Testimony

Before the House Committee on Armed Services

Witness Statement of

Lt Gen Mark Ramsay

Director

Force Structure, Resources and Assessments (J8)

Joint Staff

January 28, 2015

Chairman Thornberry, Ranking Member Smith and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. I will provide insights into the Joint Staff's role in the requirements generation and capabilities development process; specifically highlighting the close linkages between requirements, acquisition, and other Departmental processes. I want to assure you that we are committed to the delivery of key capabilities to the warfighter by using agile and responsive process integration, and will provide examples of recent requirements process reforms aimed at better synchronization with our acquisition process.

The Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, or JCIDS, is the Department's process that supports the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the JROC, in identifying, assessing, and prioritizing joint military capability needs as specified in Title X, United States Code Section 181.

The JROC is the Department's senior validation authority of joint military requirements. It is within this body that requirements for our larger, more significant acquisition programs are discussed, and trade-offs in cost, schedule, quantity and performance are deliberated, prioritized and ultimately validated. Statutory membership is comprised of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS), who serves as the JROC Chairman, the Vice Service Chiefs, and the Combatant Commanders. Statutory senior advisors include Mr. Kendall, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, the Under Secretaries of Defense Comptroller and Policy, the Director of Capability Assessment and Program Evaluation, and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. They are full-time participants in JROC deliberations, and integral to joint requirements review and validation. Leadership from the intelligence community (USD(I), NRO, NSA, and NGA), while not statutory advisors, are regular participants at the request of the Vice Chairman as the intelligence community has equity in so many of the department's capability development efforts. In addition to identifying, approving, and prioritizing all joint military requirements the JROC:

- is charged with ensuring trade-offs across life-cycle cost, schedule, performance, and procurement quantity are addressed throughout the development process
- is responsible for ensuring total cost and resource expenditure in pursuit of a given capability is consistent with the JROC assigned level of priority

- identifies alternatives to acquisition, both in terms of material alternatives and in the form of changes to our doctrine, organization, training, leadership, education etc., when non-material solutions to a gap in capability may also exist.

The JROC Charter and JCIDS Instruction prescribe JROC review and "re-validation" of previously reviewed capability development documents and programs at specific times along the capability development continuum; in general terms prior to each acquisition milestone decision. These frequent touch points are complemented by close and continuous collaboration between requirements and acquisition professional at all levels. Regular JROC review also ensures resource sponsors actively monitor and manage the cost, schedule and performance trade space throughout the capability development, production, and sustainment process. High interest programs or those requiring additional senior leader oversight are often reviewed on a semi-annual update interval or other appropriate frequency determined by the JROC.

The subject matter experts charged with conducting the day-to-day management of joint requirements reside in one of six Functional Capability Boards (FCB):

- Battlespace Awareness (BA)
- Command, Control, Communications, and Computers / Cyberspace (C4/Cyber)
- Force Application (FA)
- Force Support (FS)
- Logistics (LOG)
- Protection (PROT)

The FCB's are aligned along common capability core areas and are reflective of the Department's Joint Capability Areas which provide a common capability management language and framework. The FCB's evaluate joint capabilities and provide analytical support to the JROC and its subordinate Joint Capability Board which I chair in my role as the Director, J8. The FCB's are comprised of functional subject matter experts from across the Department and, like the JROC, have fully integrated stakeholders from across the Department. The FCB's provide assessments and recommendations that enhance capabilities integration, examine joint priorities among existing and future programs, and assess program alternatives to minimize duplication of effort across the Services. Lastly, they provide oversight in the management of materiel and non-material changes that support the national defense and military strategies to

help achieve optimum effectiveness and efficiency of the Armed Forces. In short, the FCB's provide a continuous level of oversight to ensure capabilities development stays on track.

JCIDS is a mature and proven process for generating and validating requirements. The process constantly evolves in conjunction with improvements in Defense Acquisition processes. Frequent formal and informal discussions between the JROC Chairman and USD (AT&L), provide opportunities for discussion of on-going improvements, and ensures best practices and process change recommendations are rapidly incorporated. A number of recent reforms that have refined our requirements process are worth noting. Major revisions to the JROC and JCIDS governing documents and the manner in how the supporting bodies carry out their responsibilities in accordance with 10 USC 181 and applicable portions of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 were made in 2012. This committee played a key role in those reforms that have enabled us to improve the JCIDS process. The 2012 reforms added emphasis on analysis of risk, cost, schedule, and performance; expanded tripwire criteria; incorporated pre-Milestone A review of Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) results to inform the follow-on Capability Development Documents (CDD); established deliberate, urgent, and emergent requirements lanes to better respond to capability gaps within acceptable timeframes and levels of risk; and consolidated guidance documents, streamlined procedures, and mandated shorter document length and staffing timelines.

Additionally, significant changes were made to how the JROC was conducted by limiting attendance to principles, advisors, and essential "plus ones." Significantly reducing the audience has fostered an environment in the JROC that enables more determinative discussion and impactful decision making. Tough "knee in the curve" discussions are now commonplace to help identify and pursue the "good enough" vice the "exquisite" solutions where we can do so. JROC Memorandum (JROCM) 015-13, signed by the Vice Chairman in 2013, encourages acquisition managers, in coordination with the appropriate requirements sponsor, to request requirements relief where Key Performance Parameters (KPP) appear out of line with an appropriate cost-benefit analysis. Prior to this JROCM, the JROC was rarely asked to review Key Performance Parameters once an acquisition program reached more mature levels. Shortly after the release of this particular JROCM, the Air Force requested KPP relief for the minimum number of users supported by the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System. The JROC reduced the

threshold value for the number of concurrent users and consequently enabled the Air Force to meet the timeline for increment 1 Milestone C at reduced cost.

Additionally, the Army brought its Apache Block III program back to the JROC for relief of its hover-out-of-ground-effect (HOGE) capability. The JROC approved the proposed change which allowed for a slight decrease in the required performance to account for expected engine wear over the life of the program. Additional examples of improvements in the process that can be attributed to these and other JCIDS reform efforts include:

- Joint Air Ground Missile (JAGM): The JROC-approved KPP relief for JAGM range based on an updated acquisition strategy employing incremental thresholds for range values. The new range values satisfied the necessity to exceed current Hellfire capabilities and allowed the program to remain affordable without driving delivery delay to the warfighters.
- Ground Combat Vehicle/Amphibious Combat Vehicles (GCV/ACV): After a JROC directed comprehensive review, it was determined a common platform for both Services was not achievable due to the differences in mission requirements. However, the JROC identified common technical areas and subsystems which could provide cost savings. By employing a portfolio perspective in validating the requirements, the JROC was better able to define requirements more efficiently and effectively.
- LRS-B (Long Range Strike – Bomber): From the initiation of the ICD and CDD, the JROC reviewed and approved both documents in less than 30 days. This process would have taken at least 6 months prior to the enacted reforms.
- Global Positioning Satellite Modernization (GPS) Analysis of Alternatives (AoA): Review resulted in confirmation that CCMD requirements were satisfied through the current program of record; resulting in avoidance of substantial expenditures to achieve unneeded performance improvements.
- Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV): After validation of the CDD, industry engagement resulted in a KPP change proposals to several performance parameters in order to remain within affordability targets.
- DoD / Industry Partnership: DoD is striving to push capability gap information out to industry earlier in the acquisition process and provide them insight into what DoD is

considering for future capabilities. By partnering early with industry, DoD is better able to leverage industry S&T efforts and, informed by early S&T development, provide feasible and affordable options for acquisition decisions. A recent example of this new approach is the Army's Future of Vertical Lift (FVL) Initial Capabilities Document (ICD) which defined capability gaps in the 2030 and beyond Joint Operational Environment. Combatant Command identified capability gaps are being shared with industry early in the assessment process providing a starting point for requirements determination and cost informed trades.

We have just completed our 2014 revision of the JCIDS manual which continues to enhance the JCIDS process and ultimately our acquisition process. This revision incorporates significant changes to intelligence certification; refines Capabilities Based Assessment (CBA) guidance; directs further leveraging of science and technology efforts; increases focus on the development of measurable and testable operational attributes; and further streamlines document format and staffing. We are constantly revising the way we do business and will continue to emphasize flexibility and speed in requirements review and validation, and when necessary, reassess and adjust previously validated documents when poorly crafted requirements inhibit acquisition program success. Our ultimate goal remains ensuring the requirements process remains agile, responsive, innovative, cost effective and capable of developing and delivering a technologically superior and ready joint force to achieve our Nation's strategic and military objectives.