



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Ms. Marillyn A. Hewson  
Chief Executive Officer and President  
Lockheed Martin Corporation  
6801 Rockledge Dr.  
Bethesda, MD 20817

Dear Ms. Hewson,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

*Marillyn, Hope you  
can help w  
with this.*

Enclosure:  
As stated



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. W. James McNerney, Jr.  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
The Boeing Company  
100 N. Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606

Dear Mr. McNerney,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*Jim,  
I hope you  
can help us with  
this.*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Ms. Phebe N. Novakovic  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
General Dynamics Corporation  
2941 Fairview Park Dr. Ste. 100  
Falls Church, VA 22042

Dear Ms. Novakovic,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*Phibe,  
I hope you can  
help us with this*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. William H. Swanson  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Raytheon Company  
870 Winter St.  
Waltham, MA 02451

Dear Mr. Swanson,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

*Bill,  
I hope you  
can help us  
with this*

Enclosure:  
As stated



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. Wes Bush  
Chairman, Chief Executive Officer,  
and President  
Northrop Grumman Corporation  
2980 Fairview Park Drive  
Falls Church, VA 22042

Dear Mr. Bush,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*Wes,  
I hope you can  
help us with this*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. Michael T. Strianese  
Chairman, President, and  
Chief Executive Officer

L-3 Communications Corporation  
600 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10016

Dear Mr. Strianese,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*M. K., I hope you can help w/ this.*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. Louis R. Chênevert  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
United Technologies Corporation  
United Technologies Building  
Hartford, CT 06101

Dear Mr. Chênevert,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*Levit,  
I hope you can  
help w  
this. Q*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

General John P. Jumper, USAF (Ret.)  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
SAIC, Inc.  
1710 SAIC Drive  
McLean, VA 22102

Dear General Jumper,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*John,*  
*2 help you can*  
*help us with*  
*MIT. etc*





UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. Mike Petters  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Huntington Ingalls Industries Communications  
4101 Washington Ave.  
Newport News, VA 23607

Dear Mr. Petters,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

Mike,  
I hope you  
can help us  
with this  
@



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. David M. Cote  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Honeywell International Inc  
101 Columbia Rd.  
Morristown, NJ 07962

Dear Mr. Cote,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*David,  
I hope you  
can help with  
this.*



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Dr. Ralph W. Shrader  
Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and President  
Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.  
8283 Greensboro Dr.  
McLean, VA 22102

Dear Dr. Shrader,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

Ralph,  
I hope you can  
help w/ this.



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY  
AND LOGISTICS

SEP 17 2013

Mr. Anthony Smeraglinolo  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Engility Corporation  
3750 Centerview Drive  
Chantilly, VA 20151

Dear Mr. Smeraglinolo,

Thank you for your comments on the November 20, 2012, Better Buying Power (BBP) 2.0 memorandum and suggestions on specific ways to achieve greater efficiency and productivity in defense spending. One of my top BBP priorities is to identify, analyze, and assess Department of Defense (DoD)-related statutes, policies, processes, and practices for which costs potentially outweigh benefits. As stated in the original September 10, 2010, BBP guidance, our aim is to unwind duplicative and overly rigorous requirements that add to costs but do not add to quality of product or timeliness of delivery and, in so doing, achieve a decline in the overhead that is charged to the Department by our industrial base.

Enclosed is a list of DoD- and statutorily-imposed requirements that industry indicated can be implemented more effectively. The purpose of this letter is to solicit your company's support for a DoD-led effort to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of this list of requirements to inform law- and policy-makers whether such requirements should be changed or eliminated. We request that our industry participants identify a specific program or programs for which they are willing to provide data to quantify the cost of as many of these requirements as is practical. Obtaining substantiated actual costs is vital to attaining legislative and DoD support for contemplated changes. Any data submitted in response to this request will not be treated as proprietary information. In addition, we would appreciate your support in identifying negative impacts, outcomes, or inconsistent application of the requirements listed in the enclosure.

Your participation in this effort is appreciated, and we look forward to a continued exchange of ideas. My point of contact is Dr. Mark Husband, Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analyses, at 571-256-1686 or david.m.husband.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Frank Kendall

Enclosure:  
As stated

*Anthony*  
*I hope you*  
*can help us with*  
*this.*

## **Requirements to be Examined**

### **Department of Defense (DoD)-imposed Requirements:**

1. Government-unique clauses for procurement of commercial items based on Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 12.
2. Contract auditing under FAR Part 42.1 (Defense Contract Audit Agency) or FAR 42.11 (Defense Contract Management Agency): concurrent auditing of systems and incurred costs; streamlined audit processes and enterprise-wide negotiations to better meet acquisition timelines; and eliminating audit backlogs.
3. Component-specific Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) supplements.
4. Application of Earned Value Management (EVM); streamline EVM compliance criteria and review procedures; implement tiered EVM capability with explicit incentives for improvement.

### **Statutorily-imposed Requirements:**

5. Conditions to provide cost and pricing data added by Section 817 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Pub. L 107-314) (and DFARS 215.403-1(c)(4)(A)(1)). Truth in Negotiation Act (TINA) requirements related to supplier reporting thresholds. Consider changing the reporting requirement to base it on a percentage of the Bill of Material, rather than on the supplier threshold.
6. DoD application of the Buy America Act.