MR. PETER HUESSY: I want to welcome you all here to the AFA, ROA and NDIA seminar series on homeland security, missile defense and nuclear deterrence. I also want to welcome two of our representatives, our sponsors, Bob Fiedler from the Reserve Officers Association of America and Mary Ellen from AFA. Thank you for being here today.

I also want to thank our guests from the embassies of Israel, Turkey, Austria, Russia and Great Britain. I also want to give Admiral Meese an advertisement. One of the finest pieces to be written on the issue of strategic nuclear deterrence has been written by Admiral Meese and just was published in the Undersea Warfare magazine. It is an extraordinary piece. I recommend it to you highly.

I also want to remind you of our forthcoming schedule next week. Steve Henry is retiring, but his last speech will be at this forum, in this room, on the first of August. And he’ll be followed on the third by General Formica, who is head of SMDC. Johnny Foster will speak on the 11th of September. And Jim Miller will conclude our series on the 21st of September.

I also want to make a note that we are having a special morning-long event at the Reserve Officers Association of America on the 13th. Frank Miller will be our keynote speaker at 8 o’clock in the morning. We will then have a number of Senators speak, as well as a panel made up of Admiral Benedict and General Chambers. And in addition to that, we will have what I call our outside expert wizards, a panel. And the subject of entire morning session will be the strategic nuclear triad. And you can sign up with Sarah, if you would please.

I am honored today to have a special guest, a friend and a colleague and someone who I’ve known for a number of years. Michael Donley has been Secretary of the Air Force since October 17, 2008. He was, prior to that, director of administration and management, and in that role was the principal staff assistant to the Secretary of Defense Robert Gates.

He also was senior vice president of Hicks and Associates. He was senior fellow at the Institute for Defense Analysis. He was an assistant secretary of the Air Force from 1989 to 1993 and served for seven months as acting secretary of the Air Force. And before that he was on the National Security Council as deputy executive secretary from ‘87 to ’89, and director of defense programs from 1984 to 1987, and professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and editor of the National Security Record for the Heritage Foundation back in 1978-’79.

Secretary Donley, thank you on behalf of our sponsors and our corporate supporters as well. I want to thank you for coming here and sharing with us your views about the United States Air Force and
what issues you have to deal with. Would you give a very warm welcome to the Secretary of the Air Force Michael Donley?

(Applause).

SEC. MICHAEL DONLEY: Well good morning and thank you, Peter, for inviting me to join you this morning. Thanks to AFA and ROA and NDIA for hosting this event. This does provide an opportunity to update on a few items this morning that are on the Air Force’s agenda.

I’d like to start by saying how encouraged and pleased we are the Senate Armed Services Committee held a confirmation hearing last week for the president’s nomination of Mark Welsh to be our next chief of staff. It’s critical that the committee approve General Welsh’s nomination and that the Senate act to confirm his nomination expeditiously. Action on this nomination is essential for our Air Force to ensure a smooth transition as General Nordy Schwartz retired next month.

I’ll have more to say on Nordy’s retirement later, of course, but I do want to just take this opportunity to again say how grateful I am to General Schwartz for his extraordinary and exemplary leadership and service to our nation as chief of staff over the last four years. He is truly one of our nation’s finest military leaders and public servants, and he’s been a tremendous partner since we came into our jobs together in the summer of 2008. Mark Welsh will be an outstanding successor to General Schwartz, and I certainly look forward to his confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

This morning I’d like to take some time to discuss where we stand on the Air Force’s FY ’13 budget and in particular our force structure proposals. Then I’d like to say a few words about the prospect of sequestration and what that could mean for the Air Force. It’s been a topic of great interest in Washington over the last few months.

But first I’d like to take a moment to comment on the alleged misconduct of military training instructors at Lackland Air Force Base, which is of concern to all of our Air Force leadership. It was June 2011 when a trainee alleged that she was sexually assaulted by a military training instructor. And an Air Force OSI investigation was initiated immediately and was expanded in November when additional misconduct came to light. A special victims team was also established to focus on the 33 trainees and technical training students who are the alleged victims in these cases.

At this point there are 12 MTIs that are allegedly involved in misconduct. As of Saturday, two now have been courts martialed, four are pending courts martial, another received non-judicial punishment for an unprofessional relationship that did not involve physical contact, and the rest are under investigation. This work is being overseen by General Ed Rice, our commander of the Air Education and Training Command, and he advises that the numbers of both accused, and alleged victims, may grow given the ongoing investigations.

There’s no doubt that most of our airmen, most of our MTIs, uphold the highest moral and ethical standards in their work. But some of the airmen in question here certainly broke rules egregiously and in an absolutely inexcusable fashion inconsistent with our Air Force core values in every
respect. We have a responsibility to protect our airmen. Airmen have a responsibility to protect each other as wingmen. And MTIs especially have the responsibility to protect our new inductees.

And the Air Force treats these allegations of sexual assault and unprofessional relationships seriously, and particularly so in this context. AETC continues to investigate every allegation, and a major general from the air staff has also been appointed to take an independent look at the command’s training environment at Lackland and in other technical training centers. The Air Force and AETC will continue to aggressively investigate all of these allegations, focus our attention on care of the victims and hold the perpetrators accountable while protecting due process, of course, and identify any root cause institutional problems that need correction to prevent this misconduct and abuse of trust in the future.

This is ongoing work for our Air Force leadership and we’ve provided periodic updates to members of Congress and committee staffs. We’ll continue to do that in the weeks and months ahead.

Turning to the budget, I think we have confirmed after seven or eight months of our budget being on the Hill, that certainly the proposals that we have made represent the culmination of many, many tough decisions in the Air Force. We determined that our Air Force’s best course of action is to trade size for quality, to become slightly smaller to protect a high quality and ready force, a force that will continue to modernize and grow more capable in the future. We intend to be a superb force at any size, maintaining agility, flexibility and readiness to engage in a full range of contingencies and threats.

As part of these decisions, our FY ’13 proposal would divest about 286 aircraft over the next five years and reduce Air Force personnel by about 9,900 over that same period. Our budget has been strategically and analytically based and it complies with the requirements of the Budget Control Act, which Congress and the president agreed to last August. All these facts don’t make agreeing to this budget any easier for Congress. And as you know, our proposals have meet resistance in Congress and we understand that they are difficult for members to deal with. We will continue to work with Congress and the adjutants general on a way forward for fiscal year ’13.

Our Air Force leadership is in agreement that we are at a place where we cannot stay. The issues that we confront are too important. We recognize Congressional concerns with regard to reductions in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve, but we also recognize that cuts to active duty forces could potentially result in unacceptable stress on the force as well. Our focus is on striking the right balance that will allow us to meet the peacetime and wartime and surge demands that are part of the national security environment in which we live.

Active duty cuts would be no less contentious in the communities where they might occur should we shift all of the reductions proposed by the Air Force simply to the active duty. Most importantly, if Congress directs us to indefinitely retain the capabilities that we propose to divest, then there would have to be further cuts in modernization and more risks to readiness.

So we can’t stay where we are. We’ll continue working to find a way forward that makes as much progress as feasible in the FY ’13 cycle. We’ll build on the opportunities we’ve created with the
Air National Guard to remission units to RPA and to ISR missions, among others, and to improve Air National Guard readiness.

Looking ahead, we also recognize the need to adjust the budget development process. And Secretary Panetta has initiated dialogue with the Council of Governors on how best to do that. The issue is how to incorporate the governor’s inputs regarding defense support to civil authorities, while respecting DOD’s internal budget deliberations, and what are the appropriate mechanisms and the timing to do that?

Finally, let me say a few words about sequestration, which remains a significant concern for the department. If Congress fails to act in the months ahead, DOD will face automatic across-the-board cuts in January of 2013. We have less than six months before sequester goes into effect, a meat axe approach which would drive additional reductions of $55 billion to the FY ’13 defense budget. Doubling defense spending cuts would leave the military without a workable strategy to counter global threats and would do significant damage to our defense program.

Sequestration would drive an additional reduction of about 10 percent above the phase one reductions to the Air Force’s FY ’13 budget requests that have already been approved in the Budget Control Act from last August. And this would grow to approximately 13 percent for O&M, procurement and RDT&E if there’s an exemption for military personnel. Under sequestration the Air Force funding would be reduced to about fiscal year 2004 levels.

O&M would be down by about $6 billion, resulting in reduced flying hours, weapons systems sustainment support and contractor logistics support. We would need to curtail training and reduce our civilian personnel workforce. Procurement would be down about $4.5 billion, R&D about $3.4 billion, assuming the military personnel exemptions.

If applied at the program, project and activity level, it would impact every single program in the investment accounts, including our highest priority ACAT-one programs such as JSF, the EELV, KC-46 and other critical programs. Programs would have to be restructured, reduced or terminated in the investment portfolios. And for military construction, practically every project would be de-scoped, or reprogramming actions and project terminations would be required to build an executable project list.

There’s no doubt in my mind that Secretary Panetta and our DOD leadership team have now succeeded in getting Congress to understand and appreciate the dangers inherent in sequestration. The dialogue continues apace in Washington. We appreciate those efforts underway to complete action on the FY ’13 budget later this year and also to address the threat of sequestration.

There is great uncertainty in today’s security environment: Iran, Syria, the ongoing fight against al-Qaeda and its affiliates in Afghanistan and elsewhere. But at least with respect to the budget and sequestration, these matters are under our control and they need to be dealt with.
The evolving strategic environment and national budget constraints are factors that will
to test us in the years ahead. We face more difficult choices ahead. But we’re committed to
continuing to work with Congress through this budget process in FY ’13 and, of course, beyond.

We need to ensure that budgets are enacted that will provide for a total force – a total Air Force
manned and ready to meet the current and future threats that we face as a nation. The United States
Air Force is the envy of the world in many respects. And our leadership team: General Schwartz,
General Welsh and all of our leadership team, are fully committed to ensuring that our United States Air
Force remains the world’s greatest air force and space power in the years to come.

Thanks for this opportunity this morning to share these perspectives on our Air Force, and I’ll
look forward to your questions.

(Applause).

MR. SYDNEY FREEDBERG: Sir, Sydney Freedberg, AOL Defense. I was at the hearing with
General Welsh and I got the impression from his remarks that the Air Force doesn’t – the Air Force
understand that Congress is simply not going to – not going to approve of the Guard cuts as submitted.
So, you know, what’s the way forward?

Yes, you defend the logic behind those cuts. Yes, you’ve pledged that you’re going to work
better with the governors in the future. But what’s the trade space for this budget this year?

SEC. DONLEY: We’ll continue the dialogue with the committee staffs, which has been increased
in the last couple of weeks on this issue. And, the Air National Guard continues to work through
alternative ways forward and we’ll keep the dialogue up with the TAGS and others as we do that. It may
take a while to identify a way forward, but I think we have the tools in place, as I suggested.

We have proposed a number of re-missionings for units, and there are new opportunities at
RPA, in ISR areas. We’ve taken affirmative steps to move the MC-12 capability into the Air National
Guard, for example. And we have other initiatives underway in crafting associations between Active
Duty and Guard and Reserve units that we think are a positive model for the way forward.

We have about 100 associations today. We’ve proposed an additional 15 in the FY ’13 budget
and there may be more coming in the year or two ahead. So we think we have the tools in place that
will help us craft an acceptable way forward.

MR. JON HARPER: Mr. Secretary, Jon Harper with Asahi Shimbun. Yesterday DOD announced
that the Air Force will be deploying the F-22 to Japan in the next 60 days. And obviously the reason for
the Osprey going to Okinawa is (somewhat ?) controversial over there. So I was wondering why the Air
Force chose Japan as the destination for the first international deployment of the F-22 since the flight
restrictions were lifted?
SEC. DONLEY: This is not the first international deployment since the flight restrictions, there's been another. But the deployment to Asia has been in the works for some period of time. The issue simply was timing.

And as we worked through the root cause analysis on F-22 and gained more confidence and insight, the secretary of Defense approved last week a way forward which has been articulated in the last couple of days that increases the number of long duration flights. And this one was cued up as one that was ready to go.

MR. HARPER: Just as a follow-up, can you state where the other deployment of the F-22 was?

SEC. DONLEY: There has been a deployment to the CENTCOM area of operations.

MR. JIM SCHUECKLER: Mr. Secretary, Jim Schueckler with the Air Force Times. When you ask people why the Air Force needs the F-35, the F-22 long range bomber, the answer is China. But are you worried that if you treat China like a foe you could prompt them to be hostile?

SEC. DONLEY: No, my view is the Air Force needs these modern systems to meet a range of potential challenges ahead. Our joint military team, our coalition partners, have long depended on the United States Air Force to bring to the table air superiority over ground forces and surface forces in any potential engagement, from special operations through high intensity operations. And the modernization of the U.S. fighter force over time is necessary independent of particular developments or situations in any particular country.

The march of technology continues. The United States has developed important capabilities and advantages over several decades, which we have been fielding, as in the F-22 program, that we will field in the F-35 program. And we need to go ahead with that work.

MR. SCHUECKLER: For what other potential adversary would an air superiority fighter and a long-range penetrating bomber?

SEC. DONLEY: I think we've identified in previous discussions other international challenges where potential adversaries have developed sophisticated air defense systems, or would attempt to potentially deny the United States access to global commons or areas of interest. And the ability to penetrate that air space, to accomplish missions that might be assigned by national leadership, remains an important core capability for our Air Force.

MR. MICHAEL HOFFMAN: Good morning, Mr. Secretary, Michael Hoffman with Military.com. Just to follow-up on another point that was made during the confirmation hearing with General Welsh, he talked about an issue of trust between the Air Force and Congress. I was wondering if you could talk a little bit where that comes from?

Is it a product from the wrangling over the ’13 budget or does it go deeper? Does it go back a little bit further? Were there issues before this proposal went forward?
SEC. DONLEY: Well, I think the ’13 budget proposals which involved a number of difficult
decisions, including force structure adjustments to the Guard and Reserve forces, were – I think they’re
difficult for Congress to deal with because they feel so local. They hit so local to members of Congress
and their districts.

We anticipated that this was going to be a challenging year. We prepared for it. We had
additional interaction with the TAGS early in the year. We prepared three white papers.

The chief and I had engagements – over 30 engagements with members of Congress, some just
one, two or three at a time, others entire delegations. We answered a lot of mail. We did a lot of
briefings.

But I think still just the challenge of moving from, as I have described it, from the wholesale level
of Congress asking the Department of Defense – directing the Department of Defense – to make $489
billion or $487 billion in defense reductions over the next 10 years, then the department coming back in
the January-February timeframe with the specifics of how to do that, and have those specifics affect
states and local constituencies, is a big difference. And I think Congress is still coming to grips with the
specifics of the challenges we face in the defense reductions that they’ve directed and that we have in
front of us.

MR. HOFFMAN: Just a quick follow-up, is there a reason that the credibility for the Air Force is
called into question, though? Because it’s not unprecedented for a service to ask for force structure
cuts. But for the issue of trust to come up, I guess I haven’t heard that come from Congress directed at a
service?

SEC. DONLEY: Again, I think they’re just difficult choices that have to be made. Part of the issue
of trust, I think, has to do with the level and timing of communication. As I alluded to in my remarks, for
many members of Congress these changes were not apparent until the president’s budget was released
in February.

That’s not, frankly, unusual. The president’s budget is a closely held document. The preparation
is conducted inside the Department of Defense, and so it’s not unusual that the details of the
president’s budget are revealed when it comes out in February.

In this case I think the local units affected would have preferred that they have more advance
warning. And this is an issue to work on going forward in terms of how the Department of Defense
interacts with governors and TAGS, who do have a legitimate interest in understanding our planning and
our programming intentions for defense support to civil authorities and how that is put together. But
that has to be balanced against the integrity of internal deliberations and preparations of programs and
budget, which are not broadly shared throughout the country.

So it’s really that tension that we’re trying to work on a little bit, and this has to do with how the
National Guard Bureau and how the Air National Guard, Army National Guard, share their planning
processes with the state adjutants general. And that’s the discussion, I think, that’s underway with the Council of Governors today.

MS. : Several Congressmen are concerned about (air support contracts ?) and the House Armed Services Chairman Buck McKeon said – (off mic).

SEC. DONLEY: Well, the light air support source selection is underway, so I’m not really going to speak to that. I will confirm that we’ve had interest, of course, from a couple of Congressional delegations who represent different interests in that competition and we’ve answered the mail with members of Congress. This is a highly visible source selections, one that has a great deal of Congressional interest, and we’ll let the source selection process play out, I think, hoping for a decision around the end of the year.

MR. HUESSY: Mr. Secretary, could you lay out how you see the future roadmap of the decisions being debated, the debate of issues being discussed on two things: the long-range strategic bomber, and replacing and sustaining the ICBM leg of the triad?

SEC. DONLEY: Well, on the bomber I think we’re in a pretty good place right now. We’ve said – one of the things Secretary Gates did before he departed was to establish the framework for a new long-range strike bomber program. And so we’ve been executing that guidance for the last couple of years. And we’ll go through – there are R&D funds that have been provided to various contractors to move this work forward and we’ll go through a source selection process in the future to down-select on a schedule that delivers a capability in the mid-'20s.

Our focus here is on not trying to do too much in one single aircraft. We have promoted, and the secretary has approved conceptually, a family of systems here, to recognize the value of long-range strike is not just in a single aircraft, but it’s really the mix of how aircraft are paired with weapons, how they’re paired with ISR capabilities, how they’re paired with communications capabilities, and other important work related to long-range strike. So our objective is to maintain discipline in the requirements process as we do this and ensure that cost is an important variable in those considerations.

ICBM force structure decisions are still pending national level decisions that I think are just not ready to be made. We recognize the importance of the land-based leg of the triad and have developed a program to sustain Minuteman to 2030. So that is the immediate work ahead, is focused on that. We will have some START implementation issues in front of us, again still to be resolved.

But as I’ve said before, as potentially our nuclear force structure potentially gets smaller in the context of START and potential agreements that might come later, it’s all the more important that we maintain a balanced triad going forward. In the context of rising nuclear capabilities elsewhere in the world it is even more important than ever that we have the flexibility across land, air-based and sea-based legs of the triad -- we have the flexibility in basing modes and in targeting methods and other aspects of this mission that give us confidence that we can continue to deter potential nuclear ambitions
of others, and that we would have the flexibility to respond if necessary through various modes and not get channeled into very limited sets of capabilities.

MR. JOHN TIRPAK: Good morning, Mr. Secretary, John Tirpak, Air Force Magazine. The DOD is looking to phase out the OCO accounts, but the Air Force is going to be operating in Afghanistan after 2014 helping the Afghan air force develop and build. Is the Air Force going to have some kind of special operations funding from the DOD or will you have to take that funding out of hide, out of modernization and O&M accounts?

SEC. DONLEY: Well it’s clear that the trend is that the overseas contingency operations, the OCO accounts, are going to decline and then they’re going to go away. But I would say that the finalization of those plans is still to be determined. And I do think as the Air Force and the other parts of the joint team are asked to continue with the training mission in Afghanistan or elsewhere in this theater, that we’ll have to reach accommodation with the department and with OMB on how to proceed in those areas.

So I don’t think we have quite the end game of OCO worked out yet. The major issue here is not just the training piece with respect to ongoing support to Afghanistan, it’s larger parts of our operations and maintenance activities that have been covered by OCO funding that need to migrate into our base budget. And so that is still an overhanging challenge, not just for the Air Force, but for the other services as well.

MR. : A question on the Guard and the trust issue. There’s proposals, I think in both chambers, for a commission on the Air Force force structure, particularly across the components. What’s the Air Force’s stance on whether that commission is a good idea, a bad idea? Obviously, if it’s law, it’s law. But what would be your recommendation to the legislators?

SEC. DONLEY: Well I think the chief spoke to that yesterday. I’ll let his remarks stand in that regard. This will be a matter for conference.

I think the main focus that I have right now is making sure that we can get as much progress as possible in the FY ’13 context. The challenges that we face going forward will not get easier. They will not get easier.

So the things that we are unable to resolve for FY ’13 will be in effect doubling down on further adjustments that are proposed in FY ’14, not necessarily of the same kind but in the same vein, the second year of the multi-year commitments in the Budget Control Act. So the challenges ahead are not getting easier and it’s important that we get as much done as we can in FY ’13. And if the Congress determines that a commission is appropriate and needs to go forward, we’ll work through those issues as the committees ask us for information in conference as they’re developing that.

But in principle, the more we get off the plate in FY ’13 the better off we’ll be and the less work there would be later in this same vein for any commission or any further work down the road. We need to continue to make progress on the FY ’13 budget.
MR. PAUL JOHNSON: Mr. Secretary, Paul Johnson from the Penn State Center for Homeland Security. You mentioned very briefly in your comments about defense support to civil authorities. Can you expand a little bit on the trend you see for the Air Force’s role in that support?

SEC. DONLEY: Well our discussions with the governors in the context of the FY ’13 budget has focused on trying to fill out and improve dual use capabilities. These are primarily, I think for us, the airlift capabilities that the Air Force brings to the joint team. Those work for both support to civil authorities and obviously in a military context as well.

So those are good candidates for helping governors with their issues. Also some of the ISR capabilities that we provide can be assets to governors in particular challenging – there’s fire fighting, for example, and other related – once in a while law enforcement support, that sort of thing where ISR capabilities can be brought to bear within appropriate legal frameworks. So I think those are the areas where we’d like to discuss, from an Air Force point of view, how to proceed and understand better what the governors need from the United States Air Force in this regard. So I think further discussion along those lines would be appropriate as we go forward and as we try to reach accommodations in balancing capabilities in each state across different mission sets.

MS. DEB DECKER: Deb Decker, Booz Allen Hamilton. Taking that along the same lines, have there been discussions across the Army and the Navy with the governors – (off mic)? What types of discussions are going on across the forces?

SEC. DONLEY: Well broadly speaking, this is in a box that belongs to US Northern Command, and so they’re deeply involved in this work. And then the Council of Governors is the mechanism that has been put in place by executive order to help formalize the discussion between the Department of Defense and the governors on how this is done. And OSD leaves that work – Paul Stockton, he’s the assistant secretary of Defense in this area, and Paul is really working this agenda.

But again, this is sort of – part of what we need to focus on are what are the requirements for defense to support civil authorities? How do they come into the DOD system? How does the Guard and Bureau relate with US Northern Command and with the adjutants generals in developing and tracking those kinds of requirements going forward? So those are the things that I think we’re, process-wise, that we’re focused on. How can we do this better going forward?

MR. JOE O’CONNELL (ph): Joe O’Connell from ATK. It’s good to see you again. And I’m not going to ask you a solid rocket motor question?

(Laughter).

But on that industrial base, Rear Admiral Benedict from Navy SSP has done a tremendous job and with General Kowalski at Global Strike Command has talked about commonality across platforms for strategic capabilities. Mr. Lambert’s office has been working really hard to kind of figure out this puzzle. What I’d like to know, just from your share, is what is it that you think TOP and the services can do better to help protect their interest in the industrial base? And then, what is it that industry should be
doing or could be doing that would help sustain or help to start to resolve some of the challenges and concerns, outside of just the budget?

SEC. DONLEY: Well I think, you know, as always it usually comes down to particular programs and particular decisions. But in general I would say, you know, keeping up the dialogue is always important. There are industry discussions underway and industry decisions being made, at the second and third tier levels especially, on potential consolidations and restructuring business relationships across various communities.

So we do track that. We are interested in doing that, in keeping up the dialogue with industry so we have good visibility on what industry’s perspectives are. And as much as possible, share with industry sort of the future environment, as I’ve tried to describe this morning. All our defense leadership tries to describe going forward.

The fiscal challenges we face are significant, and we’re still at the front end. So the work in front of us is still – still substantial, and it’s a multi-year effort. So the FY ’13 budget is not the final say. There’s many years behind that.

And I’m sorry to go on a little bit here, but I – the point that I routinely make to folks here is that the fiscal challenges facing our federal government are significant enough that the Budget Control Act had to go out 10 years to address these issues. And many of us have been in Washington and watched the defense budgets go up and down. We’ve watched budget deals get made for various reasons and with different forcing functions. But in my memory, never out to 10 years did we have to make these kinds of commitments and forecasts in order to get the nation’s fiscal house in order. So again, just a reminder that we’re still on the front end of a lot of hard work ahead.

MR. HARPER (?): Mr. Secretary, yesterday DOD reported to Congress the independent CSIS report on the (Asia-Pacific ?). And I was wondering if you had a chance to review that document and if so are there any conclusions that (maybe you disagree with?)?

SEC. DONLEY: I haven’t had a chance to review that in detail, no.

Okay, one more?

MR. : There was a reporting earlier this year about possible (upgrades ?) to the Massive Ordnance Penetrator. Can you say if the Air Force needed that weapon is it ready to go right now?

SEC. DONLEY: If it were ready to be – if it needed to go today we would be ready to do that. We have continued to do testing on the MOP to refine its capabilities, and that is ongoing. But we also have the capability to go with the existing configuration today if necessary.

MR. HUESSY: Mr. Secretary, thank you so much.

(Applause).