OPTIONALLY MANNED FIGHTING VEHICLE

Observations on the Objectivity, Validity, and Reliability of the Army’s Report

What GAO Found

In 2018, the Army initiated a program called the Optionally Manned Fighting Vehicle (OMFV) to replace the Bradley Fighting Vehicle. In March 2023, the Army submitted a report to congressional committees about the OMFV. GAO assessed the report for objectivity, validity, and reliability, defining the concepts as follows:

- **Objectivity** includes the elimination of biases and clearly defined limitations,
- **Validity** includes sound conclusions reasonably derived from methods, and
- **Reliability** includes dependable and complete information and data.

The Army’s report on the desired characteristics of the OMFV presented information that responded to the statutory provision and was generally objective. The Army reported on a range of perspectives by gathering feedback from soldiers and vendors, which contributed to objectivity. However, the Army’s report did not include details about the methodologies used or the data collected to allow an assessment of validity and reliability.

The Army presented initial observations on force structure and operational concepts based on studies that were generally objective. For instance, the Army contextualized its findings by reporting on assumptions and limitations. However, the Army’s report did not include enough information to draw conclusions regarding the validity and reliability of the force structure and operational concepts analyses completed as of March 2023. The Army noted that it intends to conduct a complete analysis of OMFV force structure and operational concepts over the next 18 to 24 months.

The Army’s report also contained information about the combat effectiveness of the OMFV. This information was generally objective in contrasting the three OMFV concepts and Bradley when reporting on desired characteristics such as lethality. This portion of the report did not provide quantitative metrics that would have supported GAO’s assessment of the validity of the information. The report also did not present information about data that would have allowed an assessment of their reliability. Army officials said that more details were not included due to security classification.