

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS FOR AIR AND SEALIFT MOBILITY FORCES		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Contributing Analysis Nov. 1983-Sept. 1984
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER IDA Memorandum Report M-54
7. AUTHOR(s) Norman J. Asher and William J.E. Shafer		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA 903 84 C 0031
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 North Beauregard Street Alexandria, Virginia 22311		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS T-3-150
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS OSD, OUSDRE, Special Assistant for Assessment The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301		12. REPORT DATE March 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 39
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) OSD, OUSDRE, DoD-IDA Management Office 1801 North Beauregard Street Alexandria, Virginia 22311		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Cost, cost estimating relationships, cargo aircraft, transport aircraft, sealift ships, passenger ships/transports, dry cargo ships, roll-on/roll-off ships, container ships, tankers, barge carrying ships		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This document describes the development of cost estimating relationships (CERs) for cargo aircraft and the different types of ships used by U.S. and USSR mobility forces. Both RDT&E and procurement cost CERs are presented for cargo aircraft, but only procurement cost for ships (because RDT&E costs for non-combatant ships are relatively minor and are usually embedded in the procurement cost of the ships). The principal purpose for the derivation of these [continued]		

FORM

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

IDA MEMORANDUM REPORT M-54

COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS
FOR AIR AND SEALIFT MOBILITY FORCES

Norman J. Asher
William J. E. Shafer

March 1985

Prepared for
Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering



// INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES •
1801 N. Beauregard Street, Alexandria, VA 22311

IDA MEMORANDUM REPORT M-54

COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS
FOR AIR AND SEALIFT MOBILITY FORCES

Norman J. Asher
William J. E. Shafer

March 1985



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

Contract MDA 903 84 C 0031
Task T-3-150

SUMMARY

This document describes the development of cost estimating relationships (CERs) for cargo aircraft and the different types of ships used by U.S. and USSR mobility forces. Both RDT&E and procurement cost CERs are presented for cargo aircraft, but only procurement cost for ships (because RDT&E costs for non-combatant ships are relatively minor and are usually embedded in the procurement cost of the ships). The principal purpose for the derivation of these particular CERs is to estimate the costs of the USSR and the U.S. mobility systems in the same consistent manner for relative comparisons, a basic premise in their development being that they contain only those input values and/or parameters that could be estimated based on observable characteristics of USSR systems.

PREFACE

This memorandum report is part of a broader continuing program at the Institute for Defense Analyses under the technical cognizance of Dr. Paul J. Berenson, Special Assistant for Assessment, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, under Task T-3-150, dated 23 December 1982. The broader effort, "NATO/Warsaw Pact Acquisition Balance," has as its purpose the development of an overview of the U.S./USSR technology and acquisition balance.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY iii
PREFACE iv
DEVELOPMENT OF COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS. 1
A. Cargo Aircraft. 1
B. Sealift Ships 12

TABLES

1. Data for Derivation of Transport Aircraft Cost
Estimating Relationships. 2
2. Comparison of Observed and Estimated Ship
Procurement Costs 13
3. Ship Category Cost Estimating Relationships 16

FIGURES

1. Piston Powered Cargo Aircraft First Unit Flyaway
Cost. 4
2. Turbine-Powered Cargo Aircraft First Unit Flyaway
Cost. 5
3. Estimated Versus Observed First Unit Flyaway Cost of
U.S. Cargo Aircraft 6
4. Piston-Powered Cargo Aircraft RDT&E Cost. 7
5. Turbine-Powered Cargo Aircraft RDT&E Cost 8
6. Estimated Versus Observed RDT&E Cost of U.S. Cargo
Aircraft. 9
7. Relative Costs and Prices for Commercial and Military
Aircraft Programs 11

8.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage Curve for Passenger Ships/Transports.	17
9.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Passenger Ships/Transports.	18
10.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage for Dry Cargo Ships	19
11.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Dry Cargo Ships	20
12.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage Curve for Roll-On/ Roll-Off Ships	21
13.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Roll-On/ Roll-Off Ships	22
14.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage Curve for Container Ships	23
15.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Container Ships	24
16.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage Curve for Tankers	25
17.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Tankers	26
18.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage for Barge Carrying Ships.	27
19.	Estimated Versus Observed Procurement Cost for Barge Carrying Ships.	28
20.	Procurement Cost Versus Gross Tonnage for Six Categories of Ships	29

DEVELOPMENT OF COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS

This document describes the development of cost estimating relationships (CERs) for cargo aircraft and the different types of ships used by U.S. mobility forces. Both RDT&E and procurement cost CERs are presented for cargo aircraft, while only procurement cost CERs are presented for ships. RDT&E costs for non-combatant ships are relatively minor and are usually embedded in the procurement cost of the ships.

The sole purpose for the derivation of these particular CERs is to estimate the costs of the USSR and the U.S. mobility systems in the same consistent manner for relative comparisons. Therefore, a basic premise in the development of these CERs must be that they use only input values and/or parameters that can be estimated or observed for USSR systems. Since the limited use of the outputs of these analyses was the development of long term trends over time between the two countries, the degree of sophistication in the development of these CERs was felt to be quite satisfactory.

A. CARGO AIRCRAFT

Aircraft characteristics and flyaway¹ and RDT&E costs were collected for nine historical U.S. military cargo aircraft programs. Cost data from several sources were collected and normalized for quantities of aircraft and to constant year dollars. A "best estimate" cumulative average cost for 100

¹Flyaway cost is used as a generic term related to the creation of a usable end item of hardware. It includes basic structure/airframe, propulsion, electronics, and government furnished equipment (GFE).

aircraft was developed for each aircraft. Finally, the theoretical first unit flyaway cost was derived based on an assumed 85 percent cumulative average learning curve. The results are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, the piston-powered aircraft were all placed in service during the 1949-1955 period, while the turbine-powered aircraft entered service between 1957 and 1970. Turbine-powered aircraft had considerably higher costs than piston-powered aircraft of similar weight, as would be expected since turbine-powered aircraft represent a higher level of technology and fly at approximately twice the speed of the piston-powered generation of aircraft. Accordingly, it was decided to develop two sets of CERs--one for piston-powered and one for turbine-powered aircraft.

It was not considered necessary to include the initial operational capability (IOC) year in the piston-powered aircraft CERs since those aircraft were all introduced within a six-year

Table 1. DATA FOR DERIVATION OF TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS

Aircraft	Empty Weight (Thous. Lb.)	IOC Year	Theoretical First Unit Flyaway Cost (Million 1986 \$)	RDT&E Cost (Million 1986 \$)
<u>Piston-Powered</u>				
C-119	40	1949	13.0	85
C-123	31	1955	11.7	76
C-124	101	1950	33.5	217
C/KC-97	88	1949	32.6	212
<u>Turbine-Powered</u>				
C-130	59	1957	41.1	346
C-141A	134	1965	124.2	668
C-5A	321	1970	409.7	3,246
C-133	117	1958	101.2	539
C/KC-135	98	1957	99.3	527

period and represented approximately the same level of technology. The IOC year was included in some of the turbine-powered CERs, but the relationship for one of them was counterintuitive; i.e., it indicated a decrease in cost with IOC year. Accordingly, the CERs selected use only empty weight as the explanatory variable.

The flyaway CERs are:

Piston-Powered:

$$FC = 0.389(WT)^{0.975}$$

Turbine-Powered:

$$FC = 0.1925(WT)^{1.328}$$


where

FC = First unit flyaway cost in millions of
FY 1986 dollars

WT = Empty weight in thousands of pounds.


The first unit flyaway cost estimates based on these equations agree quite well with the observed values (see Figures 1 and 2). Figure 3 shows the relationship of the estimated to observed first unit flyaway costs for both piston-powered and turbine-powered engine aircraft.

The RDT&E costs are less reliable than the flyaway costs because most of the aircraft were developed prior to the institution of the Five Year Defense Program (FYDP) in FY 1962. Prior to the FYDP, much of what is presently included in RDT&E costs in the FYDP was paid for out of procurement funds. There was some separation of development costs, but they are difficult to identify and also difficult to obtain because they are so old. Some RDT&E costs were obtained for the turbine-powered aircraft which seem reasonable, but reliable data for the piston-powered aircraft could not be obtained. Accordingly, a median ratio (6.5) of RDT&E to first unit flyaway cost for the turbine-powered aircraft was developed and used to derive the RDT&E costs in Table 1 for the piston-powered aircraft.




4-25-84-8

Figure 1. PISTON-POWERED CARGO AIRCRAFT FIRST UNIT FLYAWAY COST (In Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)



4-25-84-7

Figure 2. TURBINE-POWERED CARGO AIRCRAFT FIRST UNIT FLYAWAY COST (In Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)



4-4-84-18

Figure 3. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED FIRST UNIT FLYAWAY COST OF U.S. CARGO AIRCRAFT (In Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)

The RDT&E CERs are:

Piston-Powered:

$$RC = 2.56(WT)^{0.971}$$

Turbine-Powered:

$$RC = 1.071(WT)^{1.355}$$

where


RC = RDT&E cost in billions of FY 1986 dollars

WT = Empty weight in thousands of pounds.

The RDT&E cost estimates based on these equations agree reasonably well with the observed values (See Figures 4 and 5).


Figure 6 shows the relationship of the estimated to observed RTD&E costs for both piston-powered and turbine-powered cargo aircraft.

Some U.S. military aircraft have been procured as follow-on military production to on-going commercial programs (i.e., the C-118 version of the DC-6, the C-121 version of the Constellation, and the KC-10 version of the DC-10). Integration of commercial and military aircraft cost and price data is complicated because of the different relationships between cost and price that generally occur in the civilian and defense marketplaces. In military aircraft procurements, there is generally a direct correlation between marginal cost and marginal price, while in commercial aircraft programs prices tend to be fixed over large production quantities, even though the marginal production costs may be falling. The relationship between cost and price for commercial and military aircraft programs is conceptually illustrated in Figure 7. In commercial programs, the selling price is approximately constant (in real terms) over an extended period of the program. Initially, the company loses money while the selling price does not cover costs, and later the company makes money when the selling price is greater than costs. The manufacturer is forced to sell the early production aircraft below cost because no airline would volunteer



4-25-84-6

Figure 4. PISTON-POWERED CARGO AIRCRAFT RDT&E COST (In Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)



4-25-84-9

Figure 5. TURBINE-POWERED CARGO AIRCRAFT RDT&E COST (In Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)





Figure 6. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED RDT&E COST OF U.S. CARGO AIRCRAFT (In Billions of FY 1986 Dollars)

COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT PROGRAM



4-19-84-13

MILITARY AIRCRAFT PROGRAM




Figure 7. RELATIVE COSTS AND PRICES FOR COMMERCIAL AND MILITARY AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS

to buy first and pay a higher price than its competitors who would buy later. In the case of a military program, the government usually buys in yearly increments and pays a price that covers costs and provides a profit to the company.

Because of these differences in the pricing of commercial and military programs, it was felt that the costs to the military of aircraft procured as follow-on military production to on-going commercial programs would not be directly comparable to pure military aircraft programs; therefore they were not included in the data base from which the CERs were developed. However, the CERs will be used to estimate the costs of these combined commercial/military programs. There are a number of these programs in the USSR forces as well where the same basic aircraft are used by Aeroflot and the USSR military mobility forces.

B. SEALIFT SHIPS

The ships that comprise the sealift mobility forces, as historically and currently constituted, were organized into six categories for the purposes of deriving CERs. They are (1) passenger ships/transports, (2) dry cargo ships, (3) roll-on/roll-off ships, (4) container ships, (5) tankers, and (6) barge carrying ships. Many ships in the Military Sealift Command (MSC) active fleet in 1965 and subsequent years were built during World War II; therefore, historical cost data and characteristics on these ships dating back to 1941 were collected.

The ships comprising the mobility forces are merchant ships or ships of a merchant design that have been modified for a specific function. CERs developed for these ships were based upon a cost-to-weight relationship. The weight used to derive CERs for combatant ships is typically a displacement tonnage, i.e., light or full load displacement. Light displacement is the weight of the ship excluding cargo, fuel, ballast, stores, passengers, and crew, but with water in boilers to the steaming level. Full load

displacement is the weight of the ship including all the foregoing exceptions and all other items necessary for a voyage, which brings the ship down to load draft. For commercial ships, generally only two forms of tonnage are readily available: gross tonnage and deadweight tonnage. Gross tonnage is a measure of the entire cubic capacity of a ship where 100 cubic feet equals one ton, except for certain spaces which are exempt; e.g., water ballast tanks, and spaces above the uppermost continuous deck. Deadweight tonnage is the total lifting capacity of the ship expressed in tons of 2,240 pounds. A series of regressions were run relating procurement cost to both gross and deadweight tonnage. The procurement cost/gross tonnage regressions produced the better set of CERs.

To provide a larger number of data points upon which to derive CERs, historical data were collected on merchant ships constructed in the United States and delivered between January 1941 and January 1984 and aggregated into the six ship categories. Within each ship category, ships of a similar type and/or tonnage were aggregated to form a single data point. Table 2 displays both the data used in developing the CERs and the results of comparing the CER-estimated cost to the observed cost. A comparison of the total estimated cost to the total observed cost is made for each category and the result is in the total line of the percentage difference.

The percentage difference for five of the six ship categories is less than 12 percent. The difference for the dry cargo ship category is 34.5 percent when the C2 (Liberty) ship data is included in the regression. This large difference is driven by the C2 (Liberty) ship entry in which the sample size (2,578 ships) is over six times as large as the next largest sample. These ships were mass produced during World War II under conditions radically different from shipbuilding since World War II; therefore, the average procurement cost for the

Table 2. COMPARISON OF OBSERVED AND ESTIMATED SHIP PROCUREMENT COSTS (Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)

Ship Category	Average Gross Tons	Number of Ships	Average Observed Cost	Total Observed Cost	Average Estimated Cost	Total Estimated Cost	Percent Difference
<u>Passenger Ships/</u>							
<u>Transports</u>							
C4-S-A1	13,000	30	132.9	3,987.0	158.4	4,752.0	16.0
P2-S1-DN1	13,319	3	209.2	627.6	160.8	482.4	-30.1
P2-S2-9,11A	15,178	4	197.3	789.2	174.8	699.2	-12.9
P-2-SE2-R1	15,993	8	165.8	1,326.4	180.9	1,447.2	8.3
P2-S2-R2	17,851	11	142.8	1,570.8	194.9	2,143.9	26.7
P3-S2-DL2	23,719	2	261.1	522.2	238.9	477.8	-9.3
Total				8,823.2		10,002.5	11.8
<u>Dry Cargo Ships</u>							
C1-M-AV1	3,806	218	29.8	6,496.4	36.8	8,022.4	19.0
C2 (Liberty) ¹	7,187	2,578	24.8				
C2 (Victory)	7,608	414	31.7	13,123.8	49.9	20,658.6	36.5
C3-S-A2	7,857	59	45.2	2,666.8	50.8	2,997.2	11.0
C3 (post WW II)	9,658	54	75.2	4,060.8	57.0	3,078.0	-31.9
C4	11,216	108	85.5	9,234.0	62.4	6,739.2	-37.0
C5-S-75A	21,590	5	87.7	438.5	98.1	490.5	10.6
Total				36,020.3		41,985.9	14.2
<u>Roll-on/Roll-off</u>							
<u>Ships</u>							
C3-ST-14A	12,750	1	93.6	93.6	95.0	95.0	1.5
Undesignated	14,400	3	92.7	278.1	98.9	296.7	6.3
Undesignated	15,078	10	103.5	1,035.0	100.5	1,005.0	-3.0
C4-ST-67A	16,467	1	125.2	125.2	103.8	103.8	-20.6
Undesignated	18,000	1	87.1	87.1	107.4	107.4	18.9
C7-S-113A	18,500	3	107.6	322.8	108.6	325.8	0.9
Undesignated	20,000	2	117.3	234.6	112.1	224.2	-4.6
Total				2,176.4		2,157.9	-0.9
<u>Container Ships</u>							
Undesignated	4,000	2	28.2	56.4	62.6	125.2	54.9
C7-S-68C/D	11,400	5	112.4	562.0	76.3	381.5	-47.3
C5-S-73B	13,000	3	75.7	227.1	79.3	237.9	4.4
C5	17,000	5	69.6	348.0	86.7	433.5	19.6
C7-S-68E	18,000	2	71.3	142.6	88.5	177.0	19.4
C6-S-85A	18,700	4	94.7	378.8	89.8	359.2	-5.4
C7	19,700	1	78.9	78.9	91.6	91.6	13.9
C6-S-85B	21,470	4	97.5	390.0	94.9	379.6	-2.6
Undesignated	23,000	1	129.1	129.1	97.8	97.8	-32.0
C7-S-88A	23,740	3	113.0	339.0	99.1	297.3	-14.0
Undesignated	27,000	2	99.3	198.6	105.2	210.4	5.6
C8-S-85D	31,430	2	168.2	336.4	113.3	226.6	-48.3
C9-S-132B	40,490	3	77.5	232.5	130.1	390.3	40.4
Total				3,419.4		3,407.9	-0.3

¹This entry was not used in the development of the CER, included for information only.

Table 2. (continued)
(Millions of FY 1986 Dollars)

Ship Category	Average Gross Tons	Number of Ships	Average Observed Cost	Total Observed Cost	Average Estimated Cost	Total Estimated Cost	Percent Difference
<u>Tankers</u>							
Tankers are not designated as to hull type.	4,950	2	11.5	23.0	22.7	45.4	49.3
	6,500	1	22.7	22.7	27.8	27.8	18.3
	10,843	7	56.7	396.9	42.2	295.4	-34.4
	11,414	7	56.2	393.4	44.1	308.7	-27.4
	12,467	3	53.1	159.3	47.6	142.8	-11.6
	15,320	3	58.3	174.9	57.0	171.0	- 2.3
	16,102	11	66.2	728.2	59.6	655.6	-11.1
	17,300	17	59.5	1,011.5	63.6	1,081.2	6.4
	18,581	31	69.5	2,154.5	67.8	2,101.8	- 2.5
	19,111	9	72.5	652.5	69.6	626.4	- 4.2
	20,383	24	75.9	1,821.6	73.8	1,771.2	- 2.8
	21,000	11	66.6	732.6	75.8	833.8	12.1
	22,338	8	66.5	532.0	80.2	641.6	17.1
	23,443	14	82.7	1,157.8	83.9	1,174.6	1.4
	24,500	2	66.9	133.8	87.4	174.8	23.5
	25,500	2	96.3	192.6	90.7	181.4	- 6.2
	26,000	1	95.6	95.6	92.4	92.4	- 3.5
	27,000	6	96.9	581.4	95.7	574.2	- 1.3
	28,483	6	86.1	516.6	100.6	603.6	14.4
	29,000	2	106.7	213.4	102.3	204.6	- 4.3
	30,000	18	108.1	1,945.8	105.6	1,900.8	- 2.4
	31,000	5	97.3	486.5	108.9	544.5	10.7
	32,000	3	139.9	419.7	112.2	336.6	-24.7
Total				14,546.3		14,490.2	- 0.4
<u>Barge Carrying Ships</u>							
C8-S-82A	20,500	3	147.0	441.0	104.3	312.9	-40.9
C8-S-81B	26,400	11	105.7	1,162.7	117.0	1,287.0	9.7
C9-S-81D	32,325	9	97.3	875.7	129.8	1,168.2	25.0
Total				2,479.4		2,768.1	10.4

C2 (Liberty) ships is lower than all other ships in the dry cargo ships category. Because of these factors the C2 (Liberty) ships were dropped from the data base and a new CER was derived. This CER reduced the dry cargo ship category error from 34.5 percent to 14.2 percent, and the average absolute error decreased about one percent.

Another attempt was made to improve the fit of the regression line to the data for dry cargo ships using a least squares fit to minimize the percentage deviation. A power form equation was used to perform the percentage deviation minimization. The results were mixed. The category error was reduced about 5 percent, but the average absolute error increased by about 1.6 percent.

Other data sources examined as possible inputs to the development of CERs were ship speed and horsepower. Neither of these characteristics proved useful; thus, they were dropped from further analysis.

Light weight displacement tonnage for U.S. container ships was obtained and a CER was derived to determine how it would compare with the CER using gross tonnage. The result was an increase in the category error of about 2 percent and a decrease in the average class absolute error of about 13 percent. Discussion with personnel at the Naval Operational Intelligence Center (NOIC) affirmed that light displacement data for Soviet ships is not available; therefore, CERs based on light displacement cannot be used in the U.S.-Soviet comparisons even if they could be obtained for all U.S. ship categories. Personnel at NOIC said that gross and deadweight tonnage were available and were used by them in their work. In view of this information, no further CER analysis was attempted.

A CER for the barge carrying ships using the three cost/gross tonnage data points was unreasonable because it would indicate

that cost varies inversely with tonnage. Therefore the centroid of the three data points was determined and related to the slopes of the CER curves for roll-on/roll-off ships and container ships. These two types of ships were selected as being most similar in design and construction to barge carrying ships. A linear curve was constructed for the barge carrying ships using as its origin the midpoint between the origins of the curves for the roll-on/roll-off ships and container ships and passing through the centroid of the barge carrying ships. The CER was determined from the slope of the curve.

Table 3 presents, for each ship category, a linear CER, the error range, and the average absolute error. From this table the reader can obtain an appreciation for the fit of the CERs to the data. Even numbered Figures 8 through 16 display the observed procurement cost versus gross tonnage of the ships within each ship category and the linear CER curve resulting from the regression. Figure 18 displays the observed procurement cost versus gross tonnage for barge carrying ships for which a CER was constructed. Odd numbered Figures 9 through 19 display the goodness of fit of the data.

Table 3. SHIP CATEGORY COST ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIPS

Ship Category	CER	Error Range (% to %)	Average Absolute Error (%)
Passenger Ships/Transports	$C = 60.8 + 7.51Tg$	30.1 to -26.8	17.2
Dry Cargo Ships	$C = 23.7 + 3.45Tg$	36.5 to -37.0	24.3
Roll-On/Roll-Off Ships	$C = 64.9 + 2.36Tg$	20.4 to -18.9	7.9
Container Ships	$C = 55.2 + 1.85Tg$	48.3 to -54.9	23.7
Tankers	$C = 6.3 + 3.31Tg$	34.8 to -49.6	12.7
Barge Carrying Ships	$C = 60 + 2.16Tg$	42.7 to -32.5	25.2

Figure 20 displays the CER curves for the six categories of ships. The slopes of the curves for tankers and dry cargo ships are similar as are the slopes of the curves for container ships and roll-on/roll-off ships. The barge carrying ships curve was derived from the curves for the container ships and the roll-on/roll-off ships. The passenger ships/ transports curve rises more rapidly as gross tonnage increases than any of the other curves. Intuitively this appears reasonable as passenger ships are more costly to construct due to the large number of compartments in these ships.




Figure 8. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE CURVE FOR PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS




Figure 9. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS




Figure 10. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE CURVE FOR DRY CARGO SHIPS






Figure 11. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR DRY CARGO SHIPS



4-4-84-28

Figure 12. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE CURVE FOR ROLL-ON/ROLL-OFF SHIPS



4-4-84-22

Figure 13. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR ROLL-ON/ROLL-OFF SHIPS




Figure 14. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE CURVE FOR CONTAINER SHIPS





Figure 15. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR CONTAINER SHIPS



4-4-84-30

Figure 16. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE CURVE FOR TANKERS






Figure 17. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR TANKERS



4-4-84-31

Figure 18. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE FOR BARGE CARRYING SHIPS



4-4-84-25

Figure 19. ESTIMATED VERSUS OBSERVED PROCUREMENT COST FOR BARGE CARRYING SHIPS




Figure 20. PROCUREMENT COST VERSUS GROSS TONNAGE FOR SIX CATEGORIES OF SHIPS

DISTRIBUTION LIST
Cost Estimating Relationships for Air and Sealift Mobility Systems
 IDA MEMORANDUM REPORT M-54

<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research & Engineering Room 3D139, Pentagon Washington, DC 20301		Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Document Control Point, Room 651 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	
Under Secretary of Defense for Research & Engineering	1	Director	1
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Acquisition)	1	Director, Tactical Technology	1
Director, Major Systems Acquisition	1	DARPA Library	1
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Production Support)	1	Program Management	1
Director, Industrial Resources	1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)	1
Director, Industrial Productivity	1	Room 3E836, Pentagon	
Director, International Acquisition	1	Washington, DC 20301	
Assistant Secretary of Defense (C ³ I)	1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Logistics)	
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (C ³)	1	Room 3E813, Pentagon	
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Systems Integration)	1	Washington, DC 20301	
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Intelligence)	1	Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Logistics)	1
Deputy Under Secretary (International Programs & Technology)	1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Program Analysis and Evaluation)	
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Technology Transfer)	1	Room 2E313, Pentagon	
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (International Programs)	1	Washington, DC 20301	
Deputy Under Secretary (Research & Advanced Technology)	1	Director	1
Director, Military Systems Technology	1	Deputy Director (General Purpose Prog.)	1
Deputy Under Secretary (Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces)	1	Attention: Land Forces	1
Director, START & Arms Control	1	Naval Forces	1
Director, Defensive Systems	1	Mobility Forces	1
Director, Offensive & Space Systems	1	Tactical Air Forces	1
Deputy Under Secretary (Tactical Warfare Programs)	1	Deputy Director (Theater Assessments & Planning)	1
Director, Air Warfare	1	Defense Security Assistance Agency	
Director, Land Warfare	1	Room 4E841, Pentagon	
Director, Naval Warfare & Mobility	1	Washington, DC 20301	
Director, Defense Test & Evaluation	1	Director of Operations	1
Assistant Under Secretary of Defense (Plans & Development)	1	Director Joint Chiefs of Staff	
Assistant Under Secretary of Defense (Conventional Initiatives)	1	Joint Staff Services Division, Support Services	
Special Assistant for Assessment	1	Washington, DC 20301	
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy		Chairman	1
Room 4D825, Pentagon		Director, Joint Staff	1
Washington, DC 20301		Director, J-3 (Operations)	1
Under Secretary of Defense for Policy	1	Director, J-4 (Logistics)	1
Deputy Under Secretary (Policy)	1	Director, J-5 (Plans and Policy)	1
Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)	1	Force Planning & Programming	1
Deputy Assistant Secretary (International Economic and Energy Affairs)	1	Joint Analysis Directorate	1
Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Policy)	1	Director	
Director, Net Assessment	1	Defense Nuclear Agency	
Office of the Secretary of Defense		Washington, DC 20305	1
Room 3A930, Pentagon		Commander, Headquarters Field Command	1
Office of the Secretary of Defense OUSDRE (DoD-IDA Management Office)	1	Defense Nuclear Agency	
1801 North Beauregard Street		Kirtland AFB, NM 87115	
Alexandria, VA 22311		Director	1
		Defense Communications Agency	
		Washington, DC 20305	

<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
Defense Intelligence Agency Department of Defense Washington, DC 20301		Federal Research Division Library of Congress Washington, DC 20540	1
Director	1	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY	
Assistant Deputy Director for Estimates	1	Office of the Under Secretary of the Army Room 3E732, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
DSARC/Long-Range Threat Division	1	Deputy Under Secretary (Operations Research)	1
Soviet/East European Division	1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research Development & Acquisition) Room 2E675, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
Assistant Deputy Director for Research	1	Assistant Secretary of the Army (RD&A)	1
Soviet/Warsaw Pact Division	1	Deputy for Air & Missile Defense	1
Eastern Division	1	Deputy for Aviation	1
Western Division	1	Deputy for Combat Materiel	1
Resources Division	1	Deputy for Fire Support	1
Economics & Military Expenditures Branch (DB-4E)	2	Deputy for Science & Technology	1
Military Materiel Production Branch (DB-4G)	3	Deputy for Management & Programs	1
Assistant Deputy Director for Scientific and Technical Intelligence	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)	1
Nuclear Energy and Applied Sciences Division	1	Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army Room 3E668, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
Production Control, Resources and Technical Data Support Division	1	Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation Directorate	1
Weapons and Systems Division	1	Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence Department of the Army (DAMI-15) Room 1C460, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
Attn: VP-A1, Room 1E863	1	Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence	1
National Defense University Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington, DC 20319		Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics Department of the Army Room 3E560, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
Director, University Research Directorate (NDU-RD)	1	Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics Aviation Logistics Office	1
Commandant, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, (ICC)	1	Director of Plans, Force Structure & Systems	1
Commandant, The National War College (NWC)	1	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations & Plans Department of the Army Room 3C542, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	
Commandant, Armed Forces Staff College	1	Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations & Plans	1
Director, Mobilization Concepts Development Center	1	Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations & Plans	1
Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2	Technical Advisor	1
Commander in Chief, Pacific Box 28 Camp H. M. Smith, HI 96861	1	Director, Requirements Directorate	1
Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet Naval Base Norfolk, VA 23511	1	Director, Operations Readiness	1
MISCELLANEOUS U.S. GOVERNMENT		Mobilization Directorate	1
National Security Council Room 476, Old Executive Bldg. Washington, DC 20506	1	Chief, Army Force Modernization Coordination Office (DAMO/FDZ)	1
ADD/OCR Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505	1		
Central Intelligence Agency Washington, DC 20505			
DDI Office of Scientific and Weapons Research	1		
Office of Soviet Analysis	1		
Imagery Analysis	1		
National Intelligence Office; Strategic Programs, S&T, USSR	1		
National Intelligence Office for General Purpose Forces	1		
DDI/Policy Support Staff	1		
NPIC IEF/SSFD/MOB	1		
DDS&T/ODE/SA6	1		

<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Research Development & Acquisition Department of the Army Room 3A474, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310		Commander Concepts Analysis Agency Department of the Army 8120 Woodmont Avenue Bethesda, MD 20814	1
Deputy Chief of Staff for Research, Development & Acquisition	1	Director U. S. Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity White Sands Missile Range, NH 88002	
System Review and Analysis Office	1	Attention: ATAA-TBC	1
Director, Combat Support Systems	1	ATAA-TDC	1
Support Systems Division	1	U. S. Army Material Command 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333	
Director, Weapons Systems	1	Deputy Commander for Research, Development & Acquisition Director, Development Engineering & Acquisition	1
Aviation Systems Division	1	Commander U. S. Army Intelligence & Security Command Arlington Hall Station Arlington, VA 22212	1
Missiles and Air Defense Systems Division	1	U. S. Army Foreign Science & Technology Center 200 Seventh Street, N. E. Charlottesville, VA 22901	1
Procurement Programs and Budget Division	1	Commander HQ U. S. Army Training and Doctrine Command Fort Monroe, VA 23651	1
Director, Army Research and Technology	1	DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	
The Comptroller of the Army Department of the Army Room 2B664, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310		Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy Room 4D714, Pentagon Washington, DC 20350	
Director, Resource Management DACA-ROM	1	Under Secretary of the Navy	1
Director, Cost Analysis DACA-CAZ-A	1	Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Shipbuilding & Logistics)	1
Army Library Room 1A522, Pentagon Washington, DC 20310	1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research Engineering & Systems) Room 4D680, Pentagon Washington, DC 20350	
Commander U.S. Army Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898		Assistant Secretary of the Navy Special Assistant for Combat Systems	1
Attention: Missile Intelligence Agency	1	Special Assistant for Program Budgeting Analysis & Congressional Support	1
Director U.S. Army Air Mobility R&D Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary (Research & Applied Space Technology)	1
Commander USA Combined Arms Combat Developments Activity Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027		Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Department of the Navy Room 4E549, Pentagon Washington, DC 20350	
Attention: ATZCA-DLT	1	Chief of Naval Operations	1
ATZCA-DL-N	1	Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air Warfare)	1
Commandant U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027	1	Aviation Plans & Requirements Division	1
Director U.S. Army Material Systems Analysis Activity Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005		Aviation Programs Division	1
Attention: DRXSY-D5	1	Carrier Programs Division	1
DRXSY-S	1		
Commandant U. S. Army War College Carlisle, Pa. 17013	1		
Commandant U. S. Military Academy West Point, NY 12993	1		

<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (Cont.)		Naval Intelligence Command 4600 Silver Hill Road Washington, DC 20389	
Director, Navy Program Planning	1	Attention: PM-23 (Theater Nuclear Warfare Project)	1
Assistant for Net Assessment	1		
Advisor for Resource Analysis NOP 917	1	Commander	1
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics)	1	Naval Sea Systems Command Headquarters Washington, DC 20362	
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans, Policy & Operations)	1	Commander	1
Strategic Plans & Policy Division	1	U. S. Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, PA 18974	
Strategic Theater & Nuclear Warfare Division	1		
Director, Office of Naval Warfare	1		
Anti Air Warfare Division	1		
Director, Office of Naval Intelligence	1		
Director, RDT&E	1	DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE	
Tactical Air Surface & Electronic Warfare Division	1	Office of the Secretary of the Air Force Attention: SAFAL Room 4D947, Pentagon Washington, DC 20330	
Command & Control Development Division	1		
Commander	1	Under Secretary of the Air Force	1
U. S. Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 93555		Assistant Secretary (Research Development & Logistics)	1
Commanding Officer	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Systems	1
Naval Fleet Missile Systems & Evaluation Group Corona, CA 91720		Deputy Assistant Secretary (Acquisition Management)	1
Commander	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary (Logistics)	1
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940		Office of the Chief of Staff (USAF) Room 4B1064, Pentagon Washington, DC 20330	
Commander Naval Air Force	1	Chief of Staff	1
U. S. Pacific Fleet		Chief Scientist	1
Naval Air Station, North Island San Diego, CA 92135		HQ USAF (AF/INET)	
HQ, U. S. Marine Corps	1	Assistant Chief of Staff, Studies & Analyses/SAM	
Code HOSM-3, Room 2107		Room 1E398, Pentagon	
Naval Annex		Washington, DC 20330	
Washington, DC 20380		Assistant Chief of Staff, Studies & Analyses (AF/SA)	1
Commandant	1	Directorate of Theater Force Analyses (AF/SAG)	1
DC/S for Aviation	1	Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans & Operations	
Director Aviation Plans, Policy & Requirements Division	1	Department of the Air Force	
DC/S for Installation & Logistics	1	Washington, DC 20330	
DC/S for Research Development & Studies	1	Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans & Operations	1
Comptroller of the Navy	1	Department of the Air Force	
Navy Department		Washington, DC 20330	
Room 4E768, Pentagon			
Washington, DC 20350		Deputy Chief of Staff, Programs & Evaluation	
Commanding Officer	1	Department of the Air Force	
Naval Intelligence Support Center		Room 4E1013, Pentagon	
4301 Suitland Road		Washington, DC 20330	
Washington, DC 20390		Deputy Chief of Staff, Programs Resources & Acquisition	1
Chief of Naval Material	1	Deputy Chief of Staff, Research & Development & Acquisition	
Department of the Navy		Department of the Air Force	
Washington, DC 20360		Room 5D328, Pentagon	
Commandant	1	Washington, DC 20330	
Naval War College		Deputy Chief of Staff, Research Development and Acquisition	1
Newport, R.I. 02840		Directorate of Development and Production	1
Commandant	1	Directorate of Operations Requirements	1
U.S. Naval Academy			
Annapolis, MD 21401			

<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>	<u>ADDRESSEE</u>	<u>NO. OF COPIES</u>
Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics & Engineering (AF/LE) Department of the Air Force Washington, DC 20330	1	RAND Corporation P. O. Box 2138 Santa Monica, CA 90406	
Comptroller of the Air Force Room 4E133, Pentagon Washington, DC 20330		Attn: Library Dr. Arthur Alexander Dr. Michael Landi	1 1 1
Comptroller	1	RAND Corporation 2100 M Street, N. W. Washington, DC 20037	1
Air University Maxwell AFB, AL 36112		Science Applications, Inc., 101 Continental Blvd. El Segundo, CA 90245	1
Air University Library Air War College	1 1	Science Applications, Inc., P. O. Box 1303 McLean, VA 22102	1
HQ, Air Force Systems Command Andrews AFB Washington, DC 20334	1	Systems Planning Corporation 1500 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1
Office of Scientific Research Department of the Air Force Building 410, Bolling AFB Washington, DC 20332	1	Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA 22311	29
Air Force Weapons Laboratory Kirtland AFB, NM 87117	1	Gen. A. J. Goodpaster Mr. S. J. Deitchman Mr. Robert B. Pirie, Jr. Mr. Joseph A. Arena Mr. Norman Asher Mr. Andre R. Barbeau Mr. James H. Henry Dr. Herschel E. Kanter Mr. Mark I. Knapp Dr. Thomas H. Probert Dr. David L. Randall Dr. Robert E. Roberts Dr. William J. Schultis Mr. J. W. Stahl Technical Information Services (2) Ms. Karen Weber Ms. Dorothy Mendonsa	
Aeronautical Systems Division Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1		
HQ, Air Force Logistics Command Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1		
Foreign Technology Division Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1		
HQ, Air Force Tactical Air Command Langley AFB, VA 23665			
Attn: DOPP XPB DOP	1 1 1		
Commandant Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, CO 80841	1		
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS			
Aerospace Corporation P. O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, CA 90009	1	TOTAL COPIES	256
The Analytic Sciences Incorporated 1401 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1		
The Analytic Sciences Corporation 1700 North Moore Street Suite 12201 Arlington, VA 22209	1		
B. K. Dynamics, Inc. P. O. Box 6012 Rockville, MD 20850	1		