

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
ON ARMED SERVICES**

**TESTIMONY OF**

**MICHAEL W. WYNNE**

**PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**

**(ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS)**

**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES**

**May 21, 2002**

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
ON ARMED SERVICES**

**TESTIMONY OF**  
**MICHAEL W. WYNNE**  
**PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**  
**(ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS)**  
**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE**  
**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**  
**SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES**

**May 21, 2002**

Ms. Chairwoman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for inviting me here today to talk with you about the proposed legislation “Improved Management of Department of Defense Test and Evaluation (T&E) Facilities.” The importance of T&E in ensuring our systems work is *critical* and we appreciate your interest in this topic. Our military is the premier force in the world and part of their superior advantage is due to the exceptional systems that support them. Developing and fielding systems so that a soldier is confident a gun will fire when the trigger is pulled, a bomb will find its correct target, or a communication system will send a call for reinforcements, is what the Department’s acquisition, technology and logistics workforce does best. There are no second chances in our business. Testing provides the extra assurance that a system will work when it has to and under all types of conditions.

Improving our T&E process has been the subject of many studies such as the Defense Science Board’s (DSB) Report on Test and Evaluation released in September 1999, the DSB’s Report on Test and Evaluation Capabilities released in December 2000, and most recently, the Defense Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) Annual Report for FY2001. These reports

investigated and identified ways to improve our process and your legislation reflects many of the recommendations from those studies.

Some of these same recommendations were reviewed last August and again in December by Secretary Rumsfeld's Senior Executive Council (SEC). The SEC, a council made up of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and Service Secretaries, reviewed the issues of centralized funding and management of the test and management infrastructure. As a result of the SEC discussions, the Service Secretaries approach is: 1) for the Services to work together to effectively utilize and manage resources across the three services; 2) that neither a separate OSD range management office nor centralized funding is necessary; and 3) that the Services already have sufficient incentives to effectively manage these enterprises and to adequately fund needed facilitation. We presently have in place, a Vice-Chief-level Board of Directors that provides cross-service use and accountability of T&E facilities. Furthermore, OSD does influence T&E funding through the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) and the budget process.

We agree with some areas of the proposed legislation such as section 235 that calls for human capital planning of the T&E workforce and section 234 that creates a single DoD-wide accounting system. As you know, the Department is working on both of these areas with our human capital planning efforts and our initiative to improve financial management systems across DoD. We have reservations about creating a centralized activity to manage the test ranges as proposed in section 231 or creating fenced range investment accounts as proposed in section 232 and section 233. We believe that centralized management likely would not resolve the problem of range management but could result in a new office that will require extra reporting, extra financial management, and ultimately delay effective management.

One key area the proposed legislation fails to recognize is the fact that our test ranges and facilities also support vital operational training as well as operational testing. T&E is the

insurance policy that assures the Department that a system will meet its requirements, and as with any insurance policy, balance is the key. In managing our T&E facilities, there is a delicate balance of testing and training because training for both Service and joint exercises often involves the test ranges. A good example of this is Nellis Air Force Base, one of the Air Force's primary test facilities for aircraft and weapon systems, and home to Red Flag, an annual exercise that involves not only joint services, but also international forces. In FY00, 93% of sorties flown at Nellis, 83% at Eglin Air Force Base, and 60% of the sorties at Edwards Air Force Base were for training. Likewise, the Navy's Atlantic Underwater Test and Evaluation Center (AUTEK) facilities support T&E of many underwater systems, but also supports sound testing of submarines, necessary for pre-deployment operational readiness. Both in the DSB report and the proposed legislation, it is very unclear as to what authority the central agency holds, but it seems to unbalance the test and training that each Service manages each year.

The legislative proposal is also not clear on the delineation between developmental testing and operational testing. Developmental testing is important for learning a system's characteristics and capabilities and the results of such tests often impact the design. Operational testing confirms the systems performance once design is complete. Most of the T&E performed at the test ranges and facilities is developmental in nature and not within the purview of the DOT&E. In FY01, the Navy's developmental testing accounted for 58% of the total workload. Delegating control of the test ranges and facilities to DOT&E would put developmental testing under the cognizance of operational test. This would create significant cost and schedule impacts to crucial developmental testing. The very nature of the test community is to continue testing until all issues are resolved. Placing control of the test facilities under the testers could create an endless do-loop of testing.

The imbalance between test and training, and developmental and operational testing, would be compounded when money is moved from program accounts and fenced in range

investment accounts as recommended by section 232. While we are concerned with infrastructure issues such as better calibration, or getting more data more quickly, placing investment in a 'frozen account' might result in unbalanced investment that will impact training. We are concerned with the continuing problem surrounding overhead costs and their impact to program managers (PMs) when they use the test ranges and facilities. However, a range investment account established as a percentage of the RDT&E account from each Service would essentially result in a tax on each of the PMs, regardless of their test requirements and would introduce certain rigidities into the system that would be undesirable.

The DSB reports highlight a potential management issue with regard to the quantity of waivers from approved test requirements in the TEMP, but do not address the actual impact of these waivers on our forces. The proposed legislation in section 236 eliminates deviations from the Test and Evaluation Master Plans (TEMPs) without the approval of the DOT&E or the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense, without re-delegation, and requires notification to Congress. This provision removes any flexibility in testing, which is undesirable when we are weighing a system's readiness against the need to provide it to the warfighter. DOT&E already must approve test plans under the TEMP and is aware of test plan changes. The proposed language is not clear as to the level of deviation that is addressed. Assuming it refers to major test events and not specific system characteristics, threat presentations or other program or tester level decisions, an alternative approach could be notification provided in the DOT&E annual report as related to specific systems.

We recognize we have more challenges ahead, specifically as we continue to emphasize evolutionary acquisition and spiral development to shorten the weapon system development life-cycle. Spiral development allows us to get militarily useful capability to our warfighters and at less cost by producing and deploying systems based on mature technologies that will satisfy only a portion of the objective need. Because the Secretary desires to speed up the transition of

technology into usable equipment through incremental fielding of capability, we may need the increased flexibility that test waivers can provide as we add iterations of capability, especially if the performance of that technology is not completely understood. Additionally, in order to obtain an early understanding of what we are facing from a support and maintenance point of view, we may want to deploy equipment that may require prudent testing waivers. In certain cases, development and operational testing, by their very nature, can not exactly replicate the real world, and we need to gain real world experience to get the most accurate level of performance. Many times the early gear is for training units, which is the perfect place to gain feedback and introduce corrective actions. Our desire is to get to the warfighter equipment that is better than anything they have. Safety of our people will always be our number one concern, but beyond safety, we must not let the best be the enemy of the good when it comes to operational requirements.

In closing, I want to express my appreciation to Congress for their support. Congress has long been a valued partner in our quest for change throughout the Department. The T&E area has been no different. We appreciate the support of the Congress, but we feel this proposed legislation will not result in the goal of an integrated and well-managed T&E process.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this statement for the record.