Duties

Section 7016(b)(5)(A) of title 10, United States Code, provides that the principal duty of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology (ASA(ALT)) shall be the overall supervision of acquisition, technology, and logistics matters of the Department of the Army.

1.A. What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the ASA(ALT)?

Answer: The ASA(ALT) is the principal advisor to the Secretary of the Army on all matters related to acquisition, logistics, and technology. The ASA(ALT) serves, when delegated, as the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE), the Senior Procurement Executive, the Science Advisor to the Secretary of the Army and the Army's senior research and development official. The ASA(ALT) sets the strategic direction for Army programs and policies related to acquisition, logistics, and technology, including: acquisition management, procurement, the industrial base, security cooperation and assistance, sustainment, and science and technology (S&T). Importantly, the ASA(ALT) also appoints, manages, and evaluates Program Executive Officers (PEOs) and direct-reporting Program Managers (PMs), and is responsible for managing the Army Acquisition Corps and the Army Acquisition Workforce.

1.B. What recommendations, if any, do you have for changes in the duties and functions of the ASA(ALT), as set forth in statute or in Department of Defense regulations?

Answer: I have no specific recommendations to change the duties or functions of the ASA(ALT) at this time. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to serve in the position before recommending any potential changes that may be appropriate.

Duties

2. If confirmed, what duties and functions would you expect the Secretary of the Army to prescribe for you?

Answer: If confirmed, I would expect the Secretary of the Army to prescribe the duties currently specified in HQDA General Orders No. 2020-01 for the ASA(ALT) position, which includes:

- (1) Developing and overseeing policies and programs for:
 - (a) Logistics, including acquisition fielding, sustainment, and disposal logistics management, and administering lifecycle logistics support planning and execution.
 - (b) Security cooperation, foreign military and foreign government sales, and other related activities and general export matters.
 - (c) The Defense Industrial Base, including the Army's Organic Industrial Base.
 - (d) Aspects of the PPBE process within the ASA (ALT)'s assigned functions and responsibilities and, when appropriate, coordinating and integrating that direction with the ASA (FM&C) and Chief Information Officer (CIO)/G-6.
 - (e) The acquisition function and the acquisition management system and chairing the Army Systems Acquisition Review Council and Configuration Steering Board.
 - (f) Execution of the authorities of the agency head for procurement matters pursuant to laws and regulations, and execution of the authorities of the SEC.ARMY for matters concerning grants, cooperative agreements, and other non-procurement transactions under the Defense Grant and Agreement Regulatory System (DoD Directive 3210.06), as well as other transactions under sections 2371 and 2371b of Title 10, United States Code.
 - (g) Intellectual property, technical data, and computer software management.
- (2) Providing material solutions to equipment modernization as part of the future force modernization enterprise.
- (3) Managing the Army Acquisition Corps and Army Acquisition Workforce; appointing those personnel below the executive level; and evaluating acquisition program executive officers and direct-reporting program, project, and product managers.
- (4) Representing the Army in ALT matters to DoD and non-DoD partners

Major Challenges and Problems

3. In your view, what are the major challenges you would confront if confirmed and appointed to be the ASA(ALT)?

Answer: The central challenge I expect to confront, if confirmed, is the successful execution of the Army's top modernization priority programs. Many of these programs are reaching a point where they will soon transition from prototyping and development to production, testing, and fielding. This process is likely to be challenging in many cases due to the aggressive timelines currently assumed for these programs. It is also likely to be challenging because of the normal friction points that occur when a complex system moves to this more detailed stage of development and production. Testing will reveal things that need to be fixed. Early production efforts will likely reveal currently unforeseen difficulties in ramping up production at scale. The Army's needs may shift, which could disrupt fielding schedules. And finally, delays or difficulties with some programs may lead to cost growth. While these issues are expected when developing and deploying new systems, they will require careful management, balancing various risk factors, and constant communications across the Army and with Congress to be overcome.

Major Challenges and Problems

4. If confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing each of these challenges? If confirmed, what management actions would you direct and what timelines would you establish for addressing each of these challenges?

Answer: I am confident that the Army has an acquisition workforce with the talent and skills to successfully overcome the challenges listed in question #3. If confirmed, I will allow the PEOs and PMs maximum flexibility to navigate any difficulties, and provide them an environment in which they can succeed. At the same time, I will maintain close overwatch of their efforts and ensure that all the appropriate Army elements, such as requirements, testing, contracting, and financial are arranged to support them. I will also seek to protect the funding for these efforts to maintain program schedules and help ensure success. Finally, I will work closely with Congress to ensure members have full visibility of the Army's efforts, especially on programs that run into difficulties.

Major Challenges and Problems

5. If confirmed, what broad priorities would you establish and how would you measure progress in achieving these priorities?

Answer: If confirmed, I will prioritize five aspects within the Army's acquisition enterprise:

My first priority would be to intensely focus on acquisition program execution that ensures rapid delivery of equipment to the Army's Soldiers. For many years, Congress has directed acquisition reforms on accelerating the pace of the system. I will bias my decisions toward taking actions that prioritize speed in a responsible manner.

My second priority would be to improve the Army's policies and practices regarding the acquisition of software. With strong Congressional support, the Army now has more tools and authorities than ever to pursue software in a fundamentally different way and many promising efforts are proceeding. If confirmed, I intend to accelerate and expand those efforts.

My third priority would be to return the Army to a focus on security in acquisition, with a special focus on cyber and supply chain security. The Army faces a fundamentally different threat in this regard as compared to the post-Cold War era and must adapt its policies and practices to enable delivery of systems and capabilities uncompromised by aggressive efforts by China, Russia, and others to disrupt them before they are fielded.

A fourth priority would be to ensure realistic operational testing is integrated into Army programs, including rigorous cyber testing. While testing can be expensive at times, more time spent doing effective testing up front can pay huge dividends later and more importantly allow us to find problems on test ranges rather than in combat.

A fifth priority will be working to ensure that the Army's modernization efforts are closely coordinated with Congress. The Army cannot achieve any of its modernization goals without the support of, and partnership with, Congress.

Relations with Congress

6. What actions would you take to develop and sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the Office of the ASA(ALT)?

Answer: Based on my long experience as a staff member working on behalf of members of Congress, and my six months as Acting Army Acquisition executive, I believe that trust, transparency, and constant communication are the most important aspects of ensuring productive relations with Congress. If confirmed as ASA(ALT), I would personally communicate extensively with members and staff to set the example. I would also direct my entire organization to provide all available information to members and staff so Congress can pursue its oversight and policy-making roles with full information. When there are differences of opinion, I will seek to engage directly to understand the different positions, and offer any additional information that members may need to make their independent decisions regarding Army acquisition programs.

Budget

7. If confirmed, by what standards would you measure the adequacy of the Army's funding for the programs under your purview?

Answer: If confirmed, I will measure the adequacy of the Army's funding based upon the Service's ability to meet the Biden Administration's March 2021 Interim National Security Strategic Guidance and, when it is completed, by the Army's ability to meet the requirements laid out in the new National Defense Strategy required by Congress. Ultimately, the Army needs sufficient resources to fulfill its role as part of the Joint Force responsible for deterring, and if necessary, defeating military aggression that threatens vital U.S. interests with acceptable risk to force and mission. I plan to work within the Army's allocated funding to ensure the most modern, ready, and lethal Soldiers possible. I will also work with the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the Army's priorities of People, Readiness, and Modernization align with the Secretary of Defense's priorities of defending our nation, innovating and modernizing the Force, maintaining and enhancing readiness, taking care of our people, and succeeding through teamwork.

Relations with the Office of the Secretary of Defense

8. In your view, what is the optimum relationship between the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (USD(R&E)) and the Military Department offices responsible for research and engineering activities?

Answer: In my view, the AAE, who is responsible for research and engineering in the Army, should have a very close relationship with the USD(R&E) in order to coordinate research efforts across the Department of Defense while still focusing Army efforts that provide capabilities for Soldiers. A close working relationship between the AAE and USD(R&E) would afford the Army the ability to leverage work from the Army's sister services and Defense agencies, avoid duplication, and accelerate high risk technologies to advance warfighting capability. USD (R&E) also oversees numerous organizations that do innovative research and engineering work, such as DARPA, DIU, MDA, and SCO. A close and collaborative relationship between those entities and the Army could lead to significant efficiencies and the acceleration of new technologies into Army Science and Technology and acquisition programs.

Relations with the Office of the Secretary of Defense

9. In your view, what is the optimum relationship between the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment and the Military Department Service and Defense Agency offices responsible for acquisition and sustainment activities?

Answer: In my view, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (USD(A&S)) plays a significant role by establishing the policy that synchronizes the services and enables the department to operate effectively as an enterprise. The USD (A&S) also serves a critical role as the Defense Acquisition Executive, with the authority to retain, or delegate, milestone or decision authority for major defense acquisition programs or their equivalent middle-tier acquisition programs. A potential way to optimize the relationships would be establishing and resourcing data repositories to prevent inconsistent solutions and free the Services to focus on executing Weapon System and Ammunition programs. Another area for optimization is better coordination on cross-cutting issues such as supply chain risk management, sensitive technology policies, COVID-19 response activities, and cyber policies that relate to acquisition and sustainment issues.

Relationships within the Army

10. If confirmed, how would you work with the Army Chief of Staff to improve Army acquisition outcomes and the overall health of the Army research and engineering enterprise?

Answer: If confirmed, I will work with the Army Chief of Staff (CSA), and other Army leaders, to ensure the timely delivery of capabilities to Soldiers. This includes advising the CSA regarding the proper balance of resources against priorities as it relates to acquisition programs, working with the CSA and Army Futures Command (AFC) to ensure requirements are validated and technically feasible, and to ensure that appropriate trade-offs are made among cost, schedule, and performance before milestone or production decisions in order to avoid unnecessary costs or program risks. I would also work closely with the Army Chief of Staff to develop and manage appropriate career paths for military officers in the acquisition workforce.

Relationships within the Army

11. If confirmed, what actions would you take to develop and sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between the Army Senior Acquisition Executive and the Commander of the U.S. Army Futures Command?

Answer: Success in Army modernization requires a collective effort from multiple stakeholders and organizations that contribute to the success of acquisition programs. A strong relationship between the Army Acquisition Executive and the Commanding General of AFC is essential to successful development of new warfighting capabilities. AFC plays a critical role in executing the Army's Science and Technology enterprise and in defining requirements for the Army's next generation capabilities. If confirmed, I would work closely and collaboratively with the AFC Commander to ensure the Army can effectively develop new capabilities, to include iterating on requirements to ensure they are well-informed and technically feasible, employing robust processes to obtain Soldier feedback, developing sound acquisition strategies, and promoting the transition of S&T technology to formal programs of record. In addition, if confirmed, I would work collaboratively with the AFC Commander to prioritize resources within the Army's equipping program to promote successful fielding of critical warfighting capabilities.

Relationships within the Army

12. If confirmed, how will you work with the joint and Army requirements community to ensure that requirements are technically feasible and stable and will not result in programs that are likely to fail due to technical failures or cost or schedule growth?

Answer: If confirmed, I would continue to make use of the forums that bring the acquisition and requirements communities together to discuss those issues before acquisition programs are started, such as Materiel Development Decisions and Acquisition Shaping Panels; or when programs are underway, such as the Configuration Steering Board. It takes collaboration to balance what the user needs with what is technically feasible within cost and schedule goals.

Acquisition

Over the past year alone, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Director of Operational Testing & Evaluation (DOT&E), and others have documented that multiple Army procurement programs have experienced cost growth, schedule delays, incomplete systems at delivery, and post-delivery problems.

13. If confirmed, what would be your plan for improving Army acquisition activities?

Answer: Successful acquisition programs start with sound requirements. If confirmed, I would use multiple formal and informal decision forums to involve the Army acquisition enterprise as early as possible as requirements are formed. A process that occurs in parallel to requirements development is acquisition strategy development. If confirmed, I would work to ensure the Army develops sound acquisition strategies that identify and mitigate technical and program risks. Congress has provided many new authorities to tailor acquisition strategies to programs. I would seek to use these new authorities to accelerate the pace of programs while also mitigating cost and performance risks. Once a program begins, I would make effective use of program oversight processes, including various reviews and assessments, such as technical reviews, independent assessments and tests, program reviews, and milestone reviews and decisions. I would ensure the Army employs risk reduction strategies in programs, to include modeling and simulation, alternative design approaches, and contractor incentives, as needed to achieve program cost, schedule and performance objectives. A final critical aspect of achieving success in acquisition is close coordination with Congress, and in particular, the four defense committees. Without support from Congress, the Army cannot achieve success in any of its acquisition efforts. As such, improving coordination with Congress would be one of my top priorities.

Acquisition

14. What do you perceive to be the recent successes and shortfalls in Army acquisition activities?

Answer: Based on my work for Congress conducting oversight and my six months as the Acting Army Acquisition Executive, I believe the Army is more likely to succeed when acquisition has Army Senior Leader involvement, stable and achievable requirements, accurate cost estimates, consistent funding, support from Congress, effective test plans, and a willingness to adapt as conditions change. The Army has failed in the past when any of these factors are not in place for a particular program.

The Army has over 700 programs, from very small ones to those of national-level importance. On a given day, most are doing well in terms of cost, schedule, and performance. However, many do have challenges. A notable recent success includes the Army's role in the Federal Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Army acquisition and contracting professionals found ways to use a wide range of authorities to develop therapeutics, procure protective equipment, and provide vaccines at a highly accelerated pace compared to normal acquisition program timelines. Among other recent successes are efforts to develop early versions of hypersonic and long-range strike systems via a rapid-prototyping approach that builds on proven technologies to limit technical risk.

At the same time, the Army has struggled on some programs for a variety of reasons. For example, while the programs are now performing well, moving the Armored Multi-Purpose Fighting Vehicle (AMPV) and M109A7 self-propelled howitzer programs into large-scale production were plagued with manufacturing and supply challenges. What those programs went through is illustrative of the challenge of going from small-scale prototyping to large-scale manufacturing. In the area of software, the Army has struggled at times to keep programs on budget and on schedule, often due to unclear requirements work up front or requirements creep during software development. In all these cases, I have found that the Army can find a path to success when the problems are clearly understood and all the appropriate stakeholders, including Congress, are involved in finding solutions.

Acquisition

15. If confirmed, what steps would you take to improve oversight in the requirements determination, resource allocation, or acquisition management processes?

Answer: If confirmed, I would work closely with Army Futures Command leadership to facilitate collaborative dialogue with the Program Executive Offices (PEOs) and ASA(ALT) staff throughout the requirements determination process. This upfront collaboration allows for the Army's trained Acquisition professionals to provide cost, schedule, and performance perspective for achievability of a requested capability. In the role of Co-Chair for the Strategic Portfolio Analysis Review and the development of the Program Objective Memorandum, I would provide oversight with an understanding that the Army works in a fiscally constrained environment. Managing risk, while considering the best capability for the warfighter, will always be first and foremost in my considerations for resource allocation during the budgetary process. As the Army's Acquisition Executive, I would reserve the right to withhold milestone decision-making authority for any program, and request the PEOs to provide regular program reviews to address risk areas, and bring potential issues to light as early in the development lifecycle as possible.

Acquisition

16. What roles do you see for developmental planning, prototyping, and experimentation in the fielding of future Army capabilities?

Answer: Developmental planning, prototyping, and experimentation will always be key ingredients for the success of defense acquisitions. When used appropriately, they can reduce the length and expense of programs by gaining valuable insights early in a program. Experimentation in realistic conditions can reveal entirely new uses for systems and allow the Army to find innovative ways to solve military problems. Prototyping is also very useful, but not all prototypes are equal. Some are almost "handmade" demonstrators, while others are very mature after having gone through earlier development efforts, often in the private sector. Understanding where a program's prototyping effort lies on that spectrum is the most vital factor in putting a plan in place to get from prototype to production.

Acquisition

17. How would you propose the Army better plan and prepare for weapon system sustainment as part of its acquisition activities?

Answer: I understand the importance of identifying sustainment costs and challenges early in the development cycle of a weapon system in order to control lifecycle sustainment costs. It is my understanding that the Army has several new efforts in this area underway. For example, gaining an understanding of a program's sustainment approach is directly related to the associated intellectual property (IP) approach. If the Army does not plan for IP well in advance, it is very difficult to do so later in a program, especially after production has begun. Another example is the need to identify early on in a program whether advanced manufacturing techniques, including additive manufacturing, should be integrated into a weapon system's design to enable more flexible sustainment options in the future. A final example would be understanding a system's supply chain to ensure that it is secure and dependable. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to evaluate the sustainment plans that Army program managers and acquisition professionals develop before recommending any additional potential changes that may be appropriate.

Acquisition

18. Given that Army acquisition failures have often resulted from technologically unachievable or conceptually flawed requirements, how could you help the Army avoid these pitfalls, if confirmed?

Answer: Army acquisition receives program requirements from many elements of the Army. If confirmed I would work closely with Army leaders, such as the CSA, VCSA, AFC Commander, AMC Commander, and the Army G-2, to facilitate collaborative dialogue throughout the requirements determination process. Having trained acquisition professionals provide an early assessment of technological achievability would help ensure requirements are not written with apparent conceptual flaws. As a voting member of the Army Requirement Oversight Committee, I would ensure that all new requirements are vetted for cost, schedule and performance risks, from a materiel perspective. If a requirement is deemed improbable for long-term success, I would provide recommendations for change, or non-concur with the approval until the concept is modified for achievability.

Acquisition

19. How can the Department of Defense and the Army better access and integrate commercial and military technology to remain ahead of potential adversaries? If confirmed, how would you balance the need to undertake prototyping, experimentation, and rapid acquisition with the demands of managing the execution of the Army's programs using other acquisition pathways, such as major capability acquisition?

Answer: The Army's ability to modernize and maintain a decisive advantage over its adversaries requires the ability to effectively integrate innovative technologies, including those developed by the defense industrial base and those found in the commercial sector. If confirmed, I would look to leverage commercial innovation whenever appropriate, including in those instances where technologies already exist in the private sector and can be adopted quickly by the Army either "off the shelf" or with minimal development. I would also work to focus the Army's development efforts on military-unique capabilities that address gaps needed to enable Soldiers to have a decisive advantage in combat.

Additionally, if confirmed, I would work to ensure that Army develops acquisition strategies that employ the full range of statutory authorities, as needed and as appropriate, to ensure the rapid development and delivery of capabilities. These strategies may also include employing a combination of multiple acquisition pathways to obtain value not otherwise available through use of a single pathway, or to address specific risks to program objectives. If confirmed, I would also work with program managers and PEOs to ensure that acquisition strategies successfully balance the need for rapid development of new capabilities with the need to ensure that such capabilities are effective and safe for Soldiers.

Cost and Schedule Estimates

GAO has reported that the Army's use of unrealistically optimistic cost and schedule estimates is a major contributor to cost growth and program failure.

20. If confirmed, what specific steps would you take to ensure that cost and schedule estimates for Army programs are fair and independent, and that such estimates provide a sound basis for decision-making?

Answer: Gaining insight from a wide a range of cost estimating experts both in and outside the Army is essential to properly bounding cost risk for a program. In my experience, the ASA(ALT) staff and program offices have in recent years developed a positive and collaborative working relationship with both the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Cost and Economics office and the OSD Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office to ensure that the fair and independent cost estimates they develop are based on the best available program data. I would continue to support those relationships and the resulting open dialogue, if confirmed.

Cost and Schedule Estimates

21. If confirmed, what specific steps would you take to improve the estimation of life cycle sustainment costs for Army systems?

Answer: In my view, the Army has made great strides establishing Operational Sustainment Reviews (OSRs). While the Army has increased the capture of sustainment data in the Global Combat Support System-Army, if confirmed, I would look to improve the data quality by automating data capture and distributing Soldier input using tablet computers at the Soldier/mechanic-level to provide needed visibility in parts and equipment usage data (miles and hours), labor and failure data to improve reliability. If confirmed, I would work to improve tracking the visibility of both allocation and execution of depot maintenance and Sustainment Systems Technical Support linked directly to a weapon system.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

22. What is your understanding of the role of the ASA(ALT) with respect to the IT acquisition and software activities of the Army?

Answer: Section 7016 of Title 10 U.S. Code states that the principal duty of the ASA(ALT) is the overall supervision of acquisition, technology, and logistics matters of the Department of the Army. ASA(ALT) oversight includes acquisition and support of Information Technology (IT), software and business transformation systems; and decision authority for software acquisition pathway programs. The ASA(ALT) works closely with the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and Deputy Chief of Staff, G-6, in all matters related to IT and ensures that all IT and software systems are designed, built, and tested to meet regulatory and statutory requirements including but not limited to those related to re-use, interoperability, and cybersecurity. ASA(ALT)'s role in IT and software is distinguished from the CIO's role of budget review, IT standards compliance, interoperability, and requirements generation.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

23. If confirmed, how would you plan to address systemic and persistent cultural, process, and technical barriers to improving the Army's treatment of software activities and IT acquisition?

Answer: If confirmed, I would strengthen ASA(ALT) relationships with AFC, the CIO and G6 in order to synchronize and streamline the acquisition of software and IT capabilities. I would set policy, guidance, standards, and best practices in order to maximize the flexibility and speed of the PEOs and PMs to acquire and deploy software and IT capabilities. I would also collaborate within the Army, the Department of Defense (DOD), and with industry partners to capture lessons learned, pain points, and opportunities for increased IT and software agility to create a win/win environment for all stakeholders. In addition, if confirmed, I would seek to exploit new authorities and flexibilities provided by Congress to fundamentally shift software and IT development activities out of traditional acquisition pathways and into the new software acquisition pathway. It is my understanding that the Army already has six software development efforts using this new pathway but, in my view, much more can be done in this area.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

24. If confirmed, how would you work with the research and testing community, the Army's Chief Information Officer, and with the other Military Services—including their Chief Information Officers—in the development and deployment of Army business IT systems?

Answer: The Army possesses a mature business IT system environment and infrastructure across program management, requirements development, and testing. If confirmed, I would continue to engage stakeholders through the Army Business Council, programming and budgeting forums, and Army acquisition decision boards. The Army is assessing how to modernize and sustain its business systems and it will leverage emerging commercial and government technologies where requirements are aligned to save funding and to provide better capability. Also, if confirmed, I would continue to engage with partner Military Services where similar systems are in development or in fielding to leverage the lessons learned and investments made, and to avoid duplication.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

25. If confirmed, what would be your highest priority IT and software-related initiatives?

Answer: If confirmed, I would prioritize the use of best commercial practices for reuse, modularity, development of IT and software efforts. For example, I would fully support the use of cloud capabilities and open source software that enable data driven decisions and standards while ensuring open competition. In my view, the highest priority for software and IT should be capitalizing on cloud and data technologies, which work hand in hand, and institutionalizing their use throughout every aspect of Army operations. The cloud enables the Army to separate software and IT development from the management of hosting infrastructure, offering the opportunity to do both more efficiently, while also allowing the Army to leverage data to improve decision making, automate processes, and gain insights that would have otherwise gone unknown. A second priority would be moving more Army software development efforts into the new software acquisition pathway to ensure that the significant flexibilities provided by this new pathway are used to the move to a more modern approach to software development.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

26. If confirmed, what major improvements would you make in the Army's development and deployment of major IT systems and services and software programs?

Answer: If confirmed, I would leverage best practices and partnerships that enable data centric and Modular Open System Approach (MOSA) that reduces risk for modernization of IT systems and software programs. Simultaneously, I would work to ensure the decoupling of software from hardware and support cloud capabilities, the use of plug and play modules, and the re-use of interfaces across the enterprise. I would also promote the use of agile processes and Development, Security and Operations (DEVSECOPS) environments in order to achieve the same rapid-release cycles that private industry is able to achieve.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

27. In your view, what is the appropriate relationship between the Army's efforts to implement enterprise IT programs and supporting computing services and infrastructure to support Army missions, and the efforts being undertaken by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)?

Answer: In my view, Army enterprise IT programs, computing services and infrastructure provide a broad set of capabilities in support of the Army's mission. Partnering with DISA and utilizing the services as appropriate to obtain efficiencies and cost savings will remain a consideration and potential course of action. This is critical as the Army moves towards joint operations in support of Multi-Domain Operations and Joint All-Domain Command and Control.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

28. If confirmed, how would you coordinate the development or procurement of cloud computing services within the Army with other Department of Defense and federal government cloud computing initiatives?

Answer: The 2020 Army Cloud Plan communicates the Army's strategy for utilizing cloud computing technologies in order to ensure our Soldiers and Civilians are more skillful than any potential adversary and the U.S. maintains overmatch in the information realm. In March 2021, the Army awarded an enterprise contract for commercial cloud computing services, thus providing a single procurement vehicle to optimize Army's enterprise cloud spend. The Army contract provides critical capabilities required; particularly after the cancellation of DoD's Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure (JEDI). If confirmed, I would support Army and DoD enterprise contract initiatives that provide the Government with best-in-class performance and cost advantages that the Army's significant buying power affords. Today, the Army collaborates with the DoD's Cloud Computing Program Office on requirements for the new Joint Warfighter Cloud Capability (JWCC) contract. If confirmed, I will work diligently with the Army CIO, DoD CIO and Service Acquisition Executives to ensure Army's equities are included within the JWCC and it provides the capabilities required to enable Joint Multi-Domain Operations.

Software Activities and Acquisition of Information Technology (IT)

29. Where do you believe the best opportunities for collaboration and joint execution between the Army and Defense Digital Service (DDS) might exist?

Answer: I understand that the Army has a successful working relationship with the Defense Digital Service (DDS) and they report directly to the Secretary of the Army. To date, DDS contributes to the Cyber Institute at Augusta University and played a significant role in Hack-the-Army and Hack-the-Pentagon events. If confirmed, I look forward to additional opportunities for collaboration and joint execution between the Army and DDS. The DDS office significantly contributed in assisting with the Department's COVID response, and is capable of adding value to the most challenging cyber security issues. The Army will also benefit from continued partnership with DDS concerning their work in Counter–UAS.

Middle Tier Acquisition

Section 804 of the FY 2016 NDAA authorized DOD to employ an acquisition approach ("Middle Tier Acquisition") that was intended to support the rapid delivery of new capability to meet emerging operational needs.

30. In your view, what benefit has the Department of the Army derived from its use of Section 804 authorities?

Answer: In my view, the use of Middle Tier Section 804 authorities has yielded significant benefits to the Army, most notably by streamlining the documentation and approval process for the pursuit of mature integrated technologies. The rapid prototyping and fielding acquisition pathways also facilitate an iterative process for developing weapon system requirements that incorporates Soldier feedback through experimentation with prototypes or proofs of concept. These approaches have allowed the Army to develop informed requirements and better leverage mature technologies in the development of modernized systems. Use of these acquisition pathways also provides significantly more flexibility to adjust a program's requirements or production quantities to meet new and emerging Army needs as compared to the traditional 5000.02 series model. If used carefully, these pathways should allow the Army to develop and acquire new capabilities much more quickly than in the past.

Middle Tier Acquisition

31. What risks have accrued and been accepted by the Army as a consequence of the use of these authorities?

Answer: As with any acquisition program, those programs employing the Middle Tier of Acquisition authority do contain some level of risk. I believe, the most significant risk is related to the transitioning of a prototype effort into production. It is critical that systems have reached an appropriate level of maturity before they are transitioned into fielding or production in order to ensure producible, safe, and effective capabilities are delivered to Soldiers. Another risk is cost growth. The flexibilities inherent in this new authority, such as not having traditional program baselines in many cases, could create conditions that allow cost growth if a disciplined management process is not in place to control it. If confirmed, I will ensure appropriate oversight of the use of this authority, as well as the identification and mitigation of any risks.

Middle Tier Acquisition

32. If confirmed, what processes would you put in place to ensure appropriate oversight of the Department's use of 804 authorities? Please explain your answer.

Answer: In creating the 804 authorities, Congress granted the Army significant flexibilities compared to traditional acquisition processes. With these increased flexibilities comes a responsibility to aggressively manage program cost, schedule, and performance risk, as well as establishing effective two-way communications with Congress. If confirmed, I would comprehensively assess current Army processes to ensure that systems developed under the Middle-Tier Acquisition authorities are mature and prepared for transition to production. I would work with PEOs and program managers to ensure that acquisition strategies address specific risks associated with the transition, to include compliance with formal program of record requirements where appropriate, employment of required developmental and operation testing as required, material release and safety reviews, and sustainment planning, among others. If confirmed, I would work to ensure that these and other relevant concerns are addressed in the program's strategy and oversight and review processes, and I would implement any changes needed.

Middle Tier Acquisition

33. What best practices can the Army employ to generate realistic and technically achievable specifications, particularly in sophisticated, rapidly-evolving technical areas such as cybersecurity, long range precision fires, and artificial intelligence?

Answer: I believe the Army employs a number of best practices to ensure realistic and technically sound requirements and specifications. These include use of early prototyping and experimentation, increased use of modeling and simulation and digital engineering tools, use of independent technology readiness assessments to ensure technical maturity. This also includes close and early collaboration between the requirements developers and S&T community in AFC and PMs who oversee acquisition efforts. In addition, the use of broad market research and constant communication with industry regarding Army capability gaps are critical to success in developing new warfighting capabilities. In the areas of cybersecurity and artificial intelligence this is especially salient as the vast majority of innovation in these areas resides in the private sector. If confirmed, I would reinforce the use of these, and other, best practices to ensure development of realistic and achievable specifications.

Middle Tier Acquisition

34. In your view, does the Army have the flexibility to shift between acquisition pathways if a program warrants such a change in strategy?

Answer: Yes, in my view the Army has the flexibility it needs to shift between acquisition pathways, as appropriate. The Adaptive Acquisition Framework provides the Army the ability to use multiple pathways to obtain value not otherwise available through use of a single pathway. As part of ongoing program oversight through various venues, the ASA(ALT) must continuously assess the acquisition strategy, program risks, and appropriate mitigation approaches called for in a particular program or development effort. For larger programs, any shift in pathway would also have to be coordinated with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment. If confirmed, I would utilize these reviews to determine whether any changes, to include a shift in the acquisition pathway, are warranted.

Contracting

35. What are the major challenges facing the Army with respect to contracting activities?

Answer: There are many challenges with respect to contracting, but two in particular stand out. First, I think a major challenge, affecting not only the Army, but all of Government, are the barriers to entry for companies that would not normally do business with the Army. The use of flexible contracting mechanisms, such as Other Transaction Authority or the pilot Commercial Solutions Offering, are minimizing bureaucratic processes and opening up lines of communication with non-traditional defense contractors. In my view, the Army needs to do a better job of understanding and applying innovation from the private sector.

A second major challenge is creating and maintaining more "contracting capacity" to both speed the contracting process and provide surge capacity for emergency situations. While having a larger contracting workforce is an option, a more likely path of success given funding limitations is developing tools and training to increase the efficiency of the contracting workforce already in place. In Fiscal Year 2020, the Army completed more than 200,000 separate contracting actions. Even small gains in efficiency may have outsized results.

Contracting

36. What additional flexible contracting authorities might you recommend the Congress enact?

Answer: I know the Army appreciates the flexible contracting authorities already provided by Congress. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to serve in the position before recommending any potential additional authorities that may be needed.

Contracting

37. Do you perceive that the Army is making appropriate use of non-FAR-based contracting approaches, such as Other Transaction Authority (OTA)? If confirmed, how might you modify the Army's efforts to and processes for the use of these approaches?

Answer: Yes, I think the Army is making appropriate use of non-FAR based contracting approaches. I recently reviewed the findings from the DOD Inspector General and General Accountability Office related to the award of Other Transactions and noted that the findings highlighted the need for more transparency and consistency, especially when awarding Other Transactions through consortium based agreements, but did not identify any breach of law or procedure by the Army. I am also in agreement with recent congressional language related to improving accessibility and reporting of information related to the exercise of other transaction authority. If confirmed, I intend to improve the Army's ability to quickly provide details related to individual projects through enhanced reporting. Additionally, if confirmed, I intend to work to strike an appropriate balance between flexibility and oversight in the execution of non-FAR based approaches and evaluate the effectiveness of FAR based and non-FAR based approaches to help ensure the appropriate authorities are being used to achieve the intended objectives.

Contracting

38. If confirmed, how would you ensure that Army personnel are properly trained in the use of non-FAR-based contracting methodologies?

Answer: In my judgment, proper use of non-FAR based approaches is essential to the effective use of these authorities. If confirmed, I will support the USD(A&S) "*Back to Basics*" initiatives, and DOD's work with the Defense Acquisition University to establish training for the use of Other Transactions. Within the Army, if confirmed, I will enhance training on the use of non-FAR instruments, including the dissemination of best practices and lessons learned by the seasoned practitioners, and review the minimum requirements for personnel authorized to execute these non-FAR based authorities. The requirements strengthen the ability to include appropriate safeguards while executing innovative approaches.

Contracting

39. In your view, what are the general advantages and disadvantages of FAR and non-FAR based contracting approaches, respectively?

Answer: In my view, the FAR-based approach includes numerous controls designed to reduce risks to operational, reporting, and compliance objectives. These controls help the system operate with openness, integrity, and fairness while fulfilling important public policy objectives. However, many controls are perceived as inconsistent with commercial marketplace practices, and the sheer number of accumulated controls has been criticized for endangering the cost, schedule, and performance outcomes the system purports to uphold.

Non-FAR based approaches offer many advantages, including flexibility, teaming, increased communication with industry, speed, and access to the broadest possible pool of prospective vendors, especially with respect to non-traditional contractors. I believe the Army has been able to overcome the barriers to entry that non-traditional defense contractors often face with traditional FAR-based contract arrangements through the use of non-FAR based approaches. The lack of controls as compared to the FAR-based approach must be balanced by proper judgment to ensure the Government's interests are adequately protected.

Multiyear Procurement Contracts

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, establishes the criteria that are prerequisite to a Military Department's exercise of multiyear contract authority.

40. What types of programs are appropriate for the use of multiyear contracts, in your view?

Answer: In my view, a multiyear (MY) contract must have stable requirements and be expected to remain substantially unchanged during contract execution. Contract cost and anticipated cost avoidance through the use of a MY contract needs to be realistic and provide significant savings when compared to the use of single year contracts. In my judgment, the Army should only enter into MY contracts when the Army is confident that adequate funds for the program will be programmed in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP).

Multiyear Procurement Contracts

41. If confirmed, how would you ensure that the Army fully complies with the requirements of section 2306b?

Answer: If confirmed, I would work with the relevant Army stakeholders to ensure that analysis has been conducted to satisfy the 10 USC 2306(a) findings to enter into multiyear contracts. I will thoroughly consider these findings to ensure that they are supported by facts. Further, for those multiyear contracts that require Secretary of Defense certification, I will work with the relevant DoD organizations and provide the necessary preliminary findings (10 USC 2306(a)) to ensure that they are supported by a preliminary cost analysis performed by the Director of Cost assessment and Program Evaluation.

Multiyear Procurement Contracts

42. What is your understanding of the requirement that a multiyear contract result in "significant savings," as compared to the cost of carrying out a program through annual contracts?

Answer: I understand that a multiyear (MY) contract needs to result in significant savings when compared to a series of single year contracts spanning the life of the proposed MY contract. There is no official definition for the word "significant" when it is referring to a specific percentage or a dollar value of savings for a multiyear contract. Currently, a goal of a minimum savings of 10 percent is expected. Due to a high value of some MY contracts, I believe that a percentage less than 10 percent may be acceptable. Each contract needs to be evaluated separately and determined to be a significant cost savings for the U.S. Government.

Multiyear Procurement Contracts

43. What is your understanding of the requirements regarding the timing of a Department of Defense request for legislative authorization of a multiyear procurement contract for a particular program?

Answer: I understand that the Army may not enter into a multiyear (MY) contract in an amount equal to or greater than \$500,000,000 unless the contract is specifically authorized by a law other than an Appropriations Act. In the case of the Apache and Blackhawk programs, I understand that the discussions leading to the requested required Authorization Act language started years before it was included as part of the FY22 Presidential Budget Request. This has given all the concerned entities within the Army and OSD enough time to contemplate the benefits of a MY, as well as enough time to program funding for such a contract.

Multiyear Procurement Contracts

The Navy budget request for fiscal year 2022 included insufficient funding to avoid breaking a multiyear contract for the DDG-51 destroyer program. The committee views this action as breaking a moral commitment from the Department to fully fund multiyear procurement programs for the duration of the contract. Such an action should only be taken in the direct of circumstances. The Army also manages multiyear contracts.

44. Can you assure the committee that you intend to fully fund any multiyear contracts within the purview of the Army in future budget requests and that you would only recommend a budget request that fails to do so in a dire emergency?

Answer: I understand that the Army does lay out future funding in the FYDP that covers the cost associated with each multiyear contract. Barring any unforeseen national emergency/disaster, I can assure the committee that, if confirmed, I will work with the Army financial stakeholders to prioritize each multiyear contract for full funding for every year that it is active.

Test and Evaluation

45. Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe it appropriate to procure weapons systems and equipment that have not been demonstrated through test and evaluation to be operationally effective, and operationally suitable?

Answer: I do not believe it is ever appropriate to procure weapons systems the Army intends to field to its Soldiers before it is adequately tested and proven safe and effective – this is paramount. Through testing we are able to determine whether a system is suitable, survivable and effective. If confirmed, I will always ensure we adequately test all Army systems in order to provide the best equipment available to our Soldiers to improve their ability to accomplish the mission.

Test and Evaluation

46. What do you see as the role of the developmental and operational test and evaluation communities with respect to rapid acquisition, spiral acquisition, and other streamlined acquisition processes?

Answer: I view the developmental and operational test and evaluation processes for rapid acquisition, spiral acquisition and other streamlined acquisition processes much the same as the normal test and evaluation processes. The challenge is to accomplish the test mission quicker to meet the urgent needs of the Warfighter. The Army must conduct enough testing to determine the capabilities and limitations of any system before fielding. The Army must also ensure all systems are safe to use before putting them into the hands of our Soldiers. One way the Army is helping to speed up the testing process is by including Soldier touch points earlier during developmental testing, thereby gaining critical operational insights much sooner than what the Army was able to accomplish in the past.

Test and Evaluation

47. In your view, does the Department of the Army have adequate test and evaluation organizations, resources, and capabilities necessary to ensure that there is a sound basis for key requirements, acquisition, and budget decisions?

Answer: In my view, the Army's Test and Evaluation Enterprise has adequate test and evaluation organizations, resources, and capabilities necessary to test and evaluate the Army's priority modernization programs and also to provide test services for critical acquisition programs across the joint force.

Test and Evaluation

48. In which areas, if any, do you feel the Army should be developing new test and evaluation capabilities?

Answer: The Army is already investing significant resources to ensure it can test all Army modernization priority programs. I understand it is also leveraging the DoD managed Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program (CTEIP) funds to procure test capabilities when the Army currently has a gap—autonomy is an example of a current investment area that is focused on a future test requirement. Artificial intelligence, machine learning, electronic warfare and cyber are other areas that require attention now. I feel that the Army must also ensure that it tests systems in all the operational environments the Army intends to use the equipment. INDOPACOM, EUCOM and the Arctic present vastly different environments from those the Army operated in over the last 20 years. If I am confirmed, I will work to ensure the Army Test and Evaluation Enterprise is adequately resourced to test all systems to include the relevant operational environments of the systems intended use.

Test and Evaluation

49. In your view, would there be benefit to the Department's establishment of a comparative testing program for domestic commercial technologies—perhaps a program modeled on the successful Foreign Comparative Testing program?

Answer: Yes, there would potentially be a benefit. There is always benefit if we can find ways to provide advanced technologies for warfighters without expensive development costs. Doing this for domestic commercial technologies would also keep the Army within the bounds of statutory requirements, such as the Buy American Act (which requires Federal Agencies to procure domestic materials and products) and the Berry Amendment (which requires the Department of Defense to use American textile materials and products). The challenge, in my view, is working with the requirements community when these technologies are close to, but below, the threshold requirements to either accept the lower performance or establish an incremental improvement path that is timely and affordable. If confirmed, I would explore the feasibility of some form of a comparative testing program for commercial technologies.

Technology Transition

The Department of Defense continues to struggle with the transition of new technologies into existing programs of record and major weapons systems and platforms. Further, the Department also has struggled with moving technologies from the Department's programs rapidly into the hands of operational users.

50. What impediments to technology transition do you perceive to exist within the Army?

Answer: The Army has a mixed record in the area of technology transitions, with many successes, but also many situations where a promising technology was not able to move rapidly into production and fielding. There are many reasons for this situation, but two stand out in my view.

The first is a lack of funding flexibility. Modern Congressional appropriation and authorization acts prescribe the use of funding in a highly detailed manner, including hundreds of specific research and development and procurement lines. As a result, there are few large scale, flexible pools of funding that the Army can draw on to pursue a new opportunity that comes along unless it uses reprogramming authority. While reprograming does provide the Army with great flexibility, it is a limited resource that the Army must carefully manage to ensure that responses to true emergencies, such as a natural disasters or unforeseen deployments, can be funded. This necessarily limits its use for technology transitions. In cases where Congress has provided more flexibility, such as the counter-IED efforts that took place during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Army has been able to transition technologies much more rapidly.

A second impediment is a lack of dialogue between the innovators and the "receiving" elements of the Army regarding what is required to transition a prototype or commercial technology to a militarily useful system that is fully tested, safe, effective, and sustainable. For example, the Army can conduct an experiment to demonstrate a technology's combat effectiveness, but often does not—absent some kind of emergency need—enter into formal program until the technology is sufficiently mature to be tested and qualified against all the safety and certification requirements necessary to field a combat capability. This can take time, and can lead to understandable frustration on the part of the innovators that are trying to bring new technology to the Army. In my view, more detailed dialogue earlier in technology development efforts can help bridge this divide and lead to more successful technology transitions.

Technology Transition

51. To what extent could and should the Army Research Laboratory and other Army combat capability development centers play a greater role in enabling the transition of promising technologies from a successful initial demonstration to a program-of-record, which may include working with industry and the desired program executive officer (PEO) to develop and assist with a systems engineering plan necessary to achieve transition to the PEO?

Answer: In my assessment, the Army can no longer have technology developers work in "silos-of-excellence." I understand the value of early collaboration and frequent communication between the Requirements, Science and Technology, Acquisition, Test, and Sustainment communities; along with the Army's academic and industry partners; and, most importantly, Soldiers. However, I do not believe the Army needs more processes mandated in legislation in this area at this time. Instead, I believe the Army needs to better coordinate the efforts of those developing innovative solutions with the authorities and funding to proceed to production and fielding at scale. The Army also needs better metrics to measure success and failure of these efforts so our progress can be tracked by Army leaders and Congress. It is my understanding that many efforts in this area are underway between Army Futures Command and PEOs, but there is always more that can be done to facilitate success in this area. If confirmed, I will encourage these communities to collaborate and have Army scientists, engineers and PEOs work together to mature technologies and provide cutting edge capabilities to Soldiers.

Technology Transition

52. In your view, what can be done from a budget, policy, and organizational standpoint to facilitate the transition of technologies from science and technology programs and other sources, including small businesses, venture capital-funded companies, and other non-traditional defense contractors, into acquisition programs?

Answer: If confirmed, I will ensure the Army is leveraging all statutory authorities and acquisition flexibilities to facilitate technology transition from science and technology (S&T) efforts, including those originating from industry partners, small businesses, non-traditional contractors, and venture-capital funded companies. Mapping S&T and other technology programs, such as the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Technology Maturation Initiative (TMI) programs, to acquisition transition milestones is an effective approach to accelerate transformative technology solutions for Army problems. Another area to explore is working with OSD level centers of innovation, such as DARPA, SCO, DIU, and others, to bring together innovators and elements of the Army that need help. I understand that the Army has had several successful collaborations with these groups, but more can be done. If confirmed, I would also endeavor to work with Congress to explore new ways to provide more flexible funding that would allow the rapid realignment of available funds to meet unexpected opportunities, especially in areas where technology is rapidly advancing. If confirmed, I will send a clear message to the American innovation community that commercial success and technology partnership with the Army are not mutually exclusive.

Procurement Sourcing Issues

53. How should the Army balance the "pros" and "cons" of supporting the domestic industrial base through Army procurement activities, as compared to procuring items from friendly partner nations, as further compared to procuring items from commercial providers globally, including potentially from China?

Answer: In my view, the Army should always look first to the domestic industrial base for its procurement needs. American companies, run by American entrepreneurs and employing hardworking Americans, have been and will remain one of our strongest advantages over our competitors. At the same time, in a world of integrated and global supply chains, we should also always look to see what is available from our allies and partner nations. In many cases, American companies work closely with international partners in these countries, providing a chance for many win-win scenarios. Given the many well-documented cases of intellectual property theft, lack of supply chain reliability, and security risks of procurements from China, I believe the Army must carefully review its procurements from that country. If confirmed, I expect to work with appropriate elements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense that are conducting reviews of domestic sourcing policies.

Procurement Sourcing Issues

54. What are your views on U.S. and friendly nation content requirements, also known colloquially as "Buy America" requirements, for U.S. Army weapon systems?

Answer: In general, while ideally all Army needs—in terms of quality, quantity, and price would be met by American industry, I believe the Army needs flexibility to make informed case-by-case decisions on the amount of foreign content allowed in weapon systems. In most cases, current laws and policies provide that flexibility. However, I support data-driven approaches that lead to increased American content in Army equipment while also keeping programs affordable.

There is tremendous variation of domestic versus foreign content within the broad range of Army weapon systems. As a result, a metric that proposes a rigid percent of content for the entire bill of material may make some products with low risk impossible to procure. Many unique military items are bought in extremely low density, making it uneconomical for a business to sustain production. Once the Army has determined which components are at greatest risk, there may be a better subset of materials to apply a content-based requirement for procurement from U.S. and friendly nations. If confirmed, I would work to examine the Army's policies in this area, which are evolving rapidly based on new policies being developed across the Federal Government.

Procurement Sourcing Issues

55. In your view, for which types of U.S. Army weapon systems, or which types of components, are such requirements appropriate or inappropriate?

Answer: Generally, in my view, the Army's larger ACAT I programs tend to be the most appropriate, along with Information and Communication Technologies. If confirmed, I would stress the importance of maintaining munition production capability that is tied to a resilient supply chain of chemicals and raw materials. I would also offer that smaller, more commercial programs are less appropriate for the requirement.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

56. What is your understanding and assessment of the systems and processes for identifying, evaluating, and managing risk among the entities that form the Army industrial base, including its organic industrial base, and supply chain?

Answer: I understand that the Army industrial base risk assessment process addresses the risks to the industrial base in its resiliency, its ability to support and sustain acquisition programs, and the need to meet future requirements. It is also important to identify foreign dependency and risk mitigations where appropriate. In my view, integral to this assessment is ensuring the Organic Industrial Base is factored in to address the Army's ability to surge and sustain its systems during any emergency.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

57. What is your view of the current health of the defense industrial base, including the organic industrial base that supports the Army?

Answer: In my view, the current industrial base is overall well-positioned to support the development and sustainment of weapon systems. However, constant attention must be paid to address challenges the industrial base faces. Consistent investment in both the commercial and organic bases are required to ensure a ready and capable source of innovation and sustainment to support the Army's requirements. As in the past, I believe the Defense Industrial Base will need to consolidate or expand based on available resources and demand.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

58. How should Army acquisition leaders consider impacts on the industrial base when addressing requirements for recapitalization or modernization of major end items such as tanks, tactical wheeled vehicles, or key repair parts?

Answer: In my view, the Army should look at recapitalization and modernization as opportunities to help strengthen the industrial base, both commercial and organic. Ideally, having an existing industrial base in production not only provides a surge capability, it also helps smooth a transition to a recapitalization or modernization effort. Once production ends, the time and cost required to restart a facility or train a workforce to recap or modernize increases. Managing a major end item already in production requires stable, predictable funding to maintain a sustainable rate.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

59. If confirmed, what changes, if any, would you pursue in systems and processes to improve identification, monitoring, and assessment of actions to ensure that risk in Armyrelevant sectors of the defense industrial base is adequately managed?

Answer: If confirmed, I would continue to work closely with USD(A&S) to address service-level defense industrial base assessments and contributions to DOD-wide and whole-of-government assessments. Improving the visibility of the risks within the industrial base requires a holistic approach to ensure investments are impactful. Beyond visibility, policies must be put in place to rapidly address industrial base risk where it arises. Many such authorities, such as those under the Defense Production Act, already exist, but more may be needed given new circumstances. I have no specific recommendations to change existing systems and processes at this time. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to serve in the position before recommending any potential changes that may be appropriate.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

60. In your view, what actions should the Army take to maintain access to critical elements of the defense industrial base?

Answer: In my view, there are many areas where the Army must do more to protect crucial elements of the defense industrial base. In particular, I believe the Army needs to continue to invest in modernizing munition facilities not only for Army needs but to support the other services and coalition partners. The Army should focus limited resources on those programs within the Defense Industrial Base that provide the capabilities to contest the Army's near peer competitors, or where the DOD is the only customer for highly specialized items, such as large gun barrels used for artillery systems. In addition, I believe the Army must work with DOD to synchronize an all-of-government strategy in areas such as Micro-Electronics and Battery manufacturing. The Army should also continue to support the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) process that ensures accessibility to suppliers and prohibits the transfer of intellectual property to prohibited nations.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

61. If confirmed, what would you see as your office's role in working with or supporting efforts of the Army Office of Small Business Programs?

Answer: Small businesses play a critical role in all aspects of Army acquisition, logistics, and technology. If confirmed, I will work with the Army Office of Small Business Programs to ensure the Army employs a small-business centric philosophy; reduces barriers to entry; and leverages technology development programs such as the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR), xTech prize competitions, and Mentor-Protégé Program; acquisition programs in support of PEOs and PMs; and sustainment or logistic programs in support of Army depots and arsenals.

Army-Related Defense Industrial Base

62. If confirmed, what would you see as the relationship between your office and the Defense Innovation Unit?

Answer: The Office of the Secretary of Defense's technology-sector outpost, the Defense Innovation Unit (DIU), provides a mechanism for the services to connect with small, non-traditional businesses in the technology sector. I believe that small businesses across the non-traditional technology ecosystem are critical for modernization and innovation for the future Army. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Army is maximizing collaboration with DIU and other similar technology outreach initiatives.

Science and Technology

63. What is your understanding and assessment of the role that science and technology (S&T) programs have played and will play in developing capabilities for current and future Army systems?

Answer: I understand that the Army's current modernization strategy includes nine priority research areas: disruptive energetics, radio frequency electronic materials, quantum technology, hypersonic flight, artificial intelligence, autonomy, synthetic biology, material by design, and additive manufacturing. I agree with those priorities. Further, it is my view that Army S&T programs have played and will continue to play a crucial role in developing the six Army Modernization priorities: Long Range Precision Fires, Next Generation Combat Vehicle, Future Vertical Lift, Network, Air & Missile Defense and Soldier Lethality, as well as enable even more advanced capabilities for the future.

Science and Technology

64. If confirmed, how would you ensure that successful Army science and technology programs will transition to operational warfighting capabilities?

Answer: If confirmed, I will work with the Army S&T community and program offices to ensure S&T efforts are aligned to the Army Modernization Priorities and Programs of Record. One method for fostering effective transition pathways is through formalized transition agreements from S&T to programs of record and, ultimately, to the operational warfighter. These agreements, if overseen and managed at the appropriate level, are a proven way to increase the Army's rate of success in technology transition. If confirmed, another way I would consider increasing success in this area is to make S&T transition success the primary duty of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research & Technology, who would report directly to me.

Science and Technology

65. What is the role of university research in supporting Army modernization efforts and in developing the Army technical workforce for the future?

Answer: I understand the Army invests in a broad-based portfolio of university research in enduring and emerging Army-relevant technical areas, including those associated with the Army Modernization Priorities. These university-based investments form the basis for future applied research and advanced development efforts aligned to the modernization priorities, help prevent technological surprise by the Army's adversaries, and help to train the next generation of science and engineering professionals in areas of interest to the Army and to the overall Defense Innovation Base.

Laboratories and Test Centers

66. What experience do you have in working with the Army's labs and test centers?

Answer: While I have limited experience working directly with the Army labs and test centers, I am aware of their accomplishments from my previous roles in Congress and in the Army. If confirmed, I look forward to increasing my direct knowledge of the various labs, centers and most importantly, the expertise that those scientists and engineers bring to bear in solving the hard problems facing the Soldiers of today and tomorrow.

Laboratories and Test Centers

67. If confirmed, what steps would you take to assess and enhance the interaction between Army labs and test centers and with the acquisition community?

Answer: If confirmed, I will do everything I can to encourage these communities to collaborate and have Army scientists, engineers and PEOs work together to mature technologies and develop capabilities for warfighters. The Army labs rely on test centers to develop and demonstrate their capabilities and I would seek to understand what opportunities exist to make it easier to plan and support these efforts. I am confident that increasing senior leader oversight of efforts to bring these communities together will produce results. In addition, if confirmed, I would explore development of new management metrics to ensure that results are quantifiable and trackable.

Laboratories and Test Centers

68. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that the Army's labs and test centers can attract and retain a technical workforce with the necessary skills and capabilities?

Answer: If confirmed, I will ensure that the Army continues to expand outreach efforts to attract a diverse, highly-skilled technical workforce in order to address the Army's unique scientific challenges. It is my understanding that Army laboratories and centers have benefited from the hiring authorities, provided by Congress, to ensure the Army has the necessary technical experts. If confirmed, I will be committed to ensuring the Army continues to use these authorities to the greatest extent possible to recruit and retain science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) talent. I will ensure the Army continues to leverage the Army Educational Outreach Program to build a pipeline of STEM talent and scholarship for service initiatives like the DoD Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation, or SMART, program to bring that expertise into the Army workforce.

Laboratories and Test Centers

69. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that the Army's labs and test centers have the resources they need to acquire and maintain research and testing infrastructure and equipment?

Answer: I believe that modern infrastructure and equipment is vital to ensuring the Army stays at the cutting edge of technology and continues to recruit and retain the most talented personnel. If confirmed, I will engage with the appropriate stakeholders to better understand the infrastructure challenges, align investment and recapitalization priorities of Army laboratories and test facilities, and look for possible solutions and unique strategies to ensure the Army is making the necessary investments to sustain, restore, and modernize laboratories and test ranges.

Laboratories and Test Centers

70. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that the Army's labs and test centers are not inappropriately overburdened by bureaucratic Army or DOD regulations and practices that slow their processes and inhibit their ability to act as the Army's innovation engine?

Answer: If confirmed, I will work with the Army laboratories, test centers, and the science and engineering workforce to better understand the Army and DOD policies and regulations that slow their processes for modernizing laboratory and test infrastructure, affect their ability to hire the best technical talent, or inhibit their ability to deliver innovative technologies for current and future Army priorities. I will be committed to identifying and resolving the specific practices that delay these processes to ensure the Army's laboratories and test centers have the necessary infrastructure and technical personnel to act as the Army's innovation engine and be effective in performing their missions.

Senior Military and Civilian Accountability

71. If confirmed, what steps would you take to improve individual and organizational accountability in acquisition management?

Answer: In my view, accountability is fundamentally a function of proper management and oversight. In the case of Army acquisition, the "front line" of accountable officials resides in the Program Executive Offices (PEOs) where programs move through their entire life cycle. I believe the Army has the policies in place to hold officials professionally accountable for their performance. Based on my time as Acting Army Acquisition Executive, I can say that the acquisition professionals in the PEOs seek and accept responsibility for doing their jobs well. As leaders, they also understand that the needs of the Army come first, and that they are all subject to relief or replacement based on performance.

Another aspect of accountability is continuous and open professional dialogue so that when there is a program that runs into challenges, the issues driving the problems are well understood and communicated appropriately. If confirmed, I would reinforce the previous guidance I provided while Acting Army Acquisition Executive: that constant communication--especially regarding programs with challenges—is the standard of behavior I would expect all Army acquisition professionals to follow.

In addition, I would hold myself personally accountable for the performance of Army acquisition programs, and be responsible for communications to senior Army leaders, and to Congress, about any challenges they are facing.

Senior Military and Civilian Accountability

72. If confirmed, how would you propose to hold acquisition officials accountable for failing to follow acquisition laws and regulations?

Answer: Generally speaking, acquisition personnel at every level, to include the ASA(ALT), PEOs, and PMs, are required to comply with all acquisition laws and regulations. If confirmed as the ASA(ALT), I would ensure that accountability within individual programs is reinforced through routine program reviews, milestone decisions, technical reviews, and other program assessments. I would also ensure a close and collaborative relationship with the Army Office of General Counsel to review the Army's broader compliance with applicable statutes, regulations, and policies. Moreover, I would ensure that proper training and certification requirements are in place to educate and reinforce compliance within the Army acquisition workforce and to promote a culture of accountability and stewardship of taxpayer resources. Lastly, if confirmed, I would hold the individuals responsible and take appropriate action in response to violations of applicable laws and regulations.

Senior Military and Civilian Accountability

73. What are your views regarding the appropriate standard of accountability for senior civilian and military leaders of the Army with regard to acquisition program failures?

Answer: In my view, the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army are ultimately accountable for acquisition program outcomes. They are assisted in this effort by the ASA(ALT), PEOs, and PMs, who share accountability for the execution of acquisition programs. At every level, these civilian and military leaders are responsible for providing oversight and ensuring accountability for program objectives in terms of cost, schedule, and system performance. If confirmed, I would rigorously adhere to this standard and ensure that the acquisition workforce understands its shared accountability for these outcomes.

Senior Military and Civilian Accountability

74. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that senior leaders of the Army under your supervision and oversight are properly held accountable for their actions and performance?

Answer: If confirmed as the ASA(ALT), I would ensure senior acquisition leaders are held accountable through various mechanisms. First, I would conduct milestone and other program and technical reviews to ensure PEOs and PMs are held accountable to established acquisition program baselines and objectives. The ASA(ALT), as the Army Acquisition Executive, is also responsible for appointing, managing, and evaluating PEOs and direct-reporting program managers, and I would ensure that those evaluations accurately reflect the performance of the individual. As the Senior Procurement Executive, I would conduct routine reviews with the contracting enterprise and leadership to ensure proper use of resources when executing Army contracting actions. Lastly, across the acquisition enterprise, I would ensure proper training and certification requirements and would establish metrics to ensure compliance. In all of these efforts, I would work to promote a culture of responsibility and ownership of acquisition outcomes.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

The transformation of the armed forces has brought with it an increasing realization of the importance of efficient and forward-thinking management of the acquisition workforce.

75. What is your vision for the management and development of the Army acquisition workforce, including the scientific and technical fields?

Answer: In my judgment, to effectively modernize the Army over the next decade and beyond, the Army must continue to develop the necessary technical acumen and leadership competency within the acquisition workforce. If confirmed, talent management will be one of my top priorities and I will ensure we have the processes and tools in place for managing talent particularly in the areas of recruitment, development and retention. When it comes to competing for talent, the Army must continue to be innovative in finding ways to make the acquisition workforce a competitive employer including incentives for critical acquisition functional areas such as program management, contracting, and science and technology management.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

76. Do you believe that the Army has an appropriately sized acquisition workforce, with the proper skills, to manage into the future? If not, please describe the gaps you perceive to exist and how you would address them.

Answer: I believe the Army has a need to grow knowledge, skills, abilities in assessing and mitigating Supply Chain Risk. Army logicians will require additional analytical and critical thinking skills and training as part of Army's mission to secure its supply chains. We also have significant gaps in the software area. The Army needs to recognize that software is growing exponentially and develop strategies, skills and expertise to properly manage software intensive programs throughout the acquisition system lifecycle with a keen eye on reducing operational and sustainment costs.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

77. If confirmed, would you recommend any changes to the statutes, regulations, or policies regarding the Army's acquisition workforce? If so, what changes would you recommend?

Answer: The Civilian Acquisition Workforce Personnel Demonstration Project (AcqDemo) is currently slated to sunset in December 2023. Hiring restrictions and complex processes increase hiring timelines, exhaust valuable resources, and unnecessarily detract attention from the acquisition mission. The streamlined hiring and appointment authorities the Army has under AcqDemo are essential to the ability to attract and maintain a highly capable, agile, adaptive and professional workforce. If confirmed, I would consider pursuing a legislative proposal to make AcqDemo permanent.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

78. If confirmed, how would you work with the Defense Acquisition University and other educational institutions to improve the education and training of all members of the Army acquisition workforce?

Answer: In support of the OUSD A&S memo, dated September 2, 2020, "Back-to-Basics for the Defense Acquisition Workforce" it is my understanding that the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) is already leading the largest overall change to DOD Acquisition training in 30 years. If confirmed, I would continue to work with the DAU to minimize "scrap learning," focus on jobrelevant training, and foster a culture of life-long learning.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

79. In your judgment, how should decision-makers determine which acquisition tasks are best accomplished by government employees, military personnel, and support contractors?

Answer: In my judgment, acquisition tasks require all three categories in its workforce. Each brings different training, skills, and experience that should be considered when assigning work. Unless the task is inherently governmental in nature, which should be done by civilian or military personnel, all should be considered.

Management and Development of the Army Acquisition Workforce

80. How can the Army best make use of the foreign national technical talent that is being educated in the United States, so that these individuals continue to support U.S. national security efforts and are not attracted to work for competitor nations, while at the same time ensuring such talent is properly cleared from a security and suitability perspective?

Answer: In my view, it is critical that the Army, in close coordination with the Department of Defense, leverages all existing authorities to evaluate potential conflicts of interest and security concerns when partnering with academia. I believe a whole of government approach is required to truly address the problem by sharing grant and cooperative agreement award information across agencies and creating mechanisms for sharing adverse information across agencies.

Army Defense Capabilities

81. What is your opinion of the necessity of modernizing Army weapons systems in light of current and emerging threats?

Answer: In my opinion, modernizing Army capabilities must be a top priority. There is no responsible alternative. Army forces have lost overmatch in some critical areas as our potential adversaries have invested to exploit our known capability shortfalls, and new challenges often require new capabilities.

Army Defense Capabilities

82. If confirmed, how would you plan to balance Army readiness for today's conflicts and modernization for future conflicts?

Answer: If confirmed, I will work closely with the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff, and other Army senior leaders to strike the best balance between our investments in People, Readiness, and Modernization for both today and the future, within allocated resources.

Army Defense Capabilities

83. What are the most critical capabilities the Army needs to prioritize over the next 10 years, in your view?

Answer: In my assessment, the most critical capabilities that need to be modernized over the next 10 years are clearly represented in the Army's six modernization priorities: long-range precision fires, next generation combat vehicles, future vertical lift, the network, air and missile defense, and Soldier lethality. If confirmed, I will work closely with Army Futures Command and other Army commands to ensure our modernization priorities are continuously assessed, and refined when needed, to reflect the dynamic operational environment and the defense strategy.

Army Defense Capabilities

84. If confirmed, how would you plan to meet both Army capability and capacity requirements consistent with the Defense Planning Guidance?

Answer: I believe the Army must maintain sufficient capability and capacity in accordance with defense strategic guidance and within available resources. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary of the Army to assess its modernization priorities and adjust them, if necessary. Ultimately the Army needs sufficient resources to fulfill its role as part of the Joint Force responsible for deterring, and if necessary, defeating military aggression that threatens vital U.S. interests with acceptable risk to force and mission. If confirmed, I plan to work within the Army's allocated funding to ensure the most modern, ready, and lethal Soldiers possible.

Long-Range Precision Fires

85. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are all are pursuing long-range strike capabilities. In your view, what is the Army's role in developing and producing these capabilities and what is necessary to best position the Services to work together to avoid unnecessary duplication?

Answer: I agree that avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort among Service investments and capabilities is important. In my view, doing so starts with a Joint Warfighting Concept that clearly defines what Service forces are expected to accomplish as part of the Joint Force. However, what is perhaps sometimes seen as unnecessary duplication of effort within the Joint Force is also seen by potential adversaries as multiple, disparate ways to be defeated by US military forces. To me, complicating an enemy's calculus is an element of a good defense strategy. With regards to the Army as the Nation's land force, I take the view that the Army is charged in federal statute "for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned." If confirmed, I will work closely within the Army and across the Defense enterprise to avoid unnecessary duplication, while complicating our enemy's calculus.

Long-Range Precision Fires

The Army is rapidly fielding the Long-Range Hypersonic Weapon system at a substantial cost per glide-body based round.

86. What can be done to reduce the cost of subsequent rounds once the initial capability is fielded?

Answer: I believe the Army plans to continue to team with industry to improve upon the initial prototype design of the hypersonic missile in order to enhance the manufacturability and reduce costs. As production quantities increase there is a learning curve and a natural decrease in cost per round. As part of the Army's responsibilities in a Joint-Service Memorandum of Agreement for Hypersonics development, the Army is already actively working with its industry partners to transfer hypersonic technology from the government labs and into the commercial industrial base, which will further drive efficiencies as the technology moves into production. I feel that Congress has also been supportive of helping the Army achieve this goal of cost-saving for Hypersonics by granting additional congressional funds that have gone to the industrial base to directly support development, from which both the Army and Navy will benefit.

Long-Range Precision Fires

87. Do you believe the Army should assess possible alternative, cheaper capabilities, such as the air-breathing scramjet missile being developed by the Air Force?

Answer: Yes, I believe the Army, in coordination with the other services, should continue to assess future hypersonic technologies, to include air-breathing scram jet technologies, as they mature for integration into the long range fires portfolio. The priority of hypersonic development for the Army is the Long Range Hypersonic Weapon, which I understand will field in FY23, as the technology is mature and it will provide a near-term rapid national hypersonic capability.

Integrated Visual Augmentation System (IVAS)

The Army has made significant progress in a relatively short time with its IVAS program, which features Army soldiers are working side-by-side with Microsoft engineers to field-test the technology and make frequent changes as indicated by such testing. Additional improvements are expected.

88. In your view, are programs such as IVAS appropriately structured to provide the Army with flexibility to continue evolving the system and leverage improvements to better meet soldiers' needs?

Answer: Yes. In my view, all of the Army Middle Tier Acquisition (MTA) programs are structured to achieve the desired results within the five-year window for either rapid prototyping or rapid fielding. The Army MTA rapid prototyping efforts are tailored to leverage as much iteration as necessary between Soldier feedback and industry evolutionary improvements, based on the complexity and technology maturity. Soldier's needs and reliability are a paramount factor for success. IVAS is an excellent example of an MTA rapid prototyping effort that is adapting its schedule and funding to continue evolving the system to better meet the Army needs, as evidenced by shifting Initial Operational Test and Evaluation in order to improve functionality and reliability.

Integrated Visual Augmentation System (IVAS)

89. In your view, what factors should the Army consider when determining the quantities of quickly-evolving systems to acquire?

Answer: In my view, each case is unique, but in general factors to consider are: (1) the rate of change in that area of technology, (2) the cost to procure the system, (3) the cost to sustain the system, and (4) the possible need for surge capacity for the capability in question.

With regard to the rate of change for a technology, the Army should consider how long it would take to field the systems into the hands of warfighters and how long the critical technology remains relevant. An example of this type of technology is counter-UAS systems which are rapidly evolving as threat systems evolve. The Army must be careful not to over-invest in something that works today but will no longer be relevant a year from now.

The cost to acquire and sustain a system in a rapidly evolving technology area is frequently difficult to estimate. For example, the cost to acquire it may be low, but it may require highly specialized contractor support, which can prove very costly.

Surge capacity is a final factor to consider. What can start as a "niche" capability can, very quickly, become something that is needed across a large number of Army units. In this case, understanding industry's ability to potentially ramp up production is a critical factor.

Integrated Visual Augmentation System (IVAS)

90. Do you think there are ways the Army can position itself to build in flexibility for offramps or staggered buys when acquiring evolving technology?

Answer: I believe the Army has been successful with this acquisition approach when there is flexible funding and authorities are provided by Congress that allow a rapid shift of priorities in a rapidly evolving technology area. The Army's counter-IED effort—from MRAPs to jammers—during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is an example. A more recent, though smaller scale, example is the nascent counter-UAS efforts providing capability to deployed forces right now. Another path to success is designing capability using a Modular Open Systems Approach that will facilitate the ability to upgrade capability as more advanced technology becomes available. In addition, taking an incremental approach to providing system capability over time or fielding earlier with Urgent Materiel Releases when appropriate would allow for flexibility to keep pace with evolving technology.

Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle

The Army has made several attempts to develop a next-generation Infantry Fighting Vehicle to replace the aging Bradley Fighting Vehicle, including Future Combat System (FCS), Manned Ground Vehicle (MGV), Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV), and the initial Optionally Manned Fighting Vehicle (OMFV) effort that was halted and restructured.

91. What is your assessment of the restructured OMFV effort?

Answer: My assessment is that the current multiphase OMFV program strategy is a balanced way to procure a robust platform with sufficient size, weight, and power to integrate additional capabilities over time, while remaining responsive to emerging near peer threats in a Multi-Domain Operation environment. My understanding is that the shift from highly prescriptive requirements to a Characteristics of Need document is intended to provide industry trade space to develop optimized, achievable alternatives leading to digital design concepts and open architecture before committing to prototype builds. If confirmed, I will monitor this program closely to ensure that its new approach is executed successfully.

Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle

92. Why do you think the restructured OMFV program will succeed where the other efforts failed?

Answer: In my view, the current OMFV effort is fundamentally different than previous similar programs. First, acquisition processes have evolved in recent years, and the OMFV program is intended to take advantage of innovative approaches that will hopefully create a path to success for this vital capability. Most significant is the Adaptive Acquisition Framework which established a set of acquisition pathways to enable program managers and industry to tailor strategies to deliver better solutions faster. The restructured OMFV effort has an improved opportunity to succeed because the Army has an updated toolbox to take advantage of innovative ideas and the latest technologies surrounding design, program management, and manufacturing. Second, the OMFV program is pursuing a Modular Open Systems Architecture (MOSA) approach from the ground up to ensure that it is upgradable, sustainable, and affordable over time.

Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle

93. Several of the prior efforts failed due to requirements that were technologically unachievable and/or conceptually flawed. Do you believe the Army's requirements for OMFV are appropriately underpinned by robust analysis to avoid these pitfalls?

Answer: Yes. I am confident the path forward for the Army's requirements for the OMFV program, and the underlying analysis, is appropriately robust and will continue to evolve as technology and threats change. Lessons learned from Future Combat System (FCS) and Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) have been foundational to the establishment of Cross Functional Teams and codifying requirements commensurate with what exists and what the end state is when the Army begins to build a new fleet of next generation combat vehicles.

Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle

As part of the Army's Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle (OMFV) program, the Army is developing what it refers to as Common Modular Open Architecture (CMOA). The Army asserts that CMOA is designed to make it easier to plug a subsystem into a vehicle, even if the subsystem comes from a different manufacturer, through use of common software and hardware connectors. The Army notes that adopting CMOA would make it easier to upgrade combat systems; others have highlighted the possibility that the shift to modular and open architectures will result in increased initial procurement costs, while potentially lowering procurement costs later in a weapon system's lifespan.

94. What are your thoughts on CMOA—both as regards the Army and for its potential for interoperability with other Services' platforms?

Answer: I believe that the CMOA has the potential to fundamentally change the way we acquire capabilities as it will move the Army away from purchasing an entire platform and towards purchasing severable modules that can be used by multiple platforms. This enables better buying power, provides clear communication with industry about what components are needed and how they will integrate, and will reduce the logistics footprint. It will also increase the opportunities for horizontal integration and re-use across the Army and the other services. However, this design approach, in my view, will likely require more time up front, which could add to the program's early cost while hopefully paying off through savings later in the program's life.

I also believe this is the right program to attempt this approach at large scale. In my brief time as Acting Army Acquisition Executive, I authorized numerous sole-source contract awards as a result of the Army having limited intellectual property rights for major weapon system components. Hopefully, in the case of the OMFV, the Army can maintain competition for major system components that will lead to increased innovation and reduced costs.

Optionally-Manned Fighting Vehicle

95. In your view, what factors could be considered when assessing whether the upfront costs of the CMOA are worth the potential savings over the lifetime of the system?

Answer: I think the Army needs to consider the pace of technological change, component obsolescence, and whether the function provided by a given module is one that could be effectively used by multiple platforms. When technology for a given commodity area changes rapidly, the Army needs to keep that module severable so it can adopt the latest version. Similarly, I think we can use CMOA to guard against obsolete parts and avoid lifetime buys, instead integrating a form/fit/functional replacement that may be able to support multiple platforms. In addition, the length of time the Army intends to operate a weapon system is a critical factor. In my view, in areas where technology is changing so quickly that the Army is procuring systems it will only operate for a short time, a focus on CMOA is less appropriate.

Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT)

96. Given the expectation that the nation's ground forces may soon have to operate in GPS limited or denied environments, what priority do you think should be placed on developing alternative sources of PNT that are not dependent on GPS to function?

Answer: I believe that alternative sources of PNT are critically important to our Nation's ground forces, as well as the entire Joint Force. Army Futures Command has a PNT cross functional team, which attests to the importance the Army assigns to this capability.

Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT)

97. In your view, will GPS vulnerabilities remain, even after GPS is modernized with a new command and control system, M-Code satellites, and M-Code enabled receivers for platforms and weapons systems? Is there an enduring need for GPS alternatives in general, and for weapons guidance in particular?

Answer: I believe that PNT, like many battlefield capabilities, is a continuous competition between counter-measures and counter-counter-measures. Modernizing the Army's current capabilities is required, but doing so will not guarantee dominance forever. In my view, the Army must remain ever vigilant for adversary advancements, as well as new opportunities offered by technological advancements within the U.S. industrial base and those of our closest allies.

Integrated Personnel and Pay System – Army (IPPS-A)

The Army has recently announced a major delay in deploying capabilities as part of the IPPS-A program. This comes after many years of cost overruns, schedule delays, and changes in acquisition strategy.

98. What is your assessment of the causes of the problems that have faced the IPPS-A program?

Answer: I believe the Army is transforming its Human Resource processes from aging, disparate software systems to a fully integrated solution. This is a vast and complex undertaking that is necessary for Army talent management to succeed. Earlier efforts attempted to develop multiple major software releases in parallel, which proved too technically complex. Decisive steps were taken to rebaseline the program and reduce the technical complexity by eliminating the parallel software development efforts along with establishing a minimum viable solution. I am confident that the Army can resolve these technical issues to implement and deliver a fully integrated and working HR solution that can execute end-to-end Army business processes.

Integrated Personnel and Pay System – Army (IPPS-A)

99. What role should the Army's technical community, including at Army Developmental Command, have to address the technical challenges in the program?

Answer: I understand that the IPPS-A program leverages technical expertise from the Army's technical community, including those within the PEO EIS organization as well as the Army's Human Resource data subject matter experts. In my view, the Army should seek the expertise from scientists and engineers who provide the Army with organic research and development capability, as well as the office of the Chief Information Officer, as appropriate. This must be a collective effort where all resources are brought to bear on the challenges and the effort must include the right metrics as the program goes through development and testing. I am confident that the Army has access to the right resources to address the technical challenges in the program.

<u>Integrated Personnel and Pay System – Army (IPPS-A)</u>

100. What steps will you take to ensure that this program takes the appropriate steps to ensure the most effective and efficient deployment of this capability to soldiers?

Answer: I believe the Army understands the importance of this project and is greatly committed to delivering a modernized integrated Human Resource solution. If confirmed, I will continue to take the necessary steps to ensure the successful delivery of Release 3 in September 2022, as well as subsequent releases. I will continue to use the established metrics to measure and manage progress over time and share that data on a regular basis to Army senior leaders. I will also ensure the ASA(ALT) staff assists the PEO and PM in working directly with the prime contractor to ensure the Army delivers this transformational capability.

Technical Data

101. In your view, what are ways the Army can improve the process of obtaining the technical data needed to support requirements development, maintaining competition in the industrial base, developmental and operational testing, and sustaining systems and software?

Answer: In my view, intellectual property (IP), including technical data, plays a critical role in the Army's ability to modernize and sustain weapons. In order to ensure the Army obtains the appropriate IP necessary to achieve these objectives, programs must identify early in the process the IP needed in all phases of a system's life cycle, to include in sustainment. If confirmed, I would work to ensure that programs develop appropriate IP strategies early in the process and employ customized approaches to acquiring IP, to include working collaboratively with industry to develop mutually beneficial arrangements. I believe the Army must ensure adequate expertise is resident in the Army to allow programs to effectively identify, pursue, and negotiate IP rights and requirements. If confirmed, I will ensure that the policies and practices governing intellectual property provide the Army with the necessary access to effectively support weapons systems.

Systems Engineering

102. Do you believe that the Army has the systems engineering organizations, resources, and capabilities needed to ensure that there is a sound basis for key requirements, acquisition, contract oversight, and budget decisions on major defense acquisition programs?

Answer: In my assessment, the Army has the system engineering (SE) organizations that it needs to operate now and in the future; however, I think the Army may require additional resources to transition to the future operating environment. The digital transformation of Army systems engineering comes with a cost to change not only infrastructure but culture. I believe the challenge is to maintain and grow the engineering workforce through training, education, and SE governance, and to recognize the knowledge, skills and behaviors needed to continually meet the requirements of the ever-modernizing Army.

Systems Engineering

103. In your view, to what extent could the Army's introduction of systems engineering earlier in the acquisition process, including component and subsystem prototyping, enable improved acquisition outcomes? Please explain your answer.

Answer: In my view, introducing systems engineering early in the acquisition process has the potential to change the Army's approach to acquisition writ large. The development and use of government owned reference architectures enables modularity and agility through the rest of the acquisition process. Establishing a modular government architecture communicates to industry what kinds of components are needed now and in the future. This enables vendors to align product lines to those modules enabling early prototyping and competition and long-term technology insertion. Key practices include the use of standards-driven architectures, technical management, and risk assessments. These key practices support early evaluation of the component and subsystem prototyping viable in the current and future environments, inform requirements, and expose early opportunities for integration.

Systems Engineering

104. In your view, what would be the benefits of using advanced engineering methods and technologies, such as digital engineering practices?

Answer: In my judgment, utilization of advanced engineering best practices throughout the lifecycle of a capability promotes modernization of the Army portfolio and helps the Army recruit and retain needed engineering talent that are digital natives. Modern advances in engineering technology are only incremental within a given discipline, but also transformational in their integration across disciplines. Digital engineering practices are about integrating data from across engineering disciplines to continuously evaluate whether the design of a system/subsystem/component is consistent and meets the required design requirements. The result of effectively applying digital engineering is more rapid design cycles without sacrificing engineering rigor. That is, delivering systems faster and knowing that they will work as promised when they are delivered. I believe the implementation of digital thread processes and common modular component standards should ensure the Army's ability to maximize the benefits of digital prototyping, design, simulation, and testing throughout the lifecycle of the capability.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

105. Do you support establishing the Principal Cyber Advisor function in the Army? If confirmed, how would you envision working with the Army PCA?

Answer: I fully support the position of the Principal Cyber Advisor. If confirmed, I will support the efforts already in progress to identify risk and mitigation priorities for the Army, to develop more secure acquisition processes, and to increase the efficacy of the cyber workforce.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

106. Do you believe the Army is organized and postured appropriately to address the full spectrum of cyber threats to the Army's role in joint, multi-domain operations?

Answer: I believe the Army has the right plans in place to ensure Soldiers have the integrated force structure, modernized equipment, and interoperable command & control to address the full spectrum of cyber threats in Joint All-Domain Operations (JADO) by 2028. Since 2012, I understand the Army has been committed to operationalizing capabilities, organizations and forces to meet the challenges posed in cyberspace. As an example, one of the Army's top modernization priorities includes fielding Multi-Domain Task Forces (MDTF) aligned against National Defense Strategy (NDS) key threats, with one MDTF at Initial Operational Capability (IOC) recently supporting the INDO-PACOM theater during the DEFENDER PACIFIC exercise, and a second MDTF planned for the EUCOM theater achieving IOC by the end of FY22. The MDTF design provides the ability to deliver offensive cyber effects while also defending the Department of Defense Information Networks (DODIN) and critical infrastructure necessary for ensuring force projection. The Army's advanced warfighting platform investment, such as the Terrestrial Layer System (TLS) Echelons Above Brigade (EAB) with the Long-Range Signals Sensing, Electronic Attack, and Cyber Operations, provides capabilities essential to all phases of JADO. Finally, the Army established a Cyber Warfare Battalion that will eventually include twelve Expeditionary CEMA Teams capable of providing downward reinforcing effects at echelon for hard targets requiring reach back support from CONUS. Additionally, the Army dedicated institutional programs for technology protection, program protection, addressing readiness, testing forces in contested environments and in the acquisition community. The Army also established the Army Priority Vulnerability Management program to make sure systems are delivered and remain uncompromised through the entire life cycle. If confirmed, I will be committed to this critical challenge and I will work with the Hill, Joint Staff, and the other Services to continuously evaluate and improve our posture, programs, and capabilities.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

107. What are your recommendations for improving Army acquisition of offensive and defense cyber capabilities?

Answer: It is my belief that offensive and defensive cyber capability acquisition lifecycles are incredibly compressed. The time from identification of a requirement through delivery of a capability can be measured in months. If confirmed, I will work within existing statutory authorities to treat the Army's offensive and defensive cyber Program Managers in a manner that allows them to execute at the speed demanded by this unique warfighting domain, and provide them with the authority to decide how to meet rapidly emerging and evolving validated requirements while still maintaining necessary oversight and reporting. I will also recommend the continuation of flexible acquisition practices such as the Software Acquisition Pathway, Mid-Tier Acquisition, and will leverage the use of RDT&E Budget Activity 8 funding to enable faster and more relevant capability delivery. Additionally, the Army must find innovative ways to leverage what is being done in the commercial marketplace. Whether it is incentivizing the hiring of technical experts or being a "fast follower" in implementing or modifying commercial products for military use, the Army must find ways to continue to keep pace. In addition, if confirmed I will work closely with the Army Principal Cyber Advisor (PCA) to improve the Army's overall approach to the acquisition of cyber capabilities, including potential new structures to better align the Army with approaches used by other services and elements of DOD, as well as the private sector.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

108. How could the Army better fund the acquisition and sustainment of cyber capabilities, particularly given that the rules and boundaries of existing funding mechanisms and accounts (research and development, procurement, and operations and maintenance) create numerous obstacles to timely acquisition outcomes?

Answer: If confirmed, I will continue to work closely with the Army Principal Cyber Advisor on his efforts to assess all Army's cyberspace-related investments in order to reduce operational risk and establish a new Cyberspace Resourcing Framework IAW recent statutory requirements. I will also work in tandem with appropriate stakeholders such as ASA(FM&C), DCG G-8 PA&E, DCS G-3/5/7, Army Cyber Command and Army CIO to ensure only the most appropriate capabilities are purchased and linked to validated requirements thru the PPBE process.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

109. In your view, what should be the appropriate Army contribution to joint EW capabilities, particularly as regards Multi-Domain Task Forces?

Answer: In my view, a capability for Electronic Warfare includes the capability itself, any associated analytical and dissemination tools to enable the capability, and trained Soldiers at all echelons. Due to the Multi-Domain Task Force's responsibility across an enormous area of terrain the Army must contribute EW capabilities associated with the targets delegated to the Army by the theater. This comprises both offensive and defensive EW capabilities across air and ground to counter threat EW systems—this includes close in penetration phase EW capabilities and standoff / deep capabilities during campaigning phase and evaluation of competition phase capabilities. This also ensures access to national data served by the intelligence community and the associated authorities necessary to access, combine, and use the exquisite data for EW targeting. The foundational military intelligence and signature characterization for threat systems performs a critical element of these EW capabilities. Through Project Convergence and theater aligned exercises in the Pacific and Europe the Army drove the inclusion of MDO experimentation including non-kinetic options with the expansion of EW to echelons above brigade and multi-Service efforts to develop Joint Electronic Battle Management requirements and capabilities.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

Section 1637 of the Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act required the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress, as a part of the documentation that supports the President's annual budget for the Department of Defense, a consolidated Cyber Vulnerability Evaluation and Mitigation budget justification display for each major weapons system of the Department of Defense, starting in Fiscal Year 2021. This consolidated budget display was not provided, as required, for the Fiscal Year 2022 budget.

110. If confirmed, will you commit to providing this budget display along with the Fiscal Year 2023 budget request?

Answer: Yes. In continued transparency as outlined in the NDAA, if confirmed, I will work with the Army Principal Cyber Advisor to determine the adequacy of the budget for all cyber matters and together we will provide the information this Committee needs.

Cyber and Electronic Warfare

111. More broadly, what steps would you take, if confirmed, to ensure that the appropriate planning and budgeting is done to support a robust cybersecurity weapon systems program, as part of the traditional acquisition process?

Answer: If confirmed, my office would collaborate with Army Futures Command to refine Concepts of Operations and Concepts of Employment for cyber capabilities in support of Army formations and missions. As U.S. Cyber Command takes a more assertive role in the programming and budgeting process, I will work with the Army's corresponding staff elements in Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, the Army Budget Office, and the Army's Principal Cyber Advisor to ensure coordination and synergy between Joint cybersecurity and cyber weapons programs and the Army's critical and necessary Service-retained capabilities. Additionally, I would encourage requirements developers to ensure appropriate cyber-security requirements are included, and would task PEOs to implement cyber-security from the start of each program. In my view, the Army must include these requirements and costs up front, so they are known and resourced parts of the program, as opposed to un-funded requirements late in the life cycle.

Munitions

Army munitions inventories, particularly those of precision guided munitions, have declined significantly due to high operational usage, insufficient procurement, and a requirements system that does not adequately account for the ongoing need to transfer munitions to our allies and for operations short of major combat.

112. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure the Army has sufficient inventories of munitions to meet combatant commanders' needs?

Answer: If confirmed, I would continue to coordinate with Combatant Commanders to support their requirements. I will focus on aligning funding to modernize our munitions stock and improve overall inventory levels to ensure the Army meets combatant commanders' requirements. I will also collaborate with our industry partners to increase production and procurement of critical munitions.

Munitions

113. If confirmed, what steps would you recommend to bolster the munitions industrial base's depth and surge capacity?

Answer: I understand the Army is the DOD's Single Manager for Conventional Ammunition (SMCA). If confirmed, I would ensure that Army, Air Force, and Navy Acquisition Executives, are synchronized on ammunition requirements to ensure optimization of the SMCA's ammunition procurements and investments in the industrial base. I would ensure clear and frequent communications to industry partners to enable them to effectively plan and respond to the Army's ammunition needs. If confirmed, in order to bolster the munitions organic industrial base, I would support the completion of the 15-year Army Ammunition Plant (AAP) modernization plan to increase manufacturing readiness and safety, increase environmental stewardship, and increase operating efficiencies. By resourcing and executing this plan, I believe that critical AAPs will be well-postured to safely and effectively produce ammunition for warfighters well into the future.

Energy and Acquisition

114. How can our acquisition systems better address requirements related to the use of energy in military platforms to decrease risks to warfighters?

Answer: In my view, platform-level energy efficiency should be a critical element of all new Army systems. By reducing overall energy demand, more flexible operations are enabled and fewer logistics personnel are put at risk on a highly lethal battlefield. As the Army refines its concepts for logistics and sustainment going forward, such considerations should become a standard feature of all Army programs. However, energy efficiency is secondary to combat effectiveness. As a result, energy savings must be pursued in a manner that does not compromise a system's combat effectiveness or the safety of the Soldiers using it.

Energy and Acquisition

115. What steps would you take to invest upfront in energy savings technologies and practices to reduce the life cycle costs of Army systems, even if those savings are not realized immediately?

Answer: In my view, reducing energy demand is key. Current technology does not support moving to all electric platforms given the capabilities required on a battlefield. However, I understand the Army is exploring hybrid technologies that couple today's combustion engines with battery storage. When mature, I understand the Army plans to invest in these hybrid technologies to reduce demand and improve reliability. These same hybrid technologies would also apply to Army power generation systems.

Energy and Acquisition

116. In your view, how can energy supportability that reduces contested logistics vulnerabilities best be incorporated as a key factors in the requirements process?

Answer: In my view, an integrated approach that starts with a thorough analysis of a contested logistics environment is required to fully understand significant changes in approach to system energy requirements. If confirmed, I would look to Army logistics experts, such as those in Army Materiel Command, to take leadership in developing new logistics concepts that would then result in new platform level requirements. Once that occurs, in my judgment, it will still be critical to look at each system on a case-by-case basis. For weapon systems Soldiers will use in combat, it is my view that energy efficiency must not compromise combat capability or survivability.

Energy and Acquisition

117. Specifically, how can the Army broadly include operational energy improvements in its weapons platforms?

Answer: Two potential areas for operational energy improvements in weapons platforms are the addition of hybrid-electric technologies at scale across the Army's fleet of combat vehicles, and the assessment of the benefit of changing the policy for a single fuel on the battlefield to allow for the potential use of ultra-low sulphur diesel for some systems. Additionally, the use of electric vehicles across the Army for non-tactical tasks (such as running ranges or on base maintenance) is another potential avenue for improvement.

Sexual Harassment

In responding to the 2018 DOD Civilian Employee Workplace and Gender Relations survey, 17.7 percent of female and 5.8 percent of male DOD respondents indicated that they had experienced sexual harassment and/or gender discrimination by "someone at work" in the 12 months prior to completing the survey.

118. Having served since January of 2021 as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics & Technology), what is your assessment of the current climate regarding sexual harassment and gender discrimination in the Office of the ASA(ALT)?

Answer: I started at ASA(ALT) as the Principal Deputy ASA (ALT) on March 8, 2021. During my time in the organization, I have not been made aware of any incidents of sexual harassment or gender discrimination.

Harassment and discrimination jeopardize readiness and mission accomplishment, weaken trust among colleagues, and erode organizational cohesion. If confirmed, I will focus on maintaining a workplace that meets these standards. I am committed and responsible to provide a workplace that is free from all unlawful forms of harassment and discrimination.

Sexual Harassment

119. If confirmed, what actions would you take were you to receive or become aware of a complaint of sexual harassment or discrimination from an employee of the Office of the ASA(ALT)?

Answer: Upon receiving, or learning of, a complaint of sexual harassment, discrimination, or other harassment from an employee, I would ensure the employee receives information regarding their rights, due process and avenues of redress; and immediately put them into contact with appropriate servicing officials for intake and processing (IAW Federal laws, EEOC, DOD, and Army policy).

If confirmed, I will ensure coordination with my servicing EEO Official, legal advisor, and Civilian Personnel Official; support any inquiry or response necessary to promptly address and resolve the matter(s) at issue; and take appropriate corrective or disciplinary action as warranted. Further, I will ensure all necessary and appropriate policies and resources for prevention and response are in place. I will ensure an unfettered procedure for civilian employees to report all forms of harassment or discrimination. Finally, I will ensure that all training and education requirements and standards are met.

Congressional Oversight

In order to exercise legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this committee, its subcommittees, and other appropriate committees of Congress receive timely testimony, briefings, reports, records—including documents and electronic communications, and other information from the executive branch.

120. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, and on request, to appear and testify before this committee, its subcommittees, and other appropriate committees of Congress? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

121. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, to provide this committee, its subcommittees, other appropriate committees of Congress, and their respective staffs such witnesses and briefers, briefings, reports, records—including documents and electronic communications, and other information, as may be requested of you, and to do so in a timely manner? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

122. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, to consult with this committee, its subcommittees, other appropriate committees of Congress, and their respective staffs, regarding your basis for any delay or denial in providing testimony, briefings, reports, records—including documents and electronic communications, and other information requested of you? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

123. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, to keep this committee, its subcommittees, other appropriate committees of Congress, and their respective staffs apprised of new information that materially impacts the accuracy of testimony, briefings, reports, records—including documents and electronic communications, and other information you or your organization previously provided? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

Congressional Oversight

124. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, and on request, to provide this committee and its subcommittees with records and other information within their oversight jurisdiction, even absent a formal Committee request? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

125. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, to respond timely to letters to, and/or inquiries and other requests of you or your organization from individual Senators who are members of this committee? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes

126. Do you agree, without qualification, if confirmed, to ensure that you and other members of your organization protect from retaliation any military member, federal employee, or contractor employee who testifies before, or communicates with this committee, its subcommittees, and any other appropriate committee of Congress? Please answer with a simple yes or no.

Answer: Yes