

## Weapon Systems Annual Assessment Knowledge Gaps Pose Risk to Sustaining Recent Positive Trends (GAO-18-360SP)

**Chris Durbin, Assistant Director** 

### J. Andrew Walker, Senior Defense Analyst

May 2018



Sources: (Left to Right) Patriot Advanced Capability-3 Missile Segment Enhancement, U.S. Army; VH-92A Presidential Helicopter Replacement, 2016 Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company; Next Generation Operational Control System, U.S. Air Force; and F-35 Lightning II, 2016 Lockheed Martin.

# GAO

## **Key Observations**

- 1. Programs initiated since implementation of acquisition reforms in 2010 show better recent cost performance than other programs.
  - The 25 major defense acquisition programs (MDAP) initiated since 2010 had an overall cost decrease (\$5.6 billion) between 2016 and 2017.
  - The 61 MDAPs initiated prior to 2010 had an overall cost increase (\$60.3 billion) between 2016 and 2017.
- 2. Programs continue to not fully implement knowledge-based practices, which could portend future cost growth.
  - Lack of knowledge-based practices implementation was evident in both the since 2010 and pre-2010 subsets **of** programs.
  - In an exploratory statistical analysis, we found that programs that completed one or more of three specific practices had significantly lower cost and schedule growth as compared to programs that did not.



## **Scope and Methodology**



Selected Acquisition Report (SAR)

UNCLASSIFIED

RCS: DD-A&T(Q&A)823-197



DDG 1000 Zumwalt Class Destroyer (DDG 1000) As of FY 2018 President's Budget

> Defense Acquisition Management Information Retrieval (DAMIR)

- Using DOD's annual Selected
  Acquisition Reports, we analyzed cost
  and schedule performance for the 86
  MDAPs that comprised the 2017
  portfolio.
  - This included analysis of the subsets of programs initiated since 2010 and before 2010.
- Using programs' responses to our acquisition management questionnaire, we analyzed 57 current and future MDAPs' implementation of 8 key knowledge-based acquisition practices.

UNCLASSIFIED



## **DOD's Portfolio Cost and Size Have Increased Since** 2016, but Remain within Historic Ranges



Total acquisition cost

Number of programs

Source: GAO analysis of Department of Defense data. | GAO-18-360SP

Note: DOD did not issue Selected Acquisition Reports (SAR) in 2009, which precluded us from having the cost baseline information necessary to include 2009 in this analysis.



### Over 85 Percent of the 2017 Portfolio's Estimated Total Acquisition Cost Is for the 61 Programs That DOD Initiated Prior to 2010

Fiscal year 2018 dollars (in billions)



Source: GAO analysis of Department of Defense data. | GAO-18-360SP



## DOD Estimates that its 2017 Portfolio Will Cost More and Take Longer to Deliver as Compared to the 2016 Portfolio

Fiscal year 2018 dollars in billions						
	2016 portfolio estimates	2017 portfolio estimates	Net change between 2016 and 2017	Percentage change between 2016 and 2017		
25 programs initiated since 2010						
Total estimated acquisition cost	\$252.4	\$246.8	-\$5.6	-2.2		
Average cycle time in months to deliver initial capabilities	92.4	95.0	2.6	2.8		
61 programs initiated before 2010						
Total estimated acquisition cost	1,350.7	1,411.0	60.3	4.5		
Average cycle time in months to deliver initial capabilities	133.9	134.8	0.9	0.7		
All 86 programs in 2017 portfolio						
Total estimated acquisition cost	1,603.1	1657.8	54.7	3.4		
Average cycle time in months to deliver initial capabilities	121.7	123.0	1.3	1.1		
Source: GAO analysis of Department of Defense data. GAO-18-360SP						



## **Programs Initiated since 2010 Have Shown Less Cost Growth, and in Earlier Phases, than Older Programs**



Source: GAO analysis of Department of Defense data. | GAO-18-360SP



## Defense Acquisition Cycle and GAO-Identified Knowledge Points

### **Department of Defense (DOD) Acquisition Process**



Source: GAO analysis of DOD-provided data, DOD Instruction 5000.02, and best practices. | GAO-18-360SP

# GAO

## **DOD Programs Continue to Not Fully Implement Knowledge-based Acquisition Practices**

 Most of the 45 current programs we assessed this year proceeded through the three knowledge points without completing all 8 key knowledge-based acquisition practices associated with them.

This trend is consistent with observations we have made throughout our previous annual assessments.

Practices Associated with the Three Key Knowledge Points (KP)	programs GAO previously assessed that had completed the KP	GAO assessed in 2018 that recently completed the KP
Demonstrate all critical technologies are very close to final form, fit, and function within a relevant environment		•
Demonstrate all critical technologies are in form, fit, and, function within a realistic environment	0	٠
Completed preliminary design review before system development start		0
Release at least 90 percent of design drawings to manufacturing	0	۲
Test a system-level integrated prototype	0	0
Demonstrate critical manufacturing processes are in statistical control	0	0
Demonstrate critical processes on a pilot production line	$\bullet$	٠
Test a production-representative prototype in its intended environment	$\bigcirc$	O
Programs completing each best practice • 75 - 100 per	cent 🌓 50 - 74 perc	ent 🔿 0 - 49 percent

Thirty-seven

## <u>GAO</u>

Implementation of Knowledge-Based Practices for Programs that Entered System Development during Our Assessment Period





### Implementation of Knowledge-Based Practices for Programs that Completed a Critical Design Review during Our Assessment Period





### Implementation of Knowledge-Based Practices for Programs that Entered Production during our Assessment Period

	/			un .
Knowledge Based Practices at Production Decision	Air and Mice	CH53K Hedde	Mo, 8 Eit	So e
Demonstrate Manufacturing Readiness Level of at least a 9 or critical processes are in statistical control	0	0	N/A	
Demonstrate critical processes on a pilot production line	N/A			
Test a production-representative prototype in its intended environment	0			
● Practice implemented ○ Practice not implemented Dat Source: GAO analysis of DOD data   GAO-18-360SP	a not available	N/A Practice no	ot applicable	



## **Projected Implementation of Knowledge-Based Practices for Future Programs**

	Development Start	Projected to Demonstrate all critical technologies in a realistic environment	Projected to complete all systems engineering reviews	Plan to constrain system development to 6 years or less
Advanced Pilot Training	Spring/Summe	r 3 <b>N/A</b>	0	•
Amphibious Ship Replacement	TBE	<b>N/A</b>		N/A
B-2 Extremely High Frequency Satellite Communications	TBD	) <b>N/A</b>		
Ground Based Strategic Deterrent	9/3/2020	) 0	•	
Improved Turbine Engine Program	TBD	, 0	●	
Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System Recapitalization	3/31/2018	3 0	•	٠
Long Range Precision Fires	1/15/202 <sup>-</sup>	1 <b>N/A</b>	•	•
MQ-25 Unmanned Aircraft System	7/30/2018	3 <b>N/A</b>	0	•
Navy Frigate	9/25/2020	) <b>N/A</b>	0	N/A
UH-1N Utility Helicopter Replacement	N/#	A <b>N/A</b>	0	0
VC-25B Presidential Aircraft Replacement	6/29/2018	3 <b>N/A</b>	0	0
Weather System Follow-on Microwave	3/25/2019	9	0	0

Source: GAO analysis of DOD data | GAO-18-360SP

# GAO

## **Exploratory Statistical Analysis Suggests that Certain Knowledge-Based Acquisition Practices Correspond with Better Acquisition Outcomes**

- We observed, on average, MDAPs that completed some or all of the following knowledge-based acquisition practices had lower cost increases, 56 to 63 percentage points, than other programs:
  - 1. demonstrated all critical technologies were very close to final form, fit, and function, within a relevant environment, before starting development;
  - 2. held a preliminary design review prior to starting development; and
  - 3. released at least 90 percent of their design drawings to manufacturing by critical design review.
- We analyzed 15 programs that completed knowledge points 1, 2, and 3.
- We conducted a means test comparing averages across systems that did and did not complete knowledge-based acquisition practices using a 95 percent confidence level.



# **Questions?**





#### GAO on the Web

Connect with GAO on LinkedIn, Facebook, Flickr, Twitter, YouTube and our Web site: https://www.gao.gov/ Subscribe to our RSS Feeds or E-mail Updates. Listen to our Podcasts and read The Watchblog

#### **Congressional Relations**

Orice Williams Brown, Managing Director, <u>WilliamsO@gao.gov</u> (202) 512-4400, U.S. Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, NW, Room 7125, Washington, DC 20548

#### **Public Affairs**

Chuck Young, Managing Director, <u>youngc1@gao.gov</u> (202) 512-4800, U.S. Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, NW, Room 7149, Washington, DC 20548

#### **Strategic Planning and External Liaison**

James-Christian Blockwood, Managing Director, <u>spel@gao.gov</u> (202) 512-4707, U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7814, Washington, DC 20548

#### Copyright

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.