.0	7.19	91.9	8.1	3.7
Run 19-1	8704.6	6616.0	7288.9	7748.0	1082.3	2568.1	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.2	7.27	90.2	7.9	1.9
Run 20-1	8824.1	8496.0	7208.8	7895.3	1081.4	2403.6	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.4	7.30	83.2	9.0	3.9
Run 21-1	10351.0	6448.4	9180.4	7989.0	1368.6	2933.9	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.8	7.19	80.0	7.5	1.6
Run 22-1	9761.4	8642.2	8422.1	9759.4	1220.1	2908.5	2696.2	1953.0	5.5	-22.7	7.15	91.8	9.5	1.8
Run 23-1	8077.7	7578.1	6512.2	8825.2	968.2	2611.3	2137.4	2075.6	5.5	-23.2	7.28	86.6	10.1	1.0
Run 24-1	8848.3	9578.9	7458.8	10779.0	1035.0	3102.9	2381.3	2255.2	5.0	-22.5	7.15	91.8	10.6	4.0
Run 25-1	9076.3	6885.7	7589.1	7344.2	1178.1	2146.8	2512.1	1517.4	6.0	-22.5	8.39	84.8	7.8	0.9
Run 26-1	8978.8	6908.8	7468.1	7288.3	1170.1	2111.4	2494.6	1502.7	6.0	-22.0	8.38	85.5	8.1	1.0

**Thunder Output
Plackett-Burman Design
Observation 1 (cont)**

	RedAALosses	RedSALosses	RedAGLosses	BlueAALosses	BlueSALosses	BlueAGLosses	Runways	ACinOpen	ABAmmo(H)	ABMaint(S)	ABSpares(S)
Run 01-1	384.1	209.9	5.1	-397.3	-316.3	-0.1	0.7	4.0	53.6	175.8	22.9
Run 02-1	345.7	221.0	5.7	-459.0	-263.4	-0.2	0.7	5.1	44.2	148.3	17.3
Run 03-1	339.5	218.4	6.1	-418.1	-328.9	-0.2	1.4	5.0	51.9	160.7	23.3
Run 04-1	336.7	242.8	5.8	-414.9	-327.4	-0.1	0.4	4.8	27.9	127.7	16.8
Run 05-1	332.3	235.9	4.7	-398.8	334.7	-0.1	0.2	3.6	24.4	124.2	16.1
Run 06-1	339.8	233.3	5.4	-392.5	-328.8	0.0	0.1	4.5	20.6	124.7	16.8
Run 07-1	369.2	220.2	5.1	-376.5	-274.5	0.0	0.4	3.9	21.7	124.9	15.8
Run 08-1	336.1	236.2	5.9	-406.7	-255.4	0.0	0.3	5.1	26.5	125.5	17.4
Run 09-1	388.5	209.6	4.4	-411.2	-277.6	0.0	0.2	3.8	23.6	130.3	19.8
Run 10-1	349.5	239.1	5.4	-402.8	-252.3	0.0	0.4	4.7	29.6	130.5	16.2
Run 11-1	361.7	211.1	4.9	-435.1	-272.4	-0.1	0.6	4.4	21.1	126.4	16.5
Run 12-1	384.3	216.6	5.3	-395.0	-346.6	0.0	0.5	4.7	34.3	130.5	18.2
Run 13-1	376.7	216.0	4.0	-394.6	-281.9	-0.1	0.3	3.3	15.4	117.4	15.5
Run 14-1	342.0	235.4	5.3	-444.3	-282.9	-0.1	0.1	4.6	27.4	137.8	18.9
Run 15-1	376.5	227.8	5.2	-441.3	-266.3	0.0	0.7	4.5	37.8	146.7	20.6
Run 16-1	375.5	208.1	5.5	-397.6	-286.8	-0.1	0.3	4.7	28.3	137.7	19.5
Run 17-1	375.5	228.0	5.7	-401.7	-316.1	-0.1	0.0	4.6	15.8	112.6	15.4
Run 18-1	348.8	219.1	6.1	-432.9	-315.6	-0.1	0.1	4.3	21.4	127.2	18.9
Run 19-1	376.4	214.0	4.9	-428.5	-276.8	0.0	0.6	3.9	35.6	162.1	21.4
Run 20-1	337.8	231.5	6.6	-415.2	-257.3	-0.2	0.3	5.5	36.9	141.6	18.3
Run 21-1	374.4	211.5	4.7	-394.7	-349.4	-0.1	0.2	3.8	23.6	128.2	19.3
Run 22-1	363.7	227.0	6.2	-387.2	-320.5	0.0	0.3	5.1	29.9	132.4	14.8
Run 23-1	381.7	207.2	4.4	-414.8	-266.6	-0.1	0.4	3.6	33.2	144.1	16.9
Run 24-1	400.4	199.2	5.6	-427.2	-310.1	0.0	0.8	5.0	46.2	187.3	22.0
Run 25-1	347.9	224.2	4.1	421.9	270.0	0.1	0.3	3.4	25.0	128.1	19.5
Run 25-1	346.7	228.4	3.8	422.5	273.4	0.1	0.4	3.2	24.6	126.0	19.3

**Thunder Output
Plackett-Burman Design
Observation 1 (cont)**

	C3Ant	C3Van	ADTel	ADRadar	CmdBunker	Mainstay	Helo	StoneBldg	NBCFacil
Run 01-1	1.7	4.9	2722.3	4424.5	366.9	0.3	166.4	75.8	196.6
Run 02-1	0.2	0.3	2139.1	3843.5	401.2	0.1	170.9	76.0	150.9
Run 03-1	0.0	0.0	2540.2	3851.0	420.4	0.3	157.4	75.8	195.3
Run 04-1	0.0	0.0	2483.8	3726.8	436.5	0.1	144.5	77.1	153.1
Run 05-1	0.1	0.6	2484.5	3654.4	367.3	0.3	163.5	72.5	194.7
Run 06-1	0.0	0.0	2495.8	3683.0	379.2	0.3	159.2	69.2	195.5
Run 07-1	0.1	0.1	2138.2	3320.9	365.0	0.4	148.1	71.1	194.2
Run 08-1	0.0	0.1	2139.9	3485.8	312.7	0.1	159.8	73.0	196.2
Run 09-1	0.1	0.2	2087.8	3367.4	438.2	0.2	142.3	76.8	151.6
Run 10-1	0.5	1.0	2215.7	3871.3	386.7	0.2	145.6	78.1	152.9
Run 11-1	0.0	0.0	2059.3	3324.9	439.7	0.2	159.5	74.7	153.9
Run 12-1	0.0	0.0	2505.6	3862.8	431.2	0.2	157.3	72.9	153.3
Run 13-1	0.3	2.2	2141.0	3615.3	359.0	0.3	148.0	76.9	151.5
Run 14-1	0.0	0.0	2619.1	3884.4	337.4	0.4	163.4	75.1	194.8
Run 15-1	0.0	0.0	2093.7	3516.0	436.3	0.1	164.5	78.3	151.7
Run 16-1	0.1	0.4	2136.1	3473.2	400.4	0.2	137.5	77.5	194.3
Run 17-1	0.2	0.7	2625.7	4042.9	357.0	0.3	155.9	75.1	154.1
Run 18-1	0.5	1.1	2535.8	3888.3	380.2	0.2	154.7	75.0	151.3
Run 19-1	0.0	0.1	2222.3	3668.2	424.7	0.2	140.0	74.7	194.0
Run 20-1	0.2	0.7	2181.5	3600.7	334.0	0.2	150.5	76.8	196.2
Run 21-1	0.0	0.0	2541.4	3843.4	432.8	0.2	138.9	75.5	153.1
Run 22-1	0.0	0.2	2636.4	4218.9	386.1	0.2	164.4	75.8	153.7
Run 23-1	0.2	0.3	2241.2	3723.2	347.8	0.2	158.5	74.8	194.6
Run 24-1	0.0	0.1	2664.3	4248.1	352.0	0.4	171.7	71.5	195.8
Run 25-1	0.0	0.1	2068.0	2611.9	394.0	0.3	153.7	72.3	192.9
Run 25-1	0.0	0.1	2042.6	2584.3	392.2	0.3	154.9	71.7	193.8

The following three tables lists the aggregate values for the output collected from the second independent observation of the Plackett-Burman experimental design.

**Thunder Output
Plackett-Burman Design
Observation 2**

Run	Tank(d)	Tank(o)	APC(d)	APC(o)	Inf(d)	Inf(o)	Arty(d)	Arty(o)	Halt(days)	Halt(dis)	Restore(days)	Push	TempRdBrld	TSPT
Run 01-2	8248.5	8196.9	8019.9	10582.6	1130.7	3357.1	2472.8	2216.5	6.0	-22.9	7.17	91.5	9.6	2.8
Run 02-2	7838.4	7699.8	6145.4	8689.7	954.6	2359.0	2077.7	2018.2	5.5	-22.0	7.29	88.7	10.4	0.3
Run 03-2	7852.3	9669.5	6886.0	10880.3	915.1	3255.7	2114.7	2527.3	4.5	-23.5	7.17	91.5	8.1	2.7
Run 04-2	10340.9	7598.3	9180.0	8108.6	1381.7	2983.7	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	22.7	7.13	91.2	7.0	0.0
Run 05-2	8670.0	9584.2	7691.4	9867.2	1076.5	2920.6	2388.3	2158.3	5.0	-22.7	7.17	89.9	6.8	2.3
Run 06-2	7578.0	9706.5	6812.6	10844.1	856.8	3237.2	2038.5	2494.8	4.5	-22.7	7.15	91.9	7.7	0.2
Run 07-2	7767.7	7637.8	6445.9	8309.0	880.9	2368.0	2087.1	1891.3	5.5	-24.1	7.27	88.8	7.1	1.4
Run 08-2	7891.1	8330.7	6211.4	8382.3	941.2	2288.8	2055.5	1907.3	5.5	-22.5	7.31	88.4	10.5	0.0
Run 09-2	7615.8	8284.4	6184.1	8714.5	922.4	2612.9	2053.6	2046.8	5.5	-22.8	7.35	91.6	7.7	2.0
Run 10-2	8665.7	6549.2	7035.9	7788.8	1116.7	2592.3	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.6	7.34	82.8	9.3	2.4
Run 11-2	9685.3	7568.1	7198.8	7662.7	1099.4	2176.2	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-24.4	7.33	91.0	7.6	1.8
Run 12-2	10339.7	8925.8	9188.8	8212.0	1351.1	2578.6	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.7	7.16	91.5	8.0	0.0
Run 13-2	8542.5	7370.0	6775.2	8343.8	1077.6	2484.7	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.3	7.32	92.5	8.6	6.0
Run 14-2	8896.5	9350.1	7895.5	10210.8	1059.0	3009.2	2443.5	2141.0	5.0	-22.9	7.19	88.0	9.3	2.6
Run 15-2	8728.8	7387.3	7080.4	7915.2	1058.7	2367.4	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-23.7	7.27	90.8	9.3	0.1
Run 16-2	6540.9	9035.1	5287.0	8788.9	814.5	2809.5	1776.5	2128.5	5.0	-21.7	7.32	91.0	7.0	1.7
Run 17-2	7682.4	9508.0	8515.6	11084.6	861.3	3445.1	2010.8	2511.4	4.5	-23.3	7.24	87.0	11.8	0.3
Run 18-2	9621.1	7742.1	8310.3	9312.3	1251.3	2745.7	2881.9	1833.5	5.5	-23.1	7.17	92.1	8.1	4.8
Run 19-2	8504.8	6763.5	6982.1	7884.3	1074.0	2434.6	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-21.7	7.30	93.0	6.5	1.7
Run 20-2	8541.1	6121.6	6835.6	7216.3	1077.5	2418.1	2983.6	1502.5	6.0	-22.6	7.38	78.6	9.1	6.7
Run 21-2	10280.7	6422.9	9056.0	7955.8	1347.7	2980.0	2636.2	1445.6	7.0	-22.3	8.23	82.3	7.9	1.8
Run 22-2	8928.0	9470.9	7635.6	10273.7	1029.9	2852.7	2400.2	2210.1	5.0	-23.0	7.15	92.20	11.0	0.3
Run 23-2	8209.8	7649.4	6863.4	8900.9	1002.8	2568.1	2174.6	2106.4	5.5	-23.6	7.58	92.5	11.2	0.0
Run 24-2	8027.2	10206.1	6888.1	11441.8	870.95	3472.75	2110.8	2568.8	4.5	-22.3	7.16	91.9	11.1	9.1
Run 25-2	9076.3	6885.7	7589.1	7344.2	1178.1	2146.8	2512.1	1517.4	6.0	-22.5	8.39	84.8	7.8	0.9
Run 25-2	8465.2	7800.9	7193	8311.0	1038.0	2325.6	2326.2	1851.6	5.5	-22.9	8.23	90.3	7.6	1.4

**Thunder Output
Plackett-Burman Design
Observation 2 (Cont)**

	RedAALosses	RedSALosses	RedAGLosses	BlueAALosses	BlueSALosses	BlueAGLosses	Runways	ACInOpen	ABAmmo(H)	ABMaint(S)	ABSpare(S)
Run 01-2	390.3	205.8	3.8	-401.0	-313.8	-0.1	0.4	3.4	43.4	171.7	20.8
Run 02-2	343.4	225.0	6.8	-450.0	-263.8	-0.1	0.4	6.3	40.3	155.0	16.6
Run 03-2	323.5	233.7	4.6	-409.9	-312.0	-0.1	0.5	3.8	55.9	166.5	23.4
Run 04-2	345.7	230.6	4.5	-408.9	-332.6	-0.2	0.0	3.4	27.5	132.6	17.0
Run 05-2	343.5	230.5	4.1	-382.5	-335.4	0.0	0.2	3.6	35.8	124.7	17.3
Run 06-2	336.6	232.1	3.7	-382.9	-327.6	0.0	0.0	2.9	28.9	124.7	17.6
Run 07-2	368.8	220.7	6.1	-365.5	-288.9	-0.2	0.2	4.7	21.2	126.4	17.9
Run 08-2	328.0	235.7	5.0	-366.5	-278.7	-0.2	0.1	3.6	23.3	127.6	17.3
Run 09-2	368.6	203.3	3.4	-388.3	-271.0	0.0	0.3	2.8	24.6	131.2	18.0
Run 10-2	350.9	234.2	4.1	-417.4	-251.6	0.0	0.6	3.6	28.1	130.4	15.6
Run 11-2	367.7	206.3	4.5	-436.2	-261.0	0.0	0.3	4.0	21.2	123.7	16.3
Run 12-2	384.1	222.8	4.9	-371.7	-366.1	0.0	0.5	4.1	48.0	131.2	16.8
Run 13-2	370.8	219.3	5.8	-385.3	-282.0	0.0	0.2	4.4	25.9	121.5	17.1
Run 14-2	341.4	242.3	6.4	-410.8	-287.4	-0.1	0.0	5.8	25.1	136.2	20.6
Run 15-2	339.7	229.6	4.7	-441.8	-250.7	0.0	0.6	4.0	37.0	143.7	21.5
Run 16-2	372.9	216.4	5.5	-398.0	-282.1	-0.2	0.5	4.4	18.0	138.7	21.4
Run 17-2	363.5	230.9	4.7	-382.4	-317.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	17.4	115.7	6.8
Run 18-2	361.6	202.9	5.0	-463.5	-331.4	0.0	0.0	4.1	18.6	126.5	6.8
Run 19-2	385.2	206.1	4.7	-450.8	-273.2	0.0	0.9	3.8	33.3	161.7	21.9
Run 20-2	338.8	235.7	8.8	-423.7	-257.8	-0.2	0.6	7.7	33.6	140.1	17.9
Run 21-2	372.7	213.7	4.8	-382.0	-354.3	-0.2	0.5	3.3	17.4	131.5	17.4
Run 22-2	370.6	222.5	6.5	-383.1	-334.7	0.0	0.1	5.5	29.1	135.0	15.5
Run 23-2	383.7	198.3	3.3	-431.0	-270.3	-0.1	0.3	2.7	35.2	142.0	18.0
Run 24-2	388.4	198.8	6.5	-411.5	-305.8	0.0	0.9	5.9	44.5	168.7	21.4
Run 25-2	347.9	224.2	4.1	-421.9	-270.0	-0.1	0.3	3.4	25.0	128.1	19.5
Run 26-2	342.1	228.5	6.1	-403.9	-277.0	0.0	0.1	4.9	23.6	130.6	20.1

**Thunder Output
Plackett-Burman Design
Observation 2 (Cont)**

	C3Ant	C3Van	ADTel	ADRadar	CmdBunker	Mainstay	Helo	StoneBldg	NBCFacil
Run 01-2	0.6	1.9	2797.4	4504.9	364.5	0.2	157.6	80.9	196.5
Run 02-2	0.0	0.0	2161.5	3866.4	403.8	0.1	174.4	78.0	151.7
Run 03-2	0.1	0.4	2628.3	3942.0	421.6	0.4	157.4	74.4	198.0
Run 04-2	0.0	0.0	2507.8	3816.3	439.7	0.2	152.6	74.9	152.8
Run 05-2	1.5	1.9	2486.1	3677.8	384.4	0.2	175.2	67.1	193.3
Run 06-2	0.3	0.2	2485.0	3633.7	371.6	0.2	155.5	70.4	196.1
Run 07-2	0.0	0.0	2052.6	3210.6	380.0	0.1	151.8	72.8	196.1
Run 08-2	0.0	0.0	2041.8	3431.0	312.5	0.1	155.0	76.1	196.6
Run 09-2	0.1	0.5	2195.4	3466.4	435.2	0.3	146.5	76.3	149.7
Run 10-2	0.1	0.4	2181.1	3766.8	388.5	0.2	148.4	73.1	153.1
Run 11-2	0.0	0.0	2107.4	3384.9	441.1	0.4	156.5	76.8	154.1
Run 12-2	0.0	0.0	2472.9	3851.2	432.1	0.2	158.1	72.4	154.4
Run 13-2	0.4	0.9	2158.9	3674.5	369.8	0.5	149.6	75.2	156.1
Run 14-2	0.0	0.0	2615.8	3855.0	339.9	0.4	167.1	72.6	195.6
Run 15-2	0.0	0.0	2182.3	3543.1	438.6	0.1	149.7	82.0	152.4
Run 16-2	0.4	1.1	2095.4	3392.9	401.0	0.3	133.4	75.8	192.9
Run 17-2	0.7	2.1	2607.1	4066.7	366.3	0.3	152.8	78.5	156.2
Run 18-2	1.5	2.5	2435.2	3763.9	385.0	0.3	156.3	72.7	152.0
Run 19-2	0.1	0.2	2186.4	3618.2	423.4	0.1	146.3	73.9	193.9
Run 20-2	0.5	2.0	2126.0	3566.1	333.4	0.3	144.1	80.4	194.6
Run 21-2	0.0	0.0	2521.6	3821.8	430.5	0.1	139.7	74.9	150.3
Run 22-2	0.0	0.0	2601.1	4234.6	390.5	0.2	163.0	74.7	155.3
Run 23-2	0.0	0.0	2251.2	3642.4	352.8	0.1	162.5	73.9	193.6
Run 24-2	0.0	0.0	2737.0	4369.7	350.4	0.4	161.5	73.6	194.8
Run 25-2	0.0	0.1	2068.0	2611.9	394.0	0.3	153.7	72.3	192.9
Run 25-2	0.1	0.1	2122.9	2649.1	393.7	0.1	145.8	71.2	192.4

The following table lists the aggregate values for the output collected from the first independent observation of the Fractional Factorial experimental design.

**Thunder Output
Fractional Factorial Design
Observation 1**

Run	Temp(Brid)	TSPT	RedAALosses	RedBALLosses	RedAGLosses	BlueAALosses	BlueBALLosses	BlueAGLosses	Runways	ACInOpen	ABArms(H)	Restore(days)	Haik(days)	Haik(diet)	Push
Run1	7725	7268	6376	8882	2467	2106	2081	2061	5.5	-22.9	8.28	91.3			
Run2	7953	8538	6144	8039	2183	2048	1849	1849	5.5	-22.8	8.35	88.5			
Run3	7681	7620	6325	8211	2410	2049	1861	1861	5.5	-23.2	8.35	87.6			
Run4	7766	8316	6336	8214	2259	2071	1837	1837	5.5	-23.2	8.35	85.9			
Run5	8484	8484	7472	9586	2921	2318	2110	2110	5.0	-23.0	8.22	87.2			
Run6	9495	9184	6336	8184	2618	2554	1856	1856	5.5	-22.6	8.15	93.5			
Run7	8435	8450	7329	8663	2900	2300	2116	2116	5.0	-22.8	8.20	90.1			
Run8	9390	8976	6189	8976	2572	2621	1853	1853	5.5	-23.2	8.19	90.6			
Run9	8382	9626	6787	7279	2200	2292	1619	1619	6.0	-23.0	8.37	88.8			
Run10	8694	8247	7365	8712	2471	2394	1920	1920	5.5	-23.2	8.18	90.5			
Run1	6.4	1.5	327.2	245.0	6.3	-399.3	-362.6	0.0	0.3	4.7	13.0				
Run2	7.3	0.9	311.2	242.3	6.4	-396.4	-371.2	0.0	0.3	4.6	18.2				
Run3	8.0	0.9	331.3	235.1	5.1	-425.9	-396.9	-0.1	0.6	4.5	22.6				
Run4	7.8	0.0	332.5	226.7	4.6	-420.4	-362.9	0.0	0.4	3.9	23.7				
Run5	1.8	1.8	326.1	244.9	5.1	-398.4	-332	0.0	0.3	4.3	13.3				
Run6	7.0	1.0	335.1	238.9	4.2	-407	-330.9	-0.1	0.3	3.6	17.4				
Run7	8.3	1.2	341.5	225.6	4.9	-431.9	-335.9	0.0	0.4	4.1	16.0				
Run8	7.6	1.2	345.7	228.0	5.0	-419.8	-328.5	0.0	0.0	4.2	22.1				
Run9	8.4	0.1	372.8	226.6	3.7	-393.1	-229.8	-0.1	0.1	2.9	14.3				
Run10	7.2	1.7	333.1	239.8	4.8	-395.1	-310.3	0.0	0.1	4.1	12.0				
Run1	111.1	15.1	0	0	2098	422	0.1	154.4	86.3	152.8	NBCFacil				
Run2	110.5	16.6	0	0	1979.8	417.3	0.3	162.7	70.6	152.5					
Run3	125.2	20	0	0.2	2084.8	435.4	0.2	149.6	73.2	146.7					
Run4	129.4	21.8	0	0	2034.5	434.2	0.1	157.8	71.8	151.6					
Run5	112.9	15.5	0	0.2	2395.7	432.2	0.1	156.7	70	151.8					
Run6	106	15.4	0	0	2402.8	417.8	0.1	170.5	71.2	152.1					
Run7	120.9	20.4	0	0.2	2379.2	430	0.3	154.7	71.7	151.6					
Run8	125.1	20.8	0	0.2	2412.4	431.6	0.2	171.9	73.6	152.8					
Run9	97.9	17.1	0.1	0.3	1638.6	391.2	0.4	154.1	70.8	150					
Run10	117.1	16.7	0	0	2245.3	428.8	0.3	162	70.5	152.2					

The following table lists the aggregate values for the output collected from the second independent observation of the Fractional Factorial experimental design.

**Thunder Output
Fractional Factorial Design
Observation 2**

Run#	Tank(d)	Tank(o)	APC(d)	APC(o)	Inf(d)	Inf(o)	Arty(d)	Arty(o)	Halt(days)	Halt(dist)	Restore(days)	Push
Run1	7587.2	7463.4	8253.5	8090.8	896.5	2468.1	2048.7	1880.8	5.5	-23.7	8.4	80.8
Run2	8423.6	7742.0	8843.4	7711.2	1046.4	991.0	2302.2	1719.4	6.0	-23.3	8.0	88.3
Run3	8803.4	8819.3	7103.3	7901.8	1068.7	2351.3	2364.0	1772.6	6.0	-23.8	8.0	90.3
Run4	8522.7	7844.9	9958.8	7324.0	1056.8	994.2	2301.0	1815.5	6.0	-23.3	8.0	86.0
Run5	10216.3	8838.8	9028.3	8300.1	1351.2	2645.6	2632.6	1549.6	6.0	-22.9	8.0	90.8
Run6	8234.0	8762.0	8005.6	9206.5	1163.5	2711.3	2898.0	1858.8	5.5	-23.0	8.2	90.9
Run7	10087.1	8798.0	8787.7	8268.3	1308.8	2668.6	2880.8	1590.0	€0	-22.7	8.0	90.8
Run8	10186.1	7829.0	8941.2	8286.5	1334.0	2431.1	2875.7	1543.5	€0	-22.8	8.0	89.2
Run9	8522.2	8237.0	7179.6	8583.3	1018.1	2361.5	2287.7	1911.2	5.5	-23.1	8.2	88.6
Run10	8286.4	7384.4	7771.7	7588.5	1178.5	2117.0	2578.0	1538.1	€0	-22.6	8.0	87.1

Run#	TempRefBrid	TSPT	RedAALosses	RedSALosses	RedAGLosses	BlueAALosses	BlueSALosses	BlueAGLosses	Runways	ACInOpen	ABAmmo(H)
Run1	8.6	0.9	331.1	238.6	5.0	-394.2	-263.7	0.0	0.2	4.2	27.4
Run2	7.5	1.8	330.2	246.3	4.3	-389.1	-267.3	0.0	0.4	3.3	17.1
Run3	7.4	0.5	332.1	229.2	5.1	-419.6	-266.2	-0.1	0.5	3.8	22.1
Run4	7.0	1.4	338.5	221.8	4.8	-433.3	-274.5	0.0	0.3	3.4	25.1
Run5	7.2	1.6	330.8	235.2	4.2	-390.9	-268.9	0.0	0.3	3.3	21.8
Run6	7.1	1.0	333.5	234.8	5.0	-403.3	-320.8	0.0	0.4	4.2	19.0
Run7	7.7	3.6	327.1	229.8	5.5	-404.2	-322.9	0.0	0.5	4.7	22.4
Run8	7.8	0.1	334.8	227.5	5.4	-424.9	-326.0	0.0	0.5	4.5	21.9
Run9	7.8	0.0	332.8	244.3	4.7	-421.0	-306.8	-0.1	0.2	4.0	22.2
Run10	7.6	1.1	329.2	238.0	3.8	-412.6	-310.7	0.0	0.2	2.8	26.6

Run#	ABMainf(S)	ABSpares(S)	CSAnt	CSVan	ADTRdr	CmdBunker	Mainstay	StoneBldg	NBCFacil
Run1	110.2	17.3	0.1	0.1	3202.2	416.1	0.2	146.3	149.9
Run2	110.1	17.3	0.0	0.0	3111.7	414.7	0.2	162.7	152.4
Run3	125.4	19.2	0.1	0.1	3316.6	432.6	0.1	150.2	151.9
Run4	124.5	19.9	0.1	0.3	3189.1	434.8	0.2	168.3	153.4
Run5	110.2	15.4	0.0	0.0	3530.1	418.9	0.2	154.5	150.9
Run6	108.8	16.0	0.2	0.2	3465.6	422.7	0.2	168.7	151.2
Run7	126.4	18.8	0.1	0.2	3675.6	433.1	0.2	154.4	152.2
Run8	126.8	20.1	0.0	0.0	3629.0	432.8	0.1	174.7	153.1
Run9	114.2	15.2	0.0	0.0	3259.4	424.1	0.2	165.6	153.8
Run10	115.1	14.5	0.1	0.3	3301.7	422.8	0.5	165.3	149.7

Appendix G

The following tables reflect the factor loadings derived from Factor Analysis with varimax rotation for each design. **Boldface** values indicate the highest loadings for that factor.

Factor Scores

Plackett Burman Design

Rotated Components

	EVICT	OCA	HALT	Air Sup	C3	Air Sup	Interdiction
Tank(d)	0.04	0.06	0.96	0.01	-0.12	0.05	-0.06
Tank(o)	0.86	-0.06	0.12	-0.12	-0.04	0.04	-0.01
APC(d)	0.19	0.04	0.96	-0.01	-0.01	0.03	-0.06
APC(o)	0.90	-0.02	0.26	-0.25	-0.14	0.04	-0.11
Inf(d)	-0.12	0.01	0.95	0.13	-0.05	0.02	-0.03
Inf(o)	0.72	0.00	0.50	-0.33	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08
Arty(d)	-0.77	0.03	0.42	-0.18	-0.07	0.02	0.14
Arty(o)	0.96	-0.05	-0.05	-0.15	-0.02	-0.03	-0.14
Halt(days)	-0.94	0.09	-0.01	0.17	-0.07	-0.04	0.07
Halt(dist)	0.40	-0.27	-0.09	0.35	-0.14	0.10	0.05
Restore(days)	-0.31	-0.01	-0.22	0.84	0.03	-0.02	-0.04
Push	0.42	-0.03	0.49	-0.25	0.08	-0.13	0.31
TmpRdBrid	0.25	-0.07	-0.34	-0.19	-0.56	0.16	0.00
TSPT	0.00	-0.08	0.04	-0.29	-0.60	-0.15	-0.56
RedAALosses	0.08	-0.11	-0.04	-0.18	-0.15	-0.86	-0.02
RedSALosses	0.05	0.41	0.10	0.13	0.05	0.78	0.11
RedAGLosses	0.17	-0.31	-0.02	-0.51	0.08	0.68	-0.10
BlueAALosses	-0.11	0.00	0.05	0.90	0.05	0.00	-0.13
BlueSALosses	-0.06	0.11	0.06	0.80	0.03	0.17	-0.16
BlueAGLosses	-0.04	0.11	0.12	0.50	0.27	-0.23	0.04
Runways	0.14	-0.84	-0.24	-0.07	0.06	0.01	0.10
ACinOpen	0.17	-0.25	-0.10	-0.52	0.09	0.66	0.01
AB Ammo(H)	0.20	-0.91	-0.06	-0.12	-0.23	0.16	-0.01
AB Maint(S)	0.12	-0.91	-0.01	-0.13	-0.24	-0.09	-0.11
AB Spares(S)	-0.06	-0.87	0.23	0.03	-0.04	-0.20	-0.08
C3Ant	0.05	-0.19	0.19	0.00	-0.83	-0.16	0.03
C3Van	0.00	-0.11	0.21	0.00	-0.87	-0.21	-0.03
ADTel	0.69	-0.07	0.64	-0.25	-0.13	0.00	-0.10
ADRadar	0.53	-0.17	0.32	-0.60	-0.41	0.00	0.08
CmdBunker	-0.17	-0.28	0.11	0.04	0.46	-0.27	0.68
Mainstay	0.35	0.04	0.16	0.16	-0.06	-0.33	-0.68
Helo	0.54	-0.22	-0.03	0.09	-0.23	0.33	-0.14
StoneBldg	-0.32	-0.11	-0.12	-0.29	-0.39	0.10	0.62
NBCFacil	0.02	-0.34	0.01	0.15	0.04	0.09	-0.80

Rotation Matrix

0.77	-0.27	0.29	-0.41	-0.25	0.04	-0.13
0.09	0.53	0.75	0.32	0.11	-0.14	-0.13
-0.53	-0.30	0.47	-0.35	-0.37	-0.29	0.25
0.03	-0.44	-0.06	0.58	-0.28	-0.42	-0.46
-0.01	-0.60	0.34	0.25	0.55	0.35	0.19
-0.25	0.03	0.12	0.07	-0.43	0.76	-0.40
0.23	0.04	-0.04	0.45	-0.47	0.15	0.70

Factor Scores Fractional Factorial Design

Rotated Components

	Halt	Air Sup	Evict	Air Sup	c3	Inter	Air sup
Tank(d)	0.97	0.12	-0.16	0.00	-0.03	0.05	0.10
Tank(o)	-0.12	-0.18	0.51	0.08	-0.02	0.16	0.07
APC(d)	0.98	0.10	-0.05	-0.03	-0.05	0.06	0.09
APC(o)	0.43	-0.04	0.83	0.09	-0.07	0.32	-0.10
Inf(d)	0.95	0.12	-0.21	-0.02	-0.05	0.05	0.16
Inf(o)	0.58	0.14	0.70	-0.34	0.06	0.12	-0.03
Arty(d)	0.97	0.10	-0.13	-0.05	-0.03	0.08	0.14
Arty(o)	-0.59	-0.08	0.69	0.03	-0.06	0.24	-0.29
Halt(days)	0.29	0.25	-0.89	-0.15	-0.04	0.03	0.18
Halt(dist)	0.84	-0.29	-0.12	0.24	0.04	-0.21	0.13
Restore(days)	-0.44	-0.19	0.83	-0.05	0.00	-0.24	-0.01
Push	0.69	0.14	-0.12	0.02	-0.02	0.63	-0.20
TmpRdBrid	-0.25	0.05	0.41	-0.28	-0.41	-0.69	0.01
TSPT	0.27	0.05	-0.21	-0.49	0.18	0.09	0.44
RedAALosses	-0.27	0.30	-0.05	0.73	0.22	0.08	-0.10
RedSALosses	-0.22	-0.68	0.25	-0.11	-0.55	0.10	-0.06
RedAGLosses	0.12	0.85	0.49	-0.05	-0.02	-0.04	0.01
BlueAALosses	0.08	-0.44	0.34	-0.63	-0.24	0.17	0.44
BlueSALosses	-0.20	-0.20	0.25	0.26	-0.30	-0.05	-0.77
BlueAGLosses	0.24	-0.16	-0.07	0.07	0.12	-0.21	0.90
Runways	0.33	0.75	-0.09	-0.08	-0.09	0.41	0.22
ACinOpen	0.22	0.66	0.66	-0.03	-0.11	-0.11	0.02
AB Ammo(H)	-0.19	-0.07	-0.05	-0.18	0.42	-0.82	-0.15
AB Maint(S)	0.21	0.81	-0.39	0.06	0.18	-0.24	-0.21
AB Spares(S)	-0.07	0.94	-0.20	0.03	0.04	-0.07	0.20
C3Ant	-0.11	0.05	0.36	-0.07	0.85	0.12	0.22
C3Van	-0.04	-0.07	-0.19	0.07	0.91	-0.20	0.16
ADTel	0.92	0.12	0.32	-0.05	0.02	0.14	0.04
AD Radar	0.91	0.26	0.22	-0.15	0.10	0.03	0.04
CmdBunker	0.28	0.74	-0.26	0.21	0.40	-0.11	-0.29
Mainstay	0.01	-0.83	-0.10	-0.04	0.32	-0.24	0.14
Helo	0.33	-0.05	-0.10	0.92	-0.04	0.03	0.06
StoneBldg	0.17	0.11	-0.33	0.10	-0.01	-0.85	0.25
NBCFacil	0.01	0.50	-0.16	0.54	-0.28	0.21	-0.36

Rotation Matrix

0.85865	0.413	-0.23498	-0.00878	0.0668	0.11146	0.14132
0.39955	-0.5688	0.58426	-0.27556	-0.20786	0.19776	0.13127
-0.06426	0.56442	0.62178	0.23075	-0.17693	0.28591	-0.35269
-0.12033	0.37799	0.31905	-0.63699	0.28213	-0.40453	0.30307
0.14692	-0.1582	0.32808	0.57206	0.64043	-0.31479	0.09626
0.19938	-0.00593	0.04716	0.125	-0.52787	-0.77674	-0.24575
-0.1521	0.13927	0.07186	0.34945	-0.39069	0.0257	0.82273

Appendix H

This appendix contains the stepwise linear regression results for both the Plackett-Burman and Fractional Factorial designs.

Stepwise Regression: Total Combat Index Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
Stepwise Regression Control
Prob to Enter 0.25
Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
36215947	13	2785842	0.9507	0.909	0.378401	378.6534

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	62020.34		1	0.0	0.000
	X	F15C	566.15		1	7692697.0	2.761
	X	F16	989.35		1	23491661.0	8.433
	X	F15E	706.15		1	11967454.0	4.296
		F111			1	868854.1	0.295
		F4G			1	10961.7	0.004
	X	A10	4931.75		1	583730000.0	209.535
		EF111			1	1400635.0	0.483
	X	F117	774.70		1	14404012.0	5.170
		AWACS			1	256327.9	0.086
		JSTARS			1	325466.3	0.109
	X	TOM	649.00		1	10108954.0	3.629
		AIM120			1	619342.8	0.209
		AIM9			1	1121.6	0.000
		20MM			1	1388165.0	0.478
		MK82			1	1175123.0	0.402
	X	AGM65	771.50		1	14285266.0	5.128
	X	ARM88	584.18		1	8190520.0	2.940
	X	DELAY	659.49		1	10438118.0	3.747
		LETHAL			1	2592623.0	0.925
		CBU87			1	256789.2	0.086
	X	CBU97	-583.31		1	8165987.0	2.931
		LGB			1	1046653.0	0.357
	X	GPS	-497.09		1	5930336.0	2.129

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered		0	583730000.0	0.7946	-15.260
2	F16	Entered	0.0564	23491661.0	0.8266	-14.150	3
3	F117	Entered	0.1167	14404012.0	0.8462	-12.700	4
4	AGM65	Entered	0.1044	14285266.0	0.8656	-11.240	5
5	F15E	Entered	0.1219	11967454.0	0.8819	-9.699	6
6	DELAY	Entered	0.134	10438118.0	0.8961	-8.096	7
7	TOM	Entered	0.1255	10108954.0	0.9099	-6.481	8
8	ARM88	Entered	0.1523	8190520.0	0.9210	-4.792	9
9	CBU97	Entered	0.1378	8165987.0	0.9322	-3.103	10
10	F15C	Entered	0.1322	7692697.0	0.9426	-1.396	11
11	GPS	Entered	0.1683	5930336.0	0.9507	0.378	12

Stepwise Regression: Halt Index
Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
2242094.2	10	224209.4	0.9811	0.9527	9.476379	327.4854

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	24412.82	1	0.00	0.000	1.000
		F15C	?	1	64667.40	0.267	0.618
		F16	?	1	94.41	0.000	0.985
	X	F15E	263.93	1	1671754.00	7.456	0.021
	X	F111	234.54	1	1320235.00	5.898	0.036
		F4G	?	1	2484.74	0.010	0.923
	X	A10	1672.46	1	67130805.00	299.411	0.000
	X	EF111	233.55	1	1309094.00	5.839	0.036
	X	F117	-654.18	1	10270678.00	45.808	0.000
	X	AWACS	-181.84	1	793593.40	3.540	0.089
	X	JSTARS	-293.28	1	2064245.00	9.207	0.013
		TOM	?	1	309083.20	1.439	0.261
	X	AIM120	500.48	1	6011405.00	26.812	0.000
	X	AIM9	298.55	1	2139170.00	9.541	0.012
		20MM	?	1	156655.00	0.676	0.432
	X	MK82	656.23	1	10335150.00	46.096	0.000
		AGM65	?	1	23990.73	0.097	0.762
	X	ARM88	-306.12	1	2248978.00	10.031	0.010
	X	DELAY	-430.68	1	4451715.00	19.855	0.001
		LETHAL	?	1	92231.20	0.386	0.550
		CBU87	?	1	302985.50	1.406	0.266
	X	CBU97	296.72	1	2112979.00	9.424	0.012
	X	LGB	364.66	1	3191417.00	14.234	0.004
	X	GPS	232.79	1	1300607.00	5.801	0.037

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered		0	0.5661	57.794	2
2	MK82	Entered	0.0247	10335150	0.6532	43.769	3
3	F117	Entered	0.0129	10270678	0.7398	29.844	4
4	AIM120	Entered	0.035	6011405	0.7905	22.524	5
5	DELAY	Entered	0.0497	4451715	0.828	17.621	6
6	LGB	Entered	0.0759	3191417	0.8549	14.673	7
7	ARM88	Entered	0.1173	2248978	0.8739	13.186	8
8	AIM9	Entered	0.1103	2139170	0.8919	11.869	9
9	CBU97	Entered	0.0945	2112979	0.9098	10.593	10
10	JSTARS	Entered	0.0778	2064245	0.9272	9.3923	11
11	F15E	Entered	0.0881	1671754	0.9413	8.8002	12
12	F111	Entered	0.1048	1320235	0.9524	8.7532	13
13	EF111	Entered	0.0813	1309094	0.9634	8.7234	14
14	GPS	Entered	0.0527	1300607	0.9744	8.7069	15
15	AWACS	Entered	0.0893	793593.4	0.9811	9.4764	16

Stepwise Regression: Evict Index
Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
34386474	13	2645113	0.8615	0.7336	3.385193	392.472

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	22144.03	1	0.00	0.000	1.000
		F15C	?	1	3207482.00	1.234	0.288
	X	F16	576.01	1	7962854.00	3.010	0.106
		F15E	?	1	1197335.00	0.433	0.523
		F111	?	1	568999.20	0.202	0.661
		F4G	?	1	54950.94	0.019	0.892
	X	A10	2088.13	1	104650000.00	39.562	0.000
		EF111	?	1	3675.38	0.001	0.972
	X	F117	1042.72	1	26094193.00	9.865	0.008
		AWACS	?	1	968177.30	0.348	0.566
		JSTARS	?	1	2813432.00	1.069	0.322
	X	TOM	520.02	1	6490016.00	2.454	0.141
	X	AIM120	-496.47	1	5915500.00	2.236	0.159
		AIM9	?	1	1934949.00	0.716	0.414
		20MM	?	1	1242332.00	0.450	0.515
	X	MK82	-646.88	1	10042993.00	3.797	0.073
	X	AGM65	554.38	1	7375959.00	2.789	0.119
	X	ARM88	648.13	1	10081584.00	3.811	0.073
	X	DELAY	748.66	1	13451743.00	5.086	0.042
		LETHAL	?	1	1293623.00	0.465	0.508
		CBU87	?	1	795704.20	0.284	0.604
	X	CBU97	-661.47	1	10500916.00	3.970	0.068
	X	LGB	-458.18	1	5038184.00	1.905	0.191
	X	GPS	-508.84	1	6214076.00	2.349	0.149

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0003	1.05E+08	0.4216	-7.868	2
2	F117	Entered	0.0336	26094193	0.5268	-8.437	3
3	DELAY	Entered	0.1058	13451743	0.581	-7.761	4
4	CBU97	Entered	0.1395	10500916	0.6233	-6.795	5
5	ARM88	Entered	0.1357	10081584	0.6639	-5.787	6
6	MK82	Entered	0.1233	10042993	0.7043	-4.776	7
7	F16	Entered	0.1561	7962854	0.7364	-3.56	8
8	AGM65	Entered	0.1599	7375959	0.7661	-2.286	9
9	TOM	Entered	0.175	6490016	0.7923	-0.925	10
10	GPS	Entered	0.1721	6214076	0.8173	0.4635	11
11	AIM120	Entered	0.1693	5915500	0.8412	1.8812	12
12	LGB	Entered	0.1908	5038184	0.8615	3.3852	13

Stepwise Regression: Air Sup Index Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
Stepwise Regression Control
Prob to Enter 0.25
Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
6048888.6	19	318362.6	0.6258	0.5077	-8.72978	335.2895

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	-7215.75	1	0.00	0	1
	X	F15C	-138.51	1	460429.40	1.446	0.244
	X	F16	-192.17	1	886272.70	2.784	0.112
		F15E	?	1	291809.70	0.912	0.352
		F111	?	1	97741.61	0.296	0.593
		F4G	?	1	5304.43	0.016	0.901
	X	A10	-527.75	1	6684481.00	20.996	0.000
		EF111	?	1	27.74	0.000	0.993
	X	F117	-168.84	1	684180.20	2.149	0.159
		AWACS	?	1	37572.51	0.113	0.741
		JSTARS	?	1	13920.17	0.042	0.841
		TOM	?	1	370811.80	1.176	0.293
		AIM120	?	1	217322.60	0.671	0.424
		AIM9	?	1	1987.44	0.006	0.940
		20MM	?	1	39236.51	0.118	0.736
	X	MK82	140.37	1	472867.20	1.485	0.238
		AGM65	?	1	145735.30	0.444	0.514
		ARM88	?	1	347811.50	1.098	0.309
	X	DELAY	-196.70	1	928581.40	2.917	0.104
		LETHAL	?	1	205461.00	0.633	0.437
		CBU87	?	1	5997.68	0.018	0.895
		CBU97	?	1	199910.50	0.615	0.443
		LGB	?	1	52285.33	0.157	0.697
		GPS	?	1	316572.50	0.994	0.332

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0004	6684481	0.4135	-16.87	2
2	DELAY	Entered	0.1277	928581.4	0.4709	-15.38	3
3	F16	Entered	0.125	886272.7	0.5258	-13.86	4
4	F117	Entered	0.1662	684180.2	0.5681	-12.23	5
5	MK82	Entered	0.2421	472867.2	0.5973	-10.48	6
6	F15C	Entered	0.2439	460429.4	0.6258	-8.73	7

Stepwise Regression: C3 Index
Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
1422115.1	22	64641.59	0.7023	0.6617	-15.2167	291.6485

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob-F
X	X	Intercept	-5010.90	1	0.00	0.000	1.000
		F15C	?	1	53638.21	0.823	0.375
	X	F16	-120.98	1	351287.20	5.434	0.029
	X	F15E	-63.75	1	97537.50	1.509	0.232
		F111	?	1	74973.08	1.169	0.292
		F4G	?	1	784.33	0.012	0.915
	X	A10	-347.99	1	2906357.00	44.961	0.000
		EF111	?	1	14278.88	0.213	0.649
		F117	?	1	12696.00	0.189	0.668
		AWACS	?	1	1001.04	0.015	0.904
		JSTARS	?	1	3621.13	0.054	0.819
		TOM	?	1	45675.38	0.697	0.413
		AIM120	?	1	156.06	0.002	0.962
		AIM9	?	1	17930.67	0.268	0.610
		20MM	?	1	6700.04	0.099	0.756
		MK82	?	1	19.44	0.000	0.987
		AGM65	?	1	48168.96	0.736	0.401
		ARM88	?	1	16182.43	0.242	0.628
		DELAY	?	1	38576.20	0.586	0.453
		LETHAL	?	1	23801.40	0.357	0.556
		CBU87	?	1	1548.83	0.023	0.881
		CBU97	?	1	16422.20	0.245	0.626
		LGB	?	1	1377.14	0.020	0.888
		GPS	?	1	22668.91	0.340	0.566

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered		0	2906357	0.6084	-18.34
2	F16	Entered	0.0305	351287.2	0.6819	-17.03	3
3	F15E	Entered	0.2323	97537.5	0.7023	-15.22	4

Stepwise Regression: OCA Index Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
Stepwise Regression Control
Prob to Enter 0.25
Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
355133.65	13	27317.97	0.7436	0.507	3.129159	273.576

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	-1062.058	1	0.0	0.000	1.000
		F15C	?	1	33810.0	1.263	0.283
	X	F16	-45.975	1	50728.8	1.857	0.196
		F15E	?	1	15200.7	0.537	0.478
		F111	?	1	9227.7	0.320	0.582
		F4G	?	1	471.7	0.016	0.902
	X	A10	-74.617	1	133623.5	4.891	0.046
		EF111	?	1	1145.4	0.039	0.847
	X	F117	-97.908	1	230065.0	8.422	0.012
		AWACS	?	1	9266.9	0.322	0.581
		JSTARS	?	1	24180.8	0.877	0.368
	X	TOM	-43.125	1	44634.4	1.634	0.224
	X	AIM120	50.367	1	60883.2	2.229	0.159
		AIM9	?	1	8407.5	0.291	0.600
		20MM	?	1	11414.5	0.399	0.540
	X	MK82	69.108	1	114623.1	4.196	0.061
	X	AGM65	-41.025	1	40393.2	1.479	0.246
	X	ARM88	-53.075	1	67606.9	2.475	0.140
	X	DELAY	-67.817	1	110378.4	4.041	0.066
		LETHAL	?	1	11214.7	0.391	0.543
		CBU87	?	1	3810.2	0.130	0.725
	X	CBU97	57.192	1	78501.3	2.874	0.114
	X	LGB	43.792	1	46025.0	1.685	0.217
	X	GPS	46.867	1	52715.6	1.930	0.188

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	F117	Entered	0.0388	230065	0.1661	-11.82	2
2	A10	Entered	0.0962	133623.5	0.2625	-11	3
3	MK82	Entered	0.1096	114623.1	0.3453	-10.01	4
4	DELAY	Entered	0.1028	110378.4	0.425	-9.981	5
5	CBU97	Entered	0.1548	78501.28	0.4816	-7.672	6
6	ARM88	Entered	0.1761	67606.94	0.5304	-6.268	7
7	AIM120	Entered	0.1896	60883.23	0.5744	-4.805	8
8	GPS	Entered	0.2137	52715.63	0.6124	-3.269	9
9	F16	Entered	0.2147	50728.82	0.649	-1.716	10
10	LGB	Entered	0.2296	46025.04	0.6823	-0.122	11
11	TOM	Entered	0.2293	44634.37	0.7145	1.4851	12
12	AGM65	Entered	0.2456	40393.21	0.7436	3.1292	13

Stepwise Regression: Interdiction Index
Plackett-Burman Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
82326.17	11	7484.197	0.9548	0.8972	9.261879	239.569

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	-1887.9231	1	0.0	0.000	1.000
	X	F15C	-29.1875	1	20445.8	2.732	0.127
	X	F16	-56.1958	1	75791.3	10.127	0.009
		F15E	?	1	9239.5	1.264	0.287
	X	F111	29.6208	1	21057.5	2.814	0.122
		F4G	?	1	1818.3	0.226	0.645
	X	A10	-220.8125	1	1170196.0	156.356	0.000
		EF111	?	1	383.2	0.047	0.833
	X	F117	-96.4208	1	223127.5	29.813	0.000
		AWACS	?	1	8373.9	1.132	0.312
	X	JSTARS	-23.8042	1	13599.3	1.817	0.205
	X	TOM	-31.4292	1	23707.0	3.168	0.103
		AIM120	?	1	6590.2	0.870	0.373
		AIM9	?	1	10546.2	1.469	0.253
		20MM	?	1	5289.6	0.687	0.427
	X	MK82	21.9958	1	11611.6	1.551	0.239
	X	AGM65	-21.7458	1	11349.2	1.516	0.244
	X	ARM88	-42.7208	1	43801.7	5.853	0.034
	X	DELAY	-36.9042	1	32686.0	4.367	0.061
		LETHAL	?	1	4545.8	0.584	0.462
		CBU87	?	1	4248.0	0.544	0.478
	X	CBU97	43.9458	1	46349.7	6.193	0.030
	X	LGB	32.4458	1	25265.6	3.376	0.093
	X	GPS	28.5875	1	19613.9	2.621	0.134

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered		0	1170196	0.6426	19.592
2	F117	Entered	0.0021	223127.5	0.7652	7.3304	3
3	F16	Entered	0.0405	75791.32	0.8068	4.4862	4
4	CBU97	Entered	0.0887	46349.67	0.8322	3.5237	5
5	ARM88	Entered	0.0822	43801.67	0.8563	2.7241	6
6	DELAY	Entered	0.116	32686.02	0.8743	2.635	7
7	LGB	Entered	0.1525	25265.57	0.8881	3.0202	8
8	TOM	Entered	0.1529	23707.02	0.9011	3.5049	9
9	F111	Entered	0.1648	21057.45	0.9127	4.159	10
10	F15C	Entered	0.1575	20445.84	0.9239	4.8522	11
11	GPS	Entered	0.1508	19613.88	0.9347	5.5986	12
12	JSTARS	Entered	0.2176	13599.32	0.9422	6.7294	13
13	MK82	Entered	0.246	11611.6	0.9486	7.9873	14
14	AGM65	Entered	0.2438	11349.15	0.9548	9.2619	15

Stepwise Linear Regression: Total Combat Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
44781376	8	5597672	0.7043	0.6674	-3.71247	157.1472

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	54725.20		1	0.00	1.0000
	X	A10	3651.63		1	106670000.00	19.057
		F15E	?		1	378885.10	0.060
		AGM65	?		1	1088550.00	0.174
		MK82	?		1	1001820.00	0.160
		A10*AGM65	?		2	3576115.00	0.260
		A10*MK82	?		2	1671723.00	0.116
		F15E*AGM65	?		3	2137338.00	0.084
		F15E*MK82	?		3	3868270.00	0.158
		A10*F15E	?		2	380965.30	0.026
		AGM65*MK82	?		3	2092450.00	0.082

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0024	1.07E+08	0.7043	-3.712	2

Stepwise Linear Regression: Halt Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
4448790.2	6	741465	0.9103	0.8655	0.192755	138.0556

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	26421.80	1	0.0	0.0000	1.0000
	X	A10	2248.13	2	44084281.0	29.7280	0.0008
		F15E	?	1	9316.1	0.0100	0.9224
	X	AGM65	366.88	2	4728531.0	3.1890	0.1139
		MK82	?	1	158895.1	0.1860	0.6839
	X	A10*AGM65	675.63	1	3651753.0	4.9250	0.0683
		A10*MK82	?	2	316415.3	0.1530	0.8628
		F15E*AGM65	?	2	165836.3	0.0770	0.9268
		F15E*MK82	?	0	0.0	?	?
		A10*F15E	?	2	74657.3	0.0340	0.9667
		AGM65*MK82	?	2	225236.3	0.1070	0.9013

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0003	40432528	0.815	-1.477	2
2	A10*AGM65	Entered	0.1139	4728531	0.9103	0.1928	4

Stepwise Linear Regression: Evict Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
8210076.9	8	1026260	0.2619	0.1697	-3.60206	140.1829

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	13225.90	1	0.0	0.0000	1.0000
	X	A10	603.50	1	2913698.0	2.8390	0.1305
		F15E	?	1	122512.5	0.1060	0.7542
		AGM65	?	1	702112.5	0.6550	0.4451
		MK82	?	1	161312.0	0.1400	0.7191
		A10*AGM65	?	2	939473.0	0.3880	0.6945
		A10*MK82	?	2	259880.0	0.0980	0.9080
		F15E*AGM65	?	3	923193.0	0.2110	0.8847
		F15E*MK82	?	3	521185.0	0.1130	0.9488
		A10*F15E	?	2	163125.0	0.0610	0.9416
		AGM65*MK82	?	3	904037.0	0.2060	0.8880

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.1305	2913698	0.2619	-3.602	2

Stepwise Linear Regression: Air Sup Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
905174.65	7	129310.7	0.7682	0.702	-1.88992	120.133

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	9544.90	1	0.0	0.0000	1.0000
	X	A10	498.13	1	1985028.0	15.3510	0.0058
		F15E	?	1	7140.1	0.0480	0.8343
	X	AGM65	356.13	1	1014600.0	7.8460	0.0265
		MK82	?	1	3321.1	0.0220	0.8867
		A10*AGM65	?	1	34191.1	0.2360	0.6447
		A10*MK82	?	2	3336.3	0.0090	0.9908
		F15E*AGM65	?	2	7155.3	0.0200	0.9804
		F15E*MK82	?	3	44652.4	0.0690	0.9734
		A10*F15E	?	2	9696.3	0.0270	0.9734
		AGM65*MK82	?	2	5877.3	0.0160	0.9838

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0206	1985028	0.5084	-1.525	2
2	AGM65	Entered	0.0265	1014600	0.7682	-1.89	3

Stepwise Linear Regression: C3 Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
1017.275	4	254.3187	0.9772	0.9488	4.745589	58.22298

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	-806.90	1	0.0	0.0000	1.0000
	X	A10	-65.38	2	36207.3	71.1850	0.0007
	X	F15E	24.63	1	4851.1	19.0750	0.0120
	X	AGM65	-12.88	2	3342.3	6.5710	0.0545
	X	MK82	12.63	1	1275.1	5.0140	0.0887
	X	A10*AGM65	-15.88	1	2016.1	7.9280	0.0480
		A10*MK82	?	1	276.1	1.1180	0.3680
		F15E*AGM65	?	1	276.1	1.1180	0.3680
		F15E*MK82	?	0	0.0	?	?
		A10*F15E	?	1	0.1	0.0000	0.9859
		AGM65*MK82	?	1	0.1	0.0000	0.9859

Step History

Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0009	34191.13	0.7653	22.301	2
2	F15E	Entered	0.0438	4851.125	0.8739	11.208	3
3	A10*AGM65	Entered	0.1056	3342.25	0.9487	6.1871	5
4	MK82	Entered	0.0887	1275.125	0.9772	4.7456	6

Stepwise Linear Regression: Interdiction Index
Fractional Factorial Design

Response: Response
 Stepwise Regression Control
 Prob to Enter 0.25
 Prob to Leave 0.1

Direction
 Rules:

Current Estimates

SSE	DFE	MSE	RSquare	RSquare Adj	Cp	AIC
859582	8	107447.8	0.5566	0.5012	-3.76771	117.6162

Lock	Entered	Parameter	Estimate	nDF	SS	F Ratio	Prob>F
X	X	Intercept	6339.50	1	0.0	0.0000	1.0000
	X	A10	367.25	1	1078981.0	10.0420	0.0132
		F15E	?	1	23980.5	0.2010	0.6675
		AGM65	?	1	16020.5	0.1330	0.7262
		MK82	?	1	32004.5	0.2710	0.6189
		A10*AGM65	?	2	16220.5	0.0580	0.9445
		A10*MK82	?	2	46796.5	0.1730	0.8454
		F15E*AGM65	?	3	54793.0	0.1130	0.9485
		F15E*MK82	?	3	56185.0	0.1170	0.9466
		A10*F15E	?	2	26430.5	0.0950	0.9106
		AGM65*MK82	?	3	50475.0	0.1040	0.9542

Step History


Step	Parameter	Action	Sig Prob	Seq SS	RSquare	Cp	p
1	A10	Entered	0.0132	1078981	0.5566	-3.768	2

Appendix I


This appendix contains the Response vs. Predicted Response and Residual vs. Response plots for both the Plackett-Burman and Fractional Factorial designs. Plots were created for each of the indices calculated.

Total Combat Index Plots Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Halt Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Evict Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Air Sup Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




C3 Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Interdiction Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




OCA Index Plots
Plackett-Burman Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Total Combat Index Plots

2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Halt Index Plots

2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Evict Index Plots

2^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Air Sup Index Plots

2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




C3 Index Plots

2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response




Residual vs. Response




Interdiction Index Plots

2_{III}^{4-1} Fractional Factorial Design

Response vs. Predicted Response



Residual vs. Response



Appendix J

The following is an extract from Air Force Instruction (AFI) 65-503. Attachment A10-1 lists the fly-away costs for every aircraft type in the USAF inventory. Attachment A11-1 lists the unit cost for each munition/submunition.

AFI 65-503 Attachment A10-1 5 January 1996

Table A10-1

Unit Flyaway Costs

(FY 96 Constant \$ in Millions)

BOMBERS		FIGHTER/ATTACK		RECON/BATTLE MGMNT/C3I	
B-1B	278.5	A-7D	10.1	E-3A/B/C	121.6
B-2A	1,120.2	A-7K	19.6	E-4A	101.6
B-52C	44.5	A-10A	9.6	E-4B	215.6
B-52D	38.7	F-4C	9.6	DC-130A	14.2
B-52G	40.1	F-4D	9.1	EC-130E	26.1
B-52H	51.6	F-4E	10.4	HC-130N	12.7
		F-5A/B	3.5	RC-135A	55.0
		F-5E	6.1	RC-135B	70.1
		F-5F	8.7	EC-135A	19.0
		F-15A/B	26.2	EC-135C	38.3
		F-15C/D	29.0	EC-135G	20.3
		F-15E	30.8	EC-135H	21.5
		F-16A/B	13.3	EC-135J	38.3
		F-16C/D	16.2	EC-135K	20.3
		F-106A/B	24.2	EC-135L	16.7
		F-111A	35.7	EC-135N	33.3
		F-111D	35.1	EC-135P	19.9
		F-111E	35.7	RF-4C	9.8
		F-111F	37.8	RF-5A	3.7
		FB-111A	41.0		
		F-22	87.5		
				HELICOPTER	
				CH-53C	9.3
				HH-1H	1.6
				TH-1F	1.3
				UH-1F	1.4
				UH-1H	1.0
				UH-1N	2.4
				UH-1P	1.3
				HH-3E	4.4
				HH-53B	9.2
				HH-60D	15.5
				UH-60A	7.4
				OTHER	
				O-2A	0.4
				O-2B	0.4
				OA-37B	1.9
				OV-10A	2.2
				UC-3B/C/E	3.8
				VC-9C	19.8

Unit Flyaway Costs*(FY 96 Constant \$ in Millions)*

ELEC WAFARE/COMBAT		SPECIAL OPS FORCES	
F-4G	14.5	AC-130A	18.0
EF-111A	98.2	AC-130H	14.9
		HC-130H	14.0
		MC-130H	59.9
		MH-53H	18.9
		MH-53J	19.5
		MH-60G	9.0

The factors in this table represent the approximate original cost of out of-production and in-production aircraft in terms of the then-year dollars of a specific fiscal year. They may be used to estimate an order of magnitude cost for various planning exercises.

a. **Average Unit Flyaway Cost.** The average unit flyaway cost (equates to rollaway and sailaway) related to the production of a usable end-time of military hardware. Flyaway cost is defined in DoD Manual 7110.1-M and includes the cost of procuring the basic unit (airframe, hull, chassis, etc.), a percentage of basic unit for changes allowance, propulsion equipment, electronics, armament, other installed Government-furnished equipment, and nonrecurring production costs.

b. The following items are included in the determination of a unit flyaway cost under Appropriation 3010 (Aircraft Procurement).

- (1) Airframe.
- (2) Propulsion.
- (3) Electronics.
- (4) Avionics.
- (5) Engineering Change Orders (ECO), if any.
- (6) Government Furnished Equipment.
- (7) First destination transportation unless a separate line item.
- (8) System and project management and system test and evaluation if funded by the Aircraft Procurement Appropriation (that is, 3010).
- (9) Warranties.
- (10) Recurring costs (both contract and in-house).
- (11) Nonrecurring cost (both contract and in-house).

Unit Flyaway Costs

(12) Advance buy costs.

c. Unit flyaway cost does not include:

- (1) Research, Test, and Evaluation Appropriation (that is, 3600 expenditures).
- (2) Weapons and Armament (except if part of the airframe; e.g., the 30MM GAU-81A gun on the A-10).
- (3) Peculiar ground support equipment.
- (4) Peculiar training equipment.
- (5) Technical data.
- (6) Initial spares and replacement spares.

d. AF Form 1537, Weapon System Budget Estimate, is used as the basic data source for most of the cost factor computations. Other sources include:

- (1) Selected Acquisition Reports (SAR).
- (2) AF/LG, and XO; SAF/AQ and HQ AFMC.

e. In regards to flyaway cost and modifications, it is important to note that this table reflects only those modifications which produced a new MDS. For example, the EF-111A was modified from the F-111A. Major aircraft modifications which do not produce a new MDS are not included. Thus the unit flyaway cost for the B-52H reflects the unit flyaway cost as originally produced and then inflated to the constant dollars of a specific fiscal year. Since subsequent modifications to the B-052H did not produce a new MDS, the modifications are not included in the unit flyaway cost of the B-052H.

f. The flyaway cost factors represent average costs weighted by the "buy" size per fiscal year. The cost factors are not normalized to any particular "buy" quantity. HQ USAF Weighted Inflation Indices, which are based on OSD inflation and outlay rates, are used to convert constant year cost information to "Then-Year" dollars (tables A47-1 through A47-10).

OPR: SAF/FMCCF, Capt Pat Rose, DSN 227-0184 or (703) 697-0184, Pentagon, Room 4D178.

Table A11-1. Munitions Acquisition Cost.

WEAPON	DODIC	FY95 \$
ROCKETS		
2.75" HE W/MK66	R21AA	358.61
2.75" WP W/MK66	R31AA	416.45
2.75" SIGNATURE	Z75TB	400.98
SIGNALS, MARKERS, FLARES		
AIRBURST SIMULATOR M74A1	L366	23.94
ALA-17	LY12	353.06
FIRE STARTER	L621	
FLARE, SURFACE TRIP	L495	23.06
GROUND BURST SIMULATOR	L594	7.29
LUU-2B FLARE	L440	553.86
LUU-4	L443	450.00
M-206 CART FLARE	L429	29.36
MJU-10B FLARE	L461	63.43
MJU-2	LW61	131.31
MJU-23 FLARE	L462	1,024.69
MJU-7B FLARE	L429	21.31
RR-170	LY07	1.84
RR-180 CHAFF	SY16	8.07
RR-185		
RR-188 CHAFF	LY98	2.05
SIGNAL PERS DISTRESS KIT	L119	88.36
SMOKEY SAM SIMULATOR	YW33	96.00
CARTRIDGES		
.50 CALIBER API	A545	2.03
.50 CALIBER 4-I	A557	2.88
.50 BALL	A555	1.93
.50 CALIBER API-T	A576	3.06
5.56MM BALL	A059	0.55
5.56MM BALL	A071	0.31
5.56MM TRACER	A063	0.55
7.62MM BALL & TRACER OR BALL	A130	0.51
7.62MM 4-I	A131	0.54
7.62MM MATCH GRUDGE	A171	0.75
7.62MM TR	A140	0.38
20MM HCI PGU-28	A677	16.07
20MM PGU-27	A678	5.34
20MM TPT BULK PGU-30	A6797	.96
30MM TP	B116	9.43
30MM HEI	B103	24.75
40MM HEDO	B546	14.76
40MM TP M781/M888	B519	3.79
40MM HEDP	B542	15.34

Table A11-1. Munitions Acquisition Cost.

WEAPON	DODIC	FY95 \$
40MM CS	B567	8.95
40MM API	B552	7.82
40MM TP	B584	17.38
105MM HE	C432	160.00
105MMWP	C433	63.72
12 GA SHOTGUN 00 BUCKSHOT	A011	0.33
9MM BALL	A363	0.16
CLUSTER BOMBS		
CBU-52	C521A	2,280.00
CBU-58	C582A	2,973.00
CBU-71	C714B	4,692.00
CBU-87	C872A	12,370.00
CBU-87(WCMD)		42,370.00
CBU-89	C891B	39,090.00
CBU-97(SFW)	C971A	395,000.00
CBU-97(SFW)(WCMD)		425,000.00
MK-20 ROCKEYE	C205E	5,269.93
BOMBS		
BDU-33 25LB	ZP61C	16.00
BDU-50	ZR52A	892.00
BDU-56	ZR61A	3,644.00
BLU-109	BG9GB	220,656.00
GBU-24(MK-84)	BL4DH	56,091.00
GBU-24(12K)	BL9HB	59,874.00
GBU-27	BL9SB	57,531.00
GBU-28	BL5DA	91,192.00
JDAM/MK-84		36,176.00
JSOW/BASELINE		157,727.00
JSOW/BLU-108		291,897.00
MK-82	BR25A	2,890.87
MK-84 INERT	F262	2,602.52
MK-84	BR41M	8,345.34
M-117	BC71E	986.48

Table A11-1. Munitions Acquisition Cost.

WEAPON	DODIC	FY95 \$
MISSILES		
AGM-65A MAVERICK	M65AA	17,505.00
AGM-65B MAVERICK	M65BA	19,000.00
AGM-65D MAVERICK	M65DA	112,000.00
AGM-65G MAVERICK	M65GA	109,763.00
AGM-84 HARPOON	M84AA	334,100.00
AGM-86C CALCM		600,000.00
AGM-88C HARM	M88AC	236,403.00
AGM-130 A/C IR	M304R	357,000.00
AGM-130 TV	M304T	331,000.00
AGM-142A HAVE NAP		737,000.00
AGM-142D HAVE NAP		635,000.00
AIM-7M		208,620.00
AIM-9M		43,520.00
AIM-120B AMRAAM		500,000.00

Munitions Designators

Designator	Description
AGM	Air To Ground Missile
AIM	Air To Air Infrared Missile
ALA	Ancillary Light Assy.
API	Armor Piercing Incendiary
API-T	Armor Piercing Incend.w/TR
BDU	Simulated Bomb Units
CBU	Cluster Bomb Unit
CS	Chemical Fill
GBU	Guided Bomb Unit
HE	High Explosive
HED	High Explosive
HEI	High Explosive Incendiary
HEIT	High Explosive Dual Purpose
LAU	Launcher
LUU	Laminating Unit
M	Model Designator
MK	Mark/Model Designator
MJU	Munition Countermeasure
PGU	Ammunition Unit
RR	Radar Reflector
SAM	Surface To Air Missile
S&I	Smoke & Illuminating
TP	Target Practice

TPT	TP-Tracer
TR	Tracer
WP	White Phosphorous

Munitions Acquisition Cost. Table A11-1 provides the cost of munitions listed in AFR 50-21 . Munitions costs reflect the contract price per unit as of the last procurement-escalated to constant year dollars. Associated item costs are included in the unit price.

Data Source: AFR 50-21 & HQ USAF/ACP/MMWDS

OPR: AF/XOOT, Maj Topp, DSN: 225-7003

Bibliography

ACSC Faculty. "The A-B-Cs of the PPBS", in *Air Command and Staff, Volume 5: Seminar and Correspondence Lesson Book*. Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base AL., 1991.

Air Force Studies and Analysis Agency, *THUNDER Analyst's Manual*. Version 6.3. Arlington VA: CACI Products Company. 1995.

Air and Space Power Validation Group (ASPVG). *ASPVG Checklist of Objectives for Model Evaluation: Major Regional Conflicts*. HQ USAF/XOM, Pentagon ADM VA, 20330. March 22, 1995.

Banks, Jerry, John S. Carson II, and Barry L. Nelson. *Discrete-Event System Simulation*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Barton, Russell R. "Metamodeling: A State of the Art Review", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.D. Tews, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1994.

Box, George E.P. and Norman R. Draper. *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1987.

Dillion, William R. and Matthew Goldstein. *Multivariate Analysis: Methods and Applications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984

Donohue, Joan M. "Experimental Designs for Simulations", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.D. Tews, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1994.

Fishman, G.S. *Principles of Discrete Event Simulation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1978.

Griggs, Maj Brian. Headquarters United States Air Force / XPY, Pentagon ADM VA 20330. *Personal Interview*, 1-3 July 1996.

Johnson, Mark E. *Multivariate Statistical Simulation*. New York: John Wiley & Son, 1982

Kelton, W. David. "Analysis of Output Data", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.D. Tews, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1994.

Kleijnen, Jack P.C. *Statistical Tools of Simulation Practitioners*. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1987.

Kleinbaum, David G. and Lawrence C. Kupper. *Applied Regression Analysis and other multivariate methods*. North Scitualet: Duxbury Press, 1978.

Law, Averill M. and W. David Kelton. *Simulation Modeling and Analysis* (Second Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991.

Lin, Chinho, Christian N. Madu, and Chu-Hua Kuei. "Experimental Design and Regression Analysis in Simulation: An Automated Flowline Case Study", in *Microelectronic Reliability*, Volume 34, Number 5, 5 May 1994.

Myers, Raymond H. and Douglas C. Montgomery. *Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1995.

Naylor, T.H. *The Design of Computer Simulation Experiments*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1969.

Nelson, B.L. "Designing Efficient Simulation Experiments", in *Proceedings of the 1992 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.J. Swain, D. Goldsman, R.C. Crain, and J.R. Wilson. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1992.

Neter, John, Michael H. Kunter, Christopher J. Nachtsheim, and William Wasserman. *Applied Linear Statistical Models* (Fourth Edition). Chicago: Irwin, 1996

Seila, Andrew F. "Advanced Output Analysis for Simulation", in *Proceedings of the 1992 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.J. Swain, D. Goldsman, R.C. Crain, and J.R. Wilson. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1992.

Song, Wheyming Tina and Chien Chou Su. "An Extension of the Multiple-Block Strategy and Estimation Simulation Metamodels", in *Institute of Industrial Engineers* Volume 28, Number 6, June ,1996.

Tatsuoka, Maurice M. *Multivariate Analysis: Techniques for Educational and Psychological Research*. New York: John Wiley & Son, 1971.

Van Groenendaal, Willem J. H. and Jack P.C. Kleijnen. "Regression Metamodels and Design of Experiments", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.D. Tews, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1994.

Webb, Timothy S. Analysis of THUNDER Combat Simulation Model MS thesis. Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, March 1994 (AFIT/GOR/ENS/94M-18).

Webb, Timothy S. and Kenneth W. Bauer, Jr. "Comparison of Analysis Strategies for Screening Designs in Large Scale Computer Simulations", in *Proceedings of the 1994 Winter Simulation Conference*. Ed. J.D. Tews, S. Manivannan, D.A. Sadowski, and A.F. Seila. *Institute of Electronics Engineers*, Washington D.C. 1994.

VITA

Maj James B. Grier [REDACTED]. He earned his Bachelors of General Studies from the University of Maryland, College Park, and was a Distinguished Graduate of AFROTC, earning a Regular Commission as the top graduate of the class of 1984. He attended the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJPPT) program at Sheppard AFB, earning his aeronautical rating in December 1985.

His first operational tour was as an F-111E Instructor Pilot, assigned to the 55th Tactical Fighter Squadron, RAF Upper Heyford, UK in November 1986. He was assigned to Operating Location Romeo (OL-R), 8th Air Support Operations Group, Vilseck Germany in April 1990, where he served as an Air Liaison Officer (ALO) for 1st Brigade, 1st Armored Division. During this assignment, he deployed to Desert Shield/Desert Storm, where he served as both Brigade and Division ALO for the Royal Saudi Land Forces's Khalid Division. Maj Grier transitioned to the F-16C Blk 40 in Jan 1992 and was assigned to the 421st Fighter Squadron, Hill AFB, Utah, where he served as an Instructor Pilot and Flight Commander.

He entered the School of Engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology in August 1995. Upon receiving a Master of Science degree from the institution, he was assigned to the Air Staff, HQ USAF/XPP, Pentagon ADM VA.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE March 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Linking Procurement Dollars to an Alternative Force Structures' Combat Capability using Response Surface Methodology			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) James B. Grier, Major, USAF				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Institute of Technology/ENS 2750 P Street Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433-7765			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFIT/GOA/ENS/97-7	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) HQ USAF/XPY Pentagon ADM, VA 20330			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) A General Officer Steering Group, chaired by HQ USAF/XOM tasked action to develop and implement evaluation and analysis support to "lead turn" the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and Joint Warfare Capability Assessment (JWCA) process. This evaluation process should be designed to supply measures of the "health" of the Air Force program in light of the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) and the Chairman's Program Assessment (CPA). The Air Force needs to be able to quickly evaluate various alternative force structures with regards to it's combat capability, measured in terms of theater level campaign objectives (CO). HQ USAF/XOM tasked HQ USAF/XPY to develop a "quick turn" tool to perform iterative "exercises", allowing for comparison of alternative force structures within 24 to 48 hours. Using Factor Analysis and Response Surface Methodology, this thesis successfully developed a "quick turn" tool designed to capture the cost and capabilities of alternative force structures, linking dollars spent to campaign level measures of outcome.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Simulation, THUNDER, Factorial Design, Factor Analysis, Plackett-Burman, Response Surface Methodology,			15. NUMBER OF PAGES	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UJ	