DoD 5000.3-M-2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING (FCT) PROGRAM

PROCEDURES MANUAL

JANUARY 1994

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY)

PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

30 15DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3015

ACQUISITION AND
TECHNOLOGY

JAN 25 1991

FOREWORD

This Manual is reissued under the authority of DoD Instruction 5000.2, "Defense Acquisition Management Policies and Procedures, " February 23, 1991. It outlines procedures to be used in support of Program Element (PE) 0605130D, Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program. Funds provided by Congress under this PE provide for the test and evaluation (T&E) of foreign nations' recent developments in weapon systems, equipment, and technologies to determine their potential for acquisition and use by the DoD Components, to satisfy Component requirements. The subsequent acquisition of foreign technology and/or deployment of selected foreign systems evaluated under the auspices of the FCT program results in significant resource savings by avoiding unnecessary duplication of research and development (R&D), achieves more timely fielding, and provides viable alternative solutions to Component requirements, promoting healthy competition and resultant procurement savings. Also, the FCT program directly supports the DoD policy that equipment procured for use by personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in Europe, under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty, be standardized or be interoperable with equipment from other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nations.

This Manual applies to the office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Military Departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Unified Commands, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Defense Agencies (hereafter referred to collectively as "the DoD Components"). The term "Military Services, " as used herein, refers to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps.

This Manual is effective immediately. Its procedures are required to be used by all the DoD Components. DoD 5000.3-M-2, "Foreign Weapons Evaluation and NATO Comparative Test Programs Procedures Manual, " August 1988 is hereby canceled.

Send recommended changes to the Manual through channels to:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY)
DIRECTOR, TEST AND EVALUATION
3110 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-3110

The DoD Components may obtain copies of this Manual through their own publications channels. Other Federal Agencies and the public may obtain copies from the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

R. Noel Longuemare, Jr.

FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING (FCT) PROGRAM

PROCEDURES MANUAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
REFERENCES	v
TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1. FCT GENERAL INFORMATION	1
A. Purpose	
B. Definitions	
C. Background	
D. Guidelines	
E. Responsible Organizations	
CHAPTER 2. FCT PROJECT NOMINATION PROCEDURES	6
A. General	
B. Candidate Nomination Proposal (CNP) Criteria	
C. Foreign T&E Data	
CHAPTER 3. CNP SUBMISSION, REVIEW, AND SELECTION PROCESS	8
A. Submission of FCT CNPS	
B. CNP Review and Selection Procedures	
C. Out-of-Cycle CNPS	
D. Summary Candidate Nomination Proposals (SCNP)	
CHAPTER 4. CNP DESCRIPTION	10
CHAPTER 5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	15
A. General	
B. Quarterly Progress Reporting	
C. Congressional Reporting	

	Page
APPENDIX A. DOCUMENTATION FOR THE FCT PROGRAM	16
A. Sample FCT CNP	A-1
B. Summary CNP Format	A-8
C. FCT Quarterly Progress Report Format	A-9
D. Quarterly Financial Report Format	A-10

REFERENCES

(a) DoD Instruction 5000,2, "Defense Acquisition Management Policies and Procedures, " February 23, 1991

(b) Sections 2304, 2325, 2350a, and 2457 of title 10, United States Code

(c) Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS), Parts 206, 207, and 211

(d) Public Law 101-189, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 ," November 29, 1989

(e) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Part 6, current edition

(f) DoD 5200. 1-R, "Information Security Program Regulation, " June 1986, authorized by DoD Directive 5200.1, June 7, 1982

(g) DoD Directive 5230.11, "Disclosure of Classified Military Information to Foreign Governments and International Organizations, " June 16, 1992

(h) DoD 8910.1 -M, "DoD Procedures for Management of Information Requirements, " November 1986, authorized by DoD Directive 8910.1, June 11, 1993

TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	Test and Evaluation Schedule Format	12
2	CNP Funding Requirement Format	14
3	Sample FCT Project Evaluation Schedule	A-5
4	Sample FCT Project Budgetary Information	A-6

CHAPTER 1

FCT GENERAL INFORMATION

A. PURPOSE. This Manual outlines procedures to be used in support of activities funded under the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Program Element (PE) 06051 30D, the Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program. It outlines procedures for submitting candidate FCT projects for approval and funding, describes the OSD project selection process, and identifies reporting requirements for approved projects. The test and evaluation (T&E) of foreign systems, equipments, or technologies conducted in conjunction with other acquisition programs are not bound by the program guidance contained herein. However, DoD Instruction 5000,2, Part 8, "Test and Evaluation, " (reference (a)), still applies.

B. DEFINITIONS

1. FCT Program. A DoD T&E program, prescribed by 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g) (reference (b)) and centrally managed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition (Test and Evaluation) (USD(A)(T&E)), which provides funding for U.S. T&E of selected equipment items and technologies developed by allied or friendly countries when such items or technologies are identified as having good potential to satisfy valid DoD requirements.

2. FCT Equipment Project. An FCT project to test and evaluate a conventional item of military equipment developed by an allied or friendly country, with a view toward potential subsequent acquisition of that equipment to satisfy DoD requirements. Such equipment includes systems, subsystems, munitions, major components, and individual items that are currently, or soon shall be, available for procurement by the U.S. Government.

3. FCT Technical Assessment Project. An FCT project to test and evaluate foreign military equipment, with the primary intent of examining the underlying technology for potential application to the production or improvement of an identified conventional U.S. military system.

C. BACKGROUND

1. The FCT Program supports U.S. national policy by encouraging international armaments cooperation between the United States and its allies and promoting the procurement of non-developmental items (NDI) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 2325; Part 211. of the DFARS; and DoI) Instruction 5000.2 (references (b), (c), and (a)) covering acquisition and distribution of commercial products.

2. FCT involves the T&E of conventional military equipment items developed by U.S. allies and other friendly countries, with a view toward expeditiously and cost-effectively satisfying valid DoD Component requirements. Additional goals of the program are to reduce duplication in research and development (R&D), enhance standardization and interoperability, improve cooperative support, and promote competition and desirable international technology exchange. The FCT Program implements standardization objectives outlined in 10 U.S.C. 2457 (reference (b)).

3. The FCT Program was authorized by Congress in 1989 as part of Pub. L. No 101-189 (1989) (reference (d)). It consolidates two earlier OSD-managed programs, the Foreign Weapons Evaluation Program, and the NATO Comparative Test Program (also known as the "NATO side-by-side" testing program), dating from 1980 and 1986, respectively.

D. GUIDELINES

1. The principal objective of the FCT Program is to identify, test, and evaluate foreign produced non-developmental items (NDI) of equipment as potentially cost-effective and timely alternatives to satisfy valid DoD requirements. Such items, if proven satisfactory by DoD T&E, can then qualify for selection in subsequent procurement decisions, which must comply fully with the competition requirements of Part 6 of the FAR (reference (e)) and Part 206 of the DFARS (reference (c)).

2. Generally, the first priority for FCT project funding shall be for T&E of foreign equipment in production or in the final stages of development, where favorable test results could lead to a subsequent acquisition of the equipment by a DoD Component. T&E of foreign equipment may be conducted to assess the technology used in the equipment and its possible applicability to U.S. development efforts; however, in most cases, this will be a lesser priority than NDI projects. Technical assessment projects will not be undertaken without the full understanding of the foreign government and manufacturer that the test, regardless of its outcome, will not likely result in subsequent additional acquisition of the tested items.

3. The FCT Program shall not be used for exploitation or for intelligence-gathering purposes.

4. Generally, projects approved for T&E through the FCT Program shall be funded by OSD for no longer than a 2-year effort. On an exception basis, and only when fully justified, funding for complex or high-cost systems may be provided for a longer period,

5. Testing of U.S. equipment items involved in side-by-side comparisons with foreign items shall not be funded by the FCT Program. Costs associated with the test of U.S. items must be borne by the appropriate DoD Component. Furthermore, if U.S. NDI systems that could potentially meet a given requirement are identified by the market investigation and the DoD Component does not fund the T&E of those items, FCT funds for the test of the foreign candidate items will not be provided. It is not the intent of the FCT Program to promote acquisition of foreign equipment items when equally or more cost-effective U.S.-produced equipment may be available.

6. Subpart 206.302-1(b) of the DFARS (reference (c)) Permits contracting officers to use the authority of Subpart 6.302-1 of the FAR (reference (e)) to buy test articles and associated test support services from designated foreign sources for T&E under the FCT Program. Use of this authority must be supported by a Justification and Authorization (J&A) as provided in Subparts 6.303 and 6.304 of the FAR (reference (e)). The justification should be based on the known qualifications of the foreign source and the belief that that source's equipment may satisfy the requirement--not merely on the fact that the acquisition is required for the T&E. (See Subpart 6.303-2(a)(5) of reference (e)).

a. The authority to purchase foreign equipment items for testing should be used only when the DoD Component's attempt to obtain them by other means, such as loan or lease, proves unsuccessful. In the interest of improving the marketing position of their products, manufacturers will often be willing to submit, without charge, articles to Department of Defense for U.S. evaluation.

b. A separate J&A for acquisition of foreign items by any means other than full and open competition must be processed for each acquisition and/or source.

7. Classified or sensitive U.S. test data shall be provided to the foreign governments or manufacturers only in strict accordance with DoD 5200.1-R and DoD Directive 5230.11 (references (f) and (g)).

E. RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS

1. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, through the Director, Test and Evaluation (USD(A)(T&E)):

a. Issues policy guidelines and provides direction to the DoD Components for implementing the FCT Program.

b. Administers the FCT Program, including the review, selection, and prioritization (in coordination with other offices within OSD) of candidate FCT project nominations submitted by the DoD Components.

c. Prepares and submits the annual report to Congress on the FCT Program as prescribed in 10 U.S.C. 2350a.(g) (reference (b)).

2. The DoD Components:

a. Designate a specific office within the Component headquarters as the primary focal point for the FCT Program, to ensure that a concerted and sustained effort is made to identify potential NDI solutions, from both domestic and friendly foreign sources, that might satisfy current, validated DoD Component requirements or offer attractive alternatives to new developmental efforts, in terms of R&D cost avoidance, more rapid fielding, and/or improved performance.

b. Submit Candidate Nomination Proposals (CNPs), using the format provided in Appendix A as a guide, for each project nominated for FCT, for the initial year and each subsequent year FCT funding is requested.

c. Identify and execute appropriate planning, programming, and budgeting actions to enable procurement of the most cost-effective conforming equipment, foreign or domestic, to meet Component requirements. The acquisition strategy associated with the Component requirement must be outlined in the CNP. (See Para 4. A.5.) FCT project proposals for test of equipment to satisfy requirements supported by sound acquisition strategies will receive priority for funding.

d. Assume responsibility for executing and managing approved FCT projects under their cognizance. Expedite, to the extent possible, all actions necessary (e.g., contracting for test articles, completing the T&E plan, and executing fiscal requirements) to complete FCT projects, once begun.

e. Ensure that the formal evaluation of any system undergoing FCT includes assessments of the adequacy of the lifetime logistics support, any impact on force structure, and any special training requirements the system will have, in accordance with Component directives.

f. Provide, if possible, supplemental Component funding for test program execution.

g. Prepare and submit quarterly status and financial reports on approved projects, in accordance with the formats provided in Appendix A.

h. Submit Component-approved T&E plans to Manager, FCT Program, USD(A)(T&E), before initiating actual testing.

i. Prepare final T&E technical reports on systems, equipment, and technologies evaluated under the FCT Program and submit one copy each to the USD(A)(T&E) and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). A copy of the final T&E technical report, along with its report documentation page (Standard Form 298), should also be provided to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC).

j. Prepare, and submit to USD(A)(T&E), a final disposition report for each completed FCT project. The final disposition report, usually no more than two pages in length, shall include a top-level executive summary of the testing conducted, an overview of the test results, and a discussion of DoD Component procurement decisions, or subsequent modifications to U.S. requirements, resulting from the FCT evaluation,

k. Prepare and submit Component input for the annual FCT report to Congress.

F. Questions about the initiation of FCT projects and/or implementation or execution of the FCT Program should be addressed to the following:

MANAGER, FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING PROGRAM
USD(A)(T&E)
DIRECTOR, TEST AND EVALUATION
3110 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-3110

CHAPTER 2

FCT PROJECT NOMINATION PROCEDURES

A. GENERAL. The DoD Components are the primary source of nominations for FCT projects.

1. FCT projects should be designed to evaluate the ability of the tested item to satisfy a valid DoD Component requirement and to help build a functional purchase description or system specification to support acquisition and follow-on support. Test results alone are not to be used to select or eliminate any particular vendor or product, unless preceded by appropriate contracting determinations. (See 10 U.S.C. 2304, 2325, 2350A, and 2457, reference (b)). To ensure timely_ fielding of NDI, strict adherence to applicable acquisition procedures is strongly recommended for FCT-sponsored projects.

2. The Acquisition Executive (or his or her designated representative) for each sponsoring DoD Component shall submit to the USD(A)(T&E), by June 1 of each year, a complete set of CNPS describing projects recommended for FCT Program funding during the upcoming Fiscal Year (FY). This set shall include an updated CNP for each active project proposed for continued funding in the next FY, as well as a prioritized listing of all candidate projects. Although CNPS are normally to be forwarded as a package annually, the DoD Components may submit a CNP whenever an especially promising candidate is identified.

B. CANDIDATE NOMINATION PROPOSAL (CNP) CRITERIA. A proposal for an FCT project must clearly describe the candidate item, or technology, for test and the purpose of the evaluation. The selection or rejection of a candidate item or technology as an FCT project will depend on the extent to which it satisfies the following criteria:

1. Provides a solution to a valid DoD Component requirement for which there is no existing U.S. system; or as an alternative to a U.S. system under development, when the foreign item appears to offer significant cost, schedule, or performance advantages over that system; or when the foreign item has the potential to correct an operational deficiency or shortcoming, and presents a promising procurement alternative for military equipment, munitions, or a related technology or manufacturing process.

2. Provides a written summary, including the results, of a thorough market investigation to determine 'the availability of similar equipment and identify potential U.S and allied country vendors, with an indication of any further market investigation required to support a sound acquisition strategy. (See Subpart 207.105 of the DFARS, reference (c), regarding "market research.") Solicitation to

industry in the form of a "sources sought" inquiry through the *Commerce Business Daily* (CBD) is recommended.

3. Identifies no off-shore procurement restrictions.

4. Shows serious intent by identifying, where applicable, procurement and support funds available in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), within the DoD Component, to procure equipment to satisfy the requirement against which the foreign item is being evaluated (without prejudice for or against the foreign item, system, or technology if the T&E is positive).

5. Identifies, where applicable, any potential for establishment of a U.S. source to produce, under license, foreign-designed equipment or use foreign technologies.

6. Shows willingness of the DoD Component to share test costs, and addresses the willingness of the foreign government and/or industry to absorb all, or part of, the costs associated with providing test articles.

7. Addresses allied interoperability and support considerations (e. g., is the item or system in, or about to enter, service with one or more allies or friendly countries?). When applicable, indicates the level of support the candidate has received from potential users, for example, an endorsement from one or more Unified Commanders in Chief, a signed International Agreement (MOU), or similar documentation.

8. Addresses the results of the sponsoring DoD Component's investigation about the interest of other DoD Components in this effort. (Do other DoD Components have similar requirements? If so, do they support this project?)

9. Identifies and evaluates any security concerns associated with the test of the proposed equipment (e. g., security classifications, access requirements, and technology transfer issues.)

C. FOREIGN T&E DATA. Pertinent T&E data obtained from foreign governments and manufacturers may be useful in reducing duplication of effort and test costs. For projects involving allies, existing Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) and Data Exchange Agreements (DEAs) shall be used to facilitate exchange of data. For countries with which no such agreements already exist, T&E data may be obtained using a contract or a separately negotiated agreement. Classified or sensitive U.S. test data shall be provided to the foreign governments or manufacturers only in strict accorda-nce with U.S. controls.

CHAPTER 3

CNP SUBMISSION, REVIEW, AND SELECTION PROCESS

A. SUBMISSION OF FCT CNPS. FCT CNPS for projects requiring funding during the upcoming FY shall be compiled, prioritized, and forwarded by DoD Components 'to the USD(A&T)(T&E), to arrive no later than June 1 each year: Out-of-cycle proposals shall be considered if an opportunity arises to test and evaluate an item or technology that may fill a critical DoD Component requirement.

B. CNP REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCEDURES

1. The CNPS shall be reviewed and final selection and approval shall be made by the FCT Review and Selection Committee, chaired by the USD(A&T)(T&E) in coordination with the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Dual-Use Technology Policy and International Programs. Committee membership shall also include representatives from the following offices:

a. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

b. Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

c. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence.

d. Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E).

e. Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Advanced Technology

f. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (Tactical Warfare Programs).

g. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (Research and Engineering).

h. Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (Defense Procurement)

2. Upon receiving the annual DoD Component CNP submissions, the USD(A&T)(T&E) shall staff the proposals with the offices listed in subsection B. 1 of this Chapter, -above, for initial screening, review, and comment.

4. Based on initial OSD staff reviews, some proposals that require clarification may be chosen by the FCT Review and Selection Committee for formal briefing. The USD(A)(T&E) shall schedule DoD Component briefings and notify all selection committee representatives.

5. Following the final OSD staff review and DoD Component briefings, the selection committee shall approve or reject proposals for FCT funding. In accordance with 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g)(3) (reference (b)), the USD(A)(T&E) shall then notify the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairmen (and ranking minority members) of the four relevant congressional committees (the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Defense) at least 30 days before obligating any funds toward new FCT projects. This schedule allows notification to be made to DoD Components on or about October 1, at the outset of the new FY.

6. The DOT&E representative shall review approved projects and identify those (if any) for which the DOT&E shall provide operational T&E oversight. The DOT&E shall notify the DoD Components of projects so identified and shall direct that the DoD Component operational test plans for those tests be staffed through the DOT&E.

7. The DoD Components shall receive formal notification of approved projects from the USD(A)(T&E). This notification shall include OSD guidance, recommendations, and any restrictions on funding of individual projects.

C. OUT-OF-CYCLE CNPS. The review and approval process for out-of-cycle CNPS shall be managed *on* a case-by-case basis, conforming to the basic process described above for in-cycle proposals.

D. SUMMARY CANDIDATE NOMINATION PROPOSALS (SCNP). For new projects, a Summary CNP (SCNP) not exceeding two pages shall be submitted to USD(A)(T&E) as notification that a formal, complete CNP is being prepared. The SCNP input is required, to project upcoming FY FCT budget requirements with the congressional committees that have FCT oversight. SCNPS may be submitted at any time; however, to aid in justifying the budget request for the upcoming FY, they must be received at USD(A)(T&E) no later than April 1 of the current FY. The format is provided in Appendix A. SCNPS are not required for projects proposed for continuation; however, a summary of the funds required to continue ongoing projects in the next fiscal year shall be included with the April 1 SCNP submission.

CHAPTER 4

CNP DESCRIPTION

A. GENERAL. Normally, the CNP should not exceed five single-spaced typed pages, excluding any attached background information (brochures, photos, previous test data, etc.), All required information, as described below, should be included. If information in a particular area is not applicable or not available, this fact should be clearly stated. Guidelines are provided in subsections A.1 through A. 10, below, and a sample CNP for a notional system is contained in Appendix A.

1. Project Description and/or Identification. Describe the hardware, software, and/or technology; intended or actual military use and value; operational. use by both the country of origin and other allies or friendly countries; and any foreign government, contractor, and/or DoD Component involved, with its cost burden (if any). If available, attach company brochures, summary T&E reports, project briefings, photographs, and other descriptive documentation.

2. Requirement, Identify the existing requirement that could be satisfied by the system, equipment, or technology. If there is an Operational Requirements Document (ORD), provide a copy as an attachment to the CNP. If there is no ORD, provide a copy of the approved Mission Needs Statement citing the requirement. Identify whether the equipment or system under consideration would represent a new capability or replace a current equipment or system. Address the project's applicability to other DoD Components and their interest in and support for the project. Technical assessment projects may not have an approved DoD Component requirement; therefore, address in this section the direct military utility of the technology to be assessed, and to what military need it may be applied.

3. Project Goal(s\. Specify the goal(s) of the T&E, and state the decision to be made at the conclusion of the evaluation. For equipment items, the goal will normally be to determine whether the candidate item meets a particular Component requirement. For technical assessments, describe the contribution the project could make and the arrangements under which the U.S. Government or U.S. industry would be able to obtain the technology (e.g., government to government agreement, private industry licensing agreement, or cooperative technology exchange program).

4. Market Investigation. Describe how the investigation was conducted and summarize its results. Address the existence of any U.S. inventory hardware that fulfills, in whole or part, the requirement; whether the candidate test item is an alternative to a U.S. system in development or could offer a significant cost, schedule, or performance advantage over an existing U.S. system; the status of the foreign candidate item's development (in U.S. acquisition terms--for example,

beyond Milestone II); and the status of any corresponding U.S. development and/or technology.

5. Acquisition Strategy. Discuss the procurement plan for post-evaluation acquisition of fieldable quantities of the system, subsystem, or component ultimately chosen to satisfy the requirement addressed in the test. The acquisition plan need not apply exclusively to the article(s) being tested. In addition, the following shall be specifically addressed, point by point:

a. Preliminary estimate of the initial and potential quantities of a new item of equipment that would be procured to satisfy the Component's requirement.

b. The Program Element(s) and PI line items, if identified, that would fund the acquisition. Indicate whether or not the PE is funded for the years in which procurement would occur, by FY, If procurement funding has not been identified, indicate what actions have been, or are being, taken to rectify the situation.

c. Potential for initial competitive acquisition. Identify actions taken to engender competition and to communicate the Component's need to all potential suppliers.

d. Any other non-developmental items under test and all known R&D programs underway to address the same requirement.

e. A brief description of how the competition requirements of 10 U.S.C. 2304 (reference (b)) shall be met for any subsequent acquisition (assuming the T&E is successful).

f. Factors, if any, that would mandate subsequent production of FCT tested items, regardless of origin, in the U.S. or Canada. Identification of potential teaming or licensing arrangements for such production.

g. Follow-on logistical support for the system's projected operational life.

Note: Technical assessment projects probably will not have a defined acquisition strategy; e.g., the purpose of the evaluation may be the acquisition of the evaluation data itself. Therefore, this section should discuss how the evaluated technology will be inserted into current acquisition or development programs.

6. The T&E. This section consists of three parts, as follows:

a. Part I--Foreign T&E Data. Describe the type, quantity, and availability of test and operational data generated by the sponsoring country and/or company.

Comment on the applicability of the data to U.S. T&E requirements and the acceptability of such data to DoD Component test planners.

b. Part II--T&E Description. Identify the DoD T&E organization(s) that will lead the test effort. Describe, in general terms, the test methodology to be used. Include an estimate of the length of the test period, the quantity and cost (purchase or lease) of test articles required, the types of tests to be conducted, test locations, critical issues and. the approach to resolve them, and any major testing constraints. Identify any factors that may affect U.S. willingness to provide test results to the foreign country or manufacturer supplying the equipment.

c. Part III--T&E Plan. Prepare and submit to the USD(A)(T&E) an outline of the T&E plan. A copy of the approved test plan to be executed by the applicable T&E organization of the sponsoring DoD Component shall be forwarded to USD(A)(T&E), before the start of any testing.

7. Evaluation Schedule. Include, as a minimum, the milestones shown in table 1, the CNP evaluation schedule format, If applicable, indicate where these milestones interact with other related development or acquisition programs.

	FY xx				FY xx			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Project Initiation								
Test Article Contract Signed								
Test Planning Test Site Selection Test Plan Approved/Submitted								
Period of Test Article Availability								
Test Period								
Data Analysis/Evaluation								
Final T&E Report(s) (Results to USD(A)(T&E))								
Procurement Decision								
Final Disposition Report								

Table 1 - Test and Evaluation Schedule Format

8. Budgetary Information. Include, as a minimum, tabular input with the information depicted in table 2. Only funds being requested from the FCT Program should be shown in the table. In the case of a significant DoD Component contribution, a separate breakout of Component funding and use should be included.

9. Point of Contact Information. To facilitate transmittal of funding documents and other project information, provide names, addresses, and telephone numbers (voice and fax) of the following:

a. DoD Component Headquarters staff monitor.

b. Component FCT Program Manager

c. Principal User Proponent.

d. Evaluation Project Manager,

e. Project Budget Officer.

10. Security Considerations (when classified information or material is likely to be involved). As a minimum, the following information shall be discussed: Identify any U.S. classified information involved, foreign classified information to be provided, the sensitivity of the data, the classification and/or sensitivity of U.S. test results, visit and/or access requirements, user requirements, relevant security agreements and/or provisions, control requirements, and technical data transfer issues, either United States to foreign or foreign to United States.

11. Attachments. List attachments here.

	FY xx				FY xx			
Test Item Acquisition costs [1]								
Test Equipment end/or Instrumentation [2]								
Technical Support [3]								
Testing Costs [4]								
Other Support Costs Contractor Support Shipping Travel								
TOTAL BY FY ($K) TOTAL FOR PROJECT				$ xxx				$ xxx
FCT Funding Requested				$ xxx				$ xxx
FCT Funding Received to Date [5]				$ xxx				$ xxx
DoD Component Funding Contribution				$ xxx				$ xxx

1 Specify purchase/lease/loan costs and item contractor support costs

2 Cost of other items needed for the evaluation, to include items or expendables not under evaluation

3 Costs of project management, test plan writing, contract administration, external non-government contractor support

4 Includes direct test costs, data analysis, and tast report writing

5 For continuation of on-going projects

Table 2- CNP Funding Requirement Format

CHAPTER 5

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. GENERAL Reporting requirements include a quarterly progress report, a quarterly financial summary, notification to Congress of all new start projects, and an annual report to Congress. The sponsoring DoD Component may be requested to present a project review for selected projects.

B. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORTING

1. General. The sponsoring DoD Component shall compile and forward to the USD(A)(T&E) a progress report for each active FCT project no later than 15 working days after the end of each quarter of the FY. The report should not exceed two typed pages and be in the format outlined in Appendix A, Quarterly reports shall clearly and concisely report the current status of testing. Initial observations, key test data, schedule concerns, and so on, shall be reported in the "Status" paragraph,

2. Financial Reporting. The DoD Components shall provide an accurate financial summary depicting the funding status of each project included within its annual FCT appropriation. This summary shall accompany the quarterly progress report and provide information for projects authorized in the current fiscal year, as well as for the two preceding fiscal years. The quarterly funding report shall be in the format outlined in Appendix A.

3. Reports Control. These reports are in accordance with DoD 8910.1 -M, Section E (reference (h)), and are assigned report control symbol DD-R&E(Q)1791.

c. CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING

1. As noted in Chapter 3, the USD(A)(T&E) shall notify the Congress at least 30 days before obligating any funds toward new FCT projects. Accordingly, official notification of in-cycle project selections to the DoD Components shall be made on or about October 1, at the outset of the new FY. Out-of-cycle notifications will occur on a case-by-case basis.

2. The USD(A)(T&E) shall provide an annual report to Congress presenting FCT Program information as prescribed in Section 2350a(g)(4) of 10 U.S. C. (reference (b)).

APPENDIX A

DOCUMENTATION FOR THE FCT PROGRAM

CONTENTS

	Page
A. Sample FCT CNP	A-1
B. Summary CNP Format	A-8
co FCT Quarterly Progress Report Format	A-9
D. Quarterly Financial Report Format	A-10

APPENDIX A

DOCUMENTATION FOR THE FCT PROGRAM

A. SAMPLE FCT CNP. Refer to the CNP format in Chapter 4 for detailed guidance.

(Title Page)

FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING (FCT) PROGRAM
CANDIDATE NOMINATION PROPOSAL
FOR
THE CROP-DUSTER SYSTEM

Produced by

Grassless Industries, Ltd. of Blueland

Submitted by:
U.S. Army Chemical Defense Research Institute, CDRI
12 March 19XX

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The candidate proposed for evaluation is the CROP-DUSTER, manufactured by Grassless Industries, Blueland. The system consists of a tracked-vehicle-mounted launcher that transports and launches rocket-propelled warheads whose contents defoliate potential enemy strongholds within a 2-hour period. The warheads are designed to detonate at approximately 1,000 feet above ground level, spreading over a 100-acre site a cloud of a biodegradable talcum-powder-based chemical that settles on foliage and absorbs its life-support fluids. The defoliant chemical degrades to a harmless state within 12 hours.

The launcher-transporter vehicle carries 20 missiles, each with a range of 26 kilometers and the ability to defoliate 100 acres. The CROP-DUSTER system has completed the equivalent of U.S. Milestone Ill, is currently in low-rate initial production in Blueland, and is being fielded with Blueland Defense Forces.

2. REQUIREMENT

The Headquarters (HQ), U.S. Army, Requirements Directorate, approved an Operational Requirements Document (ORD 302-CD41) on July 15, 19XX for a mobile, ground-delivered, biodegradable, defoliant system to replace the current U.S. Army M431 "ADDER." The M431, a liquid chemical defoliant system, no longer meets the environmental safety requirements of Military Standard (MIL-STD) 6592, and its use by U.S. Forces has been suspended. The U.S. Marine Corps has a similar approved and validated operational requirement, dated January 14, 19 XX. (See attachments (a)-(c).)

CROP-DUSTER was demonstrated by the manufacturer, during September 19XX, at the Army's Ground Forces Chemical Defense Test Site (GFTS-CD) in Arizona, and the test results were considered favorable enough to warrant further testing.

The Commander in Chief, U.S. Army, North Sector (CINCAR-NS), witnessed the September demonstration in Arizona and strongly recommended that CROP-DUSTER be fully evaluated by the United States on an urgent basis. The Commander, U.S. Army Chemical Defense Research Institute, Fort Pinkerton, AL, acting in his capacity as the User Proponent, also strongly endorses the CROP-DUSTER evaluation. Headquarters (HQ) Marine Corps is also interested in the CINCAR-NS proposal, and the Marine Corps Chemical Warfare Center (MCCWC), Camp Early, VA, has requested to participate in the test. and evaluation if it is approved. Copies of all pertinent correspondence are attached.

3. PROJECT GOALS

The goal is to test and evaluate the CROP-DUSTER to determine whether it meets the requirements of ORD 302-CD41. If the system proves to be operationally effective, supportable, and otherwise suitable, it will be proposed for type classification and fielding with Army and Marine Corps units. The U.S. Army could procure as many as 260 defoliant rocket launcher systems beginning in fiscal year (FY) 19XX. The Marine Corps has an end-strength requirement for 35 systems.

4. MARKET INVESTIGATION

a. In 19XX, the domestic manufacturer of the ADDER system (HITECH, Inc. of Columbia, OH) proposed to modify the chemical loads of the ADDER missiles to conform to the new Army *requirement.* As a result, an upgrade program was being considered by the Army, and an audit of the manufacturer's facility was conducted. It was determined that significant Research and Development (R&D) would be required by HITECH to make the necessary changes to ADDER, and the HITECH plant was found to be in non-compliance with the new federal manufacturing standards for chemical systems.

b. A thorough market survey was conducted during the summer and fall of 19XX to determine if any other non-developmental (NDI) systems were available that could meet the Army requirements. In addition to Grassless Industries, two other manufacturing sources for defoliant ground-delivery systems responded to a *Commerce Business Daily* (CBD) announcement, published in October 19XX and circulated overseas.

One foreign manufacturer respondent was located in a country with which the United States is currently restricted from negotiating. Defoliant equipment developed by the other respondent, Tinney Inc. of Dallas, TX, had previously been evaluated at GFTS by the Army Military Equipment Command (ARMEC), during the third and fourth quarters of calendar year 19XX. This equipment was found to be unsuitable for military use, met only one of the critical criteria, and was based on obsolete technology. Tinney has since gone out of business. The U.S. manufacturer of ADDER did not respond to the solicitation.

c. From this extensive market investigation, it was concluded that no other alternative, non-liquid chemical, ground-launched defoliation system is currently available or in development in the United States,

d. Grassless Industries has agreed to loan three launchers for testing, provided the United States will fund a nominal refurbishment cost of approximately 20,000 dollars per launcher when testing is complete.

e. If this FCT evaluation is successful, CROP-DUSTER could be a cost-effective replacement for the liquid chemical defoliant systems now in U.S. Army and Marine Corps inventories, presenting no threat to local friendly forces.

5. ACQUISITION STRATEGY

a. The U.S. Army has a stated need for 260 defoliant rocket launcher systems. (See attached ORD.) The Marine Corps has an end-strength requirement for 35 systems.

b. Army procurement funds are found in Program Element (PE) 0201888 that allow initial procurement in 19 XX. At present, the Army FYDP supports a buy of approximately 165 systems through FY 19XX. A reprogramming action will be initiated to fund procurement of the remaining 95 systems for the Army-by 19XX. The Marine Corps is expected to follow the Army's lead.

c. Due to the relatively small quantities to be acquired, sole-source procurement from Grassless Industries Ltd. is being recommended, should testing be successful. Grassless Industries has the capacity to meet U.S. manufacturing and delivery requirements and is willing to provide a Technical Data Package (TDP), without cost to the U.S. Government, following purchase by the Army of the required 260 systems. Although there are no factors mandating subsequent production of CROP DUSTER in the United States or Canada, Grassless Industries has initiated discussions with the ACE Chemical Engineering Company of Peoria, MS, regarding follow-on licensed production and logistical support of the CROP DUSTER system in the United States.

d. There are currently no off-shore procurement restrictions, such as the "Buy American" Act, attendant to this potential acquisition.

6. THE TEST AND EVALUATION

a. Part I--Foreign T&E Data. The CROP-DUSTER manufacturer has provided, for Army and Marine Corps review, all developmental T&E (DT) data, including time-lapse movies and still photos, for both the launcher and missiles, and the results of Operational Testing (OT) by Blueland Defense Forces. Duplicative testing will be avoided.

b. Part II--T&E Description. The Army plans to receive three launchers (on loan) and procure 120 missiles to conduct controlled defoliant tests at the Ground Forces Chemical Defense Test Site, AZ, and at the Marine Corps Chemical Defense Center, Fort Early, VA. The primary test objectives are to verify DT and OT test " data provided by the manufacturer, 6-12 hour defoliant rates, and effects on personnel. A one-month test period at each site is envisaged.

(1) U.S. test costs are primarily to support the purchase of 120 missiles as test articles, which are being provided to the U.S. Army at cost by the manufacturer, and to support the analysis and evaluation of the collected data.

(2) The Army will provide a portion of the funding required for the test and evaluation.

c. Part III--T&E Plan. A draft T&E Plan is in U.S. Army coordination and the final (approved) plan is expected to be available for distribution in October 19XX. Preliminary test planning is underway at the designated test sites. A copy of the draft T&E Plan is attached.

7. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

	FY xx				FY xx			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Project Initiation	x							
Test Article Contract Signed		x						
Test Planning	x	x	x					
Test Site Selection	x							
Test Plan Approved/Submitted			x					
Period of Test Article Availability			x	x	x	x	x	
Test Period					x	x	x	
Data Analysis/Evaluation						x	x	x
Final T&E Report(s) (Results to USD(A)(T&E))								x
Procurement Decision								x
Final Disposition Report								x

8. BUDGETARY INFORMATION ($K)

	FY xx				FY xx				Totals
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Test Item Acquisition (Purchase of Missiles)	50	50							100
Tast Instrumentation		20	30						50
Technical Support		20	20						40
Other Support Costs Contractor Support Shipping Travel	40	5	5	150					150 40 10
Testing Costs		5	15	300	150	50	50	50	620
TOTAL BY QUARTER	50	140	70	450	150	50	50	50	1010
TOTAL BY FY	710				300				
FCT Funding Requested	500				150				
Army Funding Contribution	210				150				

9. FUNDING AND PROJECT POINTS-OF-CONTACT

a. DoD Component Headquarters Staff Monitor:

LtCol Robert Doughty, USA (SARDA/RDQ-CD)
Pentagon, "Room 2A310, Washington, DC 20301 DSN 228-1400

b. Component FCT Program Manager

Colonel Charles Wheeling, USA (DTC/IP-E)
Director of International Programs, Developmental Test Command
Cumberland Proving Ground, VA DSN 226-1813

c. User Proponent:

Colonel Albert Heinrich, USA (CDRI/TA)
Commander, U.S. Army Chemical Defense Research institute
Fort Pinkerton, AL DSN 746-3366

d. Evaluation Project Manager:

Maj. James Boultrie, USA (GFTS-CD/SDV)
Ground Forces Test Center, Yucca, AZ 40111 DSN 983-2104

d. Project Budget Control Officer

Mrs. Mary Weiskopf (GFTS/SDD)
Ground Forces Test Center, Yucca, AZ 40111 DSN 983-2001

10. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

No classified U.S. or foreign information, or testing techniques, are involved in this proposed evaluation. A copy of the unclassified Technical Test Report will be provided the CROP-DUSTER manufacturer upon project completion.

11. ATTACHMENTS

a. HQ U.S. Army/RD Operational Requirements Document (ORD-302-CD41), "Mobile Defoliant System for Ground Forces", approved July 15, 19XX.

b. USMC/MCCWC MNS-4121 .322, January 14, 19XX.

c. Correspondence in support of proposal to evaluate CROP-DUSTER.

d. Draft Technical Test Plan (GFTS-CD XXXX), "Test and Evaluation of Mobile, Ground-Delivered Defoliant System. "

e. Manufacturer Brochures, Grassless Industries, Ltd.

B. SUMMARY CNP FORMAT. The Summary Candidate Nomination Proposal (SCNP) will not exceed two pages in length. It will contain the same sections as the formal CNP.

Country, Manufacturer, Name of Equipment or Technology
(SCNP Preparation Date)

1. DESCRIPTION: What is the item? Capabilities? What would it replace?

2. REQUIREMENT: What ORD (or MNS) applies? What advantage does the item offer over existing equipment? Who is the user proponent?

3. PROJECT GOAL: Is this an equipment evaluation or a technical_ assessment? What decisions will be made as a result of the evaluation?

4. MARKET INVESTIGATION: How has the requirement been communicated to U.S. and foreign industry? Describe preliminary results.

5. ACQUISITION STRATEGY: What is the DoD Component procurement plan for equipment to meet the requirement? If the tested item satisfies the requirement, what then? (sole-source buy, competitive bids, Technical Design Package (TDP)?) What are the competition aspects of the acquisition strategy?

6. TEST AND EVALUATION: Provide synopsis of planned testing. How will test articles be acquired, and how many? Is a Developmental Test (DT) required? User Test? Identify proposed test location(s).

7. EVALUATION SCHEDULE (PROPOSED\: Project approval date (month): _ Test initiation: . Test conclusion: . Evaluation time span: . Milestones: project approval, contract award, start of test, final report(s), etc.

8. BUDGETARY INFORMATION (FCT $K): FY_: _; FY ___: ___; FY ___: ___. Total project estimated cost: .

9. ISSUES/CONCERNS: Examples: No POM support, competing R&D, high level interest, requirement not yet well-defined or not approved, TDP/licensing rights, inadequate R&D funding, market survey not yet completed. Include: "Target date for formal CNP submission to OSD is ."

10. POINTS OF CONTACT: (Limit to 2 users, and MSC/PM proponent).

11. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS (as required): Will the project involve the exchange of classified information or transfer of technical data, in either direction? Will test results be sensitive? Explain.

C. FCT QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT FORMAT

DD-R&E(Q)1791

PROJECT TITLE

Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program
Quarterly Progress Report for _ Qtr F Y

1. Country of Origin. List all countries, if multinational,

2. Manufacturer. Provide full name and address of each company, and licensee or U.S. representative (if applicable). Include the common or brand name of the item, if different from project name.

3. Type of Project. Indicate the type of project (e.g., Ordnance, NBC, Naval Mine Warfare, Avionics, Engineer, TMDE) and whether it is an end-item evaluation or technical assessment.

4. System Description. Provide a brief description of the item(s) or technology being evaluated. If changed from the original CNP, so indicate.

5. Project Goal. State the current purpose of the evaluation and the decision to be made at the conclusion. Describe application and current procurement intentions. If changed from the original CNP, so indicate.

6. Project schedule. Provide a current schedule, to include any changes or updates to the T&E schedule, Provide a milestone schedule similar to that in the CNP showing both old and new milestone dates, and, in the narrative in paragraph 7 ("Status") below, describe the schedule change and reasons therefore.

7. Status

a. Significant Activities This Quarter. Provide a brief description of the T&E conducted and results thus far. Clearly identify any situations, that may have a major impact on continuation of, or cause a major delay in, the evaluation. Discuss any successes and/or problems encountered and/or potential for meeting the test objectives on schedule. This paragraph should summarize the major T&E actions planned or conducted to date. .

b. Planned-Activities Next Quarter. Specify dates" and locations for upcoming project activities (project reviews, test events, etc.).

8. Kev POCS. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers.

D. QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT FORMAT

COMPONENT:

_ QUARTER, FY _

YEAR OF FUNDS: FY _

Project Name[1]	FCT Funding Provided[2]	Component-Supported Level[3]	Committed[4]	Obligated[5]	Disbursed[6]

---

[1] List projects, by priority (highest at top), by same name used in the FCT Quarterly Progress Report.

[2] List, by project, FCT funding authorization based on most recent Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR) or Allotment (Air Force) received from OSD.

[3] List, by project, the FCT funds made available by the Component headquarters to its FCT Program management office for commitment, and, ultimately, obligation.

[4] List, by project, total FCT-provided funding issued on reimbursable orders not yet accepted, and placed on contracts not yet awarded.

[5] List, by project, total FCT-provided funding accepted by activities for performance of services, and amounts obligated by contract award(s).

[6] List, by project, total amount of reimbursable billings and contract payments.

Note: All amounts listed shall be cumulative for the applicable fiscal year, as of the end of the quarter.