

**General Donald J. Hoffman
Commander, Air Force Materiel Command**

Air Warfare Symposium

19 February 2010

Moderator: Our next speaker is the Commander of Air Force Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. He has served on the staffs of U.S. Central Command, U.S. European Command, Air Education and Training Command, Air Combat Command, and Headquarters Air Force. You have a copy of his bio in the program. Please welcome to the stage the commander of the Air Force Materiel Command, General Don Hoffman.

General Hoffman: Thanks Jim, I appreciate it very much. And I appreciate AFA giving us the opportunity here to all come in front of you, the MAJCOM commanders and so forth, to talk about the issues and the challenges that we have.

Let me talk about some challenges that we have in the command first, but let me go around the map here just a little bit, just to reorient everyone of what's in and what's not in AFMC, because it has changed.

The headquarters there at Wright-Patterson in Dayton. We've got three large product centers that do our acquisition, one of our main missions. We have what you all know is the three depots, so in the sustainment side, another major mission of the command. We have the three depots. But what most people may not realize is there at Scott Air Force Base we have Air Force Global Logistics Support Center. So their mission is supply chain management. Think parts, think the projected capability to determine what parts we're going to need before we need them, and then work either by setting up the right contracts to get those parts in motion, or working with our mission partner, the Defense Logistics Agency, to get those parts moving. So we don't have to have discovery of the need of a part and then start the process. We want to be able to have that continuum going so we have parts either at the operational units or in the depots to support sustainment.

We have three areas that do developmental tests, Edwards being the biggest. We have a wing down at Eglin, and the Arnold Test Center.

Research laboratories, and this is where you're going to see a lot of change in the next year. BRAC has directed a lot of movement here, so the work you see done there in Mesa, Arizona, at Brooks City Base; sensor work done at Hanscom and so forth. A lot of that is moving. A lot of it's moving toward Wright-Patterson. So we have to complete all that activity by 2011. Most of it's happening here in 2010. That drives some amount of churn here in the S&T business.

We have our security assistance center. It does all our international partner acquisition and sustainment work. Supported by the product centers and the depots.

We have the museum. If you have not been to the Air Force Museum at Wright-Patterson you need to go there. It is the largest aviation museum in the world.

And we have the Nuclear Weapons Center. A big change here in the last year. We've had the Nuclear Weapons Center for a while in Albuquerque, but we've added this year wearing AFMC patches is these munitions squadrons that you see sprinkled around here so if there's an operational base, whether it's a bomber or an ICBM base, those that do the sustainment activities on the nuclear weapons, whether it's a gravity bomb, a cruise missile, or a reentry system, those are now AFMC personnel.

We spend a lot of money, but most of the money is other people's money. You can see the breakout there. A lot of it is tied to acquisition programs, so all the authorities of how much money that is and where it's going to go as determined by the acquisition process. We have the work force and the test centers and so forth that do the actual work.

On the sustainment side we have working capital funds that give us our resource pool for that. So although we spend a lot of money, most of it is not direct AFMC control. You can see there that we are primarily a civilian command. Unlike all the other commands, the preponderance of our work force is civilian, which gives us a unique set of attributes for how we address the work force issues.

Let me talk you through some challenges. I'll always put nuclear number one until somebody tells me to do something different. As you know, AFMC has a very large role now in the nuclear enterprise so we're working that very hard. As we've changed ownership of the operational forces from Space Command and Air Combat Command to Global

Strike Command, and as we've changed the ownership of the weapons storage areas to AFMC we want to make sure we don't drop the ball in that transition at all. New synapses have to grow and form between different people on the different ends of the telephone as we continue to do our business. We've been working that very carefully and it's really been a seamless transition.

Positive inventory control. As you know, we had some escapes a couple of years ago. We've put a wrapper around all those things that support the nuclear enterprise, and we have around 400 of these items, types of items, from control panels and aircraft to relays and switches and certain specialty cables that enable the nuclear weapon to function and the command and control of that nuclear weapon to function uniquely in a nuclear sense. So those items now have been identified and there are thousands of them out there in about 400 different categories.

We still, quite frankly, are finding some discovery there. When we do discover it for the most part it's under Air Force control. We've just taken old manual systems that track and we're getting them into an integrated system that at any second in time we can tell you exactly where they all are.

So we have two large warehouses now that accommodate all that stuff. And as we move it, there's a very definite process that says we're going to move something and how it gets moved and how it gets received and tracked is now quite different than what it was two years ago.

We have old systems, and as the nation goes through nuclear posture review and we come to closure on that, as we come to closure on what's replacing the START Treaty arrangement with Russia, we will see, I think, from a national perspective what the future of the nuclear deterrent will look like as a nation. But that nuclear deterrent, no matter what size it is and what mix it is, has to be credible otherwise it won't work as a deterrent.

So safe, secure and reliable are primary elements of deterrence. I have confidence now that what we have is safe, is secure, is reliable. I cannot project that confidence forward into the future, however, unless we do some modernization on those items. So we're sustaining them now. The pain of that sustainment continues to grow as these things age and there is a need for modernization. So as we see the path ahead, where the nation is going, we need to have the dialogue and the debate about what elements of that do get modernized.

Personnel. I told you we're primarily a civilian command. My personnel issues primarily focus right now, the biggest challenges are on the civilian side. We are hiring civilians at a rate that no one can remember we've ever done before.

First of all we had to fill the empty seats. Over a year ago we had about 2000 empty seats in the command. We had the authorizations, we had the money, we just could not get people in the seats for a variety of reasons, mainly the hiring process. So we've corrected that and we've essentially filled those seats. We've been given acquisition growth authority by the Secretary and Chief, recognizing years of decline and so trying to get the acquisition work force back up to a level where it can properly run programs.

Congress simultaneously has recognized the need to grow. They've given us authority and funding, Section 852 funding we call it to grow the acquisition work force so we can recruit, train and retain qualified civilians in the acquisition work force. That was a huge load. You add all those things together, that was a huge load. Then last year in FY10 we also got the additional guidance that we're going to now in-source. So a lot of the support contractors across the Air Force, across DoD, that do a lot of the work that our work force is not sized for, we've been outsourcing for years because we had caps on military, we had caps on the size of the civilian work force, so if you still had a new mission or something came in, that work had to be done, your only option was to take money and buy support contractors to help you with that. We are walking that back. Thousands and thousands will now be hired back into government. It may not be the individuals doing the job, but we certainly encourage that if the trained individual who's knowledgeable on the task wants to join this organically. But that process of hiring puts additional stress and burden our civilian acquisition of talented people.

So we thought that was a huge job, but laid on top of that is also the conversion for the National Security Personnel System directed by Congress in last year's legislation, back to traditional pay systems. General Services the predominant one. So many of those jobs have to now be reclassified, and there's a civilian center activity that has to happen to make that transition. I'm not sure exactly how the timing is going to go. I've heard different timeframes from a gradual transition to a very abrupt and sudden transition to get through it.

So this is a huge, huge workload. You add all this up together on our civilian hiring centers.

BRAC also directed that all this is going to go to the personnel center at Randolph. Now in AFMC we've been fortunate because of the large depot presence and the acquisition force, we have four large civilian centers and we've been given authority to keep those centers under our control for the last two years. We are starting to transition, April will be the first one where we'll transition those to the personnel center. I'm a little reluctant to do that because they are hiring at a faster rate using acquisition authorities than they are able to do down at the personnel center. So we'll see how it goes, but within a year those will all have transitioned and will all be under the centralized personnel center. But those centers have huge things to do, and I've listed them there. I didn't elaborate on BRAC, but the BRAC moves I've talked about for the laboratory and some other moves, trigger hiring actions. Traditionally only 15, maybe 25 percent of the folks actually physically move. I think that will be higher with the economy as it is, but those are additional hiring actions that the civilian centers have to do.

It's all about net growth. We're carrying metrics there for a while. It's how fast can you hire a civilian? We're beating that number down lower and lower. We're down to about 80 days now at the AFMC civilian centers. So we thought that was pretty good, high-fiving. But it turns out we were just hiring people into different jobs, changing what seat in the canoe they were paddling from. So we got into this notion of net growth. It's not just hiring to hire, it's net growth. Are we actually getting more people into the organization. So we track that metric as well.

Acquisition improvement plan. A lot of criticism of acquisition. It's too slow. There's always cost growth, requirements creep, all the things that you can lament about acquisition, and you can take whatever headline you want to in 2010, and you can find that same headline in the '80s or in the '90s. There's no golden years of acquisition from my perspective. But we are where we are today and we're working the challenges that we have today with a set of rules and so forth.

The Chief and Secretary cast the net wide there and came up with an acquisition improvement plan that they want to see implemented. We're about a year and a half into that right now. One of the pillars of that is to reorganize our acquisition centers. About five, six years ago now we converted to a wing/group/squadron notation for

the organizations that do acquisition, and for a lot of good reasons we went down that path. But essentially we took organizations that were run by a colonel and we said you should be a group. We took organizations run by lieutenant colonel or civilian equivalent, and said you'll be a squadron. So we kind of just created the wing/group/squadron structure based on how you would divide up programs and projects. We found that a lot of these units were pretty small over time.

My personal perspective is a squadron should kind of fill up a bus. If it doesn't fill up a bus it's probably not squadron size. General Schwartz looked at it and said we're going to set standards here. So a wing's got to be a thousand or more, a group's got to be 400 or more, a squadron's got to be 35 or more. If you think you have a reason to have a squadron, group or wing that's smaller than that, he has to personally approve it.

So when you take that template and you apply it over acquisition organizational structure, it was going to be major surgery. We either sit there and bring everything into wings and groups, and we only have one or two colonels in charge of a group and all the other colonels don't have a home; or we make colonels as squadron commanders, because we want that O6 level talent running a lot of these programs, whether they're civilian or military. So the surgery was going to be so painful the best option we found out was to go back to a directorate, division and branch construct. Keep all the same talent that we have right now, and it gives us much more flexibility grow a unit and shrink a unit throughout the acquisition cycle. Because a typical program starts with a small number of people, gets into a large number of people as you complete development and go into production, and then it comes back down as you go into steady state production and sustainment. So we're making that change by the end of June. A pretty massive change. It was a massive change to go the other way, it's a massive change now to go back.

I found out I had a whole bunch of squadrons in the command that were in the mini-bus category, and I actually found one moped squadron out there. [Laughter]. It was a squadron of one and it was a civilian, supervising himself. That's really not a leadership experience. That was the reason for some of the standards here, how big a unit's got to be.

Hand in hand with that, and we're doing it near simultaneously, is we're going to what we call matrix management or functional management. So rather than each program manager out there having to figure out how to hire

a contracting person, how do I hire a cost analyst, how do I hire program managers and test people, at each center we're going to have a senior functional that's going to be responsible for the hiring of that work force. They're going to be responsible for the mentoring, grooming, training, of that work force. So they'll be assigned to program offices, they'll live there on a daily basis, but their daddy rabbit at a center level will be the senior functional for the care and feeding.

We're already doing that in the hiring sense and it's working great. We're hiring batches of new contract personnel at 50 at a time or 100 at a time at the large centers like Wright-Patterson. So we bring them all in, we put them through courses right away. Instead of each program office trying to do that by themselves.

Finally, sustainment of an aging fleet. This will be a never-ending challenge for AFMC. I'll always talk to it when I get the opportunity to make a presentation. The geriatric hospitals we have out there that are bringing the patients in are performing very well but the patients that are coming in are coming in sicker every time. So we're having delays in how long it takes to get through depot; we're having surprises all the time; we're discovering new geriatric disease, if you will, and we're trying to come up with ne geriatric science to allow us to better heal the patient. But we have a fleet that's over 24 years old now on average in our Air Force flying fleet. This is going to be with us for some time. As we do get permission and authority to downsize the fleet from some of our oldest stuff, that worked primarily down in the depots. That triggers a 50/50 discussion. And for those of you that don't know it, 50/50 is a statutory limit we have from Congress that of all the dollars we spend on depot level sustainment, half of those dollars or mores have to be done by government workers, organic workers, if you will. Primarily in the depot. It could be in other places. But the pay check has to go to a government worker.

Our new systems are, for the most part at least initially, supported by contractor logistics. So as we get rid of the legacy F-16s, F-15s, KC-135Es that are primarily done in the depot, and the new stuff that is coming in like remotely piloted aircraft and so forth, which is primarily sustained by contractors, we get into the danger zone on the 50/50. We're right on the edge right now. So any changes to our force structure and all that can trigger an imbalance there.

We've been there before. It's not a good place to be. It's very painful if you get into a 50/50 violation.

We do focus on the warfighter requirements. That's the primary purpose of Materiel Command is to support the warfighter. The surge is a good example. As we go into the surge here, I got a letter from General Johns and he says I need more C-5s and C-17s. I don't need them sitting at the depot. I need them on the flight line. So what can we do with those that are almost done pushing them out more quickly? Stopping the inductions for a period of time so that I can -- Can we waive some of the inspections that are required and the depot maintenance that's required so that I can hold on to them longer to get me through this surge period here, through the summer.

So we're working with Air Mobility Command, it's just one example of how we have to tailor on the fly some of our sustainment activities just as General McNabb talked about how they have to be flexible in the transportation network, we have to be flexible in the sustainment network.

As we prepare for the demands of tomorrow, I've listed just two examples there of initiatives that we're working. It takes years to implement an initiative like these two here. First you have to study it, you have to run a pilot, you have to change all of the funding and programmatic mechanisms that support that. But what we hope to do here on the repair network integration is to correctly take apart that needs repair and send it to some place where there's capacity. That might be at the unit level, it might be at a centralized repair facility, it might be at the depot, it might be at a contractor facility. But send it where it should go to come back the fastest. One week it might be this location; two weeks later it might be another location. We don't have that mechanism right now. So we have a couple of pilot programs that are looking into that, both on commodities and on aircraft, and we'll implement that more broadly as time goes on.

The last one there is high velocity maintenance is the one I'm most excited about. If you go to a depot right now, you'll see a lot of airplanes parked inside or parked outside and there's nobody touching it. They're just kind of sitting there. So you go, what's happening on that aircraft? Well, what's probably happening in most cases is they opened it up, they found something and said hmm, this is bad, this is a corroded part or a crack that we didn't know about and it's in some major structural member, and we either need to buy a new member because we don't spare those kind of things or produce a new component, or we need to figure out what the repair has to be. That's got to be engineered.

So while that is going on the airplane sits. That's usually why it's sitting. Or sometimes it comes in because all its flying time is expired, they're waiting for either the funding or the work force to be able to repair it.

What high velocity maintenance will do is make more trips to the depot, but when they're there, they'll stay there for a shorter period of time.

We'll do a lot of work at the unit to know what the condition of the aircraft is before it comes, when it comes in. This will be the time it comes in just to work on the wings, or just to work on the fuselage or the empennage. And we'll do a cursory inspection of some other areas so that when it comes back to next time, we will know what the condition or that area is for the next visit and we'll have already prepared the engineering solution or the spare part replacement or whatever it takes to do that.

If we find a safety of flight thing we're not going to fly them with known defects that's unsafe to fly, but if it's a known defect that it's still okay to fly, we'll just button it back up and we'll fix that next time, but when it comes we'll be ready for it and we can swarm on the aircraft and prepare it for the warfighter much faster. So shorter periods of time at the depot, but more trips to the depot, and while it's there you shouldn't see airplanes sitting around. You ought to see a lot of activity on each airplane, lots at the depot.

So that's high velocity maintenance. That should increase aircraft availability for the warfighter.

In closure, and I'm looking forward to taking your questions and all that. Four major mission areas. There is dynamic change in all these areas. The mission areas themselves have not changed in number. We have those four. But our engagement in the nuclear enterprise, our BRAC moves that are going on in the next year, and the huge, huge, huge surge we have coming up now in civilian hiring are the major challenges that we face right now.

With that, I look forward to taking your questions.

[Applause].

Moderator: Thank you, sir. I've got one here that I think we can probably dispose of this one fairly quickly. Do you expect the Space and Missile System Center to fold back under AFMC in the near future or at all?

General Hoffman: It could, but I would start with how we organize space and non-space at the Air Staff first, and say what's the right governance process at the Air Staff, and we're a divided body in that regard. There's history of why that is. I think that should be addressed. If the policy or the law if it would change -- It's not law directed, but it certainly could get into political and legal issues. If the decision was made to bring it back under AFMC, we would support that.

The first question you've got to ask, is it broken now? And would we fix it by doing that? It may not be worth the pain that we would go through to make the transition. It may look cleaner on everybody's organizational charts, but you've got to ask yourself what do you get when it's all over.

Moderator: In your prior life you had a very high profile job as Director of Requirements at Air Combat Command, and now you're in a position of supporting those requirements through the acquisition process. One of the issues that it seems the Air Force has had for years has to do with providing integrated capabilities to some of our new systems that are coming in. So from a requirements process to the acquisition process, how do you see the Air Force solving some of that problem of building the integration to some of our new systems?

General Hoffman: In a perfect world we would have everything that we bought fully integrated into the greater whole. So whether it's communication systems, whether it's linked situational awareness, whether it's airplanes talking to weapons and weapons talking back to airplanes, it's nice to have it all integrated. But where I am right now, and it would be great to start your requirements there, but you're going to describe something that is going to be probably too hard to do and not digestible enough for the system to say let's go do it.

Joint Tactical Radio System, JTRS, is a good example. Grand and glorious. Yeah, bring it on. I'd love to have it. What a nirvana to aspire to. Then you get into the practical elements of how you develop those radios. And it's not just the brain of the radio, it's the brawn of the radio, so you're getting into power amplifiers and antennas and how do you integrate that into all the platforms that operate out there on the surface and in the air and space, and it becomes mission impossible. So great idea, but in execution and application, you can't get there.

So where I am right now is digestible bites of any task you may have.

We've got some major modifications going on in the C-130 program, the C-5 program, and when they were originally designed, great outcome. We're going to have one standard C-130. It's going to take 13-plus types of C-130s and give us one standard C-130. The cockpit looks the same and so forth. Hard to do. When you look at the execution schedule for that, it drug out over the years.

So my metric right now, if you can't get in and out of a project/program in about two FYDPs, you're biting off too big of an apple.

My favorite example is the new radar in the F-15E. Great idea. Get a lot of capability. It's going to take us 19 years to actually field that system. We're going to develop it, and then 19 more years to buy them at 12 a year and actually put them into the F-15E, and halfway through that, you know what's going to happen. We're going to have technology obsolescence. We're going to have vanishing vendors, and we're going to have to readjust.

So figure out what you want to do, and total system integration may not be achievable. So I'm not advocating stovepipes here, but I will say to industry, when you bring a solution to us it needs to be adaptable and flexible and I don't want to have to keep swabbing your proprietary DNA through the life of that system. I want to be able to have that system work with other systems. So if you want to call that interoperable, okay. If you want to call it totally integrated, okay. But we've got to do our acquisition. We've got to define requirements and do our acquisition in digestible bites. Because the enterprise at large, whether it's congressional funding, whether it's technology support, cannot sustain two decades of activity on any single project.

Moderator: We received a bit of good news. We got a little bit of an extra time slot here so we've got a few more questions to ask you. If you don't mind, we'll run a little bit longer than we had planned.

General Hoffman: Go for it.

Moderator: You discussed briefly the BRAC implications on the R&D facilities you have around the country, and you now have a brand new commander at AFRL, Major General Pelikowski. Can you tell us primarily what was the guidance you gave her, and also what do you see in the way of the largest new technologies that you think are coming down the road for the Air Force?

General Hoffman: S&T is always an interesting discussion because there are many cooks in that kitchen. WE have some very defined limits of what portion of our budget will go to science and technology, and within that budget how much has to be truly exploratory work that may never bear fruit, but it's way way out there if it does work. It's very practical, this is ready to be applied in the next year or two. So there's a range there of how much you're reaching in technology and we have prescribed limits of how much money goes in each category.

So you can't go into the S&T world and do major flip-flops. There's a lot of governors on that process. Congress is a major governor. They watch it very closely. OSD watches it very closely. Our customers watch it. They all have inputs whether it's space, cyber or air, of things and problems that they want solved. So there's a ballet going on there and a governance process that kind of freezes some of your options, if you will. My guidance to General Pelikowski, who by the way is a great candidate for that job. She brings tremendous space knowledge, tremendous non-space knowledge into that post. She's a PhD. She thinks like a scientist as well as an engineer, but she's also a very good practitioner of acquisition. So a combination of all those talents will make her a great leader of the Air Force Research Lab.

But my guidance to her is first of all, do no harm as you take this over. Don't expect a major flip-flop of how we do S&T. Continued refinements and how we work with the governance process in the building and so forth will probably be her major challenge.

Moderator: I have three questions here that all pertain to the civilian work force, and you mentioned you had the largest civilian work force of any of the MAJCOMs. One of them has to do with the aging work force and how are you replacing them. And in line with that, since you do have a large civilian work force, what are some of the professional growth opportunities that they have? Are they similar to the military? And what are you doing to attract college graduates into the command? So all tied to the civilian work force.

General Hoffman: Let me talk about the civilian work force then. We do have a large population that's retirement eligible. Just like a lot of industry, just like a lot of other government agencies and all that. And if everybody had a strong 401K, they may be exiting right now. They're down to their 101Ks maybe have grown back up to 201Ks and a lot of that aging work force says not yet, not yet. We appreciate them staying with us. That could

be a transitory situation. If the economy becomes strong again they may then exit in large numbers, which would give us a challenge.

For every one of them with all the experience they have, you've got to grow somebody new to replace them.

Traditionally, if you look at any organization there's a pyramid there of rank structure. You have your entry level on the bottom, you have your more senior folks on top. And in the military certainly you come in as an airman or a lieutenant and you work your way up through that pyramid. On the civilian work force, I mentioned how long it takes to hire. If we do 80 days, we think we're doing good. So let's say somebody up there near the top of the pyramid exits and we replace them in the traditional manner. Somebody one grade below replaces them, 80 days. One grade below replaces them, 80 days. One grade, you know. You get about four or five moves in there until the entry level person actually enters and it's about three years down the road. That is not practical, which is why for the growth we have going right now and the in-sourcing in the acquisition area at least, we've been given direct hire authority. So we will hire in on the side of that pyramid as well. We'll hire in journeyman level people or people that have industry experience. Maybe they used to be in the automotive industry and they're unemployed now. We're getting some pretty significant talent coming in on the engineering side and so forth at the higher ends of that pyramid.

This creates a little bit of tension in the force because the traditional way of hiring is people think that job above me is my job to have. Now it's their job to lose. We will hire the best athlete. If it's a person in the system, lateral or right below and you're the best person, we will hire you. But if that person happens to be sitting outside, we will hire them. So it's a competitive process of how we hire talent. We haven't closed doors for upward mobility by any means, but we will hire the best athlete and jobs above you are yours to lose, not necessarily yours to have. So the hiring process has changed considerably there.

So aging work force, how we're doing the hiring, and we are getting tremendous talent coming in. Civilian hiring ultimately is local hiring. It's kind of like politics. All politics are ultimately local. Civilian hiring is ultimately local. So we're not going to get somebody down here in Florida that's presently sitting up in Alaska. It doesn't do much good to recruit in Alaska for a job that's in Florida. So all the large centers

there have a very very active engagement with their community sources of talent. And whether it's the technical schools outside of a depot like Warner Robbins, or whether it's the colleges outside of Wright-Patterson, they are working those institutions or have an industry day so they know what the industry has to offer; government days; job fairs. We've had some job fairs at Wright-Pat where the line goes all the way around the stadium a couple of times of people that want to come in. So we have a lot of choice to make in who we hire. Then we've got to go through that process and actually process them.

We lose some of that talent because, quite frankly, while we're grinding through that process they get an offer somewhere else and they're gone. So the talent is there. We just have to execute on it in a timely manner.

Moderator: I had a couple of questions that had to do with the restructuring of the Acquisition Centers that you talked about. The questions focused primarily on the PEOs. Do you foresee an increase in PEOs?

General Hoffman: Good question. We are increasing PEOs. We have found that the span of control for a PEO at the large product centers was tremendous, and some of these programs, especially the large programs, really need a dedicated person looking at it. So we're going from four PEOs -- that's Program Executive Officer -- to fourteen. That will happen by June 2. We're already up to about seven or eight right now. We're starting to lead turn that. So KCX is one example. That program now is managed by a general officer, Brigadier General Chris Bogden. If there's anything about KCX you need to know, he's on top of it. He knows it.

Expeditionary Combat Support System, ECSS. Brigadier General Select Moran is running that. Massive program. It's going to be the sinews and replace over 200 legacy systems of how we do all our IT support and resource planning for sustainment. He is on top of that. He knows all the in's and out's of that program. So the focus now by expanding the number of PEOs is that we're getting good senior leadership focus on that program, to move that program forward.

In the past, the center commander would go up. He'd be a PEO for all these programs and he'd be knowledgeable on it, but sometimes that knowledge was refreshed the day before he had to go brief. He doesn't live and breathe it on a daily basis. So I see a tremendous advantage to that.

Moderator: Thank you very much, sir, we appreciate it.

General Hoffman: Thank you all for the opportunity to come here.

#