



about all this, because that would be embarrassing. I also fear being right, because that would mean a lot of hard work is ahead of us. And right or wrong, I fear getting negative reactions to such an impassioned expression of what I believe. But even more, I fear the consequences for my character if I do not express these beliefs.

And most of all, I fear lives will be lost because of our failures.

If I am wrong about all this, it should be very easy to demonstrate my error. Just point to the Bold New Ideas and Sweeping Changes that have been implemented across DoD in the years since the DAPA report came out. Point to high-impact examples of successful challenges to conventional thinking. Point to the abandoned policies and approaches of the past. Maybe all these things happened while I wasn't looking, or in times and places I was unaware of. They certainly happened in some places and on a certain scale, but I'm not sure we have quite achieved the level of improvement the DAPA report called for. For that matter, I'm not sure we even got close.

Or maybe the DAPA report was wrong. Maybe what the defense acquisition community needs is more of the same: more process, more dollars, more time, more analysis,

a better foundation for buying the right things, the right way." The title of Sullivan's report is *Fundamental Changes Are Needed To Improve Weapon System Outcomes*, and it corroborates the DAPA assessment quite closely.

I think the DAPA report and the numerous GAO reports and testimonies are probably correct. I believe things are not as good as they should be, not only programmatically and financially, but also operationally and technically. I believe change is indeed needed—sweeping change, driven by Bold New Ideas. That kind of change is scary, so courage is needed; courage coupled with gentleness and empathy for those whose ideas must be replaced.

I think that if any group of people can summon the courage required to make these changes, it is the U.S. military. Who's with me?

The author welcomes comments and questions and can be contacted at the.dan.ward@gmail.com.

more complexity, and more oversight. I must admit, the weapons we field are world-class and unmatched by any adversary, potential or imagined. Those weapons are the result of the ideas, people, and methods of the past. But as the stock market analysts tell us, past performance does not guarantee future performance, and in the same vein, the GAO's Michael Sullivan stated in his September 2008 testimony to Congress, "DoD is not receiving expected returns on its large investment in weapon systems. ... Our work shows that acquisition problems will likely persist until DoD provides