

TODAY'S OT&E:

ABUSES

AND

REMEDIES

CURRENT OT&E ABUSE

BILL REMEDY

1. SYSTEMS THAT FLUNK
OT&E GO INTO PROD'N
ANYWAY -- M-2, LLLGB

FORBID PROD'N
UNTIL ADEQUATE
OT&E (AS DEFINED
BY BILL) IS COMPLETE.

2. INADEQUATE NUMBER
OF ITEMS AVAILABLE
FOR TEST - AMRAAM,
AEGIS.

NO PROD'N CONTRACT --
EXCEPT PROD'N OF TEST
ITEMS -- PERMITTED
UNDER ①.

3. OT&E ALMOST NEVER
COMPARATIVE; THUS,
CAN'T TELL WHETHER
NEW SYSTEM IS
BETTER OR WORSE --
M-1, AEGIS

ALL OT&E MUST BE
SIDE-BY-SIDE WITH
ITEM REPLACED, OR
NEAREST COMPETITOR

CURRENT OT&E ABUSE

BILL REMEDY

4. OT&E ALWAYS IGNORES EFFECT OF QUANTITY ON COMBAT EFFECTIVENESS

MANDATES TESTING EQUAL COST QUANTITIES OF ITEMS TO BE COMPARED

5. OT&E OMITTS CRITICAL ASPECTS OF EFFECTIVENESS, PARTICULARLY ANY THAT MIGHT CAUSE FAILURE -- E.G., MANEUVERING TARGETS FOR AEGIS; SURVIVABILITY FOR BRADLEY

OT&E ASSESSMENTS MUST INCLUDE SURVIVABILITY, MANEUVERABILITY, RELIABILITY, MAINTAINABILITY, MOBILITY AND RATE OF KILL.

6. PENTAGON PREFERS SINGLE "AGREED" TEST REPORT, I.E., SERVICE PARTY LINE.

MANDATES SERVICE TEST REPORT AND SEPARATE, INDEPENDENT COMMENTS BY DOT&E

7. CONTRACTORS BUGGER TEST PLANNING, EXECUTION AND INTERPRETATION

NO OT&E VALID IF CONTRACTORS INVOLVED, EXCEPT FOR DEPOT REPAIR

CAN OT&E BE INDEPENDENT OR EFFECTIVE UNDER AN ACQUISITION CZAR?

- EVERY OSD R&D CHIEF SINCE HAROLD BROWN IN 1962 HAS BEEN, DE FACTO OR DE JURE, ACQUISITION "CZAR".
- EVERY R&D CHIEF SINCE BROWN HAS BEEN AN EMOTIONAL ADVOCATE OF MORE R&D \$, MORE NEW PROGRAMS, MORE MONEY FOR INDUSTRY.
- EVERY R&D CHIEF SINCE BROWN HAS BEEN VIOLENTLY OPPOSED TO CANCELLING PROGRAMS THAT FLUNK OT&E -- AND VIOLENTLY OPPOSED TO TOUGHER OT&E.
- BILL PERRY ACTIVELY SABOTAGED THE ONE YEAR EXPERIMENT (1976-77) IN INDEPENDENT OT&E.

- THE NEW ACQUISITION "CZAR" HAS POWERS THAT DIFFER FROM CURRENT USDR&E (HICKS, DELAVER) ONLY IN THE RIGHT TO A CHAUFFEUR.

WILL HAVING A CHAUFFEUR
MAKE THE NEW "CZAR"
FRIENDLY TO:

- TOUGHER OT&E
- CANCELLING SYSTEMS
THAT FAIL ??

OR WILL HE BELIEVE THAT
TESTING SHOULD "KEEP THE
MONEY FLOWING", LIKE ALL
HIS PREDECESSORS

- IT TOOK THE DEATH OF 7 ASTRONAUTS TO ESTABLISH THE ROGERS RECOMMENDATION THAT LAUNCH SAFETY SHOULD NOT REPORT TO THE NASA ACQUISITION CZAR
- HOW MANY THOUSAND SOLDIERS HAVE TO DIE IN COMBAT BEFORE WE LEARN THAT COMBAT SAFETY AND SUITABILITY SHOULD NOT REPORT TO THE DOD ACQUISITION CZAR ??

OPERATIONAL TEST BILL OVERVIEW

CURRENT ABUSE OF OT&E	BILL REMEDY
1. Systems that flunk OT&E (or don't have a real OT&E) go into production anyway.	No system can proceed into production until a satisfactory OT&E (as defined by bill) is completed.
2. Almost never enough systems available for adequate test. E.g., only 25 missiles for AMRAAM OT&E.	No production contract can be signed -- excepting contracts for producing test items -- until mandated OT&E is complete.
3. OT&E testing is almost never comparative, making it impossible to judge whether new system is better or worse than previous ones. E.g., M-1 or Aegis.	All OT&E must be side-by-side with system being replaced (or with nearest competitor).
4. OT&E testing always ignores the effect of quantity on effectiveness in combat.	The side-by-side tests must be conducted with equal cost quantities of the two systems being compared (e.g., 1 F-15 against 2 F-4's; 1 Bradley against 10 M113's).
5. OT&E frequently omits critical aspects of combat effectiveness, particularly if potentially embarrassing. E.g., survivability for Bradley, maneuvering targets for Aegis.	OT&E assessments must include (as appropriate) at least survivability, reliability, maintainability, mobility, rate of kill and combat maneuverability.
6. Contractors make test results artificially favorable by involvement in: planning of tests, execution of tests, or substituting for troops in maintenance of test systems. E.g., Hughes personnel telling pilots when to fire in Maverick OT&E.	No OT&E is acceptable if contractor (or developing agency) personnel are involved in any way with one exception: depot-level maintenance.
7. Pentagon prefers issuing single OT&E test report "agreed" between Services and independent Director of OT&E; the Service position almost always prevails.	Every OT&E must have a Service test report and separate comments by the Director of OT&E.