

**SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE HEARING  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2005  
DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROCESSES AND ORGANIZATION**

**Members' Interests Summary**

**Warner:**

Grateful to McCain and Ensign re commitment to reform Acquisition

Encouraged that Department, on its own initiative, has begun to look at this situation and many different reports and wheels rolling towards a comprehensive QDR.

Requested "coincidence of this work product such that we (the SASC) has impact on the analysis to be reported to the QDR – confluence of viewpoints.

DSB findings, regarding potential recurrence of the ethical problems, is worrisome.

Requirements process has to be taken out of the hands of the services and structured around the combatant commanders so the advocates for solutions are not also writing requirements.

Recommend restructured joint requirements oversight council on which service vice chiefs or chiefs are replaced by deputies to the combatants.

Should service chiefs have primary responsibility for acquisition management and the execution of acquisition programs?

I like "one person, one accountability."

What are the time schedules for the current reviews? Please provide reports as they are finished – before being integrated. (*Kadish ans: end of Nov for DAPA*)

Packard Commission report focused on unrealistic budgeting, chronic instability in funding, overstated requirements, dilution of accountability, duplication of programs and inadequate testing

Many of the easiest reforms have been implemented – the most difficult management and organizational issues require significant management attention and perseverance

Acquisition programs appear hindered by under funding, unrealistic estimates and year-to-year budget instability

Far to many service-specific solutions, overstated needs and changing requirements that increase program instability