

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BLOGGERS ROUNDTABLE WITH DAVID FISHER, DIRECTOR, BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VIA TELECONFERENCE FROM IRAQ
SUBJECT: DOD'S BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY: MOVING FORWARD INTO THE NEXT ADMINISTRATION
TIME: 2:30 P.M. EST DATE: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2008

Copyright (c) 2008 by Federal News Service, Inc., Ste. 500 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA. Federal News Service is a private firm not affiliated with the federal government. No portion of this transcript may be copied, sold or retransmitted without the written authority of Federal News Service, Inc. Copyright is not claimed as to any part of the original work prepared by a United States government officer or employee as a part of that person's official duties. For information on subscribing to the FNS Internet Service, please visit <http://www.fednews.com> or call(202)347-1400

(Note: Please refer to www.dod.mil for more information.)

CHARLES "JACK" HOLT (chief, New Media Operations, Office of the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs): Welcome to Bloggers Roundtable.

Mr. David Fisher is the interim director (sic/director) of the Business Transformation Agency.

And glad you could join us today, sir.

MR. FISHER: Thank you.

MR. HOLT: Do you have an opening statement for us? I understand there are changes that you've been working on and some things that will continue as we move on -- as we move forward. MR. FISHER: Yeah, I do.

Could I just get a sense of how many folks we have on the line?

MR. HOLT: Yes, sir.

We have Colin Clark with Military.com and Mandy Smithberger, who is with the Project on Government Oversight.

MR. FISHER: Okay, great!

Again, I'm not sure in terms of the familiarity that Colin or Mandy have with what we do. I thought I'd give just a couple of minutes on that just to kind of get to a baseline; talk for a couple of seconds about some of the things that we're working on relative to the transition, and more so to some legislative changes that recently went into effect that are having an impact on the business operations of the department. And then just open it up for whatever Q&A the folks would like to have.

Again, for those of us who are not familiar with us, the BTA was established a little over three years ago. Our mission is to guide the transformation of business operations throughout the department and to deliver enterprise-level capabilities that align to warfighter needs.

So what does that mean? We guide and we deliver and our focus is in the business space, but the business space in the context of delivering

capability to both the warfighter and the senior leaders who support the warfighter.

Part of the reason that we were created was the lack of a level of capability that was adequate to the task in delivering on those services. You know, partly it's the senior-level decision makers in the department who need good timely, reliable, accurate information. Business information -- logistics, finance, personnel, acquisition -- those kinds of areas on which to make decisions in support of the warfighter activities. And then the warfighter themselves with logistics support, financial management support, those various business arenas in which those support activities are ultimately essential to the overall mission of the department.

So you know, seeing some gaps, engagement with the folks on the Hill, the department moved forward under Secretary -- Deputy Secretary Gordon England's leadership to stand up a new agency, specifically focused on supporting the OSD-level policymakers -- that's the undersecretaries, if you will, who own functional policy -- and the people who have to deliver on those policies, which are really our military departments. They deliver the capability.

How could we do a better job in aligning those different efforts and making sure that the policy decisions relative to business -- whether it's standards or processes or data -- those enabling elements are effectively communicated and implemented in typically business systems at the component level?

The other element is -- again, in the business systems world -- there were lots of different systems spread throughout the department that were delivering enterprise-level capabilities -- capabilities that span multiple components across the department. And again, we had somewhat of a weak track record in delivering those capabilities. And so about a half of -- a little more than half of the BTA is a set of close to 30 enterprise-level business system programs where we have the acquisition and delivery responsibility for those capabilities.

So we work on the guidance side of taking requirements -- be it process or data or really anything business related -- facilitating that dialogue with the military departments for them to implement things in their solutions, as well as the enterprise level capabilities that we deliver for the entire department.

So the new element -- the new twist to this -- legislation in the NDAA 2008, and again in 2009 driving for more senior-level accountability in the business space within the departments; or longstanding GAO recommendations from the former comptroller general, David Walker; as well as key both Senate and House leadership looking for more accountability and more senior-level accountability within the department for the business side of the organization as a key enabler to the overall mission.

And so they passed legislation identifying the deputy secretary as also the chief management officer of the department, creating a new position called the deputy chief management officer, which will be filled for the first time by the new administration; as well as identifying chief management officers within the three military departments -- along with some additional statutory language on what that means and the expectations for those offices to deliver.

So we have a little bit of a head start on some of these new entities that are coming in. We see this sort of as the logical extension of some of the work that we've done at the OSD layer within the BTA and now look for, you know, I think even greater opportunity to both partner with OSD and partner with the military departments and these new leadership positions to try to deliver capability.

And that's probably the most exciting element of the transition is looking forward to those positions getting filled and beginning to work aggressively with those new leaders in trying to continue and accelerate capability deployment based on the mission that we've been at now for the last three years.

So that's just sort of a couple of opening thoughts. I would turn it over to you guys and be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. HOLT: All right, sir. Thank you very much. Mandy, you were first on line, so why don't you go.

Q I guess -- so I've, you know, studied somewhat on the BTA, but I'm trying to kind of understand it in terms of what we've seen in the past.

How is the mandate of it really different from the Defense Business Science Board? Is it just in trying to be more explicit in developing those capabilities and the technology in integrity systems, or?

MR. FISHER: Well, so things like the Science Board is really, you know, an advisory board. There are several boards that are similar. There's a Defense Business Board, which is really comprised of C-level executives, typically from the corporate world. There is the Defense Science Board and there's the Defense Policy Board, which are, again, very accomplished individuals from outside the Department of Defense who are providing independent and sort of senior-level guidance to the folks in the Pentagon.

We're a part of the organization. We are more of an internal set of eyes and ears who can provide our perspective on that guidance, but we also deliver capability.

We're an operational organization that we both engage directly with the components on their deployment of business solutions and IT systems, as well as delivering capability ourselves.

So we're an agency similar to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service or the Defense Logistics Agency or, you know, any of those other Defense agencies that is a full part and parcel of the Department, as opposed to those advisory boards, which again, are more -- you know, come together for occasional meetings and do briefing papers and policy advice, but are not really active elements of the department in delivering capability.

MR. HOLT: Okay.

And Colin?

Q Okay. Well, at the risk of sounding like moron, I've got to ask you: What do you do?

You know, I've covered Defense procurement and all that since '96 and I really don't get it. (Laughter.)

MR. FISHER: So help me understand what you don't get and I'll try to help you understand.

Q I don't really understand what your office does in plain English.

MR. FISHER: Okay. We --

Q I've read your -- you know, I've read your blurbs on your website and all that, but it does not translate well.

MR. FISHER: Okay. I'll try to translate in plain English.

We have two major portions of our organization, as I said before, the guidance side and the delivery side. The delivery side is we have an acquisition organization that delivers IT systems. So the Defense travel system, the standard procurement system, wide area workflow, business enterprise information services, the financial system.

Q Ah, okay. MR. FISHER: These are systems that previously had been distributed throughout a variety of executive agents throughout the department for which there was no single level of accountability. They were kind of all over the map. And the Def. sec. wanted a single place in which he could put, you know, a skilled set of individuals who do this for a living, who take requirements, build them into IT programs and deliver capability.

Now, many of the programs we have in our portfolio today we simply inherited. They were elsewhere in the Department and they were all transferred, if you will, into this new entity called the BTA. And so we became responsible for either continuing the delivery or accelerating or augmenting the delivery of those business systems, and really the one definition of what came to us is stuff that everybody uses.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: So it's not an Army specific system or a Navy or a DLA specific system, it's enterprise-wide capabilities.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: So that sort of half the organization is the business systems side. The other side is, again, relative to lack of accountability and, frankly, success in delivery in building the enterprise-level requirements. What are the data standards that we all in the Department think we should adopt, and if we do, then we'll be able to effectively interoperate and, you know, work together. Trade date --

Q Well, when you say enterprise-level requirements, I assume it's only for data systems. I mean, you're not doing it for weapons systems.

MR. FISHER: That's correct.

MR. HOLT: Right.

MR. FISHER: We're doing it for the realm of finance, acquisition, logistics, human resources, sort of core -- the business functions of the Department. It's not C-2; it's not Coms; it's not warfighter systems. You know, some of those activities do have linkages into the things that we're doing, so if you were going to acquire, obviously, a weapons system, you need a contracting system, you need a finance system, you need to be able to pay vendors, all those things. We support the standards for enabling those business activities that enable the warfighter to do other things down range.

So there's an enterprise architecture that we're responsible for, which is, in essence, a codification, the single place where all those business rules reside. So everyone knows if there's a set of data standards, I go to the business enterprise architecture and there they should be.

We are responsible for this enterprise transition plan that the Congress mandated where we publish twice a year -- here's all the business -- major business system investments that are going on. Here's why we're doing them. Here's when we're doing them. Here's when they're going to phase out other programs.

So it's a report that we publish a couple times a year that the Department didn't have that visibility prior to three years ago. There's an investment review element. All business systems in the Department -- again, per Congress, over \$1 million in investment need to get approved through an investment review process.

We facilitate that process -- OSD folks sit at the table and make the decisions, we facilitate that process. And then that last piece, again, back to the requirement side, so if the comptroller or the undersecretary for AT&L or the undersecretary for P&R, if they have a major business initiative, it's clearly in their mandate to identify what that is, what the priority is and what the policy is. Where we step in is to try to help them take that policy and make it implementable, if you will. How are we going to make that come to life? And how would the components who have to build systems and capabilities to make it come to life -- how would they go do that?

Q In the old days, would you have been called something like the acquisition reform center or something like that, you know, just for fun? I mean, I'm just trying to make sure I really get this.

MR. FISHER: So that -- so I'm hemming and hawing for a second because there's a policy element that you would say relative to acquisition reform and then there's implementing the policy relative to acquisition reform. We're not the policy folks --

Q Right.

MR. FISHER: -- but we help take that policy and help the Department implement whatever that policy may be.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: So that's somewhat of the distinction.

Q And as you come up on the transition, you mentioned this new job that was in the authorization bill.

MR. FISHER: Yes.

Q What will this person do? And how will it be different from what there is now? MR. FISHER: Well, what we have now is a deputy secretary who pretty much oversees the business operations of the Department. We have a management committee that the deputy chairs, meets every month, that provides senior level guidance in this space and the undersecretaries and the service secretaries sit on that and it meets once a month.

Q Is that the dog or something else?

MR. FISHER: No. That's the -- the dog is a different group that the deputy chairs, slightly different topics. In the business -- management and business systems space, it's called the Defense Business System Management Committee, which was also mandated by legislation.

The deputy chairs both of those groups, the dog and the DBSC.

Q Oh, okay.

MR. FISHER: Many of the same players, by the way, sit on both. This one has a somewhat more narrower focus than the dog and we have the three undersecretaries in the business space for comptroller, P&R and AT&L and previously those all operated somewhat independently and part of what, you know, both Comptroller General Walker in his day and the folks on the Hill and the Congress have said is there wasn't enough of a unifying force in the business side of the Department to bring all this together and -- you know, it's a big place, it's a big job. The business support enablement is important to enable the delivery of the mission and we need more senior leadership focused specifically on that. And so they created this new position, the deputy chief management officer, whose job is to be 100 percent focused at the senior level of the Department, so he's an undersecretary level position, one of only six in the Department -- so very senior job -- who is focused exclusively on the business operations of the Department and facilitating that dialogue in collaboration across the other undersecretaries to make sure that, you know, we're not getting point solutions, we're getting fully integrated solutions.

And the rest of it is we're going to find out when they fill the job because this is the first time and that's -- you know, part of the mystery, but also the excitement is that when, you know, this administration will have the opportunity to fill that job for the first time and start helping to provide us some direction as to how that's going to go. And we feel we have an opportunity to engage in that dialogue based on our experience here over the last three years in this space.

Q That brings up a question for me. What I'm curious about is if you guys are really about, you know, delivering things and not doing the kind of policy work. I guess I don't understand the contract you guys recently signed with CACI, which they described in their press release as being thought leadership to help you guys with cross-agency support services and to help change management. I guess I just don't understand what they provide you that you don't seem to be already able to do yourself, or -- I don't understand the purpose of the contract. It doesn't seem to be helping with the kind of IT work that you guys are talking about and you guys don't do policy. MR. FISHER: Right. Somebody had actually forwarded to me the note that you had written on that one and I think that what appears to be troubling is I guess the title of the contract because as you said, I think, in your blog you actually hadn't seen

the contract, which if you had, I think, it would have actually alleviated some of the confusion. I think the confusion was probably brought about more by the title.

So, first of all, it was not awarded just to CACI, it was awarded to six vendors, and it's a BPA if you will, it's an IDIQ that, so far, nobody has really won anything other than the right to bid on additional work. So while the headline said sort of \$250 million contract awarded, all we've awarded thus far is \$20,000 to each of those six vendors.

The estimates, both in terms of dollars and scope is the more detailed element of the contract, which -- what we're looking for and what we're planning to now compete amongst those six is the opportunity to bring in expertise to help us on the mission that I described. To do that, we need folks to augment the government staff, to support the government staff I should say, to do technical analysis, systems review and functional expertise so that when we engage with folks in the Pentagon, that we have that solid foundation of folks who really understand best business practices, much of which comes from industry on how to do optimal delivery of finance and personnel and logistics and acquisition kinds of solutions.

And so they help us take the policy decisions that are made by the folks in the Pentagon; engage in that dialogue; and then figure out, from a more -- much more tactical standpoint, the best way to deliver that capability.

So, they support us in the architecture bill; they support us in developing the process models that support those policies; they do the nuanced elements of data standardization, which can be a highly technical element, far beyond what the policy folks in the Pentagon may perceive when they come up with a bunch of high-level standards. So, these are people who support us in doing that.

I will say that when we first started the BTA, about three-and-a-half -- a little over three years ago, we had a contractor-to-government ratio of about almost 7:1, contractor. We were very, very small on the government side. And that ratio now is about 2.5:1. Again, it's still more contractors than it is government, but we think we've closed that gap significantly by adding to the depth of government capabilities in performing this work. But we still rely on our external partners, with their primarily technical expertise.

But the one thing I would point out, I think, in reference to the note that you wrote, is that they're -- you know, none of these contractors are writing policy, directly informing policy, and they're here to support us. They support the government staff in providing on the BTA's mission, but they're not decisionmakers. The government staff are the decisionmakers. That stuff runs through me, and then it goes up to the folks in the Pentagon, as necessary.

Q Now, again, I definitely understand that. And I definitely think that, you know, government contractors do a lot of great work for the government to support them. I guess what I'm concerned about is what kind of care are you guys taking to make sure that there's not any kind of conflict of interest, because while there isn't a direct influence on policy, you do acknowledge that there is an indirect influence on policy. And these are people who also compete for a lot of these capabilities -- contracts, later on down the line.

MR. FISHER: So, that's -- you know, these contractors don't just support us, I think you're right. They support other people as well. But,

again, in the people who work here, they support us, and we make those decisions. They're not -- they're not driving the train, they're supporting us driving the train. And that's our job, is to be the, you know -- if we're getting multiple inputs into a direction that, you know, we should pursue, whether it's a priority item, or the way to enable a certain item, I can assure you that those decisions are made entirely by government staff.

They're informed by everybody in the agency. Sometimes they're informed by people outside the agency, from the military departments, or from our sister agencies -- DFAS, DLA, et cetera. I mean, we collaborate with just about everybody in the business base in the department. That's one of the interesting things about being in BTA, is we're kind of in the middle of this, you know, spider web of facilitation and engagement, is that we engage with all kinds of parties.

But, when we make recommendations to the deputy secretary, or we make recommendations to the new DCMO, those typically are going to come directly from me, and they're going to be based on my decisions and the decisions of our senior staff. They not going to be based on what a contractor wants.

And I think if you have an opportunity to speak to some of the folks who support us, I think you would get a very similar story. I'd be surprised if you didn't. And if you don't, I'd actually be interested in hearing about it.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: I'm pretty confident in what I just said.

Q Can I ask a couple of metrics questions?

MR. FISHER: Sure.

Q You guys are supposed to -- I guess when you boil it all down, help the department run better -- MR. FISHER: Yeah. See, you got it.

Q -- how are you measuring this?

MR. FISHER: Not well. It's a good question, and it's a sore point.

In fact, there was -- I go back to legislation, and you know Congress legislates around things for the department when we're not performing well in their eyes. One of the things that they legislated in the 2008 NDAA was the establishment of a Strategic Management Plan, the first of which was published out of OSD in July of this past summer. And the Strategic Management Plan was supposed to include performance measures that would specifically identify: you know, how are we doing in this regard?

In that other document that I mentioned earlier -- the Enterprise Transition Plan, which is fairly systems-focused, we have lots and lots of metrics. I would maintain most of those are system-oriented delivery metrics, and the business-oriented ones are, frankly, very narrow in focus and not terribly indicative of overall performance. I think it's been a real gap in our capability.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: So, in the Strategic Management -- I'll just circle back and then give you an opportunity to jump in again -- the Strategic Management Plan that was delivered a couple of months ago fell short in that area. I think there were five things we were supposed to deliver in that. We delivered three. One of the ones that was not delivered were these performance measures.

This is something that we absolutely have to identify for all of our stakeholders: How do we measure success? And how do we measure success, not for an individual agency, or for an individual component, or for an individual function, but for true, end-to-end business support to the warfighter?

And I would maintain that we, as a department, haven't come to grips with what those measures are in a uniform way. And I think we're on the clock that by July, 2009 -- at the latest, frankly, when the next Strategic Management Plan needs to be delivered -- we need to have those.

I think right now some -- you know, some folks are waiting a little bit for some of the new leadership to come in, you know, because clearly they're going to need to buy into these measures. But I think it's one of our things that we've yet to accomplish as a department, and that we need to do so.

Q Interesting. As you guys --

MR. FISHER: But, we have lots of --

(Cross talk.)

MR. FISHER: -- we have lots and lots of metrics. Do we have true performance measures for business capability improvement? I would argue, no, we don't.

Q I understood the words, but could you break that thought down into a couple of pieces -- maybe give an example or two?

MR. FISHER: So, we have -- okay, so kinds of metrics that we do have: We have lots of metrics around system delivery -- you know, did we hit this milestone; did we hit that milestone -- we have lots of those metrics. And do they have a tangential relationship to capability delivery? Probably. But, they don't really necessarily tell us that we've improved -- you know, cycle time, reduced costs, you know, those kinds of things.

We have, in our own individual functional world, metrics -- so, the finance community has metrics, the logistics community has metrics. Do we have measurements that say, from a warfighter perspective, business operations have gotten better? Can we define what those measurements even should be? And I would say lots of individual folks have their ideas of what those measurements should be, but collectively we do not.

So, some metrics roll up the comptroller; other metrics about acquisition roll up to the head of AT&L; other metrics around, you know, pay accuracy, or personnel, reenlistment, those kinds of things, roll up to P&R. And so, you know, they are indicative of individual elements of the enterprise. Do we have true enterprise level measurements? I think we still fall short, in terms of identifying what they should be, and then measuring them.

Q I don't want to over- or under-play this. To somebody standing out on the street corner, and they hear what you're saying, would they be correct in understanding that you're saying that the Pentagon -- leaving aside the financial stuff that GAO looks at every year, are you saying that the Pentagon effectively still doesn't know whether what you're doing is saving money and time?

MR. FISHER: I think we don't know that yet.

Q Okay. And -- but, you're working on it?

MR. FISHER: I think there's sense that -- I think there's a sense that it will, but I also don't think we've done a good job of identifying how we're going to actually measure that we have. So, when we deploy --

Q I'm sorry, "not done a good job" of?

MR. FISHER: Of identifying, you know, if we're spending all this money, time, investment, resources on business process and system improvement -- which we are, which we inherently feel will make us either more efficient or effective or reduce costs. Those are sort of the three high-level (buckets ?) - - efficiency, effectiveness, and cost. One or more of those will get better based on these investments and I think I would agree in general that's a true statement. Do we know what the measures are that are going to be able to tell us if we actually have and are we tracking those today? I would say probably not.

Q I'm not sure if I'm reaching on this or not so this may -- whip me back if I am. Rand, about -- I don't know, it was probably five, six years ago -- came out with an enormous report where they looked at I think it was something like 75 ACAT 1 programs over 15 years --

MR. FISHER: Right.

Q -- and they tried to figure out whether these programs -- how these programs performed.

MR. FISHER: Right.

Q And their conclusion was that because of, you know, milestone changes, re-baselining, imprecisions in the data gathered and measured, that effectively they could not tell how cost effective and on time these programs were let alone how much costs had already risen or schedule had risen as a result of, you know, the normal friction that occurs with high-tech programs.

MR. FISHER: Right.

Q Are -- is this part of what you're looking at or is that sort of just so specific to AT&L that that's sort of a different kettle of fish?

MR. FISHER: I don't think it's all that different -- different kinds of programs perhaps that are being implemented. We also have a number of programs that get re-baselined and, you know, milestones slip and schedules move to the right.

Q But these are these business --

MR. FISHER: Right.

Q -- systems that you're looking at. Okay.

MR. FISHER: That's correct.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: I think -- again, one of the -- the real questions that we ultimately need to answer is, you know, once we're implemented what's the benefit, and, you know, all of these programs have business cases, many of which were built around IT cost reduction. You know, I'm going to shut down N number of systems and which have very expensive (maintenance lags ?) associated with them -- you know, very old systems that are very expensive to maintain and if I implement this new system at certain cost then we will save in IT.

Q Right.

MR. FISHER: And that may be in many of these cases because the legacy cost is so overwhelming a perfectly legitimate reason to go do this. But it doesn't necessarily get to the overall business capability benefit beyond the IT cost.

Q Okay.

MR. FISHER: And I think where we need to improve our measurement capability is in -- beyond the IT savings -- what -- what's the business capability benefit that we're going to achieve based on whether it's the Navy ERP program or Army's GFEBs financial system or the Air Force's ECSS supply chain ERP system -- I mean, these large-scale programs, a couple of which are MDAP-level programs. So they're not small in size. What is the business outcome that we expect that -- that, you know, beyond just the IT cost savings? And I think we have it in bits and pieces and it's probably in most cases compelling enough to go do the program but, you know, sometimes we struggle in communicating that value even to the war fighter community within the department because we really need to be able to communicate it in terms that resonate with them.

MR. HOLT: Okay. Any other follow-up questions? We're just -- we're running short of time here so but --

Q When are you going to fix the entire system? No, just kidding.

MR. FISHER: (Laughter.) Yeah, that's a tough one.

MR. HOLT: Mr. Fisher, do you have any final -- final thoughts for us or closing comments for us?

MR. FISHER: Well, I wanted to make sure that I addressed Mandy's question about the contractors. I know, again, as you said in your note you hadn't had a chance to see it and I wanted to make sure that I gave you a reasonable explanation as to why we don't think this is, you know, a sort of doing things inherently nongovernmental which, we're really confident that we're not doing, or that, you know, there's a policy linkage here that you still find you're uncomfortable with that I could either help clarify. I wanted to make sure that I at least answered your question.

Q I think you did. If I can get your contact information or if I can have that sent to me afterwards in case I have any --

Q Likewise. Q -- any other follow-up questions that would be fantastic because I --

MR. FISHER: Yeah. We'll --

MR. HOLT: Okay. Yeah.

Q -- (cross talk) -- and a little bit myself. (Laughter.)

MR. FISHER: Yeah. So and again, I mean, this may be, you know, a new space for -- for -- for both of you so if -- and I tend to --

Q We can start our own dialogue. (Laughter.)

MR. FISHER: Yeah. Yeah. I -- I tend to --

MR. HOLT: Yeah. And I tell you what -- I can -- I can get that information from Martha and get that to you.

Q Great.

MR. FISHER: And if there are some additional things you'd like me to comment on I'd be happy to do so.

Q I would really appreciate it.

MR. FISHER: Okay. Anything else at this point?

Q With -- with the utmost respect, good luck.

MR. FISHER: (Laughter.) I appreciate that. It's a tall order but it's an important mission.

Q Yeah.

MR. FISHER: I mean, it -- it's hard for us sometimes to communicate effectively even, you know, in this dialogue why it is I think relevant and important but, you know, I was just down at Lieutenant General Bob Dale's retirement ceremony today. He was the commander at DLA. And General Petraeus was there helping him step down from his post, and what I heard them say, actually just continue to accentuate why what we're doing is important, I mean, he -- his job at DLA and his former job at US TRANSCOM is enabling -- direct enablement to the war fighter. They can't do their job if we can't get them supplies where they need it when they need it, and then if we can't account for them, pay for them -- those are all things that are necessary to enable the war fighter mission.

And we do it today but we all know we can do it more efficiently, more effectively, and at reduced cost, and, you know, to hear those four-star and three-star generals talk about the importance of that business support element, you know, continues to, you know, convince me that we're on the path of something that is important and that we haven't done well enough for the war fighter. And that's one of the important things that we try to remind ourselves is that's what we're here for and we need to keep pushing along and we're really anxious to, you know, pick up where we left off with good support from the current administration and engage with the new administration on continuing on that mission.

MR. HOLT: All right, sir.

MR. FISHER: On that -- yeah, if there's anything else I'd be happy to do follow-ups and answer any questions you have in that regard.

Q Great.

Q Excellent.

MR. FISHER: Thank you.

MR. HOLT: Okay. Thank you very much for joining us, sir.

MR. FISHER: Okay. Bye bye.

Q (Inaudible.)

MR. HOLT: Bye bye.

END.