

Paul Solomon
3307 Meadow Oak Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361
Paul.solomon@pb-ev.com

April 11, 2025

The Honorable Stephen A. Feinberg
Dep. Secretary of Defense
1010 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1010

Subj: Exec. Order “Modernizing Defense acquisitions” Needs Systems Engineers, OT&E, and GAO

Dear Hon. Dep. Secretary of Defense Feinberg:

Pres. Trump’s Executive Order, “Modernizing Defense acquisitions and Spurring Innovation in the Defense Industrial Base,” requires you to determine which MDAPs are more than 15 percent behind schedule based on the current Acquisition Program Baseline (APB), 15 percent over cost, or unable to meet any key performance parameter.

The order cites DODI 5000.85 MAJOR CAPABILITY ACQUISITION. DODI 5000.85 discusses the use of Earned Value Management (EVM) and falsely states that “EVM provides a disciplined, structured, objective, and quantitative method to integrate technical work scope, cost, and schedule objectives into a single cohesive contract baseline plan called a performance measurement baseline (PMB) for tracking contract performance.” The APB is equivalent to the PMB. The DFARS EVM clause cites the EVM System Standard, NDIA EIA-748.

As I asserted previously to you and/or Sec. Def. Hegspeth:

1. For those contractors that manipulate the numbers or just take advantage of the loopholes and ambiguities in EIA-748 to deceive, the regulation perpetuates their license to steal.
2. Federal statutes, DFARS, and DoD policy provide incentives that reward deceptive practices and failure, not successful outcomes.
3. EVM status reports may be deceptive and based on “manipulated,” overstated, or “botched” data regarding cost and schedule performance and may disregard technical performance.(Sources: GAO, PBBE Commission Finals Report, Sec. 809 Panel Report, DoD Reports to Congress required by WSARA, my white papers).
4. DCMA compliance reviews are misleading. A DCMA assessment that a contractor is compliant with EIA-748 guidelines provides no assurance that the reported cost or schedule performance is accurate.
5. The scope of DCMA compliance reviews does not include technical performance.

Consequently, if you rely on the EVM reports (Integrated Program Management Data and Analysis Reports(IMP DAR)) and Integrated Master Schedules (IMS), you will be unable to determine which MDAPs meet the 15% criteria or the technical performance criteria.

I recommend that you enlist the systems engineers from DCMA and OT&E to determine true schedule and technical performance and to reconcile their data with reported cost, schedule, and technical performance in IMPDAR and the IMS. Alternately, you can coordinate with the HASC or SASC to authorize GAO's assessment.

Please contact me for more procedural or tactical advice.

Yours truly,



Paul Solomon

CC:

Hon. Ken Calvert, HAC	Hon. Mike Rogers, HASC
Hon. Robert J. Wittman, HASC	Hon. Donald Norcross, HASC
Hon. Ro Khana, HASC	Hon. Jim Jordan, HCOA
Hon. Roger Wicker, SASC	Hon. Joni Ernst, SASC
Steven Morani, DoD	Hon. Pete Hegseth DoD
Hon. Elizabeth Warren, SASC	DOGE
Jon Sindreu, WSJ	Anthony Capaccio, Bloomberg News