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AUSA 2017: The President’s Review

BY GEN. CARTER F. HAM, USA RETIRED
President and CEO
Association of the U.S. Army

With a powerful challenge from Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis to “Be Ready,” a preview of the most significant Army restructuring since the 1970s and glimpses of the capabilities that industry presents to modernize the Army, this year’s Association of the U.S. Army Annual Meeting and Exhibition was successful on many levels. Attendance at our biggest event of the year was up and so is our membership. About 30,000 people attended the three-day event, an increase of about 4,000. AUSA membership has grown by more than 20 percent since the 2016 meeting. Our annual meeting serves as the Army’s business meeting for the associa-
tion where we gather representatives from 121 chapters to develop plans and programs to continue our mission of supporting the Total Army. For exhibitors—more than 600—the meeting is a chance to show off not just what they’ve done but the potential for what they could do. There is good reason to have confidence in the future of land forces based on what was on display.

For the Army, the meeting provided an opportunity for major announce-
ments as the world’s premier land force is at what Acting Secretary of the Army Ryan McCarthy calls “an inflection point.”

A new operations guide, FM 3-0, was introduced, moving the Army forward after 16 years of counterterrorism operations to focus on large-scale warfare, something Lt. Gen. Michael D. Lundy of the Combined Arms Center said is important because the combat environment had changed dramatically because of advances by potential adversaries in capabilities and tactics. An operational framework is taking shape for the Army’s evolving Multi-Domain Battle concept, aided by a growing understanding that the services must embrace domain-sharing rather than domain-ownership. Air Force Gen. James Holmes, Air Combat Command commander, acknowledged at a joint-service forum hosted by AUSAs Institute of Land Warfare that things are different. “We often spoke past each other as soldiers and air-
men,” he said, praising the work done by the Army Training and Doctrine Command in shaping the debate.

On two fronts, important developments were announced about Army modernization. Army leaders announced they will form a new command, yet unnamed, to consolidate the now-dispersed elements of modernization under one roof. To be sure, much detailed planning is still required, but this is a ma-

major step forward that appears to have gained widespread support, including from Congress.

Ellen M. Lord, under secretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics, talked about steps underway to cut contracting time by simplifying the process. Like Army leaders, she is focused on changing a risk-averse acquisition culture into one that can move more rapidly to get needed capa-

bilities into the hands of warfighters.

We also had some fun at the annual meeting which serves as the Army’s family reunion. We had a Tuesday night country music concert, a Battle Challenge on the exhibit floor and got to honor a great American, Gary Sinise, as our George Catlett Marshall Medal recipient on the final night, even getting him onstage with singers and the U.S. Army Band Downrange.

Our planning is already underway for the 2018 Annual Meeting and Ex-

position. We look forward to seeing you at the 2018 Army Ten Miler on Oct. 7th and at our 2018 Annual Meeting Oct. 8-10.

Retired Gen. Carter F. Ham, president and CEO of AUSA, delivers remarks during the 2017 program.
AUSA By the Numbers

29,734
The number of people who attended the 2017 AUSA Annual Meeting and Exposition, exceeding expectations.

626
The number of steps completed by retired Army National Guard Col. Michael R. Ford of the American Business Development Group to win the three-day AUSA Walking Challenge.

115,752
The number of steps completed by retired Army National Guard Col. Michael R. Ford of the American Business Development Group to win the three-day AUSA Walking Challenge.

The number of exhibitors, including 25 military and government exhibits. That is nine more than in 2016.

8
The number of Army veterans in the family of Gary Sinise, the recipient of the 2017 George Catlett Marshall Medical for distinguished and selfless service to the United States. The first was his grandfather, Daniel, who at the age of 17 was an ambulance driver in World War I. A nephew currently serves as an Army recruiter.

2:15.84
Sergeant Major of the Army Daniel Dailey's time on the Battle Challenge course. The fastest time recorded was 1:34.4 by Harrison Barber, who was part of the top team in the competition, Honor Guard Team 1. The four-member team had a combined time of 6:50.
Notable Quotes: AUSA 2017

PHOTOS BY MIKE MORONES

“There is one thing the U.S. Army can do, and that is you have to be ready to ensure we have military options that our president can deploy if needed. The international community has spoken, but that means the U.S. Army must stand ready.”

Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, on the threat of North Korea.

“We got done and got out of the field on Thursday and here we are on Monday. Your mind wanders a lot, and you run these courses of action through your head, and you don’t know how you did.”

Staff Sgt. Ryan McCarthy, newly named NCO of the Year, describing the Best Warrior competition, held just before AUSA.

“They will look and act, in many ways, and be trained similar to Special Forces, but they are not Special Forces.”

Army Chief Gen. Mark Milley, describing the new Security Force Assistance Brigades, which will train host nations to counter terrorism.

“Nerds want to be nerds, not leaders.”

Chris Lynch, leader of the Defense Digital Service, explaining why the Army should not pressure all cyber warriors to advance in the ranks and seek a command.
Defense Secretary Jim Mattis prepares to deliver the opening ceremonies keynote address on Oct. 9 in the ballroom.

Sgt. Maj. Anthony Bowers speaks during a panel discussion titled "Man, Train and Equip the Force of the Future" on Oct. 11, show's last day.

Acting Army Secretary Ryan McCarthy, Army Chief Gen. Mark Milley and Sergeant Major of the Army Dan Dailey speak during a family forum on Oct. 10.

Acting Army Secretary Ryan McCarthy speaks with reporters during an AUSA press conference Oct. 9.

Army Vice Chief of Staff Gen. James McConville shakes hands with Spc. Hazen Ham after he was named Soldier of the Year on Oct. 9.

Retired Gen. Frederick Kroese, age 94, was named Honorary SMA on Oct. 9. Kroese, served 39 years, and his jobs included the vice chief of the Army. The highly decorated officer survived a 1981 terrorist attack while he was commander of U.S. Army Europe.

The Sikorsky S-97 Raider on display on the AUSA show floor.
Light vehicles on display

US Army plans light vehicle RFP in 2018 as industry offerings line up

BY JOE GOULD
jgould@defensenews.com

As the U.S. Army plans a competition in 2018 to buy a light ground mobility vehicle that would speed infantry troops off-road across future battlefields, companies showed their wares at this year’s AUSA.

Potential competitors — the General Dynamics’ Flyer 72, Polaris Defense’s Dagor and AM General’s Humvee, altered to carry a nine-man squad — all made appearances on the tradeshow floor.

General Dynamics Ordnance and Tactical Systems, or GD-OTS, of Saint Petersburg, Florida, is in final negotiations with the Army and poised to deliver the first of 300 vehicles for five airborne infantry brigade combat teams. The Army preempted the competition with a directed requirement from its equipping directorate to use the Flyer 72, already on contract with U.S. Special Operations Command, for its GMV 1.1 program.

The other main contender, Polaris Defense, of Medina, Minnesota, recently began a partnership with Science Applications International Corporation, or SAIC, of Reston, Virginia, on the Dagor. The partnership was borne of some wariness the Army may steer away from an acquisition strategy that might have advantaged a commercial off-the-shelf vehicle.

“At its core, it’s partnering to mutually pursue the GMV competition,” said Polaris Defense Business Development Director Mark McCormick. “We are awaiting RFP, to really see how closely they will stay to a very traditional Detroit-type procurement, with a lot of additional requirements beyond performance criteria.”

“We obviously bring a very flat, high-energy commercial business model, and SAIC brings a long history of how to provide the capabilities and intricacies that go with a traditional defense contract with a lot of specifics that sometimes that community demands,” he said. “We’re not structured for it.”

AM General, of South Bend, Indiana, is finding ways to cut the weight of its ubiquitous Humvee in preparation to compete. At AUSA, it displayed a 6,300-pound Humvee variant that could carry a nine-man squad — meeting one very likely requirement for the Army vehicle.

Army Joint Light Tactical Vehicles Program Manager Col. Shane Fullmer told reporters there will be a full and open competition, with a request for proposals, “some time next year.” Though requirements are not set, he said, the Army wants a vehicle that can be sling-loaded under a UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter.

The intent is to find the best value for the requirements, and the incumbent, GD-OTS, does not necessarily have a competitive advantage, Fullmer said.

“In combination with cost, I think it will make for a very aggressive com-
petition. If you look out on the [AUSA expo] floor, there's lots of people in that market space," he said.

Some lawmakers have even pressed for a full and open competition. Democratic Sen. Amy Klobuchar, whose home state of Minnesota is that of Polaris, proposed in recent months a failed amendment to the Senate's fiscal 2018 defense authorization bill to direct the Army to hold a competition for a "commercially available off-the-shelf Ground Mobility Vehicle" in 2018.

Since Lt. Gen. H.R. McMaster, then the chief of Army Futures and now the White House national security adviser, introduced the idea of fast-tracking a family of light, fast and lethal vehicles in 2014, plans for a formal competition — then for the ultralight combat vehicle, now the GMV — have since lagged amid budget instability and leadership changes.

The idea then as it is now is for airborne infantry brigade combat teams to use the vehicles to speed from drop zones to objectives while maintaining initiative against a future foe. The Army has since tried and bought various vehicles in limited quantities, and developed an analysis of alternatives; but plans to issue an RFP in 2015 and then 2017 ran aground.

The president's 2018 budget request proposed $41 million for 100 Army variants of the GMV1.1 special operations vehicle and associated logistics, product development, engineering support and program management. The office of Program Manager, Family of Special Operations Vehicles, would execute the procurement.

"The GMV is a critical program in the Combat Vehicle Modernization Strategy. The GMV's mobility coupled with speed will substantially increase IBCT tactical employment options and rapidly deploy infantry elements to positions of advantage," budget documents say.

Well-known Humvee maker AM General expects to compete in 2018. And at AUSA, it displayed a troop-carrying M1097 Humvee, altered using a kit to carry a nine-man squad. The base vehicles, common across the Army, are already fielded across the XVIII Airborne Corps.

AM General Executive Vice President Chris Van Slager touted the variant's safer, more comfortable ride, standard weapons ring, and crush-protection bar. He said the kit, long fielded to foreign militaries, can be installed in a motor pool in a matter of three hours. According to Van Slager, the Humvee was among the possible solutions identified by the Army's analysis of alternatives.

With the kit, the vehicle is sling-loadable under a UH-60 and air-droppable. At 6,300 pounds, the vehicle would have to be lightened to meet requirements, and that work is underway.

"AM General will be prepared to compete," Van Slager said, calling the kit "a viable solution."

"We'll know once the Army publishes the requirements."

For now, GD-OTS expects to begin delivering the first of 295 Flyer 72s to the Army in the Spring, after safety tests are complete, according to Sean Ridley, the program director at GD-OTS. The company is due to deliver its 189th vehicle to Special Operations Command.

To meet the Army's interim requirements, the GMV 1.1 has to shed its SOCOM-specific armor and weapons, but not its rollover protection, to make room for a nine-man squad and otherwise meet Army requirements.

"We ended up with a vehicle just under 5,000 pounds, that carries nine, that can fly under a UH-60, that can fly high-hot," Ridley said. "The unique opportunity it presents to the Army is it is open to all of the kits. They're not developing a one-off. They can take the four seats and rollover kit and put the comms suite in, they put themselves into a position to own their own GMV 1.1, if you will."

Whatever toehold GD-OTS may have with its SOCOM vehicle, Polaris is positioning its Dagor as a less expensive option and touting the Dagor's selection as the Canadian Special Forces' "ultra-light combat vehicle" last year. The U.S. Army's 82nd Airborne Division has also made a limited buy of 140 Dagors.

Polaris is carefully watching the Army's directed requirement to field its competitor's vehicle, though Army acquisition officials have repeatedly offered assurances there will be a competition. In an interview at AUSA, McCormick tried not to sound too frustrated with the pace of Army acquisitions and recent developments.

"SAIC is a wonderful partner, and we have embraced working with them, but how ironic that at one point this could have been the poster child for how the Army didn't need to go through a long, traditional process," McCormick said. "We still hope, whatever happens with 2018 appropriations, there might be some encouraging to get this competition moving."
INNOVATION

TETHERED DRONE CAN FLY, UNDETECTED A MONTH AT A TIME

BY JEN JUDSON
judson@defensenews.com

Hoverfly’s unmanned aircraft systems can fly for a month and are quickly deployable and barely detectable, and the company thinks its tethered UAS can scratch the U.S. Army’s itch when it comes to providing a multitude of capabilities the service needs.

The service has already put some of the firm’s tethered UAS to use. Most notably, its smaller system — LiveSky — was used during a robotics and autonomous demonstration at Fort Benning, Georgia, this summer where it was tethered to a Polaris MRZR.

Tethered drones are nothing new, but in this case, the Kevlar-strength tether provides power to a small quadcopter, giving it the ability to fly for up to 20 to 30 days, Hoverfly CEO Rob Topping told Defense News during AUSA. The tether and the drone are very difficult to detect, unlike large white balloons — the tethered UAS system of choice at forward operating bases in places like Afghanistan.

The UAS can fly up to 400 feet, the length of the tether.

The Army is going to have to operate on the tactical edge, staying highly mobile and avoiding detection by peer adversaries, who have the capability to detect frequencies and heat signatures in the electromagnetic spectrum.

Problems with current small drones is they can’t remain in the air long enough for thorough or persistent reconnaissance. A tethered drone on a small vehicle can move, unmanned, out into a position of advantage and provide consistent ISR, keeping soldiers out of harm’s way and also lightening the load, as the user doesn’t need to continuously control the drone in flight.

The drone can be launched and recovered while the supporting vehicle moves, and the system can autonomously shift midair; so even if it’s detected, it becomes very difficult to shoot down, Topping said.

It takes roughly two-and-a-half minutes to launch the UAS off the roof of a small vehicle and get a full picture of the battle space, according to the executive.

The system is equipped with batteries for safe landing should the tether lose power, and it is able to self-protect against such dangers as lightning.

LiveSky and a larger system — BigSky — are operated over a secure, live network, said Topping, and so the UAS can either be operated by someone very close to the drone or remotely from a tactical operations center.

The controls are extremely simple with only five buttons to directional-ly orient the system and to manage payloads, so training takes roughly six hours, “but that’s only because we take a long lunch,” Topping joked.

The Army is actively seeking out tethered UAS options. Its Rapid Equipping Force released a request for information in August looking for tethered UAS for “small combat outposts, route clearance elements and retrograde operations to maintain [ISR] capability on the battlefield and extend the operational coverage of both FM and Soldier Wave Radio communications and data.”

The RFI also states the UAS should be a vertical takeoff and landing solution that is persistent and rapidly deployable to be used at forward outposts in “austere, harsh environments.”

ARNSOLD SHOWCASES LASER-GUIDED ROCKETS FOR VEHICLES AND DISMOUNTED TROOPS

BY KYLE REMPFER
trempfer@armytimes.com

A group of defense companies — helmed by the St. Louis-based Arnold Defense — are hoping to field laser-guided, 2.75-inch rockets to vehicle-borne troops by mid-2018.

The companies are also looking at the possibility of fielding the laser-guided rocket system, called Fletcher, to dismounted and maritime forces, said Chris Frillman, director of military programs, weapons systems for Arnold Defense.

“It’s going to be demand driven. The idea is that this is transplantable onto anything,” Frillman said. “The great thing about the rocket system is it’s open on both ends, and, as such, it has very little, if any, recoil.”

That lack of recoil is the reason why the rockets are already in use by helicopters, which are very susceptible to stability issues, Frillman added.

Frillman wouldn’t divulge the specific demand drivers behind the need for the system, but said that Fletcher is being prepared to meet an “urgent operational need.”

“I will tell you, you can go online and find Libyans who have taken the Russian 80 mm [rocket], put it in the back of a pickup truck, and they have this capability,” Frillman said, “What we’re giving is something that’s proportion- al, that’s precise.”

Fletcher will be a 6.5 foot, four-round launcher that can relay data between a laser designator and the rocket itself, according to a press release from Arnold Defense. It will be mounted using the Universal Gun Mount, allowing it to be installed on a wide range of vehicles, as well as a dismounted tripod.

The system will weigh 30 pounds unloaded, and up to 130 pounds if loaded with all four rockets, according to the press release. The rockets have a range of up to 5 kilometers.

Fletcher is being designed by a consortium of companies, including the warhead-maker Nammo and the weapons mounting experts at Military Systems Group, Frillman said.
MODERNIZATION

ALL-ELECTRIC BRIGADES? COMING SOONER THAN YOU’D THINK

BY JOE GOULD
jgould@defensenews.com

A top Army civilian predicts the service will field an all-electric fleet of vehicles, and soon.

“In 10 years, some of our brigade combat teams will be all-electric,” Donald Sando, the Maneuver Center of Excellence’s deputy to the commanding general, told an audience at AUSA. Sando participated in a panel discussion on innovation in defense manufacturing hosted by Defense News and sponsored by Nammo.

“That’s a generational change. It’s significant; and we’re going to do it; and we’re going to need industry’s help,” Sando said. “There’s plenty of people who say we can’t do it.”

It’s an incredibly lofty goal given the Army’s infrastructure and fleet have long been geared towards gas-powered vehicles and that today’s Army’s not known for embracing and adopting cutting-edge technology.

Click here for more coverage from the 2017 AUSA conference!

The Maneuver Center of Excellence at Fort Benning, Ga., develops future requirements for individual soldiers and the maneuver force.

Sando envisioned 75-ton vehicles powered by high-capacity batteries with electric motors capable of being recharged by a10 kilowatt to 50 kilowatt generator.

“Does that mean in 10 years, the Abrams tank will be fully electric? No, we’re going to replace it,” Sando said, adding that tens of thousands of vehicles in the Army’s fleet would be replaced rather than recapitalized.

The institution’s inertia is to recapitalize right now. It makes good business sense, but it’s also making us less relevant on the battlefield,” he said.

Sando pointed to the Next-Gen Combat Vehicle program, a prototyping effort underway at the Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center. A seven-year, $700 million contract was recently awarded to an SAIC-led team to produce two prototypes by late 2022.

“We need to go to the next-generation squad, and we need to go to the next-generation combat vehicle,” Sando said. “If they’re not electric or hydroelectric, then I’m wrong.”

General Motors unveiled an electric autonomous vehicle, called Silent Utility Rover Universal Superstructure, or SURUS, at the AUSA expo.

Over the last year, GM has been testing another fuel cell platform with the U.S. Army — its ZH2 hydrogen cell-powered demonstrator.

How would electric vehicles fight? Sando acknowledged that to send electric vehicles to an austere country, like Afghanistan, the U.S. Army would have to bring power grid technology to support them.

“No, there is a huge amount of investment that would have to occur in research and development,” said the commander of Army Research, Development and Engineering Command, Maj. Gen. Cedric Wins.

Wins suggested the service closely follow and partner with the commercial automotive industry, as it introduces the technology into the market. He said the Army would “not be a leader but leverage the expertise of industry and what they produce.”

“In 15 to 20 years, it’s hard to believe if industry moved in the direction of electric-powered vehicles that the Army would not be somewhere near there,” Wins said. “Its brigade combat team consumes 2,000 gallons of fuel per day. We’ve got to think about other ways.”

5 REASONS WHY THE ARMY CAN’T REPLICATE SILICON VALLEY

BY TODD SOUTH
tsouth@Militarytimes.com

The Army has five key deficiencies to overcome if it wants to innovate more like Silicon Valley.

Lt. Gen. Edward Cardon, director of the Office of Business Transformation, and Robin Swan, deputy director of the office, told attendees at the annual AUSA meeting that for a long time, the Army lacked a strategic-level plan or thinking to foster innovation.

But through a deep review and series of meetings and conferences with industry and other government entities, leaders have spotted five areas to start working on now:

1. The Army has a risk averse culture. Leaders need to encourage risk-oriented innovation and accept that some ideas, projects will fail.

2. The service doesn’t have tools to innovate. There are not embedded ways to “surface, discuss and drive ideas” into a reality. The Army doesn’t effectively fund innovation or allow commander discretion to use funds for innovative projects.

3. Ideas from employees are not systematically captured. Too much innovation is ad hoc and not supported to fruition. Leaders must be able to align their talent with projects and then reward success.

4. There isn’t any training related to innovation or entrepreneurship within the ranks. This requires more cultural changes in thinking.

5. No innovation metrics. Top leaders and unit commanders must have a way to track the progress of their efforts and be able to adjust accordingly. All innovation must aim toward a strategic outcome.

Cardon likened the challenge to building the cyber community within the ranks. It calls for entirely different thinking than the Army has traditionally allowed.

Normally an officer is expected to be the most knowledgeable person on a topic or subject matter. That officer then directs his staff on the related task.

“That’s not the way cyber works,” Cardon said. And neither does innovation.

Sometimes the most knowledgeable persons are in the lower ranks. He said restructuring some teams to use specific leaders on tailored projects or problems, like the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency model, might be the way to go.

An Army researcher demonstrates a 3-D printed drone.

Those changes could result in more rapid and experimental prototyping of new equipment and systems that would bring results quicker, he said.

“The leader has to put the problem on the table, step back and watch the magic happen,” Cardon said.
Pentagon to shift major defense programs to services

BY AARON MEHTA amehta@defensewire.com

The Pentagon’s top acquisition official wants to shift the “bulk” of major defense programs back to the services, which could include moving individuals from the Office of the Secretary of Defense towards service jobs.

Ellen Lord, the undersecretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics (AT&L), believes that her office has been given marching orders from Congress to push the day-to-day management of Major Defense Acquisition Programs, or MDAPs, to the three services.

“Congress been very, very clear in the last few NDAs that they want to shift oversight of most programs back to the services, and I entirely agree with that. In fact, there were some programs that were transitioned back earlier this year,” Lord said.

The exceptions that remain at AT&L will be cross-service, such as the F-35 joint strike fighter or the “exceptionally high-risk and high-stakes” programs, Lord said.

Lord’s take on the situation will likely please Congress, which ordered a reorganization at AT&L, effective Feb. 1, in part, to force the OSD-level management to devolve to the various services.

Speaking to reporters after the panel, Lord expanded on the MDA review, saying that “most of the new” programs will go down to the services but that her team is “in the midst” of a review of existing programs to see if it makes sense to move those to the services as well.

And if programs currently under AT&L move, the people attached to managing those programs might move, too.

“We’re actively talking about people moving so that the services have the capability they need, because obviously, we need to keep going and be effective throughout this, so we don’t want any hiccups there,” she said.

Asked whether she needed to talk to the Hill about that, Lord said she believes DoD has the authorities needed to shift programs and people now but that she would still likely reach out to Congress, which ordered a House to study just that issue.

Lord said there was no real time table for when she would issue a recommendation on whether the Pentagon backs such moves.

Frank Kendall, the previous AT&L chief, famously opposed Lockheed Martin’s 2015 acquisition of Sikorsky Helicopters, and at one time pursued legislation on the Hill that would give his office more oversight power on potential mergers.

Kendall’s concerns then were about the health of the supply chain, telling reporters this in 2015: “With size comes power, and the department’s experience with large defense contractors is that they are not hesitant to use this power for corporate advantage.”

Asked about the health of the industrial base, Lord pointed out that there is an executive order from the White House to study just that issue.

Lord neutral on recent merger and acquisition activity

BY AARON MEHTA amehta@defensewire.com

The Pentagon’s top acquisition official is remaining neutral following a trio of major defense merger and acquisition announcements.

Ellen Lord, the undersecretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics, told reporters at the 2017 AUSA Conference that her office is reviewing the proposed changes but indicated she had not made up her mind on whether to support or oppose the M&A activity.

“We’ve gotten a lot of good inputs and we’re looking at” the facts, said Lord, who served as CEO of Textron Systems prior to her nomination. “I’m looking at where we are today and what we need as a country and going from there.”

The defense industry has seen a series of major M&A moves since the start of September, starting with the announcement that United Technologies, the 12th largest defense company on the annual Defense News Top 100 list, plans to purchase Rockwell Collins (40th) for $30 billion.

Shortly after, Northrop Grumman (5th largest) announced it will acquire Orbital ATK (31st) for just under $9.2 billion. And in October, Boeing (2nd) agreed to purchase Aurora Flight Sciences, which is not on the Top 100 but will help boost Boeing’s unmanned systems sector.

Lord neutral on recent merger and acquisition activity
INTERVIEW

Rep. Mike Turner

His take on Army programs and the defense budget

BY JOE GOULD
jgould@defensenews.com

The House Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee conducts oversight of Army and Air Force acquisition programs, all Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the National Guard and Army and Air Force National Guard and Reserve. Rep. Mike Turner, R-Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee, is well-known in the House for campaigning to end budget caps that were passed in 2011. He talked Army networks and defense budgeting with Defense News this month:

Q. Where will there be friction in NDAA talks?
A. In the Army network, [Warfighter Information Network Tactical (WIN-T)], one and two reprogramming requests, that’s going to be an area of conflict. I think our subcommittee is skeptical as to whether or not the Army really has a plan, or if they’re just disadvantaging themselves in the process of getting technical advancement to our troops.

Q. Is there any sympathy for their argument that “this isn’t working. We need to rip the bandage off and start over?”
A. It’s not true [that] it’s not working. In fact, it’s been delivered, tested and fielded. So, the issue is not it’s not working. The issue is: What are our goals and objectives? What are our technology needs? And how do you achieve those and — the Army’s going to need to have an answer, at least in scoping and in implementation while they explain the nearly six billion dollars that have already been spent.

Q. There’s this broader story about a track record in the Army acquisitions failures: Future Combat Systems, Ground Combat Vehicle, Armed Aerial Scout. Is the Army’s bad reputation for acquisitions deserved, and if it is, how does it make a fix?
A. All service branches, we see some failures of the acquisition process, which is why it’s been such an important aspect of [House Armed Services Committee] Chairman [Mac] Thornberry’s policy goals for the committee. It’s not agile. It overburdens with requirements; it under-manages; and then it does about-faces on a regular basis. We have to get better on that. But the answer isn’t, “Let’s just cancel everything.” At least you want to know that you have a plan, at least you want to know that you have a plan. If you award the Army a “D” in this program and you say they’re a “D student,” and they come, and they say they want to start over, you at least want to know what they’re going to get started over with.

Q. Looking at defense budgeting, we’ve seen Pentagon leaders come to the Hill and say they want steady defense increases to preserve America’s military edge, much less achieve the build-up President Donald Trump has talked about. Is there a commitment by House leadership to increase defense budgets into the future?
A. The debate on the spending for 2018 was so important because the Trump administration low-balled funding for 2018 but promised Congress a significant increase in 2019. [Defense Secretary [Jim] Mattis, President Trump, all looked to ’19 to be the time at which we would begin to see funding for modernization of our military, recapitalization, expansion of troop levels and a real plan to serve — to satisfy our readiness problem. In order to ensure that 2019 number would accomplish its goal, we needed to make certain that 2018 was enough of an increase or 2019 could be inconsequential at minimum. I think the debate that has happened in the House and the Senate on funding 2018 sets us up nicely for an increase in 2019. It’s going to require the administration really dedicate its resources to rebuilding the military. Mattis has made it clear he believes he has a promise from the administration that 2019 will be the year. So, we want to make 2018 as good as possible so that 2019 can be even better. ON This interview has been edited and condensed.
'Pinks and Greens' Make a Scene

New uniform gains soldier approval

BY MEGHANN MYERS
mmyers@militarytimes.com

In a surprise move, the AUSA show floor this year featured soldiers modeling "pinks and greens" uniform prototypes.

And after seeing photos of these three soldiers, Army Times readers are overwhelmingly in support of bringing back the iconic World War II-era service uniform.

In a poll of 13,200 Army Times readers, 81 percent thought the green jacket, gray pants uniform looked sharp.

"The uniform, in the works since early this year, went before the uniform board this summer, and now the Army is considering fits and fabrics for possible future fielding. The uniform must still be approved by senior Army leaders.

The return of the old school look, which get their name from the mauve tint of the gray pants, has been a pet project of Sergeant Major of the Army Dan Dailey.

"That was the uniform of the 'Greatest Generation.' There was a lot of prestige and honor associated with that. The American public identified with that uniform," Dailey told Army Times in May. "We think that is more appropriate than trying to create something new."

Next up, Dailey tweeted on Oct. 13, is a prototype with a belt, along with hints that the next version of the uniform could be unveiled during the Army-Navy game in December.

Dailey also promised to include a panel of female soldiers to discuss the finer points of the women's version of the uniform. DN
WHY THE ARMY NEEDS A MULTI-DOMAIN CAPABLE TACTICAL UAS TODAY

Every tactical, operational and strategic planner knows the devastation that will occur in the opening minutes of a North Korean attack on the south. Runways, airstrips and roads will be quickly destroyed. While forces enabled by vertical lift will be capable of rapidly displacing to survive and “fight tonight,” capabilities that can’t take off from and recover to a point will be severely hindered – if not rendered combat ineffective – without the ability to launch, recover or operate.

To achieve success, ground formations such as expeditionary U.S. Army Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) will require ISR support from their organic tactical unmanned aircraft systems (TUAS). Assuming runways, airstrips and stretches of straight roadways capable of supporting the current TUAS landings have been rendered unusable - BCT TUAS may be limited to a single sortie before attempting a runway landing in an unsuitable location.

To ensure our expeditionary BCTs, Global Response Force (GRF) and developing Multi-Domain Task Force (MDTF) units have the tactical ISR asset required to fight and win tonight, the Army should strongly consider the consequences of deploying our expeditionary forces without a proven, expeditionary, small footprint and runway-independent UAS. A modular, scalable group-2-like UAS, capable of long-endurance, expeditionary agility and point launch/recovery from unimproved and restricted terrain, hilltops, and maritime platforms would be optimal for BCT, GRF and MDTF maneuverability, survivability and effectiveness.

Given that the Army is heavily invested in its current runway-dependent TUAS program, adding a group-2-like TUAS would serve to augment these systems, not replace them altogether. Because of their unique requirements, expeditionary organizations, such as the GRF MDTF or those expected to fight in environments that do not facilitate running landings, would potentially benefit the most.

These units need a TUAS capable of addressing myriad tactical and operational threats across all domains—space, cyberspace, air, land, maritime — this expeditionary runway-independent TUAS should be capable of facilitating success in as many domains as possible. It should enhance the commander's ability to present multiple dilemmas to an enemy through scalability, agility and rapid plug-and-play Cyber (EW, EA, etc.) and ISR payloads. It should be capable of cross-domain convergence and maneuver (between Maritime, land, cyber, etc.) “to create windows of advantage, enabling friendly forces to seize, retain, and exploit the initiative to defeat enemies and achieve campaign objectives.” (Multi-Domain Battle: Evolution of Combined Arms for the 21st Century 2025-2040, Version 1.0, October 2017)

Because the need for a runway-independent UAS is immediate, this system should be affordable and able to be rapidly acquired through an existing DoD program of record. These systems exist across the joint force with the MQ-27A ScanEagle and RQ-21A Blackjack – together sharing more than 1 million hours of combat experience. Both offer an unprecedented level of joint and international interoperability, and are currently in use with U.S. DoD joint forces and more than 27 partners across the Pacific, Europe/NATO, the Middle East and Africa. These two platforms offer additional interoperability through Manned and Unmanned Teaming (MUMT) with AH-64D/E Apache and with the Army’s One System Remote Video Terminal (OSRVT) – found in nearly every operational unit in the Army.

Although U.S. ground forces, as part of the Joint Force and with partners, are currently being conceptualized and designed to operate successfully across all domains against peer adversaries, the planned timeframe for establishing this capability is 2025-2040. The U.S. Army can wait no longer to field a trusted, interoperable, expeditionary and runway-independent tactical UAS capable of effectively surviving and supporting our expeditionary BCTs in today's Multi-Domain Battle.