The Friday founder update

JC, I'd begin with the Army team that worked on RF Vision. What decision did the research leave with the customer, and who owns it now? Give me ten business days to answer that question and decide whether a congressional briefing would help.

What I would ask you to approve

Authorize Mission Operations and Engineering to review the Army work and ask one customer for a meeting. In parallel, let me examine how Congress is treating spectrum research and monitoring costs. I would bring any request for company spending or a public funding position back to you with the government decision it would support.

Why the Army comes first

The Army's $1,963,209 Phase II award lists October 7, 2026 as its end date. Ask for the latest customer decision, any extension or follow-on, and findings the government permits DS to discuss. If a sponsor already owns the next decision, I'd ask what evidence that sponsor still needs.

Army RF Vision award and dates · DS description of RF Vision

What Congress can clarify

House appropriators want the Pentagon to assess wideband monitoring at defense facilities and test ranges. Their equipment specification covers at least 45 GHz of bandwidth at once. DS says its software can work with recordings from existing sensors. I would ask staff whether the assessment could also examine the cost of reviewing those recordings.

House Report 119-715, p. 200

What would change my recommendation. If an existing Army transition takes priority, put staff there first. If a range manager says review time is immaterial, close the proposed interference-reporting evaluation.

A campaign I led. At Western Colorado Alliance, I worked with sponsors on amendments to SB 19-181 and participated in implementation rulemaking after enactment. I would bring that same follow-through to a defense budget decision.

Colorado legislative record

The assignments I would give each lead

Army customer and Mission Operations

In the first two business days, have the account lead establish what happened after the listed award end date. Ask who can authorize the next step, what technical evidence the customer accepted and when the sponsor will decide. Engineering should identify which claims the actual test supports.

If there is a separate workload question, ask a spectrum manager at a domestic test facility to describe one routine interference report. Where did time go? Who checked the result? If review was the bottleneck, agree on the evidence needed to compare the current process with a human-reviewed analysis of historical recordings.

What I want back. The customer’s decision, an accountable owner and date, and the cost of answering any open question. For a proposed comparison, record review time and how often a reviewer must correct the report.

Army award record · Test Resource Management Center

Congress and the Pentagon

By business day ten, ask defense appropriations staff whether analyst labor and reuse of existing equipment belong in the House assessment. The House report calls for a response within 180 days of enactment. Check the final instructions before assigning the Pentagon a deadline.

Separately, the Senate’s November 16 proposal includes $4 million for a national defense spectrum observatory under Army research line 14. Ask Army resource staff which office would execute that work if Congress retains it. Ask the comptroller whether an evaluation fits an existing appropriation and what funding is available.

For the next authorization cycle, ask Armed Services staff who covers spectrum policy when the new Congress organizes. I would bring a customer-approved example and ask whether a department briefing would answer an oversight question. Appropriators need to know which account would bear the cost and how the government would judge the result.

House assessment · Senate Army research proposal, p. 176 · Continuing resolution

Friday report. I would give leadership one decision per track, the office that can act, the strongest objection and our next ask. Check enacted funding or an extension at the December 11 continuing-resolution deadline. Change the plan immediately if spending authority or the customer’s decision changes.

FOUNDER PREPARATION / PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Before the Pentagon or Hill meeting

Objective. Find out whether existing equipment produces usable evidence and what it costs staff to review it. Ask the range sponsor and the Test Resource Management Center which program office can decide whether a cost comparison belongs in a funded evaluation.

Opening I would prepare for the founder. “When the range reviews an interference report, which part takes the most staff time? What result would convince you to change the process, and who would need to see it?”

Proposed committee language. “The committee requests that the Department compare the staff time, accuracy and cost of preparing interference reports using existing range sensors, and identify where additional equipment would materially improve the result.”

House monitoring assessment · House Armed Services spectrum portfolio

How I would adjust the campaign

For Defense Spectrum Organization line 253, the House matched the $49.466 million request. The Senate proposed $44.466 million, citing an unrealized budget request. That $5 million difference concerns the Defense Information Systems Agency’s broader program. Ask the program office which activities would change. If a sponsor identifies an effect on a planned evaluation, request the cost and schedule consequence in writing before recommending a position. Otherwise I would leave the proposed reduction out of the Army conversation.

The $4 million Army observatory proposal is a different account. If asked whether Congress has funded DS, I would tell the founder to say, “The public proposals fund government programs. Neither proposal identifies an award to Distributed Spectrum.”

DISA budget, PE 0303153K · House line 253 · Senate line 253, p. 232

The next engagement I would propose

By day 30, give Business Development a pursuit only if a sponsor confirms the need, evaluation criteria, a plausible account and a decision date. For recurring work, ask the resource manager when the service can still change its program submission and who will cost the proposal. If the case is missing an owner, bring it back to leadership for a decision on further effort.

Managing the team. At Baker Hughes I directed APCO Worldwide and regional lobbyists. At PolicySight I built an 11-person team. I’d give an outside range adviser one assignment before the founder meeting. Have them identify the reason a skeptical reviewer would reject our proposed comparison.