



712CD

75TH MORSS CD Cover Page

If you would like your presentation included in the 75th MORSS Final Report CD it must :

1. *Be unclassified, approved for public release, distribution unlimited, and is exempt from U.S. export licensing and other export approvals including the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22CFR120 et seq.);*
2. Include MORS Form 712CD as the first page of the presentation;
3. Have an approved MORS form 712 A/B and
4. Be turned into the MORS office no later than: **DEADLINE: 14 June 2007 (Late submissions will not be included.)**

Author Request (To be completed by applicant) - The following author(s) request authority to disclose the following presentation in the MORSS Final Report, for inclusion on the MORSS CD and/or posting on the MORS web site.

Name of Principal Author and all other author(s):

Mr Douglas Anding and Mr David Boyer

Principal Author's Organization and address:

Scitor Corporation
745 Space Center Drive
Colorado Springs CO 80915

Phone: **(719) 380-4054**

Fax: **(719) 380-4001**

Email: **danding@scitor.com**

Please use the same title listed on the 75TH MORSS Disclosure Form 712 A/B. If the title of the presentation has changed please list both.)

Original title on 712 A/B:

Billet Analysis

If the title was revised please list the original title above and the revised title here:

PRESENTED IN: 20

WORKING GROUP:

DEMONSTRATION:

COMPOSITE GROUP:

POSTER:

SPECIAL SESSION 1:

TUTORIAL:

SPECIAL SESSION 2:

OTHER:

SPECIAL SESSION 3:


This presentation is believed to be: *Unclassified, approved for public release, distribution unlimited, and is exempt from U.S. export licensing and other export approvals including the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22CFR120 et seq.)*

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the 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. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE 01 JUN 2007	2. REPORT TYPE N/A	3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Space Professional Billet Analysis for the US Air Force		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
		5b. GRANT NUMBER	
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)		5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
		5e. TASK NUMBER	
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Scitor Corporation 745 Space Center Drive Colorado Springs, CO 80915		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM202526. Military Operations Research Society Symposium (75th) Held in Annapolis, Maryland on June 12-14, 2007, The original document contains color images.			
14. ABSTRACT			
15. SUBJECT TERMS			
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	UU
			18. NUMBER OF PAGES 32
			19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON



*Space Professional Billet
Analysis for the US Air
Force*

**Mr Doug Anding
Mr Dave Boyer
Scitor Corporation
1 May 07**



Overview

- **Purpose**
- **Space Experience Codes (SPECs)**
- **Assumptions**
- **Analysis of Core Space Professional (SP) Billets**
- **Potential SPEC Groups**
- **Observations**




Purpose

- **Ensure an appropriate number of SP positions with the right experience prerequisites are available to satisfy mission capabilities for each officer grade within each SPEC**
- **Determine if relationships among SPECs define SPEC groups (career paths)**



SPECs



- Common definition for individual qualifications, job requirements
- Three characters
 - 1st: Functional code [A,O,S]
A-Acq; O-Ops; S-Staff
 - 2nd: Mission code [A-J]
 - 3rd: Experience Identifier [0-9]
- Tracked and cataloged



SPEC Examples

AFSC: 13S


Duty title: ICBM Combat Crew CC

Duty location: Minot AFB

O – Operations

B – Nuclear

1 – Missile Systems



AFSC: 62E


Duty title: Delta IV Mission Mgr

Duty location: Los Angeles AFB

A – Acquisition

C – Spacelift

2 – Launch Systems



AFSC: 1C6


Duty title: NCOIC, Space Control Plans

Duty location: Peterson AFB (AFSPC)

S – Staff

E – Space Control

1 – Ground Based Surv





SPEC Breakout

C-Spacelift

C: Spacelift				
0: Multi Systems	1: Range Systems	2: Launch Systems	3 SLEC-P	4: Spaceflight
Wing/CC Ops Gp/CC	Western Launch Range	Delta	SLEC-P	Astronauts Pilots/Mission Spec
OSS/CC/DO	Eastern Launch Range	EELV		
OGV Chief (Gp and below)	Range SPO	Titan		
LCG CC/DO		Titan		
LCSS CC/DO		Atlas		
		Shuttle		
		EELV SPO		
		Launch SPO		
		6595 ATG/1 ASTS		
		SMC Det 8		
		SMC Det 9		
		SMC Det 12		
		14 AF Launch		
		RSA II		
		RSLP		



Approach

- Review 5,443 CSP billets--core 13S, 61S, 62E, and 63A
- Billets are broken out by SPEC and rank, illustrating:
 - Total billets
 - Total billets with prerequisite SPECs (P/SPEC)
 - P/SPEC requirements from within the same SPEC
 - P/SPEC requirements from other SPECs
 - P/SPEC requirements to other SPECs
- Review P/SPEC linkage among SPECs to determine groups
- P/SPECs are derived from the Millennium database job description for each position
- 32.3% of positions have job descriptions which are considered valid



Assumptions

- **Multiple P/SPECS for a position are additional requirements, not substitute requirements**
- **Experience is not quantified in the job descriptions, so *any* experience in the SPEC is sufficient**
- **Career progression patterns (“paths”) identified as a result of the analysis are based on P/SPEC linkage between SPECS.**
- **Job description information is considered reliable for the purpose of this analysis, i.e., any subjectivity injected by the POC or potentially outdated material cannot be determined**




SP Positions

- **Positions that require an understanding of space systems and capabilities with duty directly associated with space system operation, acquisition or sustainment; or the exploitation of information obtained via space systems**



Relationships Satellite Systems





Satellite Systems Lt through LtCol

		Internal			External Sat Sys SPEC Reqs	
Internal Other SPEC Reqs →		ACQ	OPS	STAFF	→	
1	Accession LTs	51	33	2	86 Total → 29 Free	0
		Total of 57 Sat Sys P/SPEC positions for LTs			→ OK	
	LTs	51	85	7	143 Total → 0 Free	0
		Total of 161 Sat Sys P/SPEC positions for Capts			→ OK?*	
28	Capt	142	240	26	408 Total → 192 Free	71
		Total of 145 Sat Sys P/SPEC positions for Majors			→ OK	
28	Major	97	34	33	164 Total → 20 Free	61
		Total of 83 Sat Sys P/SPEC positions for LtCols			→ OK	
26	LtCol	54	18	26	98 Total	

Satellite Systems can support all internal and external requirements

* = Yes, Capts also fill Capt Reqs




Satellite Systems Validation


	A Int	T Billets	Free	A Ext	Available
A	446	813	367	132	235
B				3	
C				5	
D				11	
E				25	
F				36	
G				2	
H				33	
I				60	
Total (B – I)					175
Difference (A – Total)					60



Relationships Sat Sys



Relationships All Ranks (Combined)





SPEC Groups Assumptions

- There is significant P/SPEC interrelation among billets – almost all billets are interrelated to some extent
- *Space Warfare C2, Kinetic Effects and Space Other* have significant P/SPEC requirements and are follow-on type positions (very few accession-type positions and are typically HQ and Staff positions), therefore, these SPECS are not included in the analysis of potential SPEC groups (SPECS G, H, and I)
- A combination of groups is a Set
- A combination (or just one) of several SPECS is a Group
- Determination of the SPEC Groups is based on similar duty functions (Set 1) or balancing the number of billets in a group based on internal/external SPEC requirements based on computer analysis (Sets 2 – 11)




Potential SPEC Groups Assumptions Con't

- **An optimized SPEC group is characterized by a high number of internal P/SPECs and a low number of external P/SPECs**
- **Personnel will still be required to cross between groups**




SPEC Set 1 Groups 1/2





SPEC Set 1 Grouping 1/2 All Levels






Observations Set 1 Group 1/2

- **Groups based on like duties--*Sat Sys/Sp Cont/ISR* (Group 1) and *Nuke/Lift/Warn* (Group 2) seem viable**
 - Both groups tie into the remaining SPECs: *Sp War C2/Kinetic Eff/Sp Other*
 - Group 1 does Sat C2, satellite payload management and space control operations
 - Group 2 does time-critical/checklist-driven operations
 - Ground Based Warning and Space Surveillance perform similar functions
- **There are still requirements for movement among the two groups (1/118 2/76), these numbers are higher than group 3/4 (3/57 4/83) and group 5/6 (5/94 6/69)**
- **The internal requirements of 1/126 and 2/89 is not the optimal grouping (does not rank in the top ten)**




SPEC Set 2 Groups 3/4



Accessions



SPEC Set 2 Grouping 3/4 All Levels






Observations Set 2 Group 3/4

- **Groups based on billet numbers of *Sat Sys/Lift/ISR* (Group 3) and *Nuke/Sp Cont/Warn* (Group 4) seem viable as well**
 - **Group 3 does Sat C2, satellite payload management and spacelift operations**
 - **Group 4 does time-critical/checklist-driven operations**
 - **Ground Based Warning and Space Surveillance perform similar functions**
- **There are still requirements for movement between the two groups (1/57 2/83) but this is less than between group 1/2, showing more compartmentalized groups**
- **The internal requirements of 3/115 and 4/151 is the optimal grouping for sets with two or more SPECs in a group**




SPEC Set 3 Groups 5/6





SPEC Set 3 Grouping 5/6 All Levels






Observations Set 3 Group 5/6

- **Groups based on billet numbers of *Sat Sys/Lift/ISR/Sp Cont* (Group 5) and *Nuke/Warn* (Group 6) seem viable as well**
 - **Group 5 does Sat C2, satellite payload management, spacelift operations and space control ops**
 - **Group 6 does time-critical/checklist-driven operations**
 - **Ground Based Warning and Space Surveillance perform similar functions but are now in different groups**
- **There are still requirements for movement between the two groups (5/94/ 6/69), higher than group 3/4 (3/57 4/83) and slightly less than between group 1/2 (1/118 2/76) showing less compartmentalization than group 3/4 but more than group 1/2**
- **The internal requirements of 5/182 and 6/64 is not the optimal grouping (ranked seven out of ten)**




SPEC Set 4 Groups 7/8





SPEC Set 4 Grouping 7/8 All Levels





Observations Set 4 Group 7/8

- **This Group places *Sat Sys/Lift/ISR/Sp Cont/Nuke/Warn* all together**
- **No requirements for movement between another group (no other group) and all requirements are internal**
- **This is how business is currently done and there is no optimization**
- **The internal requirements of 7/409 is the number one optimal grouping (ranked one out of ten), but this set only has the one group**



Observations All Groups, All Levels

This chart shows the top ten computer ranked groupings plus one based on like duty functions, the computer ranking number is shown in the first row under the group number

The higher the Internal Requirements number the better, the lower the External Requirements number the better

	Set 1		Set 2		Set 3		Set 4		Set 5		Set 6		Set 7		Set 8		Set 9		Set 10		Set 11	
	G P 1	G P 2	G P 3 5	G P 4	G P 5 7	G P 6	G P 7 1	G P 8	G P 9 2	G P 10	G P 11 3	G P 12	G P 13 4	G P 14	G P 15 6	G P 16	G P 17 8	G P 18	G P 19 9	G P 20	G P 21 10	G P 22
SPECS	A E F	B C D	A C F	B D E	AC EF	B D	AB CD EF		AB DE F	C	AC DE F	B	AB CD E	F	AB DE F	C	AB CF	DE	A F	BC DE	AC DE	B F
Int Req	126 10	89 12	117 11	152 8	182 6	64 14	409 1		328 2	0 16	301 3	0 16	296 4	0 16	234 5	19 15	147 9	74 13	64 14	180 7	182 6	64 14
Ext Req	118 19	76 10	57 8	83 13	94 15	69 9	0 1		32 4	49 6	27 3	81 12	101 16	12 2	114 17	42 5	134 21	54 7	87 14	78 11	69 9	94 15
Total	29 51	22	19 21 40	21 23 43	2 2 2	6 22 28	6 24 30	20 18 38	22 20 42	30 20 50	28 18 46	15 29 44										

The 1st number shown in a box is the number of interactions for that group followed by a ranking number used to determine the overall ranking of a group. Add the ranking numbers for the Int Req/Ext Req for a group. Then add both groups to get the overall ranking for the Set. The top five lowest groups are highlighted showing the optimal groupings

Conclusion: Discounting Set 4 with one large group (7/8) and the Sets with five SPECS in one group and one in the other (9/10, 11/12, 13/14) the optimal Set with multiple SPECS in each group is Set 2



Observations

- In comparing all the Sets 1 - 11, all Levels, based on the evaluation criteria of:

“The higher the Internal Reqs number the better, the lower the External Reqs number the better”

Set 2 Group 3/4 is the most optimized for sets with more than 2 SPECs in a group

- What this tells us is we have a potentially two viable career paths for personnel one in Satellite Systems, Spacelift, ISR and the other in Nuclear, Warning and Space Control



Questions?