

Advance Questions for Claude M. Bolton Jr.  
Nominee for the Position of Assistant Secretary of the Army  
For Acquisition, Logistics and Technology

Defense Reforms

Almost 15 years have passed since the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms.

Do you support full implementation of these defense reforms?

**Yes, I fully support the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and related Special Operations initiatives for defense reform.**

What is your view of the extent to which these defense reforms have been implemented?

**From what I have learned to date, these defense reforms have been implemented and have achieved the desired results. Having said that, I believe it is important, and consistent with the intent of the reform legislation, that the Army continues to assess and modify its operations and internal procedures to meet the challenges of a dynamic security environment.**

What do you consider to be the most important aspects of these defense reforms?

**The most important aspects of these reforms were strengthening civilian control; streamlining the operational chain of command, improving the efficiency in the use of defense resources, improving the military advice provided to the National Command Authorities, clarifying authority for combatant commanders, and enhancing the effectiveness of military operations.**

The goals of the Congress in enacting these defense reforms, as reflected in section 3 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act, can be summarized as strengthening civilian control; improving military advice; placing clear responsibility on the combatant commanders for the accomplishment of their missions; ensuring the authority of the combatant commanders is commensurate with their responsibility; increasing attention to the formulation of strategy and to contingency planning; providing for more efficient use of defense resources; and enhancing the effectiveness of military operations and improving the management and administration of the Department of Defense.

Do you agree with these goals?

**I fully support the Congressional goals reflected in the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and other related defense reform legislation.**

Recently, there have been articles that indicate an interest within the Department of Defense in modifying Goldwater-Nichols in light of the changing environment and possible revisions to the national strategy.

Do you anticipate that legislative proposals to amend Goldwater-Nichols may be appropriate? If so, what areas do you believe it might be appropriate to address in these proposals?

**I am not aware of any current proposals to amend Goldwater-Nichols. It is too early for me to comment without additional evaluation and insight to address any proposals.**

### Duties

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology?

**The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology's (ASA(ALT)) primary duties are to insure the Army's soldiers are provided with the most capable and sustainable equipment and to wisely shepherd all available resources to provide that capability in the most cost effective manner. The ASA(ALT) serves, when delegated, as the Army Acquisition Executive, the Senior Procurement Executive, the Science Advisor to the Secretary, and as the senior research and development official for the Department of the Army. The ASA(ALT) also has the principal responsibility for all Department of the Army matters related to logistics. In these capacities, the ASA(ALT) advises the Secretary on all matters relating to acquisition and logistics management, and executes the acquisition functions and the acquisition management system of the Department of the Army. He appoints, manages, and evaluates program executive officers and direct-reporting program managers and managing the Army Acquisition Corps and the Army Acquisition Workforce. The ASA(ALT) executes the DA procurement and contracting functions, including exercising the authorities of the agency head for contracting, procurement, and acquisition matters pursuant to laws and regulations, the delegation of contracting authority; and the designation of contracting activities. He oversees the Army Industrial Base and Industrial Preparedness Programs and ensures the production readiness of weapon systems. The ASA(ALT) oversees all DA logistics management functions, including readiness, supply, services, maintenance, transportation, and related automated logistics systems management.**

What background and experience do you possess that you believe qualifies you to perform these duties?

**I bring nearly a quarter century of relevant experience as a successful test pilot, program manager of three major Air Force programs, an educator, an Inspector General and a Program Executive Officer. I fully understand the key**

**processes employed within the Department of Defense, particularly in programmatic discipline, planning, resource allocation and acquisition. This in-depth understanding is derived from knowledge and experience, both in theory and in practice. I have successfully demonstrated this at all levels of government and industry, domestically and globally.**

**I have an excitement of purpose, untiring energy, and a keen desire to continue to serve my country in this important capacity. If confirmed, my priority will be to ensure that the United States Army continues to be the most powerful, capable, and most respected Army the world has ever seen.**

Do you believe that there are actions you need to take to enhance your ability to perform the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology?

**I am unaware of any actions that I need to take at this time.**

Assuming you are confirmed, what duties and functions do you expect that the Secretary of the Army would prescribe for you?

**If confirmed, I expect the Secretary of the Army will delegate to me and expect me to fully perform the functions of the Army Acquisition Executive, as well as the full complement of responsibilities previously described.**

#### Major Challenges and Problems

In *your* view, what are the *major* challenges that will confront the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology?

**I believe that a successful transformation strategy and execution is one of the most significant challenges that faces the Army today. We must ensure that we meet the Army's needs to develop, acquire, and field the critical elements of the Objective Force, particularly its cornerstone, the Future Combat Systems (FCS). While this continues, the Army must maintain and sustain its current and near-term capability to meet contingencies. Another major challenge for the Army is posed by the impending loss, through retirements, of a significant percentage of resident expertise and corporate knowledge in the Scientist and Engineer (S&E) workforce, and the shortage of younger S&Es to whom this expertise would normally be transferred through training and mentoring.**

**I agree with the Secretary of the Army that the greatest challenge the Army faces is change. The challenges the Army faces are similar to those of the other Services as the Army collectively repositions organizations to overcome the threats our country faces. I feel that the Army must manage and maintain the momentum of the changes it has undertaken to assure its international preeminence in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. This will ensure America's ability to deter threats and defend our national security interests and to do it within the joint community.**

Assuming you are confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?

**With regard to Transformation, I believe that a focused, productive science and technology program is a prerequisite. The Army must maintain an adequately funded S&T program to focus on achieving the Army's Transformation to the Objective Force. I understand that the single largest investment in S&T is for Future Combat Systems (FCS) with the goal to field FCS by the end of this decade. I have no preconceived plans for addressing these challenges. However, if confirmed, I will work closely with the Secretary of the Army, the Assistant Secretaries, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) in a unified effort to transform the Army to meet America's future security needs. This includes attracting, training, and retaining America's best and brightest. It also mandates that we provide for their quality of life and well-being. The Army must assure its daily readiness, while transforming itself into an Army capable of dominance along the full spectrum of military operations in the 21st Century.**

What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the performance of the functions of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology?

**If confirmed, I would evaluate the specific roles and functions within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology. It is premature to identify potential problems at this time.**

If confirmed, what management actions and time lines would you establish to address these problems?

**If confirmed, I will need to evaluate the specific issues and work with the Army Staff and Secretariat as well as DoD to establish timelines as appropriate.**

#### Priorities

If confirmed, what broad priorities would you establish in terms of issues, which must be addressed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology?

**I see three very broad priorities. Clearly, Army Transformation is the keystone to maintaining and improving the Army's warfighting capability in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. That is the Army's paramount consideration. Within the Transformation the Army must leverage new science and technology programs and initiatives to capitalize on emerging trends and breakthroughs. The Army must ensure it transforms into a force that will have the ability to respond effectively not only against today's terrorism and force protection threats, but also tomorrow's unknown threats.**

**Underpinning this effort is the Army's Acquisition Corps. It must stand ready**

**to assist in the transformation by developing new systems and capabilities in a timely manner while recapitalizing the legacy force. This will assure that the Army is able to project an ever-improving full-spectrum combat capability. Critical to the Army's ability to effect this transformation is the health of the Army's Acquisition Corps. If confirmed, I must work to ensure the Army recruits, trains, and retains the required expertise, both military and civilian, that will support the transformation plan while positioning the workforce to successfully meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. I think the Army must also closely examine the continued viability of the United States industrial base to ensure that it does and will continue to meet current and potential wartime requirements.**

#### Army Acquisition System

The Army recently approved a plan to reorganize its acquisition structure to centralize oversight of all Army program executive officers and program managers under the military deputy and the Army Acquisition Executive.

What is your opinion of the Army plan to restructure its acquisition system?  
Do you have any specific concerns with the intended changes?

**I have only received an initial briefing on the acquisition reorganization plan, but I am pleased with the approach. One of the primary goals is to insure a single manager is assigned to develop, produce, field, and sustain all systems in the active and reserve components, and to realign programs along commodity lines. For instance, the PEO for Aviation will be responsible for the life cycle management of all aviation assets - not just those in active development. This focuses fiscal and manpower resources to develop and manage the fleet in the most cost effective manner. This appears to be a healthy approach to streamline the overall process and reduce redundant reporting and oversight layers in management. I have no specific concerns with the intended changes, and if confirmed, would continue to develop and refine the process.**

Given your experience with other services' systems, would you, if confirmed, anticipate making any specific recommendations for further changes? If so, what changes would you recommend?

**I have a broad base of experience in the DOD acquisition process and major system acquisitions. If confirmed, I intend to apply that experience across the board, where it makes sense, to improve the Army processes and take advantage of other service successes, but at this time I have no specific recommendations for changes.**

#### Streamlining the Acquisition Process

Both Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Under Secretary of Defense Pete

Aldridge have indicated that they believe that there is a compelling need to streamline the acquisition process to further reduce the fielding time for new weapons systems and capabilities.

In your view, what role should realistic testing play in the acquisition process prior to any decision to enter into high-rate production?

**I am concerned with the length of time that it takes to field new equipment. I agree that the acquisition process has to be streamlined. Likewise the way in which we integrate test and evaluation into this process must be improved. The way to accelerate acquisition programs is to integrate testing earlier in the development of new systems. In essence, we need to make testing part of the development process and not an addendum that scores the results of completed programs. Testing must be designed to examine design options, reduce risk and help move systems forward to successfully accelerate fielding.**

**At each step in a progressive test process, the test conditions should be as realistic as possible consistent with the test objectives. Many years of experience attest to the fact that there is no substitute for realistic operational testing by real soldiers in a combat-like environment. This is what has led us today to an Army that has the best ground combat systems in the world. I understand the Abrams tank, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and the Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) are successes because the Army shook out the design and manufacturing problems in realistic operational test before the systems went into full rate production**

If you are confirmed as the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, how would you propose to achieve an appropriate balance between the desire to reduce acquisition cycle times and the need to perform adequate operational testing?

**I do not see a conflict between reforming the acquisition process to accelerate fielding and the need to conduct realistic operational testing. A careful look at past programs will show that the conduct of operational testing consumes only a very short period in the development and fielding process. All early testing goes on concurrent with other development activities, and only the Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOTE) must wait for a fully production-representative system. With carefully laid out acquisition programs, operational testing need not cause delays in transitioning from low rate initial production to full rate production.**

How would you assess that the balance achieved is the appropriate one?

**I am not sure that a precise balance can be found, but I would measure the rates at which problems are being found. The degree to which problems are found early and do not occur later is the degree to which we are improving on the balance. If the occurrence of problems accelerates later in the program development, then we are clearly missing the mark.**

**While we will never abandon realistic operational testing, we also know that we must fully integrate technical testing, modeling and simulation and other data sources to resolve as many issues as possible before we get to the IOTE. If confirmed, I would try to leverage early and continuous testing and evaluation to make sure that systems are properly postured for success long before they are ready for fielding.**

In comparison to other services with which you are familiar, do you believe that the Army has adequately funded its testing activities?

**It is premature for me to comment on the funding adequacy of the Army's comprehensive testing activities but I am aware that the funding profile for T&E in the Army has improved in the past ten years. The infrastructure for DoD test ranges and much of the Army's instrumentation is aging and needs to be upgraded or replaced. Instrumentation must keep pace with the complexity and technical advances of the systems being tested. New instrumentation and test tools are needed to adequately test today's complex systems. Almost every major system now operates in a complex system-of-systems environment. This means that more sophisticated tests are required to truly create a "realistic" operational environment for validating system capabilities. We are relying heavily on models and simulations to help us create the realistic environments for these tests, but these new tools all take resources to develop and maintain. Balanced against its other priorities, I believe the Army is resourcing T&E as well as the other services.**

#### Comanche

Press reports indicate that the Army has decided to restructure the RAH-66 Comanche helicopter program, delaying initial operational capability by two years. If these reports are true, what is your understanding of:

The new schedule?

**I understand that recent reviews of the Comanche Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) program indicated that the program was experiencing both cost and schedule problems. I am told that the Army is currently in the process of developing alternatives that would implement a block upgrade strategy, maintain objective force linkages and address these concerns. Although adjustments to the program are imminent, I understand the Army leadership has not yet decided on a course of action, and remains firmly committed to the success of the Comanche program. I agree that it is a critical component in the Army Transformation and the Objective Force.**

The programmatic reasons for such a restructure?

**I am told the EMD contract is experiencing difficulties driven by system concurrency, system integration challenges, and underestimation of risk.**

Any additional costs involved, and how the Army will pay for those costs?

**As stated previously, I understand the cost of the Comanche program adjustments may be resourced from within the current approved Comanche funding by using the delay in the production program to fund the increased development effort.**

**I look forward to reviewing and contributing to this critical program, if confirmed.**

### Future Combat System

The Army currently has four teams working on the Future Combat System (FCS) under concept design agreements. The Army has announced its intention to solicit for a single lead systems integrator to take the system to a FY 2006 production decision.

In your opinion, what are the advantages and disadvantages of the Army's new acquisition approach for FCS?

**I understand there are two facets to the new acquisition approach -- accelerating Milestone B by three years from FY06 to FY 03, and placing the effort under Lead Systems Integrator (LSI) management. I agree that the major advantage of the program acceleration is that the Army may be able to field revolutionary new capabilities by the end of the decade. The FCS LSI will provide the Government with a capable industry partner, having total systems integration responsibility for designing, developing, producing, fielding and supporting the FCS system of systems.**

**I agree that the disadvantage of program acceleration is that it may limit the Army's technology options for the Block I concept and increase program risk, but I believe this disadvantage can be mitigated by an iterative upgrade plan, providing enhancements for lethality, survivability, and so on. A potential disadvantage in having a single LSI is that the selection of an LSI can limit competition for new ideas from other major defense contractors in later phases of the program. I understand DARPA and the Army are addressing this issue by requiring a rigorous best value competition process for the selection of systems and subsystems, with government access to all data and concurrence in decisions.**

In your opinion, how much risk is involved in such an acquisition schedule?

**DARPA and the Army have, in effect, asked the firms pursuing the Lead Systems Integrator role to balance technical and schedule risk in their proposed concepts in order to achieve an IOC within this decade. The winning LSI's concepts will mature in parallel with the evolving Operational Requirements Document to provide acceptable risk at MS B and beyond. If none of the answers meet the needs of the Army Transformation, the Army should reconsider the Army's requirements.**

If confirmed, how would you propose to divide the responsibilities for the FCS program between yourself and the Director of the Objective Force Task Force?

**The responsibilities of the Objective Force Task Force are spelled out by the Secretary of the Army – I do not believe there is duplication. ASA(ALT) is responsible for overall execution of the FCS acquisition program, to include science and technology efforts. The Task Force integrates, coordinates, and assesses efforts in concepts and requirements, S&T (including DARPA), and acquisition. Task Force findings are provided to ASA(ALT) for consideration and action. If confirmed, I propose to continue, develop, and refine this relationship.**

### Logistics Reform

The 2001 Report to the President and Congress stated that logistics reform must move toward performance-based support and must link modern warfighting and business practices. To accomplish this fundamental transformation, the Department has developed a long-term logistics reform strategic plan, established a logistics architect to help guide the transformation effort, and begun the process of implementing new business strategies.

In your view, what are the key factors shaping Army logistic modernization?

**The Army is in the process of transformation. As the Army moves toward an Objective Force, logistics modernization will enable the Army to field a force that is more responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable, and sustainable. Army logistic modernization is a key component of that transformation process. The Army is changing the paradigm of a logistics system built on redundancy of mass to one based on velocity, mobility, and situational understanding. I understand three objectives drive the Army's modernization process. The first is to enhance strategic responsiveness to meet the timelines outlined in the Army Vision. This is key to the Army's future relevance. The second is to reduce the size of the Combat Support/Combat Service Support footprint in the combat zone; this will enable Joint Force Commanders to maneuver without being tethered to a large supporting structure. Third, the Army must reduce the cost of logistics without reducing warfighting capability or readiness. Decreasing logistics demand is a major element of cutting cost and improving flexibility. The Army should consider efficiency, reliability, and deployability key performance parameters as the Army designs and fields new combat systems. The application of information and communications technologies to weapon systems design and logistics business processes is a key component in the Army's effort to create a more responsive logistics system. As the Army looks at the magnitude of the Army's business from installation to foxhole these are significant challenges but I think the Army has a duty to get it done.**

In your view, what commercial market logistics practices should the Department of the Army consider in its logistics modernization program?

**There are many. Nothing drives innovation like a competitive market and we can learn a great deal about efficiency and effectiveness from the commercial sector. Several promising practices do come to mind: the Army has to use a longer-term business model in the acquisition process; the Army has to invest up front in**

**reliability and predictability to reduce the cost of maintaining Army systems; the Army has to look at the total life-cycle cost of equipment when it is designed. While the Army has really improved its supply chain management with the Single Stock Fund program, the addition of commercially available automatic identification technology can pay big dividends in efficiency. The Army needs to leverage commercial sector transportation efficiencies, particularly the use of multi-modal systems that can reduce repackaging, material handling, and en-route damage as well as the costs associated with them. The commercial sector is doing some exciting things with embedded diagnostics and prognostics that really save equipment repair costs. The list goes on, but I think we can learn a lot from the commercial market and I will continue to look to world-class businesses for their logistics lessons, if confirmed.**

In your view, is the privatization of the Army's logistics function a viable alternative?

**I think there is value in privatizing some of the Army's logistics functions but I'm hesitant to endorse it as a rule. I firmly believe that we must preserve a National Military Capability in critical logistics functions. Here again, you have to take a business view. While there are many functions and services the private sector can provide at a lower cost, that's not the entire equation. In many instances, the Army owns infrastructure just for the purpose of performing those same functions and services. When we add the cost of maintaining that to the lower privatized cost, we don't always see a savings. You have to have a plan to divest that infrastructure prior to outsourcing. We have to ask two questions when we move to the private sector. First, is readiness retained or improved. Second, is the total Army cost reduced? If the objective answer is yes to both questions, privatization is an alternative that should be considered.**

#### Munitions Programs

The Army is considering the cancellation of several munitions programs including the TOW missile, the Hydra-70 rocket, the Remote Area Denial Artillery Munition, and the antipersonnel land mine alternatives.

Given that the replacement systems to many of these programs are not yet fully developed and may not be available for many years, how would these cuts, if approved, impact the Army's ability to execute the National Military Strategy?

**I understand the Army's ability to execute the National Military Strategy will not be impacted should any of these programs be cancelled. I am told the RADAM and APL-A programs do not provide an enhanced warfighting capability above and beyond when the Army has today. I understand the Army will continue to produce the Hydra-70 rocket in sufficient quantities to meet training requirements until the Advance Precision Kill Weapon System starts production in FY05. I also understand the Army has begun a dedicated stockpile management program to retain sufficient TOW 2B in the inventory under the Common Missile program begins production later this decade.**

## Army Acquisition System

If confirmed as the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, you will manage the Army Acquisition Corps and Army Acquisition Workforce.

In your view, what steps should the Army take to improve overall management of its acquisition personnel?

**Simply put, I believe that we must refine the Army's existing management system to ensure the dedicated, professional members of the Army Acquisition Corps are fully trained, constantly challenged to innovate and streamline, rewarded for their efforts, and secure in their belief that we care about them and their families. We are all aware that this workforce has been significantly reduced over the past few years. While that was necessary and productive it also created a set of new challenges. For instance, I am concerned with the number of personnel that are or will be retirement eligible in the immediate future (2-5 years). In some career fields over 50% of the personnel fit this category. While the Army cannot say with certainty how many will actually retire, the potential loss of experience and expertise is enormous. This problem is further complicated because potential replacement personnel are reluctant to enter the Acquisition Corps because of the history of reductions. To answer these challenges, I understand the Army is working to stabilize the workforce, overcome the fear of further mass reductions, attract new employees from industry and academia, and, probably most important, enhance the training opportunities and professional growth of the current workforce. Lastly, in concert with DoD and the other Services, I am gratified that the Army is developing a comprehensive strategic plan to address current problems and prepare the Army's acquisition workforce for the challenges of the 21st century.**

How do you plan to ensure that the Army recruits, trains, and retains an acquisition workforce that will be able to operate in a 21<sup>st</sup> Century environment?

**The Army has numerous programs that provide advanced training and education opportunities for the current workforce. If confirmed, I intend to review these and, in concert with the Defense Acquisition University, training managers, and private institutions, ensure these existing programs are providing the right focus, right perspective, and right tools required to support the fundamental tenets of acquisition excellence. This will ensure the Army Acquisition Corps is poised to support Army transformation and continually improve the Acquisition System.**

**We need to ensure that the Army's employees are working in a professional, safe and productive environment that enhances their desire to come to work. The Army, and indeed all the Services, have an incredibly professional and dedicated workforce that continuously answers the call to public service. If confirmed, I intend to ensure the Army has the plans and programs that enhance skills, provide for the most effective and efficient use of resources and, most importantly, makes the Army's**

employees proud to be members of the U.S. Army.

**I understand the Army Acquisition Corps has already begun to develop a comprehensive program to attract new military and civilian employees with the necessary skills to support transformation and lay the foundation for the Army of the 21st Century. If confirmed, I will do my best to ensure that the program is fully resourced and complemented by a responsive management system that allows us to swiftly react to changing priorities and technological evolution.**

#### Interservice Relationships

In your view, are there areas in which the Department of the Army and the United States Marine Corps should more closely cooperate in the development of land and air capabilities?

**I am not familiar with all functional areas where the Army and Marine Corps are able to cooperatively develop capabilities, but I am aware of several cooperative successes. This October the Army began procuring the Marine Corps developed M107, 50 caliber, Sniper Rifle. Both Marines and Soldiers are using this rifle in Afghanistan. An excellent example of ongoing cooperation between the Marines and Army is the development of the Joint Lightweight 155mm Towed Howitzer. In this program, the Marines are developing the basic howitzer while The Army develops the digital fire control for the howitzer. A Memorandum of Agreement governs the program with the Navy and Army sharing management responsibility. The Navy Acquisition Executive is the milestone decision authority while the Army functions as the head of contracting agency. Additionally, the Marine Corps product manager is located at the Army's Picatinny Arsenal and oversight is shared by the Army Program Executive for Ground Combat Support and the Marine Corps Systems Commander. This has been a successful arrangement for both services.**

If confirmed, what actions would you take to increase Army and Marine Corps joint program development?

**If confirmed, I would build on the relationship with the Navy Acquisition Executive and the Marine Corps from the Joint Lightweight 155mm Howitzer and Sniper Rifle and proactively review similar requirements across the other services to identify additional areas for cooperation.**

#### Congressional Oversight

In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed for this high position, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress?

**Yes.**

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Under Secretary of the Army?

**Yes.**

Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate Committees?

**Yes.**