

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, TEXAS, CHAIRMAN
WALTER B. JONES, NORTH CAROLINA
JOE WILSON, SOUTH CAROLINA
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, NEW JERSEY
ROB BISHOP, UTAH
MICHAEL R. TURNER, OHIO
MIKE ROGERS, ALABAMA
TRENT FRANKS, ARIZONA
BILL SHUSTER, PENNSYLVANIA
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, TEXAS
DOUG LAMBORN, COLORADO
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, VIRGINIA
DUNCAN HUNTER, CALIFORNIA
MIKE COFFMAN, COLORADO
VICKY HARTZLER, MISSOURI
AUSTIN SCOTT, GEORGIA
MO BROOKS, ALABAMA
PAUL COOK, CALIFORNIA
JIM BRIDENSTINE, OKLAHOMA
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, OHIO
BRADLEY BYRNE, ALABAMA
SAM GRAVES, MISSOURI
ELISE M. STEFANIK, NEW YORK
MARTHA MCSALLY, ARIZONA
STEPHEN KNIGHT, CALIFORNIA
STEVE RUSSELL, OKLAHOMA
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, TENNESSEE
RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, LOUISIANA
TRENT KELLY, MISSISSIPPI
MIKE GALLAGHER, WISCONSIN
MATT GAETZ, FLORIDA
DON BACON, NEBRASKA
JIM BANKS, INDIANA
LIZ CHENEY, WYOMING

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-6035

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

May 18, 2017

ADAM SMITH, WASHINGTON, RANKING MEMBER
ROBERT A. BRADY, PENNSYLVANIA
SUSAN A. DAVIS, CALIFORNIA
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, RHODE ISLAND
RICK LARSEN, WASHINGTON
JIM COOPER, TENNESSEE
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, GUAM
JOE COURTNEY, CONNECTICUT
NIKI TSONGAS, MASSACHUSETTS
JOHN GARAMENDI, CALIFORNIA
JACKIE SPEIER, CALIFORNIA
MARC A. VEASEY, TEXAS
TULSI GABBARD, HAWAII
BETO O'ROURKE, TEXAS
DONALD NORCROSS, NEW JERSEY
RUBEN GALLEGO, ARIZONA
SETH MOULTON, MASSACHUSETTS
COLLEEN HANABUSA, HAWAII
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
JACKY ROSEN, NEVADA
A. DONALD McEACHIN, VIRGINIA
SALUD O. CARBAJAL, CALIFORNIA
ANTHONY G. BROWN, MARYLAND
STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, FLORIDA
RO KHANNA, CALIFORNIA
TOM O'HALLERAN, ARIZONA
THOMAS R. SUOZZI, NEW YORK
(VACANCY)

ROBERT L. SIMMONS, II, STAFF DIRECTOR

MEMORANDUM FOR HASC MEMBERS

FROM: Chairman Mac Thornberry 

RE: Acquisition Reform Legislation

Rebuilding America's military is a national priority, and has been a priority of the Armed Services Committee for the past two years. Restoring the capacity, capability, and readiness of our military to meet emerging threats will require additional resources, some of which the Department of Defense has requested. We must provide needed funds. But in doing so, it is incumbent that we reform programs and processes to ensure defense funds are not squandered by inefficient practices or ill-formed decisions.

During the past two years, our reforms of military compensation, retirement, and health care programs have improved benefits while reducing costs during decades to come. Restructuring the Department's bureaucracy has eliminated redundancies and improved accountability. Acquisition reforms have promoted agility and innovation to maintain the technological edge that gives our warfighters an advantage. But there is still more to be done.

Today, I will introduce draft legislation that reforms additional aspects of the acquisition system. The legislation seeks to further improve agility by authorizing the Department to buy commercial-off-the-shelf products through the same online marketplaces that businesses use to acquire goods. It speeds up the acquisition process by streamlining auditing processes that are time consuming and low value. It improves up-front consideration of operating and support costs of weapon systems, developmental testing of weapon programs, and strategic planning for the acquisition of services. It provides several authorities to support further development of the acquisition workforce, especially civilian program managers. It also addresses cultural barriers that inhibit the free flow of data throughout the Department. In the coming weeks, I plan to introduce additional legislation to reduce the amount of process that is mandated in statute. It is

my expectation that transparency improvements in this draft legislation, coupled with elimination of unnecessary process requirements, will be key building blocks of further acquisition system reforms.

Like the last two years, please consider this a discussion draft. I welcome your comments and suggestions leading up to the full committee markup of the Fiscal Year 2018 NDAA. Finally, I want to thank everyone who has contributed to our efforts this year. I look forward to working further with Secretary Mattis, the Service Secretaries, and the Joint Chiefs to implement recent reforms, and with Ranking Member Smith, Chairman McCain, and Senator Reed to ensure the Department has the authorities, flexibilities, and funding necessary to give our warfighters everything they need to successfully defend our nation and protect our way of life.

DRAFT OVERVIEW

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee noted that acquisition agility could be enhanced further by improving contracting and auditing processes, enhancing testing, and further supporting the acquisition workforce. This legislation makes such improvements. It also substantially enhances transparency of business system data in the Department of Defense and, with greater transparency, the committee believes that further fundamental reforms of acquisition and resourcing processes are feasible.

The committee believes that modern procurement practices offer opportunities to greatly streamline the way the government buys goods. The Department is statutorily required to conduct market research, competition, and price comparisons prior to purchasing products. The resultant processes, however, are onerous and time consuming. Even for simple products, market research often entails issuing requests for information, while contracting and price comparisons can involve detailed requirements development and evaluation of in-depth proposals. When the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act was passed in 1994, there were 3 mandatory and 3 optional contract provisions for commercial product procurements. Today, there are a total of 138 possible provisions. This growth in red tape has cost the Department both time and scarce resources. For example, the Inspector General of the General Services Administration found in July 2016, that “Commercial prices were lower for 56 (75 percent) of 75 top-selling [information technology] items for the 1-year period August 2014 to July 2015. The commercial price averaged 13 percent lower than the lowest GSA IT schedule contract price.” Auditing further delays contracting, with the Defense Contract Audit Agency taking an average of 885 days to complete the incurred cost audits they finalized in fiscal year 2016.

The committee also notes that different incentives are needed in the planning for acquisition of major weapon systems and contracted services. It is widely acknowledged that the defense acquisition system incentivizes near-term cost, schedule, and performance tradeoffs. However, engineering decisions that reduce early program costs often result in higher sustainment expenses over the long term. Seeking to acquire broad intellectual property rights to mitigate sustainment costs can be cost-prohibitive and deter contractors from bidding on defense programs. Not acquiring enough technical data, however, can reduce subsequent competition and increase sustainment costs. The Department is typically disadvantaged in negotiations for technical data, as it has too few people who understand intellectual property laws and it negotiates for technical data too late to use competition to secure better pricing. Similarly, requirements for contracted services often are specified too late, which impedes the acquisition community from designing cost-effective contracts before the date of need. Subsequent contracting reviews typically focus on contract actions rather than underlying requirements, which precludes more thorough strategic acquisition and workforce planning. Attempts to make cost-effective, strategic decisions regarding the procurement of services are limited further by a lack of available information. While the Department currently obligates more than half of its

total contract obligations on contracted services, there is little awareness of the services being acquired and even less insight into the services that may need to be acquired in the future.

The committee has long supported a highly skilled and accountable workforce as a cornerstone of the acquisition system. However, while the Department has made substantial strides in increasing the size of its acquisition workforce, concerns remain across several key career fields. Challenges persist in recruiting, developing, and retaining experienced program managers for major defense acquisition programs. Program manager training focuses more on the acquisition process than on technical expertise, business acumen, or knowledge of industry operations. Program manager progression is impaired by a lack of clear career paths and incentives. Military program managers continue to fall short of tenure requirements due to military promotion processes. Workforce shortages and potential skill gaps also remain in other acquisition career fields, including contracting, business, and auditing—three priority career fields that have not met growth goals in recent years. The committee believes that the extension of the AcqDemo program and additional flexibilities for the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund would help address these shortages.

The committee is concerned over a lack of transparency because the Department lags well behind the private sector in effectively incorporating enterprise-wide data analyses into decision-making and oversight. Indeed, RAND found in 2015 that “institutional structure and bureaucratic incentives to restrict data access are exacerbated by policy and guidance to protect information. The result is a strong conservative bias in labeling and a reluctance to share.” The committee therefore believes that a statutory requirement that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments be given access to business system data is necessary to overcome institutional and cultural barriers to information sharing. The committee further believes that to bring about this significant culture change, it is necessary to assign responsibility at the highest levels of the Department for creating and maintaining common enterprise data structures.

DRAFT SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION

Title I – Acquisition System Streamlining

Section 101. Procurement Through Online Marketplaces

This section would require the Department of Defense to contract with one or more commercial online marketplaces for the procurement of certain commercial-off-the-shelf products. Marketplaces would be limited to those that are commonly used in the private sector; provide a dynamic selection of products and prices from numerous suppliers; provide procurement oversight controls, such as two-person approval for purchases; and can screen suppliers and products to ensure compliance with suspension and debarment, domestic sourcing, and other similar statutes. Online marketplaces primarily provide streamlined and automated access to various suppliers; suppliers therefore would be considered prime vendors for purposes of the Small Business Act. The Department would be required to accept the standard terms and conditions related to purchases on each marketplace.

The committee expects the Department to contract with numerous marketplaces to maintain competition between marketplaces and so that Department personnel have streamlined access to suppliers, products, and prices from varying marketplaces. The section therefore would not require the Department to use competitive procedures to contract with each marketplace. The section would require marketplaces to provide electronic access to information about products that are purchased, including the date of each purchase, the price paid, the Department personnel who initiated and approved the purchase, the delivery address, and the number of sellers that offered the same product at the same time. The committee believes that such information would provide much better transparency into the departmental purchasing and thereby enable more thorough oversight and accountability. The provision would require each contract with a marketplace to prohibit the sale or other use of such purchase information to a third party in a manner that identifies the Federal Government, or any of its departments or agencies, as the purchaser.

The committee believes that online marketplaces provide a substantial opportunity to greatly streamline procurement of off-the-shelf products. Marketplaces generally ensure competition and price reasonableness, and therefore would obviate many of the time-consuming government-unique processes the Department performs today. The section would not require commercial-off-the-shelf products to be procured only through online marketplaces, as it may be prudent to procure some commercial products through traditional acquisition processes. The committee therefore expects the Secretary of Defense to issue implementation guidance that may limit the products that should be purchased on marketplaces.

The committee expects, however, that opportunities to purchase additional products through marketplaces may arise as the Department gains familiarity with the use of online marketplaces. Towards that end, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, not later than

six months after the first contract with a marketplace is awarded, to provide a briefing to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on the results of online marketplace purchasing. The briefing should address the dollar value of purchases through each marketplace, the dollar value of purchases through each marketplace to small businesses, any limitations on product purchases that were established in implementation guidance, potential means of addressing or overcoming such limitations, and potential means of procuring through marketplaces products referenced in section 2410n of title 10, United States Code.

Section 102. Performance of Incurred Cost Audits

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to adhere to commercial standards for risk and materiality when auditing costs incurred under cost-type contracts. The committee is concerned that current incurred cost auditing processes in the Department of Defense are too slow, impede effective contract management, and may not provide good value to the taxpayer. The committee also understands that commercial auditors used by other Federal agencies may cost less and complete incurred cost audits sooner.

This section would transfer requirements related to auditing indirect costs in section 190 of title 10, United States Code, as proposed to be added by section 820(b)(1)(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328), to this section to consolidate provisions on incurred cost auditing. The section also would authorize contract management personnel in the Department to choose either the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) or a qualified private auditor (QPA) to audit incurred costs, subject to guidelines of an audit planning committee. The section would require the Department to enter into an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity task order contract with QPAs, and that QPAs audit at least 25 percent of incurred costs after September 1, 2020. The section also would require DCAA to pass a peer review by a commercial auditor, which is consistent with commercial practice, to continue to issue unqualified audit findings after September 1, 2022. The section would prohibit DCAA from further auditing or reviewing audits performed by QPAs and would require the Secretary to treat DCAA and QPA audits equally.

This section also would specify a materiality standard for incurred cost audits, based on private sector norms, for both DCAA and QPAs. The Department would be required to review private sector materiality standards every five years and propose changes to the materiality standards in this section, as necessary. The section would require incurred cost audits to be completed within one year after receipt of qualified cost submissions, or the submissions would be accepted in their entirety, unless the Department could demonstrate that the contractor withheld information necessary to perform the reconciliation audit. The committee intends for the Department to redefine its incurred cost backlog to include all audits that are not completed within one year of receipt of qualified incurred cost submissions. The committee further intends the Department to allocate DCAA and QPA audit resources to the highest risk audits consistent with completing incurred cost audits within one year. Towards that end, the section would direct

the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a report by April 1, 2025, on the relative timeliness, costs, and quality of incurred cost audits performed by DCAA and QPAs; relative contractor costs of incurred cost audits performed by DCAA and QPAs; any effects on other types of audits; and the capability and capacity of commercial auditors to perform incurred cost audits for the Department.

Section 103. Modifications to Cost or Pricing Data and Reporting Requirements

This section would amend sections 2306a of title 10 and 3502 of title 41, United States Code, to raise contract dollar thresholds that require submission of certified cost and pricing data. The threshold for non-competitive prime contracts, modifications of such contracts, subcontracts, and modifications of subcontracts would increase from \$500,000 to \$2.5 million, while the threshold for modifications to legacy contracts would increase from \$100,000 to \$750,000. Raising certified cost and pricing data thresholds would reduce administrative burdens, improve process timelines for smaller contracts, and make thresholds approximately consistent with standard auditing thresholds.

This section also would amend section 2313a of title 10, United States Code, to revise reporting requirements of the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) to provide more clarity on the cost effectiveness of different types of audits. It would require DCAA to report separately for incurred cost, forward pricing, and other audits with regard to the number and dollar value of audits completed and pending, sustained questioned costs, the costs of performing audits, and the return on investment of conducting audits. This section also would change the inflation calculation for the thresholds for certified cost and pricing data, as well as covered contracts related to allowable costs, to be consistent with the inflation methodology in section 1908 of title 41, United States Code.

Title II – Early Investments In Acquisition Programs

Section 201. Requirement to emphasize reliability and maintainability in weapon system design

This section would emphasize reliability and maintainability (R&M) in the system design of a major defense acquisition program (MDAP). First, the section would require the Department of Defense to revise guidance on the requirements development process to include R&M in the existing key performance parameter on sustainment. Second, when contracting for the development or production of an MDAP, the program manager would be required to include performance requirements on R&M in the contract solicitation and contract terms unless he or she determines R&M should not be a performance requirement. Third, the section would require the Department to revise guidance on source selection criteria to include R&M as factors or significant subfactors in the evaluation of proposals. Fourth, the section would authorize the use of incentive fees and would require the use of recovery options when practicable to encourage contractor performance in R&M. Finally, the section would establish a program through which

program managers would compete for additional funding to invest in R&M during the development or production of an MDAP to reduce future operating and support (O&S) costs.

The committee notes that the design of a major weapon system directly affects its life-cycle sustainment activities and consequently drives its O&S costs. Elements of sustainment that are highly dependent on the system design, namely R&M, are easier and less costly to address during the development of an MDAP than after a weapon system is fielded. Therefore, the committee believes the Department should emphasize R&M in early engineering decisions.

Section 202. Licensing of Appropriate Intellectual Property to Support Major Weapon Systems

This section would require the Department of Defense to work with contractors to determine prices for technical data the Department plans to acquire or license before selecting a vendor. Obtaining prices for technical data while competition exists among contractors encourages the Department to plan early for the technical data it needs to maintain a weapon system and affords the Department more competitive prices than it might pay later during the sustainment phase. Additionally, this section would encourage program managers to negotiate with industry to obtain the custom set of technical data necessary to support each major defense acquisition program rather than, as a default approach, seeking greater rights to more extensive, detailed technical data than is necessary.

The committee believes that acquiring broad rights to most or all of the technical data in a weapon system can be cost-prohibitive and deter contractors from bidding on defense programs. Not acquiring enough technical data, however, can reduce subsequent competition and increase sustainment costs. Therefore, the committee urges program managers when seeking technical data to consider the particular data that is required, the level of detail necessary, the purpose for which it will be used, and with whom the government needs to share it. Program managers should also consider the unique characteristics of the weapon system and its components, the product support strategy for the weapon system, the organic industrial base strategy of the military department, and the commercial market.

Section 203. Management of Intellectual Property Matters within the Department of Defense

This section would create a small cadre of experts in intellectual property (IP) that would advise, assist, and provide resources to program offices as they develop their IP strategies and negotiate with industry. The section would also establish a centralized Office of Intellectual Property within the Department of Defense to standardize the Department's approach toward obtaining technical data, promulgate policy on IP, oversee the cadre of IP experts, and serve as a single point of contact for industry on IP matters. Finally, this section would add IP positions to the acquisition workforce and would revise the training provided to the acquisition workforce on IP matters.

The committee has observed within the Department divergent philosophies toward acquiring technical data and varying knowledge of IP matters, including laws, regulations, and best practices. The committee is concerned that this inconsistency and lack of coordination disadvantages the Department. Additionally, because a provision elsewhere in this title would establish a preference for “specially negotiated licenses” to obtain the appropriate technical data customized to each weapon system, the committee believes the Department requires tools to improve its ability to negotiate with industry. A centralized Office of Intellectual Property and cadre of IP experts are warranted to address these issues. The committee intends that the office and cadre would provide advice and assistance to facilitate acquisitions. The bill would not require the office or cadre to approve IP strategies, contracting actions, or other program office activities.

Section 204. Improvement of Planning for Acquisition of Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the appropriate information is available and that the right factors are considered to enable the most effective business decisions regarding the procurement of services. This section would require the Secretaries of the Department of Defense and of the military departments to analyze spending patterns and projected future requirements for contracted services and use this analysis to inform future decisions on services acquisition. Additionally, the section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress with the annual budget clear and detailed information on the amounts requested for contracted services organized according to the common enterprise data structure required elsewhere in this Act. This section also would require the Service Requirements Review Boards (SRRBs) that the Department of Defense established last year to focus primarily on evaluating the need for contracted services, rather than the contracting action. The SRRBs would be required to critically examine requirements in light of total force management, available resources, analysis of past spending, and contracting best practices. Finally, this section would require the entities that need contracted services to plan appropriately, whenever possible, to receive validation of the requirement, secure the needed funding, and complete the contracting action before the service is needed. A requirements owner that does not adequately plan for contracted services and consequently relies on a bridge contract would be required to provide an update and explanation to the relevant senior official. Upon the second use of a bridge contract for the same service, the senior official would be required to notify senior leadership within the relevant military department, Defense Agency, Department of Defense Field Activity, or combatant command.

The committee believes that greater data and analytics would enable the Department of Defense to make more enterprise-oriented, strategic decisions about its acquisition of services. The committee also believes that if departmental organizations were encouraged to identify their known or enduring requirements earlier in the process, it would enable more thorough examination of the requirements, better and more timely alignment of resources, and opportunities to use contracting best practices. Additionally, improved planning processes

would empower local installations and commands to better manage individual contracts and their associated funding. The committee notes that this legislation would improve headquarters analysis and management of the acquisition of services but would retain the decentralized nature of procuring services at local installations.

Section 205. Improvements to Test and Evaluation Processes and Tools

This section would amend sections 2366b and 2366c of title 10, United States Code, to require an assessment of the sufficiency of the developmental test plan and resources for each major defense acquisition program (MDAP) be included in the “acquisition scorecards” that were created in section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328). The committee believes that developmental testing is critical to reducing acquisition program risk by providing valuable information to support sound decisionmaking. However, the committee is concerned that some MDAPs do not conduct enough developmental testing, so too many problems are first identified during operational testing, when they are expensive and time-consuming to fix. The section also would require the Department of Defense to evaluate its strategy for developing and expanding the use of tools that facilitate cost-effective developmental testing, including automated test methods and tools, modeling and simulation tools, and big data analytics technologies. The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 1 year of enactment. The committee believes that emerging technologies and tools, such as Automated Test and Retest and modeling and simulation, can reduce program risk by facilitating rigorous system testing early in the life of a program.

Title III – Acquisition Workforce Improvements

Section 301. Enhancements to the Civilian Program Management Workforce

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a new career development program to increase the pool of highly experienced civilian employees qualified to serve as program managers for major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). The committee believes that a focus on career development and incentive structures for program managers would increase the number of personnel ready and willing to successfully manage MDAPs, thereby increasing the professionalization and tenure of personnel in these critical positions. The new career development program would include selection criteria for personnel in the program, necessary human capital flexibilities, and structured training and career paths. The Secretary would be required to provide a design for the program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within one year of the enactment of this Act. The section also would require the Secretary to designate one or more job series to effectively track program management personnel throughout the Department of Defense. Lastly, the section would require an independent study of personnel policies and financial incentives needed to attract, retain, and hold accountable program managers for the largest and most complex

acquisition programs in the Department. The study would be required to be completed within nine months of the enactment of this Act, and the Secretary would be required to provide the study to the congressional defense committees within 30 days thereafter.

Section 302. Improvements to the Hiring and Training of the Acquisition Workforce

This section would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund to pay salaries of personnel to manage the Fund. The committee expects that this authorization would improve the Department of Defense's ability to effectively sustain its acquisition workforce. The section also would require the Comptroller General of the United States to report by January 15, 2019, on the effectiveness of existing hiring flexibilities for the acquisition workforce, as well as the need for acquisition training for personnel who work in acquisition programs but are not formally considered part of the acquisition workforce. The section would require the Department to evaluate gaps in knowledge of industry operations, industry motivation, and business acumen in the acquisition workforce. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment would be required to report on this evaluation to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by December 31, 2018. Lastly, the section would require the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on strategies to enhance the professionalization of the Agency's workforce no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

The committee believes that the hiring, training, and retention of highly qualified civilian personnel for the defense acquisition workforce is vital to maintaining military readiness, increasing the department's buying power, and achieving substantial long-term savings through systems engineering and contracting. Therefore, the committee urges that planning for any workforce reduction that would affect the civilian acquisition workforce takes into consideration potential long-term effects of those reductions on cost, technical baseline, and warfighting capability.

Section 303. Extension and Modifications to the Acquisition Demonstration Project

This section would amend section 1762 of title 10, United States Code, to extend, through December, 2023, the Acquisition Demonstration (AcqDemo) personnel demonstration project that was established in section 4308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106). AcqDemo allows the Department of Defense flexibility in setting compensation for recruiting and retaining high performing acquisition personnel. The section also would require the Secretary of Defense to develop an implementation strategy to address potential AcqDemo improvements that were identified in a recent RAND assessment, and brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the implementation strategy within one year of the enactment of this Act.

Section 304. Acquisition Positions in the Offices of the Secretaries of the Military Departments

This section would help to retain qualified acquisition personnel within the Department of Defense by amending sections 3014, 5014, and 8014 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to exceed statutory personnel caps for civilian employees when hiring acquisition oversight personnel from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics or requirements personnel from the Joint Staff that supported the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. For the caps to be exceeded, a determination would be required that a position was no longer needed due to restructuring required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) and that the position would not be refilled by the Office of the Secretary of Defense or the Joint Staff.

Title IV – Transparency Improvements

Section 401. Transparency of Business System Data

This section would amend section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to require that all data within Department of Defense business systems be considered owned by the Department and be readily available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments. To facilitate the management and analysis of data from across the military departments and defense agencies, the section would require the creation and maintenance of common enterprise data structures (CEDs) into which business system data could be mapped to populate common data sets. The section would assign responsibility to the Deputy Chief Management Officer for creation of CEDs and would amend section 139a of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation maintain the CEDs and establish and maintain access to all related data. The committee is concerned that the Department lags well behind the private sector in effectively incorporating enterprise-wide data analyses into decision-making and oversight. The committee therefore believes that a statutory requirement that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments be given access to business system data is necessary to overcome institutional and cultural barriers to information sharing. The committee further believes that to bring about this significant culture change, it is necessary to assign responsibility at the highest levels of the Department for creating and maintaining CEDs.

Section 402. Major Defense Acquisition Programs: Display of Budget Information

This section would require greater transparency in the budget requests for major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). Budget justification documents for MDAPs would be required to separately depict funding for developmental and operational testing and evaluation, the purchase of cost data from contractors, and the purchase or license of technical data. The committee believes that testing and evaluation, cost data, and intellectual property are necessary

investments made early in a program. However, the committee is concerned that associated funding is often decremented when cost, schedule, or performance risks materialize. Improving transparency of funding for these items would improve the ability of the committee to conduct oversight.

Section 403. Enhancements to Transparency in Test and Evaluation Processes and Data

This section would require several improvements to the transparency of test and evaluation (T&E) processes and data. It would amend section 139 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Director of Operational Test & Evaluation (OT&E) to document specific circumstances that require the addition of smaller programs to the OT&E oversight list and to summarize those circumstances in the annual OT&E report. The section also would amend section 2399 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Director of OT&E to provide data in test reports on how the capabilities of new systems being tested compare to those of legacy systems. It would amend section 139 of title 10, United States Code, to enhance the opportunity of the military departments to comment on the annual OT&E report to ensure that OT&E information is complete, accurate, and timely. The section also would require improved transparency of T&E cost data to enable oversight entities to better evaluate the adequacy of a program's T&E plans and resources. It would require the Department of Defense to develop an enterprise approach to T&E knowledge management to leverage T&E data across programs. The Director of the Test Resource Management Center and the senior Department official responsible for developmental testing would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's enterprise approach within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.