

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 1 October 2008 16:02  
**To:** White Paper  
**Subject:** WWW Submission: 2. Navy/Sea Power [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Name: David

Submission: Navy

Air Warfare Destroyer

The Howard governments delayed decision on the AWD program and eventual choice of the Spanish NAVANTIA-IZAR F-100 class frigate over the Gibbs & Cox Evolved Burke class. I believe this decision was wrong on 4 reasons.

1. Aegis combat system is this year (2008) 35 years old and has been in active service for 25 years, it can hardly be regarded as new. It principally uses the AN/SPY 1 radar, its replacement the AN/SPY-3, is due to enter service a year before our AWD's. The AN/SPY 1 radar uses passive electronically scanned technology and works in the S band frequency to provide long range 3D Air-search. AN/SPY-3 uses Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) technology and works in the X-band and S-band frequencies to provide fire control and target illumination as well as long range 3D Air-search.

2. The US navy has already retired the first 5 ships built with this system, to my knowledge the option of leasing or purchasing 2 or 3 of these ships to bridge the current capability gap formed when HMAS Hobart, Perth and Brisbane were retired without replacement, until new ships can be built with AN/SPY-3 radar and systems (potentially including the 155mm AGS [Advanced Gun System] to provide Naval fire support), I believe that over the life time of the new AWD's (potentially 40 plus years) this will be cheaper if not more cost effective. I also believe there is some doubt as to the ease of fitting AN/SPY-3 into the F-100 design.

3. The F-100 was and is clearly less capable than Gibbs & Cox design in key areas; Pay Load, the number of Mk 41 VLS (Vertical Launch System) cells carried directly determines the capability of the ship, All weapons carried by the Mk 41 VLS apart from the RIM-162 ESSM (a short range air defence missile) require 1 cell per round. The F-100 carries 48 cells whilst the Gibbs & Cox design carries 64 cells. There for it requires 4 F-100s to match the firepower of 3 Gibbs & Cox's. The number of fire control radars determines the number of missiles able to be simultaneously guided to there target the F-100 has 2 (same as on the previous Hobart Class) compared to 3 on the Gibbs & Cox (the use of AN/SPY 3 would eliminate the need for any of these). The Gibbs & Cox has hanger space for 2 helicopters to the F-100s 1, besides the obvious, this provides greater flexibility and growth potential for UAV's etc. The number of CIWS (Close In Weapon Systems) carried by the Gibbs & Cox is

2 versus 1 for the F-100, this limits the defensive capability of the ships. The Range of the Gibbs & Cox is 700nm more than the F-100 design enabling the ships to be deployed further and or longer without support.

4. It is my belief that the Navies stated requirement for 3 AWD with a possible 4th were based on the preferred Gibbs & Cox Evolved Burke class, not the smaller and less capable NAVANTIA-IZAR F-100

5. Whist the NAVANTIA-IZAR F-100 is cheaper and less risky than the Gibbs & Cox Evolved Burke design I believe that the relative small increase in cost is worth it and that the small increase in risk is negligible when compared to the extra capability. Gibbs & Cox have more experience with AEGIS than any other firm and given the number of ships it's built with it over the past 25 years any problem (if indeed there were any) would be able to quickly be ironed out, with little extra cost.

To summarise I would like to know of the option of leasing early Aegis ships until the inevitable bugs of the AN/SPY 3 system are worked out. Alloying us to build the new ships incorporating the latest technology. Has been looked at, at all and if not why and will it be done?

I would Also like to ask that in future acquisition projects (apart from urgent

capability requests) the public have some form of input either in a process like has been used for the white paper or even some form of voluntary vote between finalist for a contract (such a process was used in 1993 successfully, resulting in purchase of F-18s).

I agree to my submission being published on the Defence website

I agree to my submission being quoted in the Community Consultation Report