

not present in the vertical experiments. While the 10 vertical experiments provided the structure necessary to evaluate the technical capabilities of a system or concept for the initial candidates, this was not possible with the new candidates.

While the users clearly endorsed some of these new candidates, the experimental data needed to support a fully integrated analysis were limited at best. Bringing these candidates into the process earlier would have eliminated this situation.

This late introduction of upgraded technologies into a situation or experiment is common throughout the testing community. As program managers strive to balance cost, schedule, and performance, they must first establish a good idea cut-off date. If a new product is to be brought forward after that date, the ramifications of that action must be evaluated in total. From our perspective, the decision to allow the introduction of new products into the Joint Experiments may ultimately shortchange the individual soldier or Marine "user" in the long run unless some mechanism emerges to obtain additional data supporting an integrated analysis. These candidates were not evaluated head-to-head against the baseline or other technology candidates; therefore, the final integrated analysis is not, in fact, a fully integrated analysis.

Transition to the Acquisition Process

The MOUT-ACTD has provided an excellent transition mechanism for the Army and the Marine Corps to expedite their respective acquisition processes. During the 10 experiments, the MOUT-ACTD TPO evaluated over 118 technology candidates to satisfy 24 joint user requirements. While many of these candidates were not selected, 19 requirements were satisfied through this process, and the Department of the Army approved one technology candidate as a Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Program candidate. To improve technology and focus future testing, the team made additional recommendations for the 13 remaining requirements. In the long run, this will expedite the acquisition process

for the 13 unsatisfied user requirements by eliminating much of the legwork for the Concept Exploration (Phase 0), and Program Definition and Risk Reduction (Phase 1).

Transition to the Test and Evaluation Process

The data collected and assessments made during this ACTD will reduce future developmental and operational test costs. ATEC provided necessary support to the Combat Developer and Program Manager through the recommendations based on a candidate technology's ability to satisfy a given requirement and its technical maturity. The early soldier feedback, supported by ATEC's Assessment, will assist future ACTD Program Managers' efforts in recommending their systems for one of the following decisions: return for further development (government or commercial); discard the system; enter the Extended User Evaluation Period; or commercial procurement.

Final Thought

Over the past decade and continuing today, declining budgets, changing threats, and the acceleration in the pace of technology development pose significant challenges for the acquisition community and its ability to provide technological solutions for the warfighter. While we do not presume the ACTD process is a panacea for all challenges facing the acquisition community today, from both an experimental and management perspective we believe the insights highlighted in this article do indeed provide significant value-added for future ACTD Program Managers, Material Developers, and the Battle Labs as they enter their own ACTD process. Clearly, the ACTD process is on the right path.

Editor's Note: The authors welcome questions and comments on this article. Contact McVeigh or Ryan at (703) 681-9166. Or E-mail Ryan at ryanmike@hq.atec.army.mil.

1999 TOP 100 CONTRACTORS REPORT RELEASED

The Department of Defense announced today [Feb. 15, 2000] that the fiscal year 1999 report of "100 Companies Receiving the Largest Dollar Volume of Prime Contract Awards (Top 100)" is now available on the World Wide Web. The Web site address for locating this publication and other DoD contract statistics is:

<http://web1.whs.osd.mil/peidhome/procstat/p01/fy1999/top100.htm>

According to the new report, the top 10 defense contractors for fiscal 1999 were:

	(\$ in billions)
1. Lockheed Martin Corp.	2.7
2. The Boeing Co.	11.6
3. Raytheon Corp.	6.4
4. General Dynamics Corp.	4.6
5. Northrop Grumman Corp.	3.2
6. United Technologies Corp.	2.4
7. Litton Industries Inc.	2.1
8. General Electric Co.	1.7
9. TRW Inc.	1.4
10. Textron Inc.	1.4

In fiscal 1999, DoD prime contract awards totaled \$125 billion; \$6.9 billion more than in fiscal 1998.

Editor's Note: This information, published by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), is in the public domain at <http://www.defenselink.mil/news> on the Internet.