

"Air Force Life Cycle Management Center"

Lieutenant General Clyde Moore

AFA Air & Space Conference
National Harbor, Maryland
18 September 2012

Lieutenant General Moore: Thanks for coming out. I see a lot of familiar faces in the audience. I told my aide-de-camp, I think I'm going to be talking to myself this morning because I didn't know if there was going to be real interest in someone talking about a new organization within Air Force Materiel Command. So, thanks for being here. For those who are about halfway back, if you're like me, you should have probably brought glasses because that's a pretty small screen. I'll try to point out the important stuff on it.

Also, thanks to my boss for being here, General Wolfenbarger, for joining me today. Now I've really got to watch what I say. Thanks, ma'am, for being here.

This first chart, if you can read it at the top, (says) Air Force Life Cycle Management Center. You got just a snippet in the introduction about what that means. You'll hear me refer to it as LCMC. In fact, that's catching on across the community. People are starting to embrace being part of this new organization. It's hard when you take a proud legacy, proud organizations, stand those down and then embrace something new, so I get excited when I hear people talk about being part of LCMC.

A little vignette - I was out at the marathon on Saturday with my boss and we were hanging medals on folks. I had one young troop come up to me. He saluted me smartly and said, "Sir, I'm part of LCMC." I said, "Yeah, we're doing (well)." At least I've got one of them out there.

In the middle of the chart you see a mission statement. We brought together our team, this new enterprise, from across the country and we did some soul-searching about why we exist. Why do we exist as an organization? The conclusion was we've really got a two-part responsibility. We acquire and we support war-winning capabilities. I'll talk more about that, but that support piece is so critical if you think about life cycle management. I'll (also) talk about support, product support and what we're doing to ensure that we have systems available for the warfighter. Not just when we put them on the ramp, not just when we field them, but through the lifecycle of that weapon system. So, that mission statement is the one that binds us together as a new organization, LCMC.

Next chart.

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

For those who have followed the saga of the 12 center to five center reorientation of Materiel Command, this is what the final lay-down looks like. Five centers. The one on the far left, the blue one, is LCMC. The other ones deal with the Sustainment Center, the Test Center, AFRL, and the Nuclear Weapons Center. Four core missions that are reflected there from left to right, blue, green, brown and kind of mauve color. Those are the four core missions of Life Cycle Management -- sustainment, test, and the S&T, the research part of our mission. We're neatly bundled now around those four centers into the core mission. We retained the Nuclear Weapons Center, intentionally, because of the challenges we've faced over the last several years. We could have broken it apart and mapped it into those other four, but we determined at this point in time that was not the right thing to do. So, we have now five centers.

You'll see underneath there, it's described what's in LCMC. All programs, as the moderator mentioned -- aircraft engines, munitions and I like to say electronic/cyber systems. So we're responsible for acquiring and supporting those weapon systems through the life cycle.

We have now two large locations that are LCMC locations -- Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and Hanscom Air Force Base in Massachusetts, the 88th Air Base Wing and the 66th Air Base Group, which are the installation commander organizations responsible for day-to-day operations at those locations. We established a Propulsion Directorate intentionally because of the life cycle responsibilities of engines. And I think wisely, we put that directorate at Tinker Air Force Base where we have the center of gravity for our sustainment and product support responsibilities. There's now a Directorate lead that is part of my team who runs that part of our enterprise. Then, the Air Force Security Assistance and Cooperation Directorate, AFSAC. It used to be a stand-alone center. Now it's part of LCMC. Again, looking at our four military sales customers with our cradle-to-grave life cycle management responsibilities, it was a nice fit.

So that is the compilation, then of all of the parts and pieces of life cycle management.

Notice every program, non-space program, is now part of this particular center. I'll talk more about how we distribute that workload.

Next (chart).

This is an important chart for those who wonder how we're operating. In fact, I've had those questions this morning. My role versus PEOs versus General Wolfenbarger. How does it work?

The box at the bottom that says PEOs, Program Executive Officers, 10 of them now that are part of LCMC, each of those PEOs have a relatively large number of programs that have been matched to their portfolio. Within the Air Force portfolio, all those programs are now matched to those 10 PEOs who have day-to-day oversight responsibility for execution of those programs -- aircraft, engines, munitions, and electronic/cyber systems.

You'll note the two lines that come out of that bottom box. One deals with execution, and that runs directly to the Service Acquisition Execution. Day-to-day every program manager, each of those PEOs, is accountable to our Service Acquisition Executive and our Defense Acquisition Executive for execution of those programs. Delivering that capability, ensuring that we're meeting our commitments associated with contracts and executing the funds that have been allocated to those programs.

There's a second line that comes out of those PEOs because they are dual-hatted. They are also directorate leads as part of the Life Cycle Management Center. So as we organize, train, equip, develop the most efficient way of doing business across the enterprise, the processes as we work enterprise solutions across their portfolios, they are accountable to me as the LCMC Commander. So day in and day out I'm not in the middle of their execution of what we like to call the each's, each of their programs, however, I'm working with them as they are working the processes associated with executing to ensure that they're getting all the support they need within their portfolio and across their portfolio to effectively execute.

You can see the other directorates. I've mentioned a couple already. Propulsion and AFSAC, our two installation leads with the 88th and 66th. And we have a number of what we call execution directorates. So for those of you who have been in our business, often you have fairly significant large staffs. We've actually broken that apart so we have relatively small staffs, but we have people that are low density/high demand that are part of our headquarters organization, but are effectively matrixed back into the field. Those are our execution directorates. So we're taking advantage of those skilled people that are needed by the PEOs and program managers, but we've centralized them to what we call execution directorates. So when you see this chart it will make a little more sense in the future.

Next (chart).

This gives you just a bird's eye view, and I apologize again for the small picture for those that are in the back, but this is just a pictorial of those 10 PEOs and it just gives you an idea

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

of what's distributed pictorially in each of their portfolios. For example, starting on the top left, agile combat support where we manage simulators, uniforms, a wide variety of systems like pods. Battle management. You can see a picture of -- We've got AWACS, JSTARS. We've got a number of systems that are dealing with battle management that are in that portfolio. Business enterprise systems, information technology, managed out of Gunter Annex at Maxwell Air Force Base; communications, command and control, information networks managed out of Hanscom. What it says there, a lot of cyber-type systems, command and control systems.

But, each one of these portfolios -- fighter/bomber, ISR, SOF, tanker, mobility, strategic systems and weapons -- each one of these has a combination of programs. In fact, what we're already learning, and General Wolfenbarger and I recognized on day one that there were benefits to this organization we didn't even recognize going in. We're already seeing that, to where we've now brought programs together in portfolios and we're seeing the synergy where platforms and command and control and other types of systems are already working better together to come up with better system of system solutions, and we're just eight weeks into it. So, we're already seeing benefits. The challenge I think going forward is not just within the portfolios, but getting those right across portfolio solutions to ensure that we're meeting the warfighters' needs most effectively.

Next (chart).

I'm often questions about the breadth of responsibility for LCMC. Well, the first answer is I'm not working day in and day out on the each's execution, those 500 programs that I just referenced through the PEOs. That's their job day in and day out. But there's still a pretty considerable breadth of responsibility if you just look at the size and magnitude of our organization. Twenty-six thousand people, 77 locations both CONUS and worldwide, 77 locations, and you can just get an idea of where the centers of gravity are just by the pictorial here, the stars, and for those that can't read it, you'll see Hill Air Force Base, Tinker Air Force Base, and Robbins Air Force Base. Where previously we had Air Logistics Centers, now there are program offices at those locations which were there before. They're now part of LCMC. That's one of those benefits.

We've now taken those program offices. They're working as part of a PEO's portfolio so we have instantaneous connection across the geographic seam as we're working each of those programs.

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

The other ones you see here I mentioned, Gunter down in Alabama that does the IT work; Eglin Air Force Base in Florida; Robins Air Force Base, I mentioned that, in Georgia; then Hanscom where we do the C3INF and the Battle Management portfolios. Those are the main centers of gravity. A lot of other locations across the country where we have LCMC personnel -- 26,000 total. In fact, when I was looking at the diagram of where our people are around the world, when I was told we had 77 locations I thought wow, that's pretty cool. Where are they? Well, we've got them all over the world, but there's one person in Oslo, Norway. I want to go see that person. So ma'am, can I get a TDY to Oslo, Norway?

Next (chart).

This gives you an idea of the responsibility that we have from an installation perspective. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. You probably can't read the words here, but supporting about 25,000 aircraft movements, 27,000 employees, 115 tenant units. (That's a) fairly significant installation responsibility. The 88th is part of my organization.

Next (chart).

Then the 66th Air Base Group, comparable type responsibilities at Hanscom where we have a work force of about 5600 people, a large number of people that are supported from about a six-state vicinity, over 100,000 people that are supported through that facility. That's again, part of the LCMC responsibility, those installations.

Next (chart).

This just pictorially gives you an idea of the other organizations that are affecting execution of the program. Let me point out AFSAC. That's an unusual and exciting part of our mission if you think about it, and a growing part of our mission, Foreign Military Sales.

I like the picture they came up with. It's a globe, and it's a globe with all the flags of the countries that we're supporting through our Foreign Military Sales. (It represents) over 100 flags of the countries that we're supporting with Life Cycle Management, both acquisition and product support. You just get an idea with all those flags planted around the world the impact that this organization has, not just to U.S. services, but also to our FMS customers and allies.

Next (chart).

Life Cycle Management. It starts at the beginning, what we like to call pre-milestone A, pre-milestone B, where we're coming up with the right ideas and concepts for meeting a warfighter need, all the way through producing, fielding and then providing product support through the life of the weapon system for all those weapon systems to do it most effectively to achieve max readiness, max availability, capability for the warfighter.

Next (chart).

Some of the benefits. As we started eight weeks ago, and we had an idea of where we thought the benefits would be with this program. Then frankly, if I rewind the clock, a year, year and a half ago we felt that we had a pretty good idea of where the benefits were going to be. But there was a compelling reason for the timeline that we were operating to and the roll-out that we did this summer. We took a strategic approach to how we dealt with reductions in manpower across our MAJCOM. In the past, and for some of you who have been in this business when we've taken reductions we just spread them out. Go figure it out. Figure out in your little business unit how best to absorb them. We realized that given the dynamics that were at play and the size of the reductions we had to be more effective about how we did it. We took a strategic approach. We intentionally brought down headquarters staffs. We preserved our core mission capability at all of our locations. And by doing that we have gotten more efficient in how we're doing business and we think we've gotten more effective in our interaction and support for the warfighter. That's where these four bullets come from.

Now the warfighter, as they're working with our organization, with Materiel Command, with LCMC, they have one person to turn to for every one of those systems. One person.

In the past, we had multiple people working multiple parts of a weapon system, and frankly, the integration often happened inside the Pentagon. There was nobody else doing the integration. We now have a program manager who has cradle-to-grave responsibility, life cycle management responsibility for every system. That PM is accountable to a single program executive officer who is accountable to the service acquisition executive. So if you are interested in weapon system A or asset B, there's only one person to turn to. So it got a lot cleaner.

We're still working through the cultural change here because in the past as a customer you might have worked with two, three, four different people on your parts of the system. We now have one person who has that responsibility. There's much goodness in that.

Probably the biggest benefit, we're already seeing it, we brought down, I call them barriers. Not necessarily in a negative connotation, but we have grown up around centers. Centers have unique ways of doing business, unique cultures, and they would optimize for their location but not necessarily optimize for the enterprise. We brought down those barriers by moving those headquarters staffs. It was a little bit painful to bring down staffs and to come up with a new way of doing business, but we're already seeing the benefits where people now are working across those geographic seams to come up with better ways of doing business and we're just starting on that journey. It's a very exciting part of what we're doing.

The cross portfolio integration, I would just tell you we're taking baby steps now to understand how best to do that. But I have those 10 portfolios where those program executive officers are working full time to ensure that they're meeting the capability in each of the warfighter in their portfolio. Our challenge now is to ensure that when we're looking at the right system of system approach, that we're looking across those portfolios. I'm really excited about the opportunities we have, particularly early on in our pre-milestone A, conceptual development. Are we taking the right system-to-system approach to be able to field the right system, combination of systems, to meet the warfighter needs? You all can help us, particularly in industry, in that area as we're harvesting ideas to meet needs and making sure we're connecting the dots and the connective tissue between those portfolios. We don't want artificial barriers there in that phase of the enterprise.

Finally, we reduced the overhead. Reduced cost. That was a compelling reason for what we did and why we did it. But, I would say that wasn't the only reason. We did this because it was the right thing to do.

Go back 20 years when we actually merged Systems Command and Logistics Command. That was the first big step. It took us about two decades to take the next big instrumental step in my humble opinion. This was the right thing to do. We can debate whether it's the right time, but it was the right thing to do.

Next (chart).

Again, if I could hand out a picture I'd hand out this one because this tells the story of LCMC. At the top, I told you about our mission. We acquire and support war-winning capabilities. That support is an important one. We no longer just field something and then let somebody else worry about how it gets supported. That's our responsibility to ensure these systems are being effectively supported.

Below that, in very fine print, you see AFLCMC providing the warfighters' edge. As we collectively came together as a new team, a new enterprise, we said why do we exist? We have an edge today, a technological warfighting edge today and we have 26,000 people as part of LCMC and their role in life is to ensure that our country never loses that edge, that our Air Force never loses that edge, so this really resonated with our team. We provide the warfighters' edge. We have it today and we will not lose it on our watch. I'll tell you, emotionally that connected with our team, why we exist.

The roundel, which captures the rest of our enterprise, we think there are three governing principles behind this new enterprise that we have embraced. One is speed with discipline. We understand that we can be effective in how we do our job, but if we're not fast, if we're not efficient in how we do our job, we can't get capability cost effectively to the field. So pardon the expression, but at times we are constipated and speed with discipline is a way that we can actually unplug, unclog the system. We need to be able to actually preserve the quality of how we do things but we have to do them faster and we're going to spend a lot of time on the processes that we've used to make sure that happens.

Trust and confidence. New organization. It's our intent by actually governing this organization around speed and discipline, unity of purpose, we'll develop trust and confidence of all of our customers that we are delivering to the commitment that you see at the bottom as our guiding principle, our foundational principle.

The product, fine print there, deals with the acquisition piece and the product support piece of our mission. Under process we talk about launching high confidence programs that are sustainable, as well as improving how we do processes across our enterprise. On the people part is ensuring we've got the right people, at the right place, and right time. Then a safe and secure work environment. Obviously in this world you cannot forget that you have to have a safe and secure work environment to be able to accomplish your mission.

Those are the objectives that we've embraced as an organization. I know there are probably some yawners out there about strategic planning, but I've got to tell you, this was so beneficial to us as a new organization to come together and to understand why we exist, what we're going to do, how we're going to measure ourselves for effectiveness, and then we can proudly show over the next months and years how we're taken this program forward around those objectives, around the initiatives that

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

we've put in place to demonstrate that this was the right thing to do.

Next (chart).

The challenges. It's not all a cakewalk. There are challenges in where we are right now. Building a one-team culture, and I've had a chance to talk to some of my industry counterparts who have experienced something similar to this. It doesn't happen overnight. Build that one-team culture, particularly in organizations that number one, haven't worked together in the past or maybe don't even like working together and forge that one team. In fact, someone told me today, you know you've arrived when you have a problem at one location and you say I've got a problem and nobody's thinking about it geographically. They're actually saying where across our enterprise can we get the right person to bring in to solve that problem. You know you've arrived because you're not thinking about it geographically.

We have to horizontally integrate and mature our processes across this enterprise. I think there are a lot of good examples in industry and in government that we're tapping into on how best to do that.

I'd say we lost a little bit of the touch dealing with life cycle management through the years. As a young buck in this business, when we were under integrated weapon system management we were making progress. We walked away from that for a while. Now we're re-embracing it. It's the right thing to do. We're re-growing the part of our culture that frankly we let wither too much.

We've got to be innovative and responsive in those cross-portfolio solutions. Industry can help. Industry can help us there as we're looking at solving some really tough challenges going forward. How do we tie these portfolios together most effectively to get cost-effective solutions?

We've got to meet our mission requirements in a resource-constrained environment. I'm sure that's going to be a topic of conversation here at AFA. Our challenge and our commitment is we're going to continue meeting the warfighters' needs even if the resources get constrained. We'll put the resources in the right places to meet the warfighters' most imminent needs.

Next (chart).

A complex chart but I think it really shows the sweet spot of enterprise management. Those pipes in the middle that say PM,

PEO, the service acquisition executive are not stovepipes. They are cylinders of excellence. [Laughter]. A new paradigm, folks. Cylinders of excellence. But there is a challenge of integrating across those cylinders of excellence, and that's what that blue line shows us. We look at product support from an enterprise perspective. As we look at designing in system of system across those portfolios, as we look at designing in life cycle management early on in the weapon system, you don't do that in a cylinder or a stovepipe. You have to do that across.

My boss and I are working hard to make sure we get that enterprise piece right so we don't let down the warfighter. You can see a number of inputs come into this. Warfighters (are) down on the right with their expectation (along with) other staff agencies that have a piece of that enterprise. It all comes together under life cycle management as we work with all the stakeholders to deliver what's up in the top left box, which deals with readiness and availability. That's what it's all about -- putting capability out there for the warfighter and ensuring that as we manage this enterprise we get it right. That we're not sub-optimizing anywhere in this enterprise, but we're optimizing across the enterprise for the warfighter.

Next (chart).

When we talk about where this organization is today and where we're going, I have to tell you starting out I thought about this like an engineer, in very serial fashion. If you read the words in the box here, I've laid out a vision of where we are today and where we need to go. I said today we need to actually build trust across this organization. Trust and familiarity so people will be comfortable working together. Then the next step is after you've developed trust and confidence, then you work together to come up with good ways of doing business together. By doing that, the third box, you start achieving some really value-added ways of doing business. But, I had somebody smarter than me say you know, CD, it's not serial. You could interject anywhere in there today ad it's a circular one because it feeds on itself. As you're building that familiarity you're going to do smart things together. You're going to see the value which is going to build more trust and confidence which is going to allow you to do smarter things even better than what you did before. It's almost like continuous process improvement. It was my vision of this organization. In fact, I said when we get to the point in this organization when we're dealing with problems and we're doing it zip code free, geographically agnostic and we're solving problems not like it's a Wright-Patterson problem, or a Hanscom problem, or a Tinker problem but rather like it's a LCMC issue and we deal with it by bringing in the best and the brightest

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

without even thinking about geography, then it's time for me to bow out because we've achieved the vision.

I know it's not going to happen overnight. Someone told me we'll never get there. I'm not convinced of that. I think we're going to get there and I'm already seeing the benefits of the organization with that vision. So ma'am, don't fire me yet. I'm not there yet.

Changing the behavior changes the culture. I've had the opportunity to be General Wolfenbarger's Vice and General Hawkins' Vice before that, so I had 12 months to do case studies of organizations that have done similar type things. What became very evident to me was you don't change culture overnight. You've got to change behavior. By changing behavior, you change culture.

I've got time for a vignette. When I first took over, day one, I had a wonderful ceremony. General Wolfenbarger was there and was kind enough to hand me a flag and say go get 'em. We had a wonderful reception. I (drove) over to the club at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, pulled into the parking lot. To my lovely bride (sitting) next to me I said, "Honey, I'll bet I've got a LCMC sign out front." Show of hands, how many think (there was) a LCMC sign sitting out front? Not a chance.

I (drove) over to my new office and I said, "Honey, I'll bet I've got a sign in front of my office." Not a chance.

So, I pulled my staff together. I was going to talk to them anyway, just about my expectations and where we're going. I said this, "ladies and gentlemen, is your grace period this afternoon. Because come Monday morning," this was Friday afternoon, "Come Monday morning -- I pulled out the magic marker. I said, "I'm going to be the number one graffiti guy on base. If I find any sign that's not LCMC, it will be." Within about an hour the signs started changing. Changing behavior changes culture.

It's exciting now when I hear people say I'm part of LCMC. They're starting to get it, but it doesn't happen overnight.

Next (chart).

As I thought about the opportunities and expectations, I tried to bring them up to the right level, one team I think is a tremendous opportunity for us. The framework of operating across those 77 locations. To build and deliver those integrated solutions I talked about. We brought down barriers that, in many ways, artificially constrained how we did our goal before. We can effectively address capability gaps and what I think are

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

asymmetric threats, that we're going to face as a nation. I believe this gives us a much better foundation for dealing with those types of threats and coming up with the smart solutions that are going to deal with those. Again, we need your help as we come up with those right solution sets.

The enterprise approach, that as we work across this geographically disbursed organization, it's going to allow us to come up with smarter ways of doing supportability, to drive down the cost of how we support literally hundreds of systems. And then that integrated product support planning and execution. We'll get better over time as we operate as an effective enterprise.

Next (chart).

Conclusion. We're on the journey, eight weeks into it. One integrated team. We are focused on delivering that combat capability and that support within the field. I do think we've got the right structure. It may not be perfect. In fact, we'll be the first to tell you we didn't get it perfect on day one. We're working through that now. We're working through some of the adjustments that we need to make. But the nice thing is we haven't even declared IOC, initial operating capability. That's still a couple of weeks away. Then we've got another year to get to full operational capability. So there was some wisdom in the timeline we put together because we recognized that we were going to make some adjustments to ensure that we do get it right.

We're operating there today, folks. We're operating the five centers today. LCMC is up and running. In fact, I've got an office up at Hanscom Air Force Base. I spend time up in Massachusetts with the good folks up there. I'm (really) excited about the organization we've put in place.

I think we're better positioned to provide the solutions to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world. We're watching that play out real time today. I think it's up to us as a community to ensure that we're doing the right things with fielded systems as well as the new capabilities to meet the needs today and the needs in the future. We are going to continue providing the warfighters' edge.

Next (chart).

This is our patch. I'm very proud of it. Our emblem. It ties together the proud legacy of the prior commands that were working our systems. That lance in the middle represents munitions. The little lightning bolts that come together represent the electronic/cyber systems that were so effectively

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

produced under the legacy system. And, the platform at the top with the aircraft engine. We've brought all those together into an integrated picture of LCMC for all the systems that we support with the globe as a backdrop. Twenty-four/seven support to our warfighter around the world.

Next (chart).

You now have kind of a 20,000 foot perspective of LCMC. I thought I was going to be just talking to myself, this morning. Thank you all for breaking away and coming out. I do appreciate you being here and I look forward to questions. I think we've got a few minutes.

Question: Good morning, General. Keith Taylor from Hanscom Air Force Base. Thank you for being here.

We're the quality [inaudible] chapter up at Hanscom and we're happy to work with you. We're looking forward to working with you to help get the message out, get the vision out there. We're all jazzed up, just like that marathon runner. A lot of great people, a lot of good teaming up there with the [inaudible] association and the CGO. I just want you to know you have a standing invite. General Wolfenbarger has a standing invite for our monthly meetings. We're ready to go. Thank you.

Lieutenant General Moore: Thank you. I was there recently and I had a chance to talk at the Old Crow Cyber Conference. (That was a) really a great opportunity to get to know more of the community. I plan on being back there in November, and we'll be back there regularly. I've got a lovely office there in the headquarters building and I plan to park myself there frequently. So thank you very much.

Question: Sir, Pat [inaudible] from Ogden, Utah. First, thank you very much for being here to share with us information about the new LCMC. Any time something new comes along there's a need to communicate what it's all about, so we appreciate your sharing that.

One area I'd like to ask about deals with sustainment. For many of us life cycle management has always included sustainment. Your responsibility, as you referenced on the chart, extends through sustainment. Yet, you have a three star counterpart who is a commander of a sustainment center from which some might infer that sustainment is not a part of life cycle management since it's a center all by itself.

You also showed the execution arrow up to AQ for the EEO programs, and sustainment is a part of execution.

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

Can you describe for us the roles and responsibilities, the seams and the overlaps regarding sustainment between AQ, LCMC and the sustainment center?

Lieutenant General Moore: It's good to see you. In fact, I'm going to be out there in about two weeks. I'm hoping to interact with you and the community along there. We can have even further dialogue there about this.

I guess I'm pretty excited about it. Going into it there was a little uncertainty about the interface between AFSC, LCMC. I think the overarching theme is partnership. If you look at how we're working closely together at AFSC, LCMC and in the broader context of sustainment. Both critically important as we think about doing product support for each of those systems in the field. How the sustainment enterprise supports that, whether it's in the production side or the supply side. You can't divorce the two. So as I think about things as an engineer, I look at this as a Venn diagram where there's a lot of overlap between my responsibilities and General [Mitchell's] and how we have to work together to make sure that we have effective life cycle management to ensure that our lanes, that we don't have seams that develop between us.

One of the exciting things we've done, as you know, is the ASD organizations. To ensure that we don't allow those types of gaps to grow between those who are doing the day-to-day program management and product support for those fielded systems and those who are providing the critical support whether it's on the production or the supply side, and those ASDs, which as we continue to mature those are going to help us ensure that we don't lose that connection. I think we're already seeing good examples of that at each of the sustainment bases where they're effectively working together and ensuring that we don't lose that special relationship that we had previously. We're continuing to mature that, that process between the two centers, and to make sure that we understand the various roles that we have and how we have to work together to ensure that we achieve what I talked about, favorability, readiness of weapon systems. We have to do it together.

I look forward to carrying on that conversation further when I get out there with you and Fred Baker.

Question: Good morning, General Moore. Bob May, from [inaudible]. I was part of the original, I was on one of the standup teams and I really support this LCMC approach [inaudible]. One of the problems that I saw way back when was that when we got up to the Air Staff things split apart again.

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

Has there been any thought to creating an AT&L like the other services as opposed to an acquisition executive who really doesn't own logistics?

Lieutenant General Moore: Bob, it's good to see you again. You know you're an old fighter pilot when you look back and see blurry faces, so thank you for telling me the name because I can't see you.

Even though we've got this new construct at a MAJCOM level and a center level we still need to work through the roles and responsibilities in the Air Staff as we work closely with AQ, IE, IEL, A4/7, because if you think about life cycle management all those organizations have a stake in the success of effectively supporting systems in the field. AQ as they're looking at the acquisition and the product support piece, are we doing the right things on behalf of the warfighter? [No less from] IEL and A4/7, they have a role also.

You know, Bob, I don't know if that's the right answer, but we do need to have that type of collaboration at the Air Staff level just like I talked about with myself and General Litchfield, because if you're not working together and those seams develop they can be just as problematic at the Air Staff level.

We do have some forums where we bring those key leaders together. We need to capitalize on that. What direction that goes in the future I'm not sure, but we do need to make sure that those key stakeholders are part of the process.

Question: With this one integrated product... I think we've talked about this before... How do we put our military T-shirt on to (communicate) between the government and industry what with contractual requirements, what with fear of protests, et cetera. How can we bring the contractor community into this one integrated team so that we have this strategic dialogue?

Lieutenant General Moore: Good question. I think in some ways we've simplified it. In the past as we were managing systems, industry would have multiple parties to go to to try to paint the mosaic of how a system was being effectively managed and what the long term vision of the system was. Now we at least have one program manager, one PEO, which is a clear interface when you're dealing with a single weapon system. However, if industry has an enterprise-level dialogue you now have a clear way of dealing with (a single weapon system.) For example, if you're looking at what we are doing as an enterprise with acquisition product support, and then what we are doing on the reduction, the organic reduction supply, we've now got a single

interface into that enterprise. So, I think in some ways we've cleaned it up. I think we will continue maturing where best to plug in. I'm really excited about that early on developmental planning piece of our enterprise and making sure that we're tapping into industry to ensure that we're getting the right concepts, the right ideas, and the entry point for that is LCMC as we work closely back with AFRL to ensure we're getting the right technology, the right time for those system of system approaches.

Question: Great pitch. Very informative and worthwhile. As the first PEO for C4ISR, there was a thought that there was a certain amount of benefit to have PEOs collocated for synergy. Under your construct, do you see the need to have PEOs collocated or can they get the benefit of lessons learned, how programs break, how to fix things under the constructs that you presented today? It was in the Pentagon, in the field, collocated and not collocated. Is that still a work in progress or do you feel like you are where you need to be?

Lieutenant General Moore: I think the gist of your question was as you look at the baseline that we start with, with those 10 PEOs, where they're located, and step one was removing barriers that were there previously because as you think about the world, we had a PEO world but then we had these center constructs that in many ways would inhibit how the PEO could interact across programs. Just by bringing down those barriers and now aligning all those programs to the PEO, just the natural integration into a PEO portfolio regardless of where they live, has already started to show benefits.

I think more and more important is not where they live but the processes we put in place to tie them together. Because it's not just the PEOs it's the PMs. Think about it. ACAT-1, ACAT-2, ACAT-3. We're talking 500-plus programs not including services. So it's not a matter of trying to put everybody at the same location, it's how do we tie them together in the process, whether it deals with that up-front developmental planning, whether it deals with product support and how we're managing the enterprise. How do we effectively tie them together?

So what we did is when we actually stood this up, we didn't move anybody. That was one of the going-in positions. We're not moving anybody. We brought down the headquarters. So we're dealing with the hand that we were dealt with. It may not be a bad hand. Right now what we're doing is focusing on how do we tie them together, programs within a portfolio and then across portfolios to ensure that we've got the right process and the right communication.

Moore - "LCMC" - AFA - 9/18/12

If we have to make adjustments, that's why I mentioned IOC, FLC. We have the ability to adjust, but I first want to see how effective we are in this current construct.

Thank you all for coming out today. I do appreciate it.

#