



Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

All right, ladies and gentlemen, good morning and welcome to the Operational Imperatives and Cross-Cutting Operational Enablers. Industry panel entitled Readiness to Deploy and Fight. Strategic Competition is in the context for future and air and space power. United States will face increasingly varied and dynamic threats as the global stage evolves and pacing challenges emerge.

To combat this, the Department of the Air Force must be able to mobilize, deploy, and fight rapidly, which will require hardening the joint forces mobilization and support chain against cyber and non-cyber threats. This is summarized as the ability of the DAF to transition to and sustain a wartime posture against a peer competitor and is underscored in the Secretary of the Air Force's operational imperatives and directly ties into our readiness to deploy and fight.

I'm Major General John Klein, commander of the United States Air Force Expeditionary Center, headquartered at Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey. Thank you for joining us as we welcome the following the esteemed gentleman to today's panel. This morning we have with us, US Air Force Lieutenant General retired and Managing Director in Deloitte Cyber and Strategic Risk Practice, Chris Weggeman. United States Air Force Major General, retired, and CEO of Marvin Test Solutions, Steve Sergeant. And Chief Technology Officer and Co-founder of Systecon North America, Mr. Justin Woulfe.

Gentlemen, thank you for joining us today. As a warmup for our discussion. We'll start off by giving each of you the opportunity to briefly share your industry perspective with respect to the evolving strategic environment. General Weggeman, start with you.

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Thanks, Speedy. Appreciate it. Good morning everyone. Glad to be here with you all. And just in light of the Gulfstream video, I just want to say put me down for two G-700's please and we'll just put that on burner's tab. Thank you sir.

I'll just offer, from an industry perspective, how we do force generation, force deployment in today's era of great power competition. I put it into three main challenges that we all will have to deal with collectively, public and private sector united. The first one is what I would say is unity of action and unity of effort. The second one is probably the most powerful two words and the most challenging, and that is force integration. Interservice, intraservice, and whole of government force integration.

And the last one is what I would characterize as external dependencies. As we converge public and private sector, as we converge and our allies and our partners around the globe and what we want to do with great power competition and power projection, we're going to have to figure out what it is we control and what we don't control and how, at times, we inspire others to want to do the things that we need to do to be successful in the security and defense of our nation. So I'll stop there.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Wonderful. Thank you sir. General Sergeant.

Maj. Gen. Steve Sargeant, USAF (Ret.):

So I look at it from this way. As agile combat employment and accelerate change or lose have now been the drumbeat for the last couple of years and it looks like will continue to be the drumbeat. The requirements that the government needs to put out, the military needs to put out, need to be clear and concise and consolidated. And when they are presented to industry, both those that are at the startup



end and those that are at the prime end, the innovation and the solutions can be reached together much more effectively than when those requirements are disparate.

And so, I think at this point, there's been enough time for that drumbeat to be heard that both the internal forces that reside across the bureaucracy and the external forces called the threat need to come together sooner than later for victory in the future.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

All right, thanks sir. Okay. Over to Mr. Justin Woulfe.

Justin Woulfe:

Yeah, thanks general. So I guess I'll start with, at AFA two years ago I was on a panel on AI and I thought I had this really revolutionary tool. This was before ChatGPT became quite ubiquitous and I used it to write my intro. And I thought this was a pretty amazing thing, that the speech was great, way better than I could have written by myself. And when I gave the speech, told everyone exactly what I'd done and afterwards it was kind of funny. The other panel members, one person called it cute, which I guess is okay. And the vast majority of people that I talked to afterwards thought that I just made that up, that it wasn't possible that that had happened. You fast forward two years later, and now this construct of AI and ChatGPT and many other kinds of AI and machine learning are out there, are everywhere. They're around us. They're part of our daily lives. And what does that have to do with readiness, deploy, and fight?

Well, nothing really, except that two years has elapsed, right? And what happens in two years in our trade space is monumental. Two years also happens to be the average lead time for a spare part for one of our weapon systems. So what do we need to think about now that's going to happen in two years and what can we not even fathom that is likely to occur in the next 24 months. It's something that I think about a lot. I run a predictive analytics software company, so we're trying to always predict the future, but it's amazing as we think about the pace and evolution of things in meeting our competitor or meeting our near peer competitors in this relatively short 24 month period on our horizon.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

All right, thank you Justin. Okay, gentlemen, with that, let's get to these questions. General Weggeman, I'm going to give you lead on this first question, but let set it up just real quickly. So DOD and Transcom and the Department of the Air Force have relied heavily upon commercial industry partners, having them integrated into our processes and our systems and organizations and contracts to get out the door when the nation calls.

The challenges we face in this realm are what the Secretary has deemed the fight to get to the fight. So can you discuss the challenges and threats within our digital dependency across public and private sector and specifically how we struggle with perhaps the will and the focus and accountability necessary for identifying and ensuring key cyber terrain for forced generation and power projection both home and abroad?

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Is that it?

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

That's it. Softball.



Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Well, B. The answer's B. Yeah. So there's a lot to unpack in that and so I'll do my best. I think there's three primary risks that we have to deal with in this what I call the intersection or the convergence and entanglement of public and private sector, digital spaces or cyber spaces. Our attack surface area, the internet of things, is expanding rapidly and literally approaches infinity every day. More and more. Billions and billions of connected devices that we have to secure and defend.

It's a digital imperative and it's an organizational imperative for us to collaborate and depend upon which imbues trust between the public and private sector. Why? It's their stuff. What we fly, fight, and win in three domains with is 98% the private commercial dib sector stuff. So of course we have to partner with them and we have to get intimately integrated with what they do moving forward.

A couple of risks. The convergence risk I think I talked about, and that is everything we're doing as citizens and as Airmen and Guardians is entangled now. And so when we look at force projection, power projection, airspace and cyberspace superiority, and we'll come back to that last one, there's nothing we can do that doesn't require the dependency of the private sector, the commercial sector, and our partners and allies around the world.

And so, it is an imperative that we figure out how to work together, how we build trust, and how we have a collaborative dependency moving forward. The other one is we need to think about operational velocity. It's a little bit to Chief Brown's accelerate change, but operational velocity is the result in fact that if you're keeping up with current events, we want to impose costs and deny benefit, which is how we deter great powers like China. That's deterrence theory 101.

We're on the receiving end of a very robust cost and position strategy from China right now. And it's forcing us to think through how do we force, aggregate, train, develop ready and capable forces, and deploy them to where we need to be to actually deter. And so our operational velocity is constantly slowed down because we are siloed organizationally. We don't trust across the public private sector scene. And... I lost my train of thought. So we don't have the trust, then the velocity is lost because we're constantly looking about how we fight in D-DIL environments. If everything is about a pace plan, about contingency planning, et cetera, et cetera, how fast are we going to be able to achieve the decisional advantage we need and put the adversary back on their heels instead of us being on our heels? And so that's one of the things that we're going to have to figure out.

And the last one, if you really want to get into the digital dust right now about operations in the information environment, which we talk about a lot, but we're struggling to figure out how we actually solve for X, is what I call truth provenance. So right now, if we're going to go to war or we're going to do better in competition, what does it mean if we can't trust the data sets, the information, or the decision cycles that we get from our systems, our cloud base analytics, the visualizations, the dashboards, even what we're hearing and seeing on the phone from each other. If we have lost truth provenance, how fast are we going to operationally be able to move and have the maneuver agility required to be successful? So those are a few things.

In terms of what can we do, let's just talk about the fact that I think we're doing better at how we secure our Air Force network, the SIPRNet, NIPRNET, and JWICS. I think we have a pretty good defensive scheme of maneuver there that can be better. But for our weapons and mission systems, we are woefully behind and a few things we need to do. We need to have the ability to know ourselves, see our networks, and maneuver our networks at scale. We can't do that today. So what do we need to do that? We need a toolkit of lightweight sensors that we can put on these systems, flashlights, and tape recorders. For those of you that don't understand, we're not going to wreck your system by doing this stuff. And then we need to tie it all and integrate it to a correlation, big data platform where we can run analytics and actually see enemies, adversary behaviors in our networks.



We can maneuver the network and then we can actively defend cyberspaces, not passively defend with firewalls. And so we need to do that at scale and how do we scale? We need automation because there's not enough of y'all to make it happen and there's not enough to make it happen fast enough because the enemy gets a vote. So we have to automate the hard things and that'll deliver scale. And then two more things. We got to buy down our tech debt. You all have heard that probably a lot in your day and a half here. Tech debt, how do we buy it down faster? Three words. Abandon in place. Let's stop trying to re-platform refactor and build a 2.0 version of everything from 1989. The fastest way is to do the bigger costs, abandon in place, adopt best of breed commercial sector practices at scale and start running with scissors.

And that's what we need to do. And the last thing is, for all of you that run program management offices out there, that run acquisition systems and programs, we need cyber mindedness in your organizations. It does not exist today. Who is there to advocate for cyber resiliency in your weapon system and bake it in end to end? It's not about more. It's not about being a bigger gorilla. It's about equity, mission resilience, and being able to compete with China in this era of great power competition. So I think I answered probably 40% of your question.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

No, that's very good, sir. Hey, we are doing okay on time with this particular question. So gentlemen, anything you'd like to add regarding that digital dependency with respect to force generation and power projection?

Maj. Gen. Steve Sargeant, USAF (Ret.):

I think the one piece I would add is on the cyber piece. I remember going to AFRL about 2012 and we were talking support equipment. And the question was can you guarantee that your support equipment, if it touches an airplane, can't transfer malware? In other words, was cybersecurity baked into the support equipment? And it opened up a great discussion across industry and the answer was, not much. Well fast-forward to 2023. Now there are systems that have cybersecurity baked in, in the last, I would say 24 months, which is adding a whole nother level of security that didn't exist before.

But guess what? That's in the newer systems. There's a lot of those that are out there. So the question is do we go back? Can we go back to those mainly analog systems and actually make them cyber secure or is it time to move forward, as was suggested, and move forward faster with systems that have that cybersecurity built in from the very beginning? Probably the latter.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Yeah, Justin.

Justin Woulfe:

I'd say certainly we are absolutely dependent on that cybersecurity layer. If we think about what we're trying to do across the department and across the DOD in general with AI and predictive maintenance and any kind of predictive logistics to be able to understand or pre-position material, you really have to understand and have confidence and truth in that dataset. If I can inject a demand signal into your IT system to have you push all of your critical spare parts to a location where they're not necessary, that's a problem. And of course, trusting that when I get a signal back that says a particular turbine engine needs to be maintained, we need to be able to believe that.

Otherwise, our maintainers have no confidence in the data, so they're going to stop using the data system as it was intended. They're going to put poor data in, and then we're going to be back where we



are today, where all of my mean time to repair the systems is an hour because that's the singular value that gets the system to accept it. And then we can't trust the information as we're trying to look forward and do things into the future.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Great. Thank you. General Weggeman, I'm going to come back to something that's near and dear to your heart, and that's cyber superiority. So why is it that you think we have yet to declare a cyber superiority as a common joint mission for all the services? If we're fighting readiness is our North star, as a service that operates in three domains of war, airspace and cyberspace, why do we only seek superiority in two?

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Yep. I gave him that. That's awesome. Thanks. So let's just set the stage real quick. I can say, in my opinion, that you cannot argue with the fact that the most contested and congested domain of warfare today is cyberspace. The most contested and congested domain of war today is cyberspace. Cyberspace, superiority, ladies and gentlemen is a common core mission for every service in the Department of Defense. I'll say it again, cyberspace superiority is a common core mission for every service in the Department of Defense, yet not a single one of them has that written down, acknowledges it, or talks about it. And we had a wonderful keynote this morning by General Saltzman, a friend of mine, a cohort. I've worked with him for years. And we had one more opportunity there. And as Speedy said, the Department of the Air Force has two services that operates in three domains of war.

We operate in three domains of war. And we have missions that have air superiority, space superiority, that's it. We hang. Why not cyber superiority? We need to acknowledge that the wonderful Airmen and civilians that deliver cyber effects, offense, defense, network operations, intelligence, insights 24/7, they need to see themselves in these services. They need to be better recognized. And the why. The why gets to brinkmanship. Superiority. If you put that as a mission requirement, there's a certain budget requirement, there's a certain force requirement, there's a certain acknowledgement of what that requires.

And again, I don't want more. I just want an equal seat at the table to ensure that when we integrate space, cyber, and air, maritime, land, subsurface, that we win. Because without cyberspace superiority in today's day and age, across the comp and spectrum, without it, we will lose or we will come short of all of the required objectives in the battlespace. And so we have to do that. It's the only way we're going to get serious about it. And you can't put it all on the backs of 140-ish teams at US Cyber Command. I'm a founding father of birthing those forces. I know all about them. They're amazing. That doesn't scale. The services need to acknowledge cyber superiority as a common core mission.

And then when you see JADC2, maybe we call it JADC3, what it actually is. Maybe with ABMS, we talk more about the foundational digital backbone required to underpin it. Maybe we'd get closer to mission and weapon systems cybersecurity at scale. We'd have better retention of the talent that's being competed for with great companies like Justin and Google and Amazon and everyone else out there that's taking them away from us because they don't feel like they're acknowledged, that their mission is valued, and they're getting the reps and sets they need as a maneuver and effects force. I'll stop there. I love my cyber people.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Thank you, sir. Great. I want to transition now a bit to discuss the other half of today's discussion. So it's not just about the readiness to deploy, but also the readiness to fight once we get there. Potential



adversaries have invested heavily in long range precision munitions designed to attack forward air bases and other high value targets. This touches on the SEC gap's operational imperative number five, resilient forward basing and has clear implications for agile combat employment. So General Sergeant, this next question is primarily directed at to you, but definitely one we can all touch on.

How do you address the demands agile combat employment has placed upon MAJCOM commanders requiring them to be able to quickly and effectively deploy both small footprint maintenance packages and ensure that Airmen have the tools and training to enable them to be multi capable Airmen?

Maj. Gen. Steve Sargeant, USAF (Ret.):

Well, I think that question is almost as big as the first one that you gave to Wedge, but I'll try to keep it concise. They have a very, very big mission, and they need to be able to pick up and deploy as rapidly as possible. And in order to do that, if you start from where we are today and just say go with what we have, there's not enough airlift and in many cases, c-lift to get them there in any reasonable amount of time.

And so, from an industry perspective, trying to help the MAJCOM prepare to actually deploy and execute. There's been a lot looking across the support systems that are there, whether it's supporting precision weapons, and I know that certain companies are looking at how to deploy those precision weapons more rapidly than in the past with packaging systems, but also how to support them with common across the fleet equipment. That goes against the last 40 to 50 years of deploying major weapons systems because we of a system have allowed program managers for all new major weapons systems to deploy, in many cases, all new support equipment that was specific to that major weapon system. And started the train then from an item manager throughout the life cycle of that support equipment to go back to what was said earlier, going to 2.0 and schlepping it and continuing to just replace what was out there without stepping back and looking at the innovative ways to actually consolidate support equipment that could go across the entire fleet of armed aircraft, for instance, as we're talking precision weapons here.

That technology didn't exist 30 years ago when many of these systems were deployed, but it does today. And so in order to help reduce the footprint, so that forces can be deployed faster and supported with a limited number of Airmen, that common standardized equipment can actually lead to true multi capable Airmen. So as this, over the last couple of years as multi capable Airmen were being discussed by career functional managers, there wasn't a lot of progress being made in the first six months. Questions like, well, could we take a phlebotomist out of the hospital or the clinic and send them forward to pump gas or help armed weapons? And the answer is, not anytime soon, and not without a lot of training and reevaluating the type of equipment.

So staying within a career field, let's just say armament for instance, if you had common support equipment across the armament field, that could actually work across multiple MDSs. Now someone who was qualified only on one MDS, let's say an F-15, could pick up a common standardized tool and probably in short order, be a multi capable Airmen taking care of something like an F-16 or an F-35. And I think that's where the forces are trying to go. That's where the Airmen are trying to go, and that's where industry has tried to help them.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Okay. Justin, I want to string all this together just a little bit. We've talked about integrating across department lines and all of that could definitely extend to system integration in the supply and distribution systems. I know you've done some work in that realm. What are your



thoughts about the complexity of the deployment and distribution enterprise when the threat of adversaries is working to disrupt integrate our capabilities?

Justin Woulfe:

Well, it's certainly complex. I guess we could leave it there, but if we really dive into this, we talk about, and you see a lot, and we talk about ACE operations and contingent environments or contested environments where we really, for the first time since World War II, is really the mantra that everyone goes back to, that we will operate in this ACE environment. And I'd argue that it's far more complex now than it ever was during World War II, because while we may have had a near peer competitor that would sink our supply lines and have the ability to shoot our aircraft down, they were much less technically complex. And what was necessary to support our weapon systems deployed was a far smaller footprint and a far smaller package than we could ever have imagined in the 1940s.

So when we think about ACE operations, or any kind of contested environment where we need to project power, the support package for a Mustang back in the 1940s is very different than an F-35 today. And the ability to detect that support package, not the F-35. We're not talking about that. We're talking about the C-17 or the C-130 or the ship or whatever it is that's going to deliver the maintenance personnel, the spares packages, the support and test equipment, the AME and everything else that's necessary is obviously, it's a flying target.

And so understanding our requirements is going to be absolutely critical. That's where we need to understand and actually make predictive logistics be part of our war games in a way that I don't think they ever have been. We always sort of sprinkle magic fairy dust and spare parts appear. And that isn't going to happen in a contested environment. When you carry that sort of next step forward and say, okay, well we have a relatively small ability to carry with us, so we have to pre-position things. Are we ready as a nation to pay that bill? Programs today are already funded from a material requirements, not at a hundred percent to meet their current flying hour program. Most programs anyway. If we're going to add RSPs on top of that and pre-position them in places so that we can actually accomplish a 30 day contested environment, are we ready to pay that bill? And I think the answer is unequivocally no, in most cases, based on the current environment for budgets.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Okay. Gentlemen, anything you'd like to add on that complexity and how to maybe unravel that and deal with that going forward?

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Well, I'll kind of zoom us out back to, I think a key word that we're all focusing on is integration, force integration. And so when you look across the Air Force, who does force integration? We have six four-star MAJCOM commanders that do organize training and equip emissions for the Air Force, Force providers, as we say. Six four-star Force providers. We have two three-Star Force providers in the United States Space Force. Who does force integration?

And so I think Secretary Kendall has given us some recent charges that just came out a day or two ago where maybe we're going to look at that again. I believe, disruptively, that the Air Force needs and Air Force Forces Command whose sole mission is war fighting tomorrow and force integration. Let's unify for effort. Let's unify for effect. Let's unify against the missions and minimize the seams we have to integrate that are challenging us right now. How do we integrate at the exercise level.

You command the Expeditionary Center. I think the partnership, the Wonder Twin Powers is the Expeditionary Center and the United States Air Force Warfare Center together unified under a



governance model that builds an integrated, calendar oriented, exercise schedule for what may become our air task forces. A single commander with a single A staff organized and training together for a year at an installation ready to go in a moment's notice.

You work as I think we like to say, five feet and below, and they work five feet and above with the Warfare Center, and we're rocking and rolling. And we get agility. We get tempo, and we're not doing a pickup game at the line of scrimmage, like we've done the last 20 years in the Middle East. We're going to send a organized, trained, agile mission command focused team of war fighters that know each other and fight with each other, and will crawl through broken glass through each other and know how to do it forward when called upon. That's going to start with us really looking at, do we have the right org design to integrate that level of force integration as a service?

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Yeah. So I can tell you. Basket Cunningham and I are already working together to integrate our respective exercises to get at that. I would add one more though. That would be IMSC. So, John, you can pay me later. But that integration between our agile combat support forces into all that so that logistics don't get forgotten. We got to bake that in. Absolutely have to bake that in. So, okay. Gentlemen, believe it or not, we're getting close. We're entering our-

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

It says we have 40 minutes left.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

I know somebody forgot to hit the clock down there.

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

For you guys.

Justin Woulfe:

It's frozen on 40 so you got a long way to go.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

That's right. So we're going to enter our lightning round here to begin closing the discussion. I'd like to give you each two to three minutes to offer your perspective on the challenges lying before us and how the air and space forces can better partner with industry as we move forward. So why don't we start with Justin down at the end.

Justin Woulfe:

Yeah, great. Thanks. Like I said, it really comes down to this, we as a department and as an Air Force need to decide are we trying to be efficient or are we trying to be resilient? And I think those two things are often this tug against one another. Where the idea of efficiency is have the just in time delivery system and really minimize our footprint, really minimize the cost that we have to support today's operating environment. The resilience side is are we prepared to meet those requirements in the future that aren't the same as they are today, both from an operating hours perspective, as well as a logistics delay time perspective. And we have to find that sweet spot and we need to do the analysis to understand what that means so we can make a reasonable proposal to say, this is what we actually need





to do this work. It can't be the old way of doing things, which is don't tell the whole story and then we'll get more money later because that's not going to happen.

Maj. Gen. Steve Sargeant, USAF (Ret.):

This era that we're in. And to quote to the secretary, focused on China, China, China, is not one MAJCOM or the Air Forces or the Space Forces problem. It's a department of the Air Force problem that needs everyone in the Department of Air Force from the fourth floor of the Pentagon to the basement of the bureaucracy to recognize the change needed and to accelerate it. And from my experience, the only way you're going to do that, is you have to incentivize people that have been doing the same thing for the last 30 or 40 years.

You have to find a way to incentivize them to want to change and to accelerate the change that's necessary. And I would just offer that that hasn't occurred yet. The bumper stickers are out there in neon, but the incentives are not there. And until everyone in the Department of the Air Force is incentivized in some way, shape, or another to change when that cheese needs to be moved, when their office needs to be reorganized, from all the item managers that are out there today who have jobs to support all that equipment, all that support equipment that's been fielded over the past 40 years or so and gone through schleps or 2.0 or about to do that again.

Until that happens, it's just going to continue on. And there may be a shortfall, and that shortfall may result in what everyone says cannot happen, which is the lose part of accelerate, change, or lose. So when the change is incentivized in industry, those requirements will come out loud and clear that industry can actually step up to and help deliver solutions back to the military and to the government that make the most sense going forward in a consolidated, consistent, integrated manner. So hopefully that happens sooner than later.

Lt. Gen. Chris Weggeman, USAF (Ret.):

Yeah. I think this fundamentally, this public private partnership and the challenges, it's just fun. It's another P, it comes down to people. It's all about people. And so I don't know, one of my favorite mentors is Sharon O'Malley Berg. I don't know if Sharon's here. But she gave me two words that I've used, and many of you may have heard me say this before. What do we need is a collaborative dependency between the organizations. Whatever the public private sectors are, we need a collaborative dependency, and that's founded on trust. We have yet to build the trust required to go faster, to accelerate, to Burner's point.

And I think one of the things we can do, just one thing people wise that we can do to help it is what I call talent permeability. Let's get more of our Airmen and Guardian and civilians on education with industry. You pick your card, however you want to play it. Let's get them out in the private sector, in the commercial sector, learning, understanding their culture, how they operate. And then the same, let's bring them across the aisle into industry, and let's have some revolving door, some permeability between the talent models. Because fundamentally, what I'm getting at and what we don't have is trust. We don't have trust.

Look at cloud's security services. I had the pleasure of sitting across from Jeff Bezos and asked him about why don't we trust Amazon for our operational data? And he said, "Hey, Wedge, last I checked, we have all of Goldman Sachs's data and the financial sector. Last I checked, Wall Street hasn't collapsed." He goes, "I think if we can do that for Wall Street, we can probably do it for your NIPRNET."

But we still get on our own way and say no. We try to do it with enterprise IT as a service and other things. We want to bolt on a thousand things in between the blue line that comes from the vendor to our endpoint because we don't trust them and we need more and we want more. And we have people



that have current jobs that are afraid of going to different jobs, et cetera, et cetera. So I want to build trust. I want to do that through talent permeability. And ultimately, when we have a collaborative dependency, when we have each other's sixes, then we're going to be a hard one, and then we will win. So my thoughts, thanks for asking.

Maj. Gen. John M. Klein, Jr.:

Awesome. Great, sir. Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen. Very much appreciate the ingenuity, the innovation, and probably most importantly, the patriotism of our industry partners. We absolutely cannot do our job of defending this great nation and fighting alongside our partners and allies without the foundation of American industry. So thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our discussion on Readiness to Deploy and Fight. Please join me in thanking our esteemed industry panel. Thank you.