

Dr. Bruce D. Jette  
Assistant Secretary of the Army  
Army Acquisition Executive

Project for Media and National Security  
George Washington University

Defense Writers Group

10 January 2019

**DWG:** Welcome to Defense Writers Group breakfast with Dr. Jette. Sir, thank you so much for being our guest today. We have a new moderator today with us today – Meghann Myers from Army Times. I would like to thank our sponsors Carnegie Corporation of New York and The George Washington University School of Media and Public Affairs. Over to you Meghann.

**DWG:** What are the successes you've had in changing the way that you would have acquired something and what kind of successes you've had in that idea of rushing to failure and failing early and failing often. If something's not working, just abandoning it.

**Dr. Jette:** I know sometimes the Army structure is a little bit confusing. So you have the civilian portion of it which is the political piece which is overlooking. I'm a political appointee because I represent the executive branch in controlling the military, which is not a political or elected entity. So I work for the Secretary, so my responsibility then is with Acquisition, Logistics and Technology.

The way Title 10 has set things up is that the ASALT has the responsibility for the acquisition of, development and acquisition of equipment from research and development on. Though there are different levels of tightness of control.

Where there has been a challenge is that the operational side of the force has to come up with the requirements. And they were somewhat piece-mealed and they weren't focused. When the Secretary came in, he sat down with his Chief, and the two of them agreed that what they wanted to do was generate these top

Professional Word Processing & Transcribing  
(801) 556-7255

Jette - 1/10/19

six and find a way to restructure the Army so that they could be more focused against what they felt was the threat environment.

So we had 18 years, you know, we had some [ways] that brought us the big weapon systems we had, we had peace dividend in the '90s, and fall of the Wall, war, and the lack of focus at that point and then boom along comes the war, the terrorism issues. And that's consumed us. How you deal with the issues of terrorism are different than how you deal with a near peer competitor in developing your capabilities. In many ways, there was a pivot towards trying to deal with that, and because of resourcing there was less focus on those things that were near peer. But that didn't mean the peers didn't focus on us. So they were able to make significant strides versus our capabilities so that when we got to a point of beginning to look back towards that, towards them, we realized we needed to do something. The Secretary and the Chief sat down and generated the AFC.

The idea was to try and bring under a single command the capability to deal with the larger threats, again, in a focused way.

They then identified six priorities. They created CFTs, cross-functional teams. We've always had something akin to a CFT. The CFTs are basically super TISMs or TICMs, and I'd probably get beat up if I was to -- the Chief has assigned, he's put resources behind this. He put a general officer in charge of each of these. TISMs or TICMs were colonels in the past. They report to the four-star. So it gives him a lot more focus against these specific areas, and then the Secretary and the Chief have held to their word. I mean I sit in meetings with them. Every Monday in the afternoon we do a review of one of the six -- there are six focus areas, but there are eight functional teams. There are two cross-cutting teams. And each Monday we go through one of them and it just keeps on spiraling. So you have the Secretary and the Chief very focused on that.

My role in acquisition is then to find a way to bring these to, bring the acquisition process in alignment with this much more

Jette - 1/10/19

improved requirements development process.

In the past, and I don't know how you guys will be able to write this down, but in the past, the way requirements were generated and the way acquisition worked was you had the requirements guys and you had the acquisition guys. And the requirements guys had their responsibility and an interface called a piece of paper, and they gave it over to the acquisition guys. That's it. There was this -- you don't have any impact on my production schedule and I have no impact on your requirements.

That led to quite a number of our difficulties and the lack of getting the most out of what we could have done had there been a much better exchange.

The objective of the CFTs, and frankly it's filtered out because the CFTs again focused on those eight areas. And there are 32 programs that are CFT focuses. But there are bunches of other, I think somewhere around 839 programs that are [inaudible]. Thirty-one versus 839. I've got a lot of other programs. Those are still run by the schools. But the velocity of an integrated, shared development process both for the requirements and the acquisition strategy, has become much more pervasive across the board.

So my description is, instead of like this, we're like this. That doesn't mean that the requirements still come from AFC and the acquisition still comes from ASALT, but it's, that way you know who's responsible for what they're going to do, and they know the exact to deliver, and they've got their chains of command for responsibility and authorities up to the Secretary and within Title 10, but there's much more of an integrated collegial, cooperative approach to things. So that's kind of a long answer, but it really sets the stage, because I know people wonder about how AFC -- I tell my people, they're a scuff. Go get in there and scuff it up. Okay? We're developing new processes and procedures and sometimes we get grumpy with each other but we work through it and in the end, I think we'll have a much better product.

Professional Word Processing & Transcribing  
(801) 556-7255

Jette - 1/10/19

So I got the first part, I think.

**DWG:** So what are some concrete examples of successes that you've had with this new philosophy?

**Dr. Jette:** I'm trying to think of one that would be real easy. In a way, some of them are nascent efforts.

**DWG:** Or even -- it doesn't have to be something that's going to production, but something that is, things that, you're doing it differently. You're concrete, doing it differently than you would have.

**Dr. Jette:** I'll give you a prime example. In the past we looked at air defense as systems. The way you do air defense is okay, I've got this altitude, that altitude and that altitude. I need a system that works at this altitude, that altitude and that altitude. Okay, you told me to buy a system, develop and build a system that can deal with an air threat at this altitude or that altitude or the other altitude. They were stand-alone concepts. The integration of them in a battle space was purely done at the operator level. So when I deliver a system under that methodology, I give you a Patriot battery. Here's a Patriot battery. It stands alone. All you've got to do is put fuel in the thing and a couple of soldiers and the thing works. Okay?

So we've taken a look at the overall threat environment. Threats become more complicated. It's not just tactical ballistic missiles or jets or helicopters. Now we've got UAVs. I've got Swarms, I've got cruise missiles, I've got rockets, artillery, mortar. Okay, I've got to find a way to integrate all this.

So using the CFTs, the technical side has come back and said listen, normally if you want to deal with some of the inbounds that are not rockets, or not missiles, TDMS, things like rockets, artilleries and mortars, that radars that come with the Patriot battery are not the same radars that you need to see RAM. But we have radars that see RAM. So why don't we integrate them into a

Jette - 1/10/19

network? And, oh by the way, we were working on this thing just for the air defense. That's called IBCS. So we went, and I came on board a year ago and the IBCS system was in trouble mostly because of muddy requirements. Some of us, the way we approach it acquisitionally, we fix the requirements, we fix the [MUD], all in cooperation. We've got an acquisition process in place and we're doing really well. We'll be delivering next December systems that are deployable.

It now breaks out, so I don't deliver you a Patriot battery anymore. I deliver you missile systems, I deliver you radars, I deliver you a command and control architecture. They all integrate and any of the command and control components can fire any of the missiles against any of the threats. They can leverage any of the sensor systems to be able to employ an effector against any particular threat. What that's positioned us is to begin putting our artificial intelligence in the back side of it to optimize against the threat that we see in the aggregate, to include the air defense community.

People who deal with counter-battery are in the artillery community, and they're both out at Fort Bliss, but now we've got them talking across through the CFTs and AFC about how to put that entire concept together, because I'm also going to be putting directed energy on the battle space.

So how do I provide targeting to directed energy systems when I may be using them against things that would be more likely to be seen not by a THAAD radar or a radar for the Patriot, but a radar that's used in the artillery regime.

So it's given us that ability to get our arms around much greater, and we have a much more holistic view of where we're heading now in the air defense area.

This is discussions that go all the way up to the Secretary. Oddly enough, he likes air defense.

Does that help?

Jette - 1/10/19

**DWG:** Yes.

**DWG:** Hi, Dr. Jette. Jack Dash from [Al Monitor].

I had a question about your indirect fire protection capability. I understand the Pentagon's certified to Congress that it will meet interim capability in that range, and I'm curious what you're learned about what it might need for that interim capability, and if it's something like Iron Dome or that a mere interceptor might be a possible fit for that?

**Dr. Jette:** I've got to make sure I don't do stupid things, because there's this rule book about what I'm allowed to say and not allowed to say with respect to acquisitions per se. So we do need to look at an interim system. We need to get some things, we want to have some things in place that provide us some immediate protection. So what that's going to do is we're going to look at things that are readily available. Things that are readily available may meet some of our requirements but not all of our requirements. But we may be able to deal with those things that are, I don't want to call them necessarily shortcomings, they're, because something's not a shortcoming if you never planned to do it. It's just different.

So we've got some systems that are available that we're, and I don't know where we are in the procurement, whether any RFP's been put on the street or acquisitions have been put on the street. So check with Matt as to the specific because I don't want to -- I know too much, I don't want to tell you something that I'm not allowed to say.

**DWG:** Let me just interrupt to say I have Matt's card. He had one, so I'm going to, at the end of this, send you all his contact.

**Dr. Jette:** So we did look, we have looked at a number of systems. We have winnowed that down to a very small set of candidates for quick availability and quick deployment. And then

Jette - 1/10/19

what our plan then is to put those in place as we develop a more robust set of plans to the future. That may require a new system or it may, what we're looking at is some systems. I said there are shortcomings. Well, the shortcomings are that they may not, the existing systems we're looking at may not have the ability directly to integrate into this IBCS network, for example.

So how hard is it to get that system to integrate in?

We have a larger threat scenario than pretty much anybody else that we have to contend with. So how extensible is the current system that we would be using for an interim system to be able to cover our entire spectrum of threat issues that we have to deal with? So we'll be making evaluations. You do an interim because that's what it does. It gives you a little breathing room, it gives you some protection against something that you think you have some gaps on at the moment, and we're taking a pretty balanced look at it.

What's the most benefit to the taxpayer? Can we get a defensive system for this purpose that meets our needs in the long run out of the interim system? Cost effectively? Modifications? Or do we go to a pure developmental approach and produce a new system? We haven't made that decision.

**DWG:** Specifically with regard to time lines. I understand that there was an asked for strategy with regard to the IFPC. Do you have a set date for when that will be out? And do you expect to be able to deliver two batteries by September 2020 as the NDAA asked for?

**Dr. Jette:** We'll meet the NDAA requirement. And I believe there was a report we already put together, I don't know if it's been sent over to the Hill. Matt will have to tell you that. I read a lot of stuff and I just don't remember, did I read it and send it over. Did I just read it? But yes, we're on schedule, on track, we're going to solve this in accordance with the NDAA.

**DWG:** Have you looked into the feasibility of Iron Dome

Jette - 1/10/19

subsequently after the House Armed Services [inaudible] last year?

**Dr. Jette:** Yeah, we've looked at Iron Dome. We looked at anybody that had a good system that we could reach for. So we've looked at Iron Dome. We've looked at a number of others as well.

**DWG:** Dr. Jette, it's good to see you again.

I'd like to talk about the recent contract award for prototypes for the Mobile Protective Firepower System.

Could you explain, in the beginning when that system was first being talked about and lobbied for, it talked about having it for forced entry capability. Maybe not all of it, but possibly giving it to airborne units to drop in. So air droppable.

When the contract award came out it was like okay, it's going to be air/land, it's not going to be air droppable.

Could you talk about what the reasoning behind that was? Also, so if there's no need for it to be air droppable, then were there systems that you looked at, you know, like the Mobile Gun existing systems readily available like the Stryker Mobile Gun system which has a 105 cannon on it which is, I guess, at the low end of the requirements.

**Dr. Jette:** This is one of the things I wanted to make sure I said. The 830-some systems, I don't know the details of some of the things, and particularly because some of the questions go back to history. I can't answer you. Not because I don't want to, but because I really don't know the answer.

And I don't want to sound like a, depending on what questions you ask I may give this answer a lot. I'm just going to have to get that answer through Matt. Why the specifics of the down-select were acceptable to both the operational community, because we had operational community people involved with the down-select, as well as the programmatic piece.



Jette - 1/10/19

And I'll tell you what, it's kind of interesting. The operational side of the house really thought they were going to have to push against us to get us to not buy that junk they don't want, and what you need. So somewhere in there there was a significant involvement of the operational community to look at it and say given the features that are available, this outweighs that. And I just don't know the specifics of it.

**DWG:** So you can't speak to like analysis of alternatives.

**Dr. Jette:** I can't, no. I mean I just, if I told you, it would be my opinion based upon my knowledge of the system, not a real answer to your question.

**DWG:** Then I'd like to ask a follow-up. You talked about how AFC was stood up, and I've heard you speak in the past about how you're going to be working directly, you are working directly with General Murray, the Commander of AFC. You know him. I've heard both of you say great things about each other.

But this is a new command and it does take some of the responsibilities away from you. At least that's my understanding.

**Dr. Jette:** No.

**DWG:** I thought it did. I thought it --

**Dr. Jette:** No. My responsibilities are in law. They're not going anywhere. That's not to say that we're not doing some things differently.

**DWG:** The question I had is, you are working together. Despite your great relationship, this is a new thing. Can you talk about any challenges that you've had, any headaches that you've had as far as the Army says this is the way to go, it's the most fantastic thing in the world? And I'm sure it is. But I mean this is a new product and you're kind of moving -- can you talk

Jette - 1/10/19

about any of the things that are challenging as opposed to the past?

**Dr. Jette:** I think that probably the biggest challenge tends to be where we have meeting engagements. I don't know if you're very operationally oriented. But you're moving along on the terrain, you think the enemy's five miles away and the next thing you know the guy shows up in the tree line. Those are meeting engagements. We end up having meeting engagements periodically as we try to do things. So they think that they are supposed to do something, I think that we're supposed to do something or our guys do, and the next thing you know, we've got two entities in contact, both trying to do the right thing but both doing it the way they thought they were supposed to do it, et cetera, et cetera. So what we end up having is a number of times where we just, it's a continuous process. We have to get together and then adjudicate okay, who's got what responsibilities? How are we going to do this? Would it be better to be done on the AFC side? Or on the ASALT side? What are the limitations? Some things, it's just Title 10 says they'll be done here. So we sort those things out.

That's where I tell my guys, don't worry about getting scuffed up a little bit. Get in there, find those things, and let us do interface, resolution of interface.

On the other side, it's improved the, it's kind of an interesting perspective that I've encountered in the [polling] and I hadn't realized it, having been in the Army's acquisitions programs a while in the past. There was a philosophy that somehow the acquisition community had been foisting upon the soldiers the stuff that they got, and they decided how many they were going to buy and they decided how the money was going to be allocated. It's a resourcing. They get no pushback from me. The responsibility for deciding what will make the Army the best fighting element is on the uniformed side because they're the people that do that. That's like going into your, I don't go into my doctor and tell them, you know, I don't want you to do the x-ray of my back, I want you to do acupuncture or something.

Jette - 1/10/19

That's a, I'm not a medical doctor. I don't tell medical doctors what to do. At the same time, I've got responsibilities about making selections and choices in my life.

That's what we've worked through, and we're doing I think a fairly decent job. I have made a focus, I'm the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology. I think in the past an awful lot of my predecessors focused on being essentially the Assistant Secretary of the Army for PEOs. That's what they focused on, just being the PEO guy. I've got industrial policy, I've got industrial base, I've got foreign military sales, I've got logistics and the logistics chain.

General Perna, for example, doesn't work for me. He works for the Army. But many of the things that he does require my oversight and control. So we have to work together. Again, it's that interface.

So it's not just AFC. It's AFC, AMC, in some cases TRADOC, the Army Staff. I don't know if that --

**DWG:** Yes. Thank you.

**DWG:** About early October you spoke to my colleagues about the AFC framework with ASALT, kind of a ten-week time line of putting that together. I believe that ten weeks has passed. I was hoping you could talk about what that's created, where that stands. And then as kind of a follow-up or addendum to that, you also mentioned changing program review to a monthly program view between the Secretary and the Chief, whereas before there were [inaudible] reviews and some kind of check-in. If you could speak to those two points. The framework and [inaudible] review increasing to monthly.

**Dr. Jette:** The core of the relationship between ASALT and AFC is defined in an AD, an Army Directive, that the Secretary completed and signed out this fall. I think that's publicly available. I don't know. Matt might know.

Jette - 1/10/19

It addresses, it's signed by the Secretary. I don't own the Army. I don't own AFC so I can't write something. At the same time, I'm in the Secretariat. My organization belongs to the Secretary. I work for the Secretary of the Army. So the Chief of Staff of the Army can't tell me what to do. Everybody knows you've got, the Army's nice [frozen] columns sometimes. That doesn't mean I wouldn't be responsive to them. It just means that when you're doing formal things like relationships and organizations, they get defined by the right people. So the AD that the Secretary signed puts some clarity to some of these delineations and responsibility areas because he owns acquisition. All my authorities come through him. And it also defines where the limits of AFC are and it doesn't just talk about me. It talks about other elements in the Secretariat as well.

So that document exists. We can see if we can get you a copy if you want to read it. And that lays the foundation.

Then the Chief created a General Order, I don't remember which order it is. That too is a, it might be public, I don't know. And the General Order tells the Army what to do. It mentions us, but it doesn't tell us.

So for example, and there's always subtleties in there. It's like okay, well, AFC I want you to coordinate with ASALT on your priorities in the budget. Okay. Somebody could read that and interpret it as the Chief saying the AFC is in charge of the budget. It's not. We still control it on the Secretariat side, but he prioritizes, and that makes a lot of sense because do we need to put the money against more landing craft? Or do we need to put the money against a next generation combat vehicle? That's an operationally relevant strategic decision on the part of the Army uniformed side. So those documents can probably provide that in more detail. I don't know if we can give them to you or not, but we can probably give you enough data that if you start asking questions, we can kind of give you enough of what you might need.

Jette - 1/10/19

**DWG:** Okay. And the second part of the question about the program review. I believe you said at that time it was about an annual review, now it's a monthly review. Do you see anything significant that has changed as a result of those monthly meetings?

**Dr. Jette:** Much less painful. Sometimes you think about these things and you think this is going to be a real pain in the rear end. And the truth of the matter is, the greater involvement of the senior leaders in the acquisition process, that's the big A acquisition, from requirements on, is making it much easier.

Last year we had something called SAR reporting. SAR is --

**Voice:** [System] Acquisition Review.

**Dr. Jette:** Thanks. I've got to keep a couple of memory cells around.

So we report to Congress on our MDAP programs, our Major Defense Acquisition Programs every year, and we have to tell them how it's going. At each level we have certification requirements. So the PM has to certify to the, the product manager certifies to the project manager who certifies to the program executive officer who certifies to me who certifies to the Secretary who certifies to Congress. And in that process of doing those reports we do these program reviews.

Last year we did SAR reviews. Number one, the Secretary hadn't seen these systems. They hadn't been done at the Secretariat level prior. So when the new Secretary came in he said okay, we're going to do this. It was let's just, and nobody had asked the questions that the senior leaders asked. The first thing is, you produce the report you think you need, you put the briefings in front of them and they've got different questions than you answered, so then you would say it was painful.

This year, we're fundamentally done. They're not due until the end of February, beginning of March. We're done. All the SAR

Jette - 1/10/19

reporting, go in there, he knows everything that's going on, every -- I do basically a mini-SAR review every six weeks with the entire Army Staff senior leadership. With the Secretary and the Chief present, we go over any issues.

If you figure out what's important and make a way that you can put your metrics together and your reporting process, it makes it so much less painful, and that's what we're doing. Particularly for these major programs. We report regularly, we report often, we report any change. If any change occurs that I need him to know about, if it's a significant one, we've had a couple of those significant issues that I've raised. He gets an email that day. He knows what we've talked about. And an information paper comes to follow up and then we'll update him at the next briefing and if there's an issue that's an ongoing one, okay, we need to make sure that this, that and the other thing are done. In some cases he's gotten in a plane and flown up to see the company with me. He and I talk about direct contact with corporate presidents. The Secretary is very much into making us much more accessible to industry. So every Monday night, for example, we have dinner -- pretty much every Monday night. Once in a while my wife gets [her way] with that, but every Monday night we have dinner with a CEO of a company, and it's been everything from it being big defense contractors to second or third tier suppliers. And then they retain that access so we can keep them abreast of where we're headed, and they can keep us abreast of where, what did we do that we should be doing better and what did we not ask for that we should be asking for?

This much deeper involvement is making it much easier to keep on track. Does that sort of answer the question?

**DWG:** The NDAA requires that medical research acquisition, logistics, I mean all the [inaudible]. Secretary Esper has indicated he doesn't want to give those things up and he sort of [inaudible] things over to [inaudible] to you, some of it for Futures Command.

Representative Thornberry says that he is determined to continue

Jette - 1/10/19

with those reforms.

Can you give me an update as to what the thinking is and what the activity is?

**Dr. Jette:** We comply with NDAAs, and I'm sure the Secretary will do that. That doesn't mean that you can't talk to, we interact with the Hill all the time. And Mr. Thornberry is trying to be very responsible. I don't know if this is exactly true now, but for a long period of time the largest source of research money for breast cancer was the U.S. Army. Part of the reason is we actually do what you tell us to do. If I give it to them we don't know where it's going to go so we give it to the Army because they'll do what we ask. So we've ended up with a large number of medical-ish things that don't necessarily look like they ought to be Army focused in the medical community.

I believe that the Secretary's position is that we might ask that they reconsider looking at this from a holistic perspective only, where you see these large programs that may not be really kind of Army specifically related, but we have a lot of issues in the Army that are medical in character but are not, it's almost like orphan diseases. They're in bizarre little places, but this is a really important thing. I mean Ebola, Plague. These are not things that are going to make the big drug companies and NIH a whole bunch of recognition and money. But we go where those things are. So they become, even though it's like why is the Army doing disease research? It's because we end up where there are some really weird little diseases, and so we want to make sure, and I think what the Secretary's position is, and I'm stepping a little beyond my bounds here, is to make sure that the boundary, in compliance with the directive we divest of those things which fit into the category of probably less Army focused. But we don't do so at the cost of losing control over or focus on those things which are medical issues which are of specific importance to the Army.

**DWG:** What about things such as what you just said for the training?

Jette - 1/10/19

**Dr. Jette:** Medical logistics and training will stay in the Army. We still, we're not depending on somebody else to provide medical logistics on the battlefield.

**DWG:** The NDAA says it's [inaudible].

**Dr. Jette:** For the hospitals, not, I mean your operational field commanders are not calling back to some guy at Walter Reed and asking him to ship me some bandages to the battlefield.

**DWG:** Do you have any idea how receptive the Hill has been to this argument?

**Dr. Jette:** I don't. I haven't been over -- you've probably gotten, because most of this is -- I do have oversight overall on research and development, but most of it's done in Army entities. So therefore, in my oversight you've gotten about my level of importance because the other piece is the Secretary is personally taking a very deep interest in this.

I don't want to be presumptive about telling you what the Secretary's thinking unless I specifically know issues. That's kind of where we are.

**DWG:** I kind of wanted to ask a little bit of a non-traditional question concerning software and IT. I know the Army has a couple of authorities [inaudible] equipment, but [inaudible]. How is the Army sort of approaching purchasing IT and software systems as they're not really [inaudible] because your traditional acquisition programs like tanks and airplanes and helicopters and such?

**Dr. Jette:** When you say IT, now we've got this big ball of wax and there's some fuzz in there too. Where we're talking about, the boundaries. If you're talking about operational IT systems, they tend to be more oriented on specific environmental issues. How do I get this box I buy to survive? So they become more militarily oriented. And of course industry has kind of figured



Jette - 1/10/19

out that sometimes if you make stuff that the military likes, so does -- the military looks like mining companies, the military looks like oil drilling companies. You know. I used to work for those guys when I was on the outside. My company did.

So some of the characteristics of hardware and software, if we can find an economic way of leveraging that which is commercially available as far down in the food chain to, you know, Private Jones. I mean if you take a look at the individual soldier, he essentially has a Samsung on. That's what they're using as a computer for the individual soldier. It's straight out of the box.

So on the hardware side, we try to optimize our use of commercial products where applicable. Then we may migrate to more unique systems.

I will tell you that I don't think we've gotten as far as I want us to go. I still have, I got in the vehicle the other day and they were really proud of it, and essentially to make it short, they created an iPad. They had an iPad. I mean it was an iPad. It was 12 pounds. Boy, we've got to make sure that this sucker is rugged. I mean it's a 12-pound iPad. Nobody's going to use that thing, it's stupid. But boy, it met all the Mil Specs. And the Mil Specs were written in World War II. Okay? So we do have some issues like that we're still working on. There are a number of new technologies in wireless, for example. There are extremely secure wireless systems that are LPI/LPD, you know, low probability of detection, low probability of intercept that are developed for the rest of us because I don't want, oddly enough, one of them that we're looking at, the motivation behind its development is that you've got two kids and they can both have TVs and games in their room and you know, Billy doesn't want to have Mary's game to bleed over onto his TV screen. So it's a relatively short-range commercially available datalink, high bandwidth, encrypted, isolated, and it won't go through the wall, and boy, that looks just like the type of datalinks I need inside of military facilities.

Jette - 1/10/19

I want to know where I know it won't go so nobody else can be listening in to my data, and I want to secure it. Oddly enough, that's exactly what Mary and Billy want to do. For totally different motivations.

So we are looking at even emerging technologies that we can leverage.

Cloud, there's a big discussion on Cloud and moving to the Cloud. It's just a fancy word, for we put some servers some place else. That's really what a Cloud is. Okay? The question then becomes is it economical to rent those servers from someone else? And is it economical, can we secure them properly? Those are the biggest things. Because once you move something someplace else, now you have to be able to get to that item, tell it to do something and bring back your answer without being easily intercepted, being easily spoofed, somebody breaking in, those type of things.

So we are trying to sort through that, both those questions.

When you get down to software, if we can leverage commercially available software, that includes relatively unique commercially available software, so some of our cyber tools, for example. Actually available to banks. You're not going to find them on the shelves of Micro Center, but they're commercially available systems that are useful. So we leverage those to the maximum extent that we can.

But we are working on making sure that if we do develop our software ourselves, that it becomes, first of all, I talk about IT policy. Just generated. We have in the past not paid attention to the ability to retain control of our own destiny. Our software development, for example, IBCS, a defense contractor's writing it for us. It's written in standard code, it's not some weird thing that we can never find another coder to touch again, and it's been structured in such a way that we can easily plug and play much like Windows. You just add DLLs. I'm going to add a new radar. What's the DLL to control the radar?

Jette - 1/10/19

Put that in there and boom, the thing can work quickly. So we've paid specific attention to trying to get our structured softwares in a way that we retain ownership of the IP and delivery of the IP which is, oddly enough, we have in the past not asked for both of those. We pay for the IP don't ask for [inaudible]. It's like buying a car and letting somebody else drive it.

Does that answer?

**DWG:** Yeah.

**DWG:** I wanted to ask about the racking or stacking of programs, sort of as you're looking at the whole program and trying to make sure that there's enough funding in place to go after these six priorities. Can you talk about sort of the process up to now, some of the winners and losers, challenges and successes you've had?

**Dr. Jette:** Okay. The process that we've done, we began something called deep dives. Our funding is broken up into PEGs, Program Element Groups I think is what PEGs stands for. I thought I knew all the acronyms in the Army. I'm just an amateur at it.

So the PEGs, PEGs are groupings. Procurement is one of the PEGs. Procurement money. This is cryptic. I challenge how you're going to explain this to people in a published article. Our money comes in different colors, they come with different constraints, they come with all these things. How we can use it and what we can use it for. To manage that against priorities and comply with the law, we have these Program Element Groups, and within those are the type of money that's normally associated. So all procurement style money gets managed through the EE-PEG. It's the equipping PEG. Why they put two letters there, I have no idea. I just know it's called the EE-PEG. It's not like it's the equipping exclusivity PEG because we also have the Training PEG which is the TT-PEG. So I don't know, some of the things are actually entertaining to run into in the Army. Maybe I'm just searching for things to be entertained by.

Jette - 1/10/19

So the EE-PEG is an example for the procurement which is, which last year the Secretary and the Chief which meant all the rest of us too, sat and went through every single program and said why are we doing this? The truth of the matter is, programs have momentum, and so why are we doing that? Because we did it last year. Do we need it? Is it the most important thing? Should we reallocate that fund against something else? And then the rest of the staff then would go back and develop -- what was that thing called? The deep dives followed it after, it was another name. Basically it was like you're all in the room, you're not coming out until we're done. And it went for 12 hours in a day and then we'd do it again the next day until we were done. And the Chief and the Secretary sat there the whole time. We did that and went through every one. The EE-PEG, the SS-PEG, the II-PEG, all of them, and prioritized all of the funding allocations for the Army.

And they would ask questions, for example in the procurement PEG, the equipping PEG. Well, why do we have a program on salt shakers? Well, we had a program on salt shakers last year. What if we, operationally, is it relevant that we have a program on salt shakers? Well, you know, we do have tables in the mess hall. Okay. So I need some of them. Do we need to have a program or can we just purchase them? That would be tossed back to the ASALT who would then have to go back and go well, if we cancel the contract, we have a minimum buy of 100 million salt shakers and it costs, you know, that type of thing. So we'd have to go back and say if we cancel the program, if we downsize the program, what are the effects? You can't just decide you're not going to buy something that you said you were going to buy. We have things on contract.

So depending on the characteristic of the contract you have exit costs. Some of them you can just walk away from, some of them you can't. So we'd have to put that together, because if you thought you were going to harvest \$100 million out of something, you may only harvest \$20 million out of it. So do you want to spend the \$20 million and get delivery? Or do you want to just

Jette - 1/10/19

not and harvest the \$20 million? So it was a very deliberate process that we went through last year to figure, for the Secretary and the Chief to go through those things and prioritize where does the Army's operational effectiveness come from and are we properly funding and how much of that is just because of momentum? And what should we do about it?

We did that. There are these deep dive follow-ups that we've done through the year, so well okay, what if we cut it -- there's always the salami slice system. You know. Okay, I'm only going to get \$20 million if I cancel it, but sometimes you get \$60 million back if you cut your production rate to the lowest level. Because I'm only going to buy my minimum quantity, but the program's going to stay open. Therefore I don't have all the cancellation fees.

So we ended up going through a number of those. So those things have been done throughout the year.

As part of this AE and General Order, the EE-PEG has been modified so that for example on the EE-PEG, General Murray and I are co-chairs. So he and I will be sitting down and going through the EE-PEG. We've already started some of our preliminary efforts. To go through, look at the EE-PEG and determine okay, now what? What are we going to do? What modifications to the current plan based upon the new knowledge that we have on where we're going and modifications of our effort are we going to do this year? And so he and I will be on the EE-PEG. General Perna and I are on the SS-PEG which is the sustainment PEG. Co-chairs on the sustainment PEG.

And R&D funding is a little bit different. It doesn't have a PEG, but all of it goes through my office. So my DASA-RE coordinates directly with the Deputy CG of AFC on those funding questions and they sit together all the time.

**DWG:** Could you give us an example of something that you've decided to curtail in order to --

Jette - 1/10/19

**Dr. Jette:** No. None of that stuff's been announced and I'm not going to be the one to do it. That's the Secretary's prerogative as to what he wants to -- I mean he's got to go over and talk to the Hill. He's not going to, I don't want to be too glib. Actually I do because it's kind of fun. But there are programs here, there may be programs that might be sensitive for other reasons. So the Secretary needs to work with the Hill, to socialize it over there, tell them why we're doing things, and sort through those pieces before he starts putting out the details of what got cut and what got skinned down and what got plussed up.

**DWG:** You mentioned a role for artificial intelligence in Air Defense. I wonder if you could expand a little bit on that. Also, are there other roles for AI and machine learning that you kind of see coming down the pike?

**Dr. Jette:** AI is critically important. You'll hear a theme inside of ASALT, time is a weapon. And that's one of the aspects that we're looking at with respect to AI. So Under Secretary McCarthy has been very active in trying to position the Army for being able to pick up on some of these critical new technology areas. Somebody has to work with OSD on resource considerations.

So we, AFC has a responsibility to focus on AI from a requirements and research -- remember, they've got the executing arm of research and development. It's gone over to, RDECOM is going over to AFC. So we've established a center up at -- Carnegie Mellon for AI. And we, and AFC has established a person who is actually really, really good. He and I had a long conversation over AI just two weeks ago down in Texas. He's trying to put his arms around AI in an operational context and what type of developments need to go in the background. In the meantime, the Under Secretary and I have talked and ASALT is going to be establishing for the Army a managerial approach to this.

AI can, when you do this, and you've got a blank sheet of paper, the nice thing is you've got a blank sheet of paper. The bad

Jette - 1/10/19

thing is you've got a blank sheet of paper, and it's like what do I put on the paper? How do I want to do this?

So we're trying to structure an AI architecture that will become enduring and will facilitate our ability to allocate resources and conduct research and implementation of the AI capabilities throughout the force.

We already do -- that's not to say that we're not doing AI in various places. There are AI efforts ongoing. It's just that we need to organize for combat, so to speak, a little bit better and that's what we're putting together.

**DWG:** Is there anything more specific you can say about AI and Air Defense in particular like you alluded to before?

**Dr. Jette:** So here's one of the issues that we're going to run into. People get worried about whether a weapon has, you know, an AI system is controlling the weapon. And there are some constraints on what we are allowed to do with AI, and I know there are a number of public organizations that have gotten together people and say we don't have what AI, you know, tied to weapons. But here's your problem. If I can't get AI involved with being able to properly manage weapon systems and firing sequences, then in the long run I lose the time deal.

Let me give you an example. If I've got a system, and I'm just making up a for instance. Let's say you fire a bunch of artillery at me and I can shoot those rounds off. And you require a man in the loop for every one of the shots. There's not enough men to put in the loop to get them done fast enough. So there's no way to counter those type of shots. So how do we put not just the AI hardware and architecture and software in the background, but how do I do proper policy so we do attend to weapons that don't get to fire when they want, and weapons don't get to fire with no constraints, but instead we properly architect a good command and control system that allows us to be responsive and benefit from the AI and the speed of some of our

Jette - 1/10/19

systems?

Those are some of the wrestling matches we're dealing with right now.

**DWG:** One real quick follow-up. You mentioned the AI guy at Futures Command. Can you tell us anything about his kind of background? What kind of --

**Dr. Jette:** He's an AI guy. [Laughter]. He's actually, I mean sometimes I end up across the table from somebody who's in charge of nuclear and the lug nuts and he doesn't know anything about lug nuts. He just got put in the position, or she. This guy really, he knows his nuclear lug nuts. We can get you name and contact data if you want to talk to him.

**DWG:** Military guy or uniformed guy?

**Dr. Jette:** Yes. I think he was a Reservist. So we have this large database that tells us what you know, and they pushed the I need an AI colonel and his name came up. It was like remember how you were a Reservist? Well now you're not so Reserved. [Laughter]. He's in uniform all the time now.

**DWG:** Thanks.

**DWG:** Dr. Jette has enough time to get from here to his next engagement so we're going to let him go. But as David said, he has his aide's contact info if anybody else has follow-up questions that they want to get staffed.

**David:** I'll send you Matt's email as soon as I'm back in the office, in the next half hour, for follow-ups.

**Dr. Jette:** And all I ask is just clearly reiterate your question to me. Don't ask me, hey, that question I asked.

Thank you.



Jette - 1/10/19

This is my first event like this. Was this useful to you all?

**DWG:** We'd like another hour I think.

**Dr. Jette:** My staff has learned this of me. Oh, we're going to have a meeting and it might have some meat in it. Well, we only have an hour. You're in deep trouble. You ask me a question, I'm going to try and give you a meaty answer, and I hope that some of the answers I gave you had some meat to them.

**DWG:** It's appreciated.

**DWG:** Thank you.

**Dr. Jette:** Thanks, I appreciate the opportunity.