

RECORD VERSION

**STATEMENT BY
THE HONORABLE CLAUDE M. BOLTON, JR., DSC
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY)
AND ARMY ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE**

AND

**LIEUTENANT GENERAL JOHN M. CURRAN
DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL – FUTURES
AND DIRECTOR, ARMY CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION CENTER
U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND**

**BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND LAND FORCES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**ON
ARMY GROUND FORCE PROGRAMS**

FIRST SESSION, 110TH CONGRESS

MARCH 27, 2007

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

Introduction

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: thank you for this opportunity to report to you on Army ground force programs. It is our privilege to represent the Army leadership, the military and civilian members of the Army acquisition and capabilities development workforce, and the Soldiers who rely on us to provide them with world-class weapon systems and equipment to enable mission success and a safe return home.

While fighting the Global War on Terror (GWOT) and sustaining our global commitments, we are accelerating our efforts to transform and to modernize. We are building a modular force in which brigades – not divisions – can “plug into” joint and coalition task forces in expeditionary and campaign settings. We are improving readiness to deal with traditional, irregular, catastrophic, and disruptive challenges by providing Soldiers with capabilities to be dominant across the full range of military operations. And, we are ensuring that every investment in our current force benefits our future force.

Our task would be impossible without the tremendous support the Army receives from you, the Members of the House Committee on Armed Services. We are constantly working to better equip and better support our Soldiers. Your wisdom, sound advice, and strong support are keys to our success.

Modular Force

The Army is transitioning continuously from the current to the future force through the combined effects of transformation and modernization. The main focus of transformation is modular conversion. To sustain a steadily increasing demand for military forces, we are building a modular force centered on Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) as the basic building block of our fighting capability. Our modular conversion of active and reserve components is designed, as mentioned at the outset, to create brigade based modules able to “plug into” joint and

coalition task forces in expeditionary and campaign settings. These forces will be better organized to accept advanced new capabilities and technology in order to meet the demands of the current war, sustain other global commitments, establish the organizational structure needed to accelerate modernization, and support a new global basing posture that will rely more heavily on rotational presence.

With respect to the total acquisition cost, the Army no longer tracks the costs of modularity separately from other equipping costs because our modularity requirements mirror the equipping requirements for the Army as a whole. Whether we buy a truck, for example, using funds in the base budget in order to fill a modularity requirement or a modernization shortfall, or using funds in the GWOT supplemental budget to replenish a battle loss or mitigate a wartime capability gap – in the end, a truck is a truck. Our ability to precisely track funds targeted specifically for modularity requirements versus other requirements has been lost, and what was originally known as “modularity” has permeated across the Army’s equipping accounts, thus making it a distinction without a difference with respect to equipping the Army as a whole. In short, the budget that the President submitted to Congress in February together with the GWOT Supplemental requests that the Congress has generously funded, reflect the equipping requirements for the total Army through the Future Years Defense Program, modularity or otherwise.

Future Combat Systems

The 21st Century necessitates a highly versatile Army that can handle a diverse array of operations and missions. The principle effort of our modernization program is the Army’s Future Combat Systems (FCS), which will provide much needed capabilities to our Soldiers and will greatly strengthen America’s national defense. The Army, as an institution, learns and grows, and Army modernization through FCS is continuously informed by lessons learned in combat operations and further improved by the study of threats we are likely to face in the future.

The FCS program has sustained three significant and consecutive budget cuts and will need full funding as we begin early production efforts for the Spin Out 1 networked systems and the Manned Ground Vehicle (MGV) early Non-Line of Sight-Cannon (NLOS-C) deliveries in 2008. We recently made several adjustments to the program – informed by operational analysis and bounded by the fiscal reality of the current environment. With these adjustments, the Army continues to have an affordable and executable FCS strategy to better ensure program success and the delivery of essential capabilities to our Soldiers.

The Army took a hard look at the status of technology development a year into the program in 2004, and invested over \$1.5 billion to ensure that technologies would develop along the timeline required to meet program objectives. FCS technology maturation is being executed exceptionally well – 75% of the program’s critical technologies are at Technology Readiness Level 6 or higher and the others are progressing according to plan. The Army continuously reviews the status of the FCS Program technology maturation and will do so in detail with the Defense Acquisition Board prior to the Preliminary Design Review in 2009.

With FCS, the Army takes advantage of technologies as they are developed and expeditiously puts them into the hands of Soldiers. Our BCT will be regularly enhanced by the insertion of FCS technologies. While the total integrated development of FCS proceeds, we are inserting capability into the current force as soon as it is ready.

The FCS program is on schedule to deliver Spin-Out 1 technologies to the Army’s Evaluation Task Force (AETF) in 2008. Spin Out 1 networked systems will be resident on current force Abrams, Bradley Fighting Vehicles, and High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles. Spin-Out 1 technologies include: the Unattended Ground Sensors (UGS) – Tactical and Urban, the Non-Line of Sight Launch System (NLOS-LS), Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS), and an early version of the FCS Networked Battle Command. Soldiers, testers, and material developers mature and improve the whole FCS package in a “One Team”

environment over time. In parallel, the FCS program is on track to deliver the early MGV NLOS-C prototypes in 2008.

FCS modernization costs are reasonable and affordable because they are budgeted incrementally over a two-decade period. The FCS program is 42 months into System Development and Design (SDD) and is on contract cost, schedule, and performance. FCS is an Army run and Army administered program. The Lead Systems Integrator (LSI) was competitively selected to help the Army manage high-risk complexity; however, the Army has complete control of overall program management and development efforts and specific authority over program requirements, designs, and specifications.

The Army also oversees subcontracting and make-or-buy decisions and is responsible for LSI performance. Army personnel, moreover, are actively engaged in daily program operations; they oversee LSI functional and engineering activities. Comprehensive Army oversight is facilitated by the co-location of the Army and LSI program leadership in the same office in St. Louis, Missouri.

The Army's LSI management approach was devised to tackle today's program complexity and integration challenges; it is imperative for the creation of a joint networked force. Program complexity is reduced and made manageable by the high degree of commonality in systems and subsystems design. The LSI provides integrated program management, which makes large-scale systems integration achievable. Furthermore, the Army has successfully converted the FCS SDD Program from an Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) to a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) based contract. This conversion further ensures the Government interest through clauses such as the Procurement Integrity Act, the Truth in Negotiations Act and Cost Accounting Standards and includes a very strict Organizational Conflict of Interest Clause that prohibits the LSI – specifically Boeing and SAIC – from competing for any SDD development work at any tier.

FCS performance to date confirms program management success. FCS is the most complex weapons procurement ever managed by the Army; yet the program is on contract cost, on schedule, and performing to plan. FCS

Operation and Support (O&S) Cost Avoidance benefits will have a significant multi-billion dollar impact on the force. Substantially increased reliability and commonality of parts, subsystems and systems coupled with significant reductions to personnel and fuel consumption will drastically reduce life cycle costs for FCS equipped BCTs.

FCS Requirements Development

The U.S. Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), as the representative of the Army's user community, developed and documented required operational capabilities for FCS. These requirements describe the attributes and qualities of systems within the family of systems. These requirements are codified in the FCS Operational Requirements Document (ORD) and subsequent revisions of the ORD. The Joint Readiness Oversight Council approved the first FCS ORD in April 2003 with change two in April 2006. In parallel with the FCS requirements document, TRADOC also developed the FCS BCT Operational and Organizational Plan (O&O) approved by the Army in July 2002 with the most recent change in December 2005. TRADOC published the initial draft Field Manual for FCS BCT Operations, FM 3-9.9, August 2006.

The intellectual and analytical foundations for FCS can be traced back to the conceptual work from the TRADOC led Louisiana Maneuvers, Force XXI, Strike Force, and the Army After Next initiatives in the 1990s. Additional underpinnings were provided from 1999 to the present with TRADOC's Futures Technology Seminars, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's (DARPA) Multi-Mission Combat System project, Joint Forces Command's Joint Operational Environment documents, and the classified System Threat Assessment Reports for FCS developed by TRADOC and validated by the Defense Intelligence Agency. These efforts produced an extensive body of work to project the future operating environment and the threats our nation would face.

From these assessments, we anticipated that future threats include military forces made up of light and motorized infantry, armored / mechanized, and Special Operations Forces; and paramilitary elements to include special police,

terrorists, militia, and civilians. We saw adversaries that would employ conventional and unconventional methods along with asymmetric and adaptive tactics. The operational environment projected for FCS includes urban as well as all other complex terrain where adversaries attempt to deceive and shield via combatant / non-combatant mix. This projected environment involves extreme dispersion with enemies attempting to use fire and maneuver at a time and place of their choosing with hit and run via ambushes at the tactical level. These adversaries will also seek operational level advantages by denying the U.S. entry through improved air and sea ports at the operational level. Our evaluation indicated that the threats would appear across the entire spectrum of conflict from small scale contingencies, including stability and support operations, to major combat operations. This assessment was a driving factor in the development of the FCS BCT Concept in 2000.

TRADOC developed requirements for the FCS family of systems account for current and future capability gaps in terms of responsiveness, deployability, agility, versatility, lethality, survivability, sustainability, and training. Based upon the FCS BCT Concept, TRADOC and the TRADOC Analysis Center completed the Mission Area Analysis in July 2001 that identified capability deficiencies. They then completed a Mission Needs Analysis in August 2001 to evaluate deficiencies using a task to need methodology to identify mission needs. FCS was one of the critical needs derived from this analysis. TRADOC developed the FCS Mission Need Statement (MNS) approved by the JROC in November 2001. The FCS MNS states:

“The requirement for a Future Combat System of Systems (FCS) is driven by the evolving operating environment and capabilities-based threats, combined with the need for a full spectrum dominant force as described in the DPG, JV 2020, and the Army Vision. Clearly, the Army must be capable of effective response against both modernized conventional and unconventional forces employed in asymmetric strategies and tactics. The FCS mission need has application throughout the range of conflict from peacekeeping missions to major theater war (MTW).”

The TRADOC Analysis Center also conducted the FCS Analysis of Alternatives and subsequent annual updates. As the operational environment changes and our adversaries adapt, TRADOC continues to adjust concepts and doctrine to account for lessons learned from the current operating environment and refines capabilities development for future Army needs. The FCS program is a key element in this campaign of learning.

From the very beginning of the FCS program, TRADOC teamed with the acquisition community, DARPA, industry, and academia to define the capabilities our Soldiers, leaders, and the Army needs today and well into the future. The FCS requirements document reflects 551 individual requirements that provide the attributes and qualities needed by land forces in future BCTs. These requirements have been relatively stable since they were first documented, but, as part of our ongoing refinement process, we have made prudent adjustments. Working within the context of the FCS “One Team,” comprising the Program Manager (PM), LSI, and TRADOC, we have clarified, refined and adjusted our requirements through a disciplined process. TRADOC has been actively engaged and continues to leverage the creative energy and innovative thinking of our schools and centers, battle labs, deployed forces, analytic community, industry, and other Services. This disciplined approach allows the Army to balance survivability, lethality, size, weight, and affordability to mitigate risk.

TRADOC established the Unit of Action Maneuver Battle Lab (UAMBL) under the leadership of Commandant of the United States Armor Center to support and synchronize developments activities during the FCS Concept Development and Technology Demonstration phase. UAMBL served as the “hub” to harness the full efforts of the other TRADOC centers and schools “spokes” to support the FCS program. TRADOC commandants along with PM FCS (BCT) gather quarterly in a Requirements Integrated Concept Team to help manage and exploit this collaboration network to continuously refine requirements. UAMBL hosted quarterly Joint Interoperability Senior Advisory Group of retired joint flag officers to assist in ensuring joint integration. Additionally, TRADOC established the UA Experimental Element at UAMBL to support recurring experimentation

efforts during the FCS SDD phase and beyond. The TRADOC Capability Manager (TCM) FCS was placed at UAMBL with personnel assigned and located both at UAMBL and PM FCS (BCT) / Boeing facilities to provide direct User support to FCS developments and refinements in real time. TRADOC has User representatives in each of the 14 Integrated Product Teams (IPT) that manage cost, schedule, and performance day to day. These IPTs range from System of System level integration to specific system level IPTs (e.g. manned ground vehicles, C4ISR).

The Army Capabilities Integration Center (ARCIC) within TRADOC Headquarters holds a quarterly Futures Review that assesses the FCS program and examines requirements. This review provides the basis for quarterly Army Review Councils with the Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff. TRADOC continues to provide unprecedented support to the development of FCS in order to permit the PM FCS (BCT) and LSI the ability to share advanced capabilities with direct User representatives. TRADOC is with them every step of the way to execute prudent trade or adjust requirements as the designs mature. By making this commitment, TRADOC enables the PM to mitigate risk in pursuing technologies.

This support is increasing with the establishment of the Future Force Integration Directorate and the Army Evaluation Task Force (AETF), both at Fort Bliss, Texas. These entities were created to ensure the User is actively involved as the Army evaluates and refines FCS prototypes for spin out to the current force and for further development of the main program. AETF is receiving Soldiers and equipment today and has begun training as a brigade task force. AETF will undergo New Equipment Training on FCS spin out systems in preparation for mandatory testing. The AETF will support evaluation and testing of the FCS BCT organization designs, operational concepts, warfighting capabilities, training, and equipment to produce enhancements in lethality, survivability, tempo, sustainability, deployability, and Joint force linkages. It will

also assist in assessing performance of FCS spin outs and core program systems.

TRADOC will continue to play a key role in developing the core operational capability envisioned for FCS. TRADOC is currently working refinements and assessing their impacts in the context of the User's perspective across the domains of Doctrine, Organization, Training, Material, and Leader (DOTML) requirements (i.e., not through the lens of Material alone). It is this ability, combined with a major level of support to the PM FCS (BCT) that allows the program the ability to adjust along the DOTML lines as it matures.

FCS Transportability Requirement

One Key Performance Parameter (KPP) requires that FCS systems be transportable worldwide by air, sea, highway, and rail. This KPP states the requirement for the FCS to be strategically deployable and capable of conducting operational maneuver to execute a full range of missions. C-130 transport, although an important metric, is not part of the KPP. Nonetheless, the C-130 metric has served us well and has its roots in our operational concept. TRADOC and PM FCS (BCT) have worked closely to ensure the sizing constraint of the C-130 "box" does not negatively affect our survivability, lethality, or other requirements.

The benefits of the C-130 metric include:

- The capability to insert Army forces into austere points of entry to maximize force flow and counter enemy anti-access strategy.
- The C-130 size make the FCS BCTs compatible with Theater Support Vessel to land at less predictable locations in theater and ensure FCS BCTs will fit more easily on current and future strategic sealift.
- The C-130 form and fit greatly enhances mobility in austere environments with low bridge weight classifications, and ability to negotiate narrow streets in compartmented or urban terrains.

- The options available to combatant commander increase for entering forces into theater. He can combine available C-130 and C-17s to maximize force flow using multiple entry points to bring in combat configured units. During entry or decisive operations the FCS BCT can be transported by a wide range of air, land or sea modes and leverage options for entry points.
- The Joint Task Force Commander is enabled by FCS units in executing operational maneuver by combining vertical and inherent horizontal maneuver. FCS BCTs can quickly reposition to positions of advantage over great distances.

C-130 transportability is a challenge. As we assess the latest FCS design work, we will balance the effect of platform size and weight with our requirements for survivability and lethality. This assessment includes lessons from current operations. More importantly, we will continue to measure what is technically achievable within the context of our operational concepts. At the same time, we are looking forward to see what future lift capabilities the Army will need. Certainly, our FCS requirements and concepts will be the driving force in selecting what types of air platforms we need in the future.

Active Protection System Requirements

Analysis of FCS platform design concepts show that, except for heavily armored current platforms receiving frontal impacts (M1 and M2/M3 with reactive armor in frontal engagements), FCS MGCV project provides similar, or in many cases, improved levels of personnel protection compared to their current force counterparts.

The Army will continue to work to increase the survivability of the FCS platforms as we go through the various design stages. It is important to remember that survivability is no longer simply a passive approach to survive a direct hit, but a combination of passive and active protection suites, network provided situational awareness, and networked lethality.

The Army will not procure and field a FCS that is not effective and survivable under operational conditions. In short, survivability is not an area to trade off. Doing otherwise would violate the trust given to us and our fundamental commitment to providing our Soldiers with the best combat equipment possible.

To counter future threats, the Army has embarked on a holistic approach towards survivability, including leveraging the network for improved situational awareness, reducing signature management, improving ballistic protection, modifying operational tactics, and pursuing hit avoidance. In the context of military ground combat vehicles, hit avoidance comprises technologies that enable defeat of the threat prior to its impact with the vehicle. The hit avoidance requirement for our future force is a 360-degree hemispherical “bubble” of protection to our combat platforms. Currently, the FCS program is developing a full-spectrum solution to counter short- and long-range threats, which include a wide range of ballistic projectiles: RPGs, mortars, antitank guided missiles, tank-KE/HEAT, top attack/precision guided missiles, and large caliber cannon.

The FCS BCT will operate as a system of systems to provide the needed protection to ensure survivability across the full range of military operations. Current designs for FCS MGVs provide a suite of protection capabilities that generally project similar, or in most cases, improved levels of personnel protection compared to their current force counterparts.

It is important to understand that on today's and future battlefields, passive defense alone will not defeat all known or projected threats. For example, M1 tanks are vulnerable now as evidenced by combat losses in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). Survivability is no longer simply a passive approach or platform centric for sustaining a hit, but a combination of passive and active protection suites, network provided situational awareness, and networked lethality.

Current systems lack the active protection suites, network provided situational awareness, and networked lethality of FCS-equipped units. FCS requirements are for survivability with an active protection system and APS is a part of the proposed solution to meet our requirements. APS within FCS offers the potential

to move beyond merely armor protection and also to eventually address threats from top attack.

All FCS variants with Active Protection Systems (APS) provide *more* personnel protection against Rocket-Propelled Grenades (RPG) and Anti-Tank Guided Missiles than current counterparts. APS is an explosive ballistic countermeasure capability that will serve as one element of the overall hit-avoidance solution. The current developmental approach is diligently working parallel paths in order to address current force system needs for defeating short-range RPG attacks, as well as FCS MGV requirements for a full-spectrum hit avoidance subsystem that is robust enough to defeat the complete array of anticipated threats, including top attack. We view APS as common across the force (FCS MGVs and Current Force – Stryker, Bradley, and Abrams). APS also needs to be capable of receiving upgrades over time to meet the evolving threat.

In conclusion, TRADOC is absolutely committed to providing our Soldiers with the best force protection and active protection available. We will not endorse procurement and fielding of any system that is not proven, tested, and validated to be operationally ready and safe and can meet our KPP for Survivability/Force Protection. Again, to do otherwise would cause the Army to breach its implied contract with its Soldiers and families.

Other Priority Programs

WIN-T

Warfighter Information Network - Tactical (WIN-T) is the Army's future, robust, multi-layered secure joint network that gives the commander a fully mobile network. This is a mobile infrastructure that passes relevant information – voice, video, and data – effectively and efficiently for combined arms capabilities in all required terrain and environmental conditions. WIN-T is leveraging commercial capabilities as well. The WIN-T architecture utilizes terrestrial, air, and space components that deliver continuous networking capability for both fixed assets and assets on the move.

Though the WIN-T program will begin fielding to the entire Army in 2014, the focus of the WIN-T Research, Development, Test and Evaluation funding line is on supporting the FCS. In that light, WIN-T is synchronized to deliver Engineering Design Modules to FCS by FY2009, which meet all size, weight, and power specifications for the required WIN-T Points of Presence on the FCS platforms. The program is, however, considering ways that portions of the developing WIN-T technology could be made available for use in the Force much earlier. Plans are for such technologies to be introduced as early as 2011.

The Army made a decision in 2006 to field to a larger operational force. Previously WIN-T was originally planned for fielding to approximately 66% of the Army. This resulted in a cost growth necessitating a Nunn McCurdy breach requiring certification. The process of certification is ongoing with an expected report to Congress no later than June 5, 2007. A new Capabilities Developments Document for WIN-T was approved in November 2006. We are confident that WIN-T is keeping pace with the urgent and resultant challenges to the program, and we fully need the network capabilities that it will provide. In short, the WIN-T program is essential to meeting the challenges of the asymmetric operational environment.

JTRS

The Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) is an essential component of Army modernization and plays an integral role in the success of the FCS Program. JTRS program execution is closely aligned with FCS and requires continued full resourcing to ensure fully integrated networked performance.

JNN-N

The Joint Network Node-Network (JNN-N) program is a state-of the-art Commercial Off The Shelf/Government Off The Shelf communications network that enables the exchange of voice, video, and data throughout the tactical Division and into the Sustaining Base. It leverages commercial satellite

technology to provide beyond line of site capabilities and commercial internet networking technology to increase functionality and efficiency while reducing size, weight, and power. JNN Network components reside at Echelons above division, brigade, and battalion levels and provide interfaces to lower level systems including on the move and Solider platforms.

JNN-N is in the process of becoming a formal program of record. The Army is working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense to finalize all required documentation. The program is fully funded in the Army's FY 2008-FY2013 Program Objective Memorandum and is preparing for a Milestone C decision. At the same time, the program office recently released a Request for Proposal to industry and expects to competitively award a contract for future JNN-N procurements.

Abrams/Bradley Multiyear Procurement

The Army's is seeking multiyear procurement authority for M1A2 Abrams Tank and M2A3 Bradley Fighting Vehicle programs. With reference to the FY2007 National Defense Authorization Act (HASC Report H.R. 5122, section 109-452, page 31b), on March 5, 2007, the Army provided the response to Congress as to the feasibility and rationale for both an Abrams Tank and a Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFVS) multiyear procurement (MYP). In that letter, we stated that the Army could enter into a MYP for both programs as early as FY2008 contingent upon the anticipated FY2007 and FY2008 Supplemental budgets plus each platform's base program funding for FY2008 to FY2012. If the anticipated Supplemental funding did not come to fruition, the Army could still enter into a MYP for both programs, but the MYP would not begin until FY2009. Again, irrespective of any future Supplemental request, the Army would most likely request MYP authority for both the Abrams and BFVS programs in the FY2009 President's Budget based solely on the funding available in the Abrams and BFVS base budgets. Again, in our recent letter, we stated that upon a complete review of the available funding in FY2008 through FY2012 for the

Abrams and BFVS, we determined that it was feasible to proceed with a MYP strategy for both combat platforms.

In regard to how the Army would award a MYP beginning in FY2008, the Army could award a MYP for the M1A2 SEP tank beginning in 3rd Quarter of FY2008 for a period of 5-years with a total estimated savings of \$178 million or approximately 10 percent (\$300,000 per vehicle) and a MYP contract for the BFVS/BFIST beginning in 3rd Quarter of FY2008 for a period of 4-years with a total estimated savings of \$131 million or approximately five percent (\$135,000 per vehicle). The M1A2 SEP tank MYP will buy approximately 577 tanks and the BFVS/BFIST MYP will buy approximately 965 vehicles. These quantities achieve Modularity end-state for all Heavy Brigade Combat Team formations.

The benefits of any MYP is not limited to cost savings, rather there are significant benefits to the industrial base and their inherent capabilities. Government Depots and the Defense original equipment manufacturing facilities are not only our business partners, but they also represent the unity and strength emulated by the combat systems they produce. The significant benefits for the Abrams and BFVS MYP procurement serves to further stabilize work load at Anniston Army Depot, Anniston Alabama; the Joint Service Manufacturing Center in Lima, Ohio, operated by General Dynamics Land Systems; and the Department of Energy armor production facility, Idaho Falls Idaho. For the BFVS/BFIST, the MYP provides stabilized work load at Red River Army Depot in Texarkana, Texas, and British Aerospace in York, Pennsylvania.

STRYKER MGS

A review of the Stryker Mobile Gun System (MGS) vehicle program's status, operational considerations for employment of this capability, continued product improvements, results of initial unit training, and the successful collective training and mission rehearsal exercise in preparation for the unit's deployment, led to the conclusion that this unique capability should be integrated and deployed with the 4/2 Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) in summer 2007.

The Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) will test all proposed corrective actions prior to retrofit to 4/2 vehicles, and will publish a safety confirmation for MGS with those corrective actions applied, prior to entering combat. The process for validating proposed corrective actions includes performance and durability testing and a safety assessment. The validation report will provide an assessment of fixes to address the critical issues, and an updated Capabilities and Limitations report will assess the MGS with fixes applied. Several proposed fixes are in test now, and some are already demonstrating improved performance. Others are scheduled to be in test over the next several months. ATEC will confirm that all validated corrective actions are applied to 4/2 vehicles prior to publishing a safety confirmation.

The concerns listed within the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation's memorandum of initial assessment are receiving aggressive action from the PM to ensure that approved fixes are either applied prior to the unit movement into theater, or, that approved mitigating actions have been accomplished prior to the vehicles entering into any type of combat situation. To date, the PM is on track to meet the agreed schedule coordinated with the unit.

The Army's process to identify, assess, prioritize, correct, and validate issues is rigorous and independent. It will ensure the SBCTs commanders and Soldiers have the best product available to accomplish their mission. The process is based on providing safe, effective, survivable, suitable, and supportable equipment to Soldiers. The process includes identifying the MGS' strengths and weaknesses and informing the leaders and Soldiers on how best to employ the system based on its inherent capabilities and limitations. This independent assessment is based on test data from Production Verification Test, Live Fire Test, additional developmental testing for OIF-specific items, and operational data gained from the unit's Mission Rehearsal Exercise. The Army's process also includes a Materiel Release review which further assesses the system's safety aspects, supportability plans, training, and leader awareness and acceptance of any system limitations prior to employment.

Army Global Commitments

The Army has nearly 600,000 Soldiers on active duty today, including 46,000 members of the Army National Guard who serve with great distinction. We are resourcing the Army National Guard (ARNG), in reference to equipment, consistent with its roles as both an operational military force and as the first responder for homeland defense and civil support at the state level. Indeed, our ultimate goal is to equip the ARNG to full active component-like structure. This would be accomplished both through the procurement of new equipment from the industrial base and by providing current on-hand equipment from the active inventory. We have made significant progress towards this goal since 2005, particularly in the areas of aviation, armor, and transportation. But we still have a long way to go, and we will need the Congress's continued support in the future if we hope to remain on track.

There are two issues of great importance in terms of the total acquisition cost of equipment for the ARNG. First, as a result of our most recent Army Equipping and Reuse Conference in the first quarter of FY2007, we have identified approximately \$10.6 billion of equipment for distribution to the ARNG between 2007 and the first quarter of FY2009. The intent is to help ensure that every ARNG unit deploying to Iraq or Afghanistan has the best equipment available, and that those remaining at home will be adequately equipped to respond to homeland defense and security missions as necessary.

Secondly, the Army has programmed—in total—\$36.8 billion for new equipment procurement for the ARNG from FY2005 to FY2013. An additional \$10.6 billion is programmed to the Army Reserve over the same period. While we acknowledge that this will still leave equipping holes to fill across the Army beyond FY2013, we think this approach strikes the best balance between the competing needs of the Army as a whole and the total funding available. It also brings the ARNG to an equipping level that allows it to better manage risk in terms of cross-leveling equipment to deploying units while still maintaining the capability to mobilize, train, and respond to homeland defense and security missions.

Acquisition Workforce

The Army Acquisition Corps is dedicated to supporting the warfighter with world-class capabilities. We provide professional development and unsurpassed education, training, and acquisition experiences to our acquisition, logistics and technology workforce who support the fight, improve the force, and build the future. Army Acquisition is transforming to get products to the Soldier faster, to make good products even better, to minimize life cycle cost, and to enhance the synergy and effectiveness of the Army Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (AL&T) communities. The push towards a more integrated, holistic approach to product development and sustainment is driving changes in acquisition training and education to better prepare our future acquisition leaders for the challenges they will face.

There is great concern that the Army Acquisition workforce is declining too rapidly while the workload continues to increase. From a high of 140,000 people at the end of the Cold War, we're now at roughly 43,500 civilians and 1,450 military members. And in the next three years, including the potential of early retirements, almost one-half of all AL&T civilians will be *eligible* to retire. Of all the issues that I deal with on a daily basis, aside from those that impact our Soldiers who are fighting today, the most critical one to me is the declining workforce and the vast knowledge that is walking out the door. Without a well-trained and educated workforce, all other things necessary will not happen.

Our most important asset is our people. Our workforce focus is to develop flexible Acquisition officers and civilian leaders who possess a diverse and well-rounded background, can effectively support all phases of acquisition, and are prepared to lead any complex, multifunctional acquisition command, agency, organization or team. Our workforce is well credentialed – almost 75 percent of the Army AL&T workforce possess at least a Baccalaureate degree. This education is balanced by their participation in acquisition specific and leadership learning events offered by the Army Acquisition Corps. The Defense Acquisition University (DAU) is responsible for conducting acquisition specific training in

each of the 12 acquisition disciplines in which the Army participates. Army compliance with this requirement is laudable, in FY2006, for example, there were 10,733 Army graduates from DAU classroom training. It is mandatory for the Defense Acquisition workforce to complete at least 40 hours per year of Continuous Learning activities and many Army workforce members achieve this standard by selecting from the over 160 on-line Continuous Learning Modules offered by DAU.

The Army AL&T community at all levels is offered additional opportunities to augment the minimum education, training and experience standards established for mandatory acquisition certification purposes. The U.S. Army Acquisition Support Center, through its Acquisition Education, Training and Experience program and Regional Customer Support Offices, continues to provide avenues for leadership development at all levels. As an example, the Competitive Development Group/Army Acquisition Fellowship Program provides diverse experiential opportunities over its three year program span and creates a leadership career track that includes both staff and line positions both within and outside the Washington, D.C. area. A new civilian Training with Industry Program has been launched to provide civilian acquisition professionals direct exposure to best practices within the defense industry so that they may become more proficient and effective in their Acquisition positions when they return after a one year assignment.

The Army is using its human capital strategic planning process to define the current acquisition workforce, the required future acquisition workforce, and identify the actions that we need to take to make sure we have the right acquisition professionals where and when we need them in the future. Such planning will allow us to look at how many people we need with various technical skills and allow the leadership to prioritize needs based on our fiscal constraints. We have implemented process improvements that enhance productivity and facilitate transformation efforts and we continue to pursue acquisition excellence in order to make further productivity gains.

Conclusion

America remains at war. This is one of the most dangerous times in our history. It is imperative that we provide our Soldiers with the best possible equipment to enable their mission success and safe return home. We thank you for your continued wisdom, sound advice, and strong support.