



Submission No 15

Review of the Defence Annual Report 2010 - 2011

Name: Mr Mike Price

Organisation: REPSIM Pty Ltd

A SUBMISSION TO THE DEFENCE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE JOINT STANDING
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DEFENCE AND TRADE

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON COMPLAINT REGARDING THE
PRESENTATION BY LOCKHEED MARTIN REGARDING
REPSIM PTY LTD**

This additional information is provided in response to a request by WGCdr Karen Ashworth of 12 April, 2012 regarding the original complaint lodged by REPSIM Pty Ltd (REPSIM) on 11 April 2012.

“CHAIR: We will continue on. No doubt there are a number of people wishing to ask questions, and we will have a fair distribution of questions asked. I might start with a few myself. The committee received evidence a couple of meetings ago in relation to a simulated combat exercise. Maybe Mr Liberson might be able to answer this question. The evidence was such that a combat exercise was developed using simulated combat fights somewhere over the northern Pacific and that that indicated that the F35 was deficient in terms of fighting against foreign aircraft. I would personally like to know whether that is possible, to do a simulated combat exercise doing that with the information given the evidence that was provided. Also, have you got any response to the evidence? I am not certain whether you have heard the evidence in respect of those particular matters.

Mr Liberson: I need a little more of the specifics in terms of what exercise you are talking about.

Page 4 JOINT Tuesday, 20 March 2012 FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DEFENCE AND
TRADE JOINT COMMITTEE

Air Cdre Bentley: If can talk to simulations, and then Gary can—he probably talks best to simulations—I would say this. You can only truly represent what the F35 is capable of and what other fifth generation and other fourth generation aeroplanes are capable of when you have all of the classified information. Trying to simulate something that you do not fully understand is based on false assumptions and false ground rules. If you go in with false assumptions and false ground rules, you will get false answers.

CHAIR: So I take it from that response you have not provided that confidential statistics to anyone other than those that are no doubt purchasing the aircraft?

Air Cdre Bentley: All of the participants, all of the partners, all of the FMS customers, their senior Defence officials—

CHAIR: I am sorry, the bells are ringing for a Senate division.

Mr ADAMS: The green team will stay.

ACTING CHAIR (Dr Jensen): We will continue. Air Commodore Bentley?

Air Cdre Bentley: They have all been provided with that classified information, they have all made assessments and they have all decided, against all the opportunities that they have, that the best airplane for them is the F35.

Mr Burbage: It is probably also important to add that pilots from the Royal Australian Air Force, all the participating nations' air forces and all three US services have come into the manned tactical simulator, the pilot-in-the-loop high-fidelity simulation of an advanced high-threat environment. They have actually flown the airplane in that environment, and the results of those simulations show that the airplane is effectively meeting its operational requirements.”

Mr Bentley attempted to dismiss REPSIM’s simulations by implying that it did not fully understand what its simulation entities represented and that it based work on false assumptions and false ground rules.

I contacted Robert Little the Inquiry Secretary on the next working day following the initial evidence presented by Defence. Mr Little advised me as follows:

Dear Mr Price

Thank you for your email. I have taken advice regarding Hansard. We cannot hold the production of Hansard or add a “caveat” to any evidence given within it. My advice has been that the best thing for RepSim Pty Ltd to do would be send in a supplementary submission outlining where RepSim Pty Ltd believes evidence has been misleading and/or damaging to RepSim Pty Ltd’s reputation. The Sub-Committee will then consider this.

I also have advice that the proof Hansard from Friday 16 March should be available on Wednesday 21 March.

Regards

Robert

Robert Little |Inquiry Secretary

In the subsequent submission I quoted an article that was published by the Canberra Times on 22 March, 2012 **Delaying fighter deal would 'cost billions'** written by Mr David Ellery where he directly conveys the construction presented by Mr Bentley to the detriment of REPSIM’s business reputation worldwide.

“Lockheed Martin's Australian business development director, Graham Bentley, told the committee evidence it had been given about the F-35's combat performance by REPSIM, was badly flawed.

REPSIM had said that in combat against the Russian Su-35S fighter JSFs would be downed at the rate of five planes to two.

Mr Bentley, a 34-year veteran with the RAAF, said US studies against contemporary threats gave the JSF a kill ratio of six to one.”

This article was widely circulated on the internet as well as published and has been the subject of much comment since.

As stated previously concerning the simulations designed, constructed and run by REPSIM it rejects the statement that its analysis is flawed on the basis that REPSIM produced work to the specification and satisfaction of RAND, and the USAF Chief of Operations, Plans and Requirements has publicly confirmed that the USAF, the largest and most informed F-35A customer, has come to a similar assessment in that particular scenario.

To clarify the issue for the Committee REPSIM provides the following guidance.

There are currently four tiers of manned air combat solutions;

- a. Tier One is represented by the F-22 / AIM-120 capability as well as other air combat solutions;
- b. Tier Two is represented by the F-15 / AIM-120 capability as well as other air combat solutions;
- c. Tier Three is represented by the F/A-18 / AIM-120 capability as well as other air combat solutions; and
- d. Tier Four is represented by the A-10 / AIM-9 capability as well as other air combat solutions.

Against a very capable anti-access aerial denial environment the F-35A / AIM-120 capability is a Tier Three air combat solution.

Against a non-existent or dated anti-access aerial denial environment the F-35A / AIM-120 capability might be regarded as a Tier Two air combat solution.

China, Europe and Russia are designing, producing and marketing predominantly Tier One and Tier Two air combat solutions.

On the basis of the evidence presented by REPSIM to the Committee it is unlikely that the F-35A / AIM-120 solution would be capable of consistently prevailing over Tier One and / or Tier Two adversaries.

Michael Price
Managing Director
REPSIM Pty Ltd

26 April 2012