		Page 1	
1		DEFENSE INNOVATION BOARD	
2		PUBLIC MEETING	
3			
4			
5	Moderated k	oy Dr. Marina Theodotou, DIB Executiv	re
6		Officer	
7			
8		Friday, January 26, 2024	
9		10:00 a.m.	
10			
11			
12		Pentagon	
13		Room 3E188	
14		Washington, D.C. 20301	
15			
16			
17	Reported by:	Jean S. Tompane	
18	JOB NO.:	6344988	
19			
20			
21			
22			

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Michael Bloomberg, Chair
4	Dr. Gilda Barabino, Board Member
5	Sue Gordon, Board Member
6	Reid Hoffman, Board Member (by videoconference)
7	Admiral Michael Mullen, Board Member (by
8	videoconference)
9	Dr. Will Roper, Board Member
10	Ryan Swann, Board Member
11	Dr. Mac Thornberry, Board Member
12	Dr. Marina Theodotou, DIB Executive Director
13	Brigadier General Frank Kelley, Guest Speaker
14	Dr. Mark Livingston, Guest Speaker (by
15	videoconference)
16	Dr. Craig Martell, Guest Speaker (by videoconference)
17	Ms. Mary Meeker, Board Member
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

	Defense finio vacion board	Juliuary 2	,
		Page 3	3
1	CONTENTS		
2		P <i>P</i>	AGE
3	Michael Bloomberg 4, 22, 29, 50	, 54,	77
4	Dr. Marina Theodotou	6,	76
5	Sue Gordon		8
6	Dr. Mark Livingston		12
7	Brigadier General Frank Kelley		16
8	Ryan Swann		24
9	Dr. Craig Martell 30, 50, 54, 61	, 65,	68
10	Admiral Michael Mullen		49
11	Dr. Will Roper		58
12	Dr. Mac Thornberry		61
13	Reid Hoffman		64
14	Dr. Gilda Barabino		67
15	Mary Meeker		72
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

MR. BLOOMBERG: Thank you for joining us. As we all know, the United States has the finest, best-prepared military in the world. It ain't perfect. It can always be better.

Hopefully, we can add something to help those who devoted their lives to keeping this country safe and doing an even better job and bring some experience from our different backgrounds.

Innovation isn't the only thing about new and futuristic techniques, but it's often the culture that is really we should worry about.

And when we've had discussions like at dinner last night, it was the culture really much more than one kind of playing versus another one whether we should shoot here or shoot there.

And I think successful organizations are really groups of people, and our responsibilities as managers is to get them to work together and get them the resources they need to do their jobs and discipline them if they don't. That sort of stuff.

And I've always thought that the

difference between the military and the private sector
isn't as great as we always complain.

People still worry about their careers.

They still worry about doing -- wanting to be respected, and all of those human reinforces and human relations things by just as much in the military as in

the private sector and maybe even more.

Because the private sector, you can reward people a little easier than you can in the military where it's very structured progression as you move up. But you can fudge things in the private sector with titles and where the officers and things like that to incent or discipline people as you want.

We just got to make people more agile and hopefully some of the things that we're going to talk about today will do that. We have two studies that we're -- we're going to have to approve.

DR. THEODOTOU: Yes.

MR. BLOOMBERG: I've talked about

bureaucracy --

Okay. Why don't you go ahead and do

22 that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

Thank you. 1 DR. THEODOTOU: Yes. Thank 2 you, sir. 3 Welcome, everyone. Thank you for 4 joining us today for the Defense Innovation Board 5 public meeting. My name is Dr. Marina Theodotou. I'm the executive director and designated federal officer 6 7 for the Defense Innovation Board. 8 Today's meeting is being live-streamed and recorded to allow members of the public to attend 9 10 the meeting virtually now and view all of you later. 11 Thank you to the Defense Media Agency 12 for providing their expert support and the Defense 13 Innovation Board team -- to bring this event to you 14 today. 15 The board would now convene this public 16 session. First, I would like to make some procedural 17 remarks. 18 The board is discretionary, independent 19 advisory board operated under the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the Government Sunshine Act. 20 2.1 Today's meeting was announced in the 22 Federal Register Notice posted on January 23rd.

Page 7 have been no significant changes to the meeting's 1 2 agenda as posted in the Federal Register Notice. The public was invited to submit 3 4 written comments for the board members to consider. We received 77 public comments in advance of today's 5 meeting which we will review during the meeting. 6 7 As a reminder, these are comments to 8 the board and not a question-and-answer session. These comments have been posted on the Defense 9 10 Innovation Board website which is 11 innovation.defense.gov. 12 And now I'd like to turn it back over 13 to our chair, Mr. Bloomberg, for his remarks. 14 MR. BLOOMBERG: Glad we got that out of 15 the way -- I'll feel better --16 We're reading two reports. Why don't 17 we jump right in? Do you want to go first, or do 18 you --19 MS. GORDON: -- go first. 20 MR. BLOOMBERG: I knew that's exactly 2.1 what you were going to say.

MS. GORDON: Leap into the fray.

2.2

1 MR. BLOOMBERG: -- should I -- you were 2 not, I've always thought. Thanks, Mike. And thanks 3 MS. GORDON: 4 for the opportunity to talk about the board study on lowering barriers to innovation. 5 First, I really do want to thank the 6 7 board staff and especially the experts and 8 professionals inside and outside of the department. They gave us their time and insight and perspectives 9 10 that they shared with us as we tried to identify 11 tangible steps that could be taken to lower these 12 barriers to innovation. 13 You know, creating advantage and mission outcome in a changing world requires 14 innovation in three areas. You have to have new 15 technologies and capabilities. You have to consider 16 17 different approaches.

We have to consider different approaches, and you have to consider how you want to get things into use, on what approaches need to develop, and how you look at the procedures and policies --

18

19

20

2.1

22

So this study really focused on this last area. Because for all the strength of our systems and approaches in our -- it is our install base that over time has become a challenge to achieving what we want.

2.1

2.2

Now what was most heartening about this is that there was no meaningful difference amongst all the experts we talked to in the -- in the outcome we wanted to achieve.

And all of them wanted procedures, processes, and processes, and allow solutions to be put to use faster, easier, and more mindful of the imperatives of all elements of our acquisition ecosystem from the creators in the private sector to the operators in the field.

So our goal was to identify actionable recommendations that can be immediately implemented that will improve real, tangible, recognizable impact on how quickly, how efficiently, and how user-friendly we can do these things.

So we had looked at seven domains of innovation. From security to acquisition to

information technology and human capital. And I will very briefly describe some of the recommendations.

The first started with leadership.

Someone has to believe that it is their responsib

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Someone has to believe that it is their responsibility to actually make use happen at a relevant speed and in a way that allows all to participate.

The second is security. Need to reform how we grant access to those who have already been cleared. How we allow access to SCIFs. Is it DoD-wide asset so that the work that the department wants to do can be engaged with all who have the ability to participate.

We need to establish direct reciprocity for any software is a service product with an authority to operate amongst every cloud we have.

We can't afford to each time we think about using it anew to spend a year getting things into use. We need contracts that are mission capability operated oriented and outcome-driven.

We have to maximize competition in usury use and IP and data sharing agreements. And you'll hear more about data in the next study.

2.1

2.2

Page 11

We need to adopt industry-aligned proposal processes. We can't with a square hole be forcing people with a round peg to chiefs banking against it, but we have to align those two things for speed.

We need to purchase enterprise software through single entities, so we get broader both efficiency and effective. And we need to eliminate the requirement for nontraditional vendors to prove commercial viability before they can bid on the process. None of these require new authority. They just require action.

But I will say that we were not cavalier in thinking that it is easy nor are we dilatants in thinking that we can give up these for security or repeatability or transparency or fairness because that's what our system is based on. But decision to achieve these areas and innovation in the processes we think help innovation.

MR. BLOOMBERG: Is there -- never mind, I'll come back to the question.

We have two guest speakers. Dr. Mark

Page 12 1 Livingston via Zoom or whatever the -- what's the 2 Microsoft's --3 MS. GORDON: MS Teams. 4 MR. BLOOMBERG: It doesn't work very 5 well. The people at Zoom have been desperate to get their employees to come back to work. You can't make 6 7 this up. Literally, they've sent out a number of 8 messages internal. 9 Anyways, he's the Assistant Director of 10 Personnel Security and the Defense Counterintelligence 11 and Security Agency. Thank you for joining us, Mark. 12 And here in person, Frank Kelley, 13 retired Brigadier General. Thank you for your 14 service, and you still got to tell me what that other 15 airplane you flew was about, but I'll talk to you 16 later on about it. 17 He works in close partnership with 18 senior leaders in the Defense Department and has a lot 19 of experience so --20 Mark, you want to start by telling us what you're doing? 2.1 2.2 DR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, sir. So I'm with

DCSA. We perform four distinct national security missions. We work together to protect the nation's data, our critical technology, and our supply change from our adversaries.

2.1

We do that with four elements.

Personnel security, which is clearance. Industrial security, which is facilities clearance. We do counterintelligence and insider threat looking at adversary actions against our structure. And then lastly, we provide security training.

What I wanted to talk today is three quick things. One is the reciprocity issue that's been around since President Reagan. We're still talking about it today. If we want to use innovation or lower barriers, one of the things that we're thinking about is why can't it be on your CAC card.

So when you go to a new unit or a new IC element, you simply check-in and it's there. Right now, we're spending one to three days best case, seven to ten days worst case, just to get people ready to go to work. And it's the same government, the same intel community, so we're trying to expedite that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Page 14

The second point I wanted to make is our investigative model. It was born in 1947. It's not broke, but I think it sure needs to be fixed. What I mean by that is we're using what worked in the past. I think we're stuck there. At one point, three or four years ago, we had almost 700,000 backlogged. Today we've got it to a manageable level, but we stopped innovating after we got to that 200. I think we need to be more aggressive. And that leads to my third point, AI. So if we're going to be successful in the future, I think we're going to have to embrace AI, MTM in the ML. A smart friend of mine recently told me that the internet was a game changer that spun off Google, Facebook, Twitter, X, and all the other things that came with it. AI is that third rail, and we need embrace it. I think there's an opportunity here

I think there's an opportunity here where we have background investigations across the entire federal government. We do about 95 percent of

those. A lot of that could be automated. You're still going to have to have the human element there, but the bottom line is we need to be leaning forward and take some risks.

2.1

The problem is in the government once we've had a success, we tend to stop. It's kind of like putting brakes on a car. Some people think it's so you can stop the car, some people think so you can go faster.

So when we talk about AI, we need to go faster, and we need to be more proficient. We need to be aggressive. We can't wait for a crisis to drive us to act on AI.

And that's my pitch this morning. I've got lots more I'd like to talk about, but I wanted to keep it under five. This is an exciting time to be in security.

We've done more in five years than we've done in the last seventy. And I think the next five are going to be even better if we are aggressive with AI. I'll stop there. I know I got going there, but this is good stuff. I think we're going to make

- 1 | big changes, so I'm ready for them.
- 2 MR. BLOOMBERG: -- Frank, you want to
- 3 add some --
- 4 MR. KELLEY: So I'm here because Marina
- 5 | told me to be here. And -- and I'm not sure if I'm
- 6 here as a vice president of DAU or for recovering
- 7 unmanned systems -- within the Navy or a
- 8 retired -- retired Marine.
- 9 So in my panic in terms of preparing
- 10 for today, I came up with three big things. Change,
- 11 transformation, innovation, and readiness.
- 12 And -- and something that I'm not quite
- 13 | equipped to do, I tried to come up with some unifying
- 14 theory for all of those things. But I'm reminded
- 15 Drucker -- Peter Drucker, who I never met in my
- 16 | life -- about him and jumped on for -- and I kind of
- 17 | put together two things that they said.
- 18 You know, Drucker told us all about
- 19 culture. A culture is a thing. We don't teach people
- 20 how to change culture in any training I've ever had.
- Joe Dunford said it's all about -- I
- 22 | should say, General Dunford, it's all about decisive

engaged leadership. And I think if you have those two ingredients, you have everything you need.

2.1

By the way, I remember years ago at a job I had down in Orlando, Florida, I had to meet the governor of Florida with a bunch of other three stars.

Natali who was absolutely fantastic person for me -- to helping me out down there. Meeting Governor Crist was like which of these is not like the others when it comes to something -- and that would be me. I am not like all -- all the people that are super smart at this table.

One of the things that we've done at DAU is when we address change, we adopted and went to school on the Kotter Leading Change model, and that has worked very well for us which emphasizes the fact that you start with urgency and you lead with going to action which is I believe your point, ma'am.

That -- that you got to implement this stuff, and there's six other steps in between that starts with urgency and then finishes off with action.

On the transformation piece that we're

- 1 doing at DAU, again, we still use that Kotter model.
- 2 But John Kotter, and I would recommend somebody here
- 3 | picking up the phone and talking to John Kotter
- 4 at -- at Harvard.
- He said, "Hey, I got everything right
- 6 in the mid-60s with my Leading Change book, but
- 7 | there's some things that need to be adjusted in -- in
- 8 | the 21st century."
- 9 And he wrote another book called
- 10 | "Accelerate." And what he endorses there, is -- is a
- 11 two-model system. Retain the hierarchy. That's the
- 12 stuff that keeps the lights on, keeps things, like,
- 13 you know, the bureaucracy functioning. That's called
- 14 the hierarchical side.
- 15 The other side is this network model.
- 16 And this is where you can flush out innovation at the
- 17 grassroots level. Give people the freedom to try and
- 18 experiment. And the big job for leadership there is,
- 19 you know, let it happen. And that led us to think
- 20 about innovation.
- Now -- had an innovation ecosystem
- 22 model. Marina was still working at DAU at that time.

DAU involved on -- an effort to explore, you know, how do we promote innovation. She formulated an innovation competency model.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

I also like to think about that as being, like, a readiness model that we used -- been employed and make sure that their organizations are -- are, you know, ready for innovation.

But it's these two -- it's these two sides. The hierarchy side and the -- and this network side that helps promote -- it helps foster and also promote innovation.

And the last thing that I want to see is readiness. And General Miller as the Commandant used to talk about readiness, and you need to give people the opportunity. The worst time to expect to get innovation out of people is when you need it.

When the panic button is pressed, and you don't have that culture. You've -- you have never experienced the raising of their end and suggesting what could -- what could be next.

Last thing, we need to do new work, I believe, with industry, and I don't mean that to

sound, you know, like that's an easy thing. A great
place to start, I think are places like NDIA, NTSA,
National Training Simulation Association.

2.1

And we just recently did -- with the AUVSI. So that's the Association of Unmanned Vehicle Systems International.

I'll tell you what, one of the things that I know that it's working. We did this effort out in San Diego, and it was in response to the replicator effort. And we had industry, government, some academia, but we had the fleet there and that was the most important thing. It was third fleet out in San Diego.

At one point, I couldn't really figure out who the industry folks were, who the government folks were, and unless they were in uniform, I'm not so sure -- or a good haircut, I'm not so sure I could've figured out who the government folks were.

They were all working together to think about ways to actually get things like replicator into action. I've seen some great evidence on the Marine Corps side of the house where great leadership really,

1 really matters.

2.1

Brigadier General Walsh, who's the commander at Marine Corps Systems Command right now, has innovation. Getting out of the way of your smart people is an expectation.

I had a chance to visit one of his commands out in Camp Pendleton MCTSSA under the leadership of Craig Clarkson. The guy is a running a brilliant show out there, and all he did was -- out to talk to his captains, lieutenants, staff sergeants, and sergeants about the great work that they were doing in the technical field.

And here's my -- here's my asset test.

I spent 32 years in the Marine Corps. I got a brief
that was highly technical, I can barely hang on, and I
thought I was a pretty smart guy.

The kid who gave me the brief,
brilliant. And I asked him, "What's your MOS,"
expecting him to be like a CABO or an intel officer.
He was a grunt who knew how to write code. And I
said, "Wow." I'm not so sure I ever would have
expected to see that in the Marine Corps.

There's a software factory that the

Marine Corps is tapping into today. We've got grunts

out in the field writing code on the fly. It's a

brave new world.

So from my perspective, just like, you

know, Mr. Livingston out there, I think it's a very

2.1

exciting time to be part of the acquisition, you know, the acquisition environment and this marriage of strong leadership with culture change, you know, to help bring about these changes in --

MR. BLOOMBERG: I'm -- I started reading a book, I'm only at page 200 out of 700 in the book. It's called "Rules of the Game," and it is about Jutland and the battle cruisers and battleships, and how the British Admiralty went from sail to call. And the signaling from flags to eventually teletype, Morse code, and radio, and it's just fascinating.

They went through all of this innovation stuff in real time, and there's not much difference than what we're doing now. It's just what the issues are. But innovation's tough and there's lots of excuses why not.

	Page 23
1	But thank you for your service and
2	everything you've done. We have to vote on your
3	study.
4	I'm going to take a vote, and I will
5	read the names of each person, and they can vote. I
6	will vote with you incidentally just to make you
7	comfortable.
8	Mac?
9	DR. THORNBERRY: Aye.
10	MR. BLOOMBERG: Gilda?
11	DR. BARABINO: Aye.
12	MR. BLOOMBERG: Will?
13	DR. ROPER: Aye.
14	MR. BLOOMBERG: Ryan?
15	MR. SWANN: Aye.
16	MR. BLOOMBERG: Charles is not here
17	today. Mary?
18	MS. MEEKER: Aye.
19	MR. BLOOMBERG: And Mike Mullen?
20	MR. MULLEN: Aye.
21	MR. BLOOMBERG: Reid Hoffman?
22	MR. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Aye.

MR. BLOOMBERG: And I will vote age as well, so it's a wrap on the first study.

And now, Ryan, we're turning to your recommendations.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MR. SWANN: Thank you, Mike.

So we set out with building a data economy, DoD data economy, really to understand data centricity across the department.

We set out with a purpose of figuring out how do we accelerate the use of data in AI in our systems engines kind of across the department. We had over 50-plus engagements really across the department, industry, academia.

So we definitely want to thank all of the experts, all of the time, all of the incites. It was really refreshing to see that there is great work happening, but we have more to do. And so some of the key blockers that we identify in doing this study really came down to -- to a few key things.

One, data, and I'm going to use that word kind of loosely. I'm going to say data and AI.

I'm going to use the word "data" loosely here. Data

innovation is happening in the department, but it's happening in silos. It's -- it's not broad, kind of broad basin. There's great work happening but -- but we have to break down those silos.

2.1

The second is that the industry,

the -- the DoD industrial base tech has accelerated

and has really outpaced the department on a number of

levels, right? And so that shows us that there is

opportunity there. There's opportunity within our

basement. We really have more to do inside -- inside

our four walls.

And then the third, is that the CDAO is an essential organization. It is critical that the CDAO is empowered to kind of really become the DoD data economy leader, and that the service level CDAOs or the combatant command CDAOs are really positioned in the right way.

Today, there are challenges around how they're utilized. There's inconsistencies on how they're utilized. But when we -- when we look at all of this, one of the things that comes to -- that comes to light, is that there is a huge opportunity.

There's a huge opportunity for us to unlock the value of data and AI at a scale that has never been -- never been seen before.

2.1

And so that means in order for us to do that, it has to be both important and urgent, right?

And some of us see it that way and some of us don't.

And so as I'm going through some of the recommendations, I encourage you to read the report.

I'm not going to -- it's -- it's -- I'm not going to go through all of it here, but what I will say is that the recommendations can kind of be categorized in three kind of categories. Under people, process, and technology.

On the process side, one of our -- one of our recommendations is to include NDAA FY25 recommendations. That -- that creative requirement for all DoD contracts to actually prioritize data rights and data inner operability so that we can get data out of our platforms and systems, so they can be shared securely kind of across -- across the enterprise where -- where we find value or where we are able to leverage AI to -- to create value.

2.1

Page 27

The second is really about changing the value opportunities of data in our contracts. We see this in industry already, but we want to be able to include data incentives in those contracts so that the industrial phase can really help us unlock the value of data. We can align those incentives.

But internally, we also have to incentivize data sharing and access within a department. And this kind of really connects to -- to Sue's comments on how we classify data, how we share -- share data across echelon, and how we actually bring that to light.

On the people side, this is where the report lays out some recommendations both for the CDAO at the DoD level, making sure they're empowered and properly resourced, that type of thing. But also to make sure that the CDAOs at the service level and the combatant commands don't have additional jobs.

That this is important enough that the CDAO is -- is the job. Why? Because we will be able to unlock value and create an advantage that we're just on the cusp of.

2.1

Page 28

And then -- then third, we also -- this is not just about from a people perspective about the CDAO. It's about the broader workforce. The broader force. We have to empower the digital natives, the data experts that are within the departments, the innovators, the --

As -- as General Kelley just said,

the -- the grunt that -- that knows how to code. We

have to build that data literacy, that AI acumen, and

empower them to be innovative. Give them that safe

space so that they can innovative and take the great

ideas and scale them.

And then from a technology kind of perspective, we have to enable things like an API first technology. Where our systems have platforms from our technical requirements are able to get access -- we are able to get access through the data in a machine-readable way. So we don't have to reengineer or reverse engineer the logic, if you will, from platforms in order to get our data out.

And then finally, we have to really embrace the data as a product, a strategy focus kind

of across the department. So when you -- when you take all of these kind of recommendations together, this can really create meaningful change in a department.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

And -- and we see the potential of creating that change and driving that change, and we have clear evidence of where it's working well in a department today.

So I encourage you to read the -- the report and really think deeply about how your role as a leader across the department wherever you may be, how data and AI can help you do your job better, faster, more efficient --

So before we -- we go to our guest speaker, I would like to open up to my colleagues for any comments on the report.

MR. BLOOMBERG: If you read the newspapers, all of the issues really center around where you get the data. The business of collecting the data and distributing it, are being separated.

It's not clear what business model would let you still have the money to collect if

Page 30 you're not controlling the distribution. And so, 1 2 you're going to see an awful lot of battles over that. 3 And those companies that have data that 4 it's not available to anybody else will have a real 5 advantage if all they have is the same thing that everybody else has. 6 7 I will say you did a great job, I 8 think, in working to ensure that the most relevant of the private sector practices are included in this 9 10 There's a lot of different private sector report. 11 companies working on it so there's a lot to be learned 12 no matter how smart. The Pentagon is -- it's just 13 nobody can control all of the good ideas. 14 I thought it would be useful at this 15

time to hear from the department's Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Officer, Craig Martell.

Craig, do you want to fill in?

Yeah. Thank you, DR. MARTELL:

Mayor Bloomberg.

16

17

18

19

20

2.2

And Reid, haven't seen you in a while,

I just wanted to say, "Hi." 2.1

So I wanted to say that I'm a strong

believer in this report and, in fact, most of what's

this is in the report -- what's most of what's in this

report, is essentially the marching orders that we've

been following internally.

2.1

When I first got to the departments a year and a half ago, I -- I asked what's -- what's the -- what's -- what's the way to build. Allow for short-term wins.

It's extremely important that in our organization we have to allow for the short-term wins while building sustainable change and sustainable value, and striking that balance is really what CDAO has been shooting for.

So on -- on the sustainable part,

I -- I looked hard at -- we looked hard at what

was -- what was broken. And what we saw was a bunch

of things being delivered at the top.

We have a hierarchy of needs, the top of which is AI, and we saw a bunch of things being delivered at the top that were -- that brought AI value, but the -- the lower parts of the hierarchy, which I'll mention in a second, were stove-piped, were

owned by a particular vendor, and so that if you wanted to move that value somewhere else in the department, you had to rebuild the same stovepipe.

2.1

And that sort of stove piping is what's gotten to us -- what has gotten to us to a lot of the pathological things we have today. So we worked really hard to think about what would be the right thing to do.

And the right thing to do is to allow for -- for those individual wins to continue to be built -- continue to be built but to recognize that they're tech debt.

So that if -- if I build a win right now and this win, it's a particular win for IndoPACOM, that's great. We're going to build that, we're going to allow that to go forward, we're going to encourage that.

We're going to recognize the tech debt that's there, and we're going to recognize the way we need to going forward tweak contracts. We're going to recognize the way we need to make contracts even more robustly different than they are now so that we can

get to the state that we want to get to down the road.

2.1

And what is that state? We think of that state as a hierarchy of needs. I think I'm just going to be echoing most of the report, and I'm glad to do that because I was really impressed with what your team did, Mayor Bloomberg.

But that hierarchy of needs has at the bottom quality data. And what do I mean by "quality data"? Well, first of all, it has to be discoverable.

Think about the data and the Department of Defense. It's distributed everywhere, and not only is it distributed everywhere, it's not distributed in any accessible way everywhere. It might literally be in a machine under someone's desk; right? So -- so the ability to discover that it's there is extremely difficult.

Then the ability to know who owns that data so you can actually go talk to the person to figure out how can I get that data and what's the value that that data can bring to me. And finally, how can I access it, so accessibility is extremely important.

2.1

2.2

Page 34

So we drove forward this notion of a data mesh, and I want -- I want to be clear about what we mean by "data mesh," because there's too many terms right now, data fabric, data mesh, data lake, data warehouse.

I want to differentiate data lakes and data warehouses on one side with data fabrics and data mesh on the other because they're too very different ways to think about it.

A data warehouse is, as you say, sucks it all into -- I mean, as the name says, sucks it all into one location, and it's there and it's warehoused. Data should not be warehoused. Data should be used. Data has a value when it's a product. Data has a value when it has customers that are delivering value to their customers.

So the idea of treating it as a warehouseable thing or, as we had said in the department, that data is an asset. It is an asset, but if you think about an asset incorrectly, an asset becomes a fungible thing. Data is not fungible.

Different data has different value, and

2.1

Page 35

data isn't something that you lock away. An asset is something you want to lock away such as the more of you have of it, the better you are. But the more you have of the data is not the metric to decide the value of that data. It's the more people who you use your data.

So as the report pointed out, we've been driving really hard on this that we see data as a product. That we -- we -- in the data mesh mentality, the data is distributed, the data is closest to its owners because the owners are the ones that know the most about that data.

The data has centralized discoverability, so we're taking CDAO's role as building that centralized discoverability tool.

So -- so there's some data in the Air Force, there's some data in the Navy, there's some data in the Army, together we can build the right dashboard that talks about readiness for example.

So knowing where that data is and how to find it, that's going to be in this centralized tool that the CDAO is building. And the ability for

the owners of that data to put an API over it to make it accessible. That's also tools that we're bringing to the table.

2.1

So we work with the CDAOs at each of the departments, each of the components -- components in the department to learn how to take their data, make it accessible, publish it, put a schema around it so you know -- you know what's in that data.

And then very strongly I agree with this idea of data as a product. So we're also teaching the department how to treat data as a product. How to -- how to treat data as to having customers. How to put on your hat a customer point of view, so that the more your customer uses it, the more the data has value.

And along that line, we actually want to push really hard to -- to promote people and praise people and reward people the more they treat data as a customer not the more they gather the data.

And I think that's one of the pathologies that I saw early on is that people treated the data as an asset, and they treated it as gathering

1 | it is the value, and that's actually not the value.

The next layer on top of our hierarchy

of needs, we were calling it analytics and metrics.

4 You know, in this hierarchy of needs is really a

5 | polemical device. It's not a device where we fix the

6 | bottom before we get to the top. It's really a device

7 | that says, "Here's the way we should think about for

any product that we build, the layers that you need."

So first we need quality data. Then you need the ability to -- to analyze the data, to

11 look at that data to see what that data tells you, so

we have a strong infrastructure that we're building

out for analytics dashboards. And we've pushed really

14 hard at metrics.

8

9

10

22

So this is a really fascinating one. I

16 think the last time I talked to the board, we talked

about this briefly. In the last year and a half, we

went from 70 percent effort-based metrics.

19 If anybody who's been in the department

20 knows, many people count their value by the number of

21 meetings they go to, not the value of those meetings.

So we've made a real push for -- from effort-based

metrics to outcome-based metrics. And I'll tell you
in a moment how we're trying really hard to drive
that.

And finally, at the top of that, we have AI. Now, when -- when the JAIC was part of -- it was one of the constitutes of the CDAO, and when the JAIC started in 2018, they were really thinking about what are point solutions that I could do -- that we could do to bring immediate value.

I -- I immediately thought that that was a slight mistake. And the reason I think it's a mistake, is they centralized, you know, we're -- we're OSD, we're here to help. No one likes to hear that; right? That's like saying, "We're the government," were to help -- "We're here to help."

So a centralized organization that was producing point solutions for particular AI problems, is not scalable. So what we've switched to is what we're calling "AI scaffolding."

I hundred percent agree with you,

Mayor Bloomberg, the real value in building AI is in
the private sector. The private sector knows how to

do this. There is no way that we as a department are going to have that value.

2.1

For the years that I worked for Reid at LinkedIn, they were so far ahead of -- of other teams and now Microsoft has continued that, and Google has continued that.

And all of these remarkable companies are so far ahead. There's no way we -- we should even play in the same -- the same ballgame. What we should do though, is show up with a clear definition of our problem, analytics, and metrics.

We should show up with our owning the data that we labeled because that is our IP. We shouldn't leave the labeling of the data, the description of the data, the value of the data, and what it means to the war fighter necessarily to the private sector because we're going to understand the war fighter value significantly better than a vendor will.

So what we see as our role is producing tools both from the left and the right of the model.

The model building itself is going to be industrial

task, and it's almost a commodity at this point. A model building is almost a commodity. Modelo, the new -- the current battles with generative AI, but that's going to get commoditized as well.

2.1

So on the left of the model, we've worked really hard at data labeling as a service. So taking -- taking a video, stream it for example, and saying this is a truck, this is a school bus, this is a truck, this is a school bus.

Now, in our use cases, which I can't do over this call, we get very fine grain about what each object is in a video stream. And how fine-grained we get takes an expertise that only a soldier or a war fighter is going to know.

it as easy as possible for us to own the labeling of the data. That -- the telling the system what matters in that data. And then the building of the model, a hundred percent. That belongs -- that belongs to industry and that we should -- and we're also building tools.

We have something called SUNet which

allows for multiple vendors to come to the same data and compete their models so that we can pick the best model for a particular problem. So that's part of our AI scaffolding on the left of the model.

On the right of the model,
we're -- we're thinking very hard, and it's really
difficult in government. It's much easier in
industry. We're thinking very hard about what model
monitoring looks like.

So right -- let's just -- let's just level set. For me, when I say "AI," I basically mean statistics at scale, and what -- what that means is we count the past in order to predict the future; right?

So if you look at almost any AI -- AI tool that you use, it ends up not working very well if the deployed situation isn't sufficiently similar to the data gathering situation.

So you gather data in one scenario and then you deploy in one slightly different. Well, that's what fine-tuning's for; right? Because the deploying it in that different scenario didn't quite get you the value that you thought you'd get because

that deployed scenario is different than where you gather the data.

2.1

Well, sometimes in war, the -- it works really well when you start off, or even in business cases, the world changes. It works really well when you start off, but the world changes, and the model over time has less and less and less value to you.

Right now, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars for a model or models. We ship them, and we no longer evaluate the value of that model going forward.

So we're thinking really hard about what it means to do model monitoring on the right-hand side so that we can say, "Oh, it's time to retrain your model," or "It's time to look at your model because I see that the distribution of inferences that you are making is now changed pretty significantly."

So quality data almost completely echo the report there. We hundred percent agree that that's the right way to drive forward. On top of that analytics and metrics. And on top of that AI in the form of AI scaffolding.

2.1

Page 43

Just one more quick thing because I don't want to take up too much of your time. We've chosen to marquee use cases to drive this forward because we're not going to be able to just say magically, "Please give us quality data." That's not going to work.

I mean, that wouldn't work in an organization the size of Google. It's definitely not going to work in an organization the size of the Department of Defense.

So we've chosen two marquee use cases.

The first marquee use cases -- use case is -- oh, and by the way, we're not going to try to get all of the data. That's boiling the ocean. That won't work.

We're looking metaphorically for the 10 percent of the data that's going to bring 60 percent of the value. And I say "metaphorically," because we have no idea what the denominator is, so I don't know if it's actually 10 percent, but we're looking for the biggest chunk of -- that -- that -- the low-hanging fruit chunk of data that's going to bring the most value and drive a virtuous cycle.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Page 44

So the first use case is a dashboard on the deputy's desk, and a -- and a -- deputy secretary's desk, and a dashboard in the secretary's desk. These dashboards now present a view of the department for the key metrics that the secretary and the deputy secretary care about, and each of those is data-driven. So we've worked with the reports to the deputy secretary, and we've asked: "How do you measure the quality of your work? How do you know when you're successful?" That's how we drove that flip from effort-based to outcome-based metrics. And then we went to figure out, my team just dove in and was embedded with all of the PSAs. We dove in and we said, "Okay, where does that data come from?"

And then we went to the services, and we found that data. And then we went to the components within the -- we went into the components within the services and found that data.

And for the key metrics that the deputy wants to see, and the key metrics that the secretary

wants to see, we have found the right data, we have built the data flows, we have assigned data ownership.

2.1

And every meeting that the deputy
secretary now has with the PSAs, every one of them
starts with a review of the metrics and whether
they're red, green, or yellow. And this is a massive
change in thought from the year and a half I got here.

So that was our first use case, and we think that's the right -- a right marquee use case because it really drives down to the bottom the need to get to the data, to get to the executive decision-making.

And when we pushed down to the bottom to get to that data, that's when we institute these data mesh principles. That's when we teach the -- that's when we're teaching them to fish.

That's when we're teaching them how to be a data product managers for example, and how to use an API to make the data accessible, and how to get it in the catalog.

All right. So that's -- that's use case number one. I only have ten minutes so I'm

rushing it all in there. I'll pause in a second for questions. I'm sorry.

2.0

2.1

And then the second one which I think is the right war fighter use case, is CJADC2. If you think about what CJADC2 is, it stands for Combined Joint All Domain, Command and Control. The key there is Command and Control.

If you look at the press from a year -- two years ago, CJADC2 was a product. CJADC2 was a thing that we were going to buy. That's not true. Command and Control -- Admiral Mullen correct me here because I am not a war fighter, but Command and Control has happened from the beginning of human history; right?

Command and Control is just a war fighter thing that leaders must do. It just happens that in the modern world, we can do it significantly differently -- differently and significantly more effective.

So we see CJADC2 as a dataflow issue. Getting the right data from the sensors to combatant commanders and then the right decisions back down to

where they need to go. And so we're building a data integration layer for -- for the combatant commanders.

Now, I'm going to be really honest with you, the phrase "data integration layer," has worked really well in DMAGs. It has worked really well when we go and talk to the combatant commanders because it sounds like something they can understand. They are going to plug their devices into this layer, and the data is going to flow.

But all it really is, is an extension of these data mesh principles. That the right data that a combatant commander needs is going to be available. That we can build apps on top of that data, and those apps will allow for Command and Control. And that -- and -- and once a Command and Control decision is made, it can be pushed down into the right levels.

Now, we are -- we are -- this one as a use case, where -- where we're focusing first on IndoPACOM, but -- but we had just had massive successes. And I only say it this way, and I'm happy to brief anybody. We're actually having a DV Day next

week, but I'm -- I'm happy to brief anybody about the
specifics, but we are not just -- it's not just
IndoPACOM.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

One of the largest frustrations is the inability to do cross-combatant command coordination.

And AOR boundaries, area of responsibility boundaries, were very hard boundaries with respect to the way the data flowed.

And, you know, things move around in the world and cross those boundaries. And we are now at the point where we have leave behind capability for combatant commanders so that CENTCOM can know what's happening, and IndoPACOM can know what's happening in AFRICOM, and as things -- and as things flow in between those areas of responsibility.

So these are our two marquee use cases. They have immediate value for the department. They have -- and we have leave behind capabilities. And we are incurring tech debt in the sense that we're -- we're, you know, Palantir's a big helper here, Andrew is a bigger helper here.

All the major players are helping us

deliver this value, but we're just having them do it
in a non-stove-piped way so that we can build up this
underlying data layer.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Now building up the underlying data layer so it sounds as strong as it was presented in the report, that's going to take years. And that's going to take years of -- of leadership that drives in that direction.

The trick is to make sure that every time we deliver immediate value, because we always have to deliver immediate war fighter value, we're doing it in a way that contributes to the long-term stability and the long-term sustainability.

I'll pause there. I hope that wasn't overwhelming.

MR. BLOOMBERG: Craig, could you repeat your question from Mike Mullen?

DR. MARTELL: What was -- oh, I was just going to say --

MR. MULLEN: C2 -- it was C2, Mike.

Yeah. We've had Command and Control from, you know, the start of time. That was really

the issue. And that's not insignificant to

what -- what you're talking about, Craig, in terms of

my ability to Command and Control in a way where

everybody understands clearly what's going on across

lots of domains, lots of services, lots of warfighting

requirements.

MR. BLOOMBERG: It occurs to me that the security people are going to have a nightmare of time in looking at the AI software and seeing whether it is secured in itself.

As you pointed out, it's most likely to be developed outside in the private sector. There's no way the military could possibly keep up with the number of different organizations and people that are out there creating. And yet, if you look at the AI software, it's not clear that anybody could look at the code and decide what's really happening in there.

One of the things about AI, we always joke about, nobody knows how it does it. So what kind of security issues are we going to face, and how do we deal with that?

DR. MARTELL: Well, that's a -- that is

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

just an absolutely great question. I think -- I think
we just need to shift the way we think slightly
differently, so I'll give you an example.

So when I'm driving my car, I -- I choose to use adaptive cruise. Why do I choose to use adaptive cruise? Because I've practiced with it. In military terms, I've trained with it over and over and over and over again.

I have a justified confidence in how it behaves. And I can't -- even though I can't look inside what's going on with my adaptive cruise system because it's making millions of decisions per second and too many sensors and there's no way to interpret it if I could, I do understand the statistical envelope around it -- the statistical -- the behavioral -- behavioral envelope in a statistical way.

It's very likely to do X in this context. It's very likely to do Y in this context. And just like any other technology, the military is excellent at training, training, training, training, training, training, and developing a

1 justified confidence in the system.

2.1

So I think the right way to think about it going forward is not something analogous to person in the loop. It's not something analogous to explainability. We're never going -- so if you look at our responsible AI principles, we don't have explainability as one of them in there. We have traceability, which is do we understand why this input statistically speaking gave us this output.

So you have to think about it like a complex system where you're evaluating its behavioral patterns, not necessarily what's going on in the inside. And I don't think that's very different than any other technology.

Let's pick a really old technology.

Periodically, guns misfire. Periodically, guns

explode in -- in a soldier's face. Periodically,

missile guidance or torpedo guidance, which is

very -- you know that -- that feedback loop's been

around for a long time, goes awry.

So what we're really saying is, did we have a justified confidence in the -- the way the

system behaves because of the training such that a commander feels confident in making a decision to use that tool?

2.1

And then just to -- to close the loop there. Other parts of -- so the car I drive is a Subaru. Other parts of it, I don't trust the lane keep assist because it bounces back and forth between the lanes, so I do not have justified confidence in that.

I always turn that off, and I would not take the responsibility to use that, but I do take the responsibility because it is my fault if I hit another car to use the adaptive cruise. It's this sort of mentality that we have to switch to.

And I would even argue, sir, that for most complex software systems, even if we can look at the code, when you do it en masse, we don't really know. It's very hard for us to trace exactly what happened, and we really look at it in a behavioral pattern for the device itself.

So that's -- I'm pretty sure that's -- I'm -- I'm confident that's the right way to

move forward. And we have a T&E team that's building
this out and working with a -- the DoD T&E team on
exactly this.

2.1

MR. BLOOMBERG: People that work in the security have a -- they have to be a hundred percent secure. Their jobs are on the line. We expect when they say it's secure, we mean a hundred percent secure, endless. And yet, AI software hallucinates unpredictably, and you're never going to get that.

So how do you square Senate and

Congress people who are screaming bloody murder:

"What do you mean you let that out of -- that cat out

of the bag? Your job is to keep it in there under all

circumstances."

And we'll have Ryan explain how this is going to happen afterwards -- but what do you do there?

DR. MARTELL: Yeah. So this

is -- let's -- let's talk about generative AI

particularly with hallucination. I think, you know,

the last time we met, I had a very strong opinion

about the -- the concerns that we should have about

1 hallucination.

2.1

And -- and the way I see it is this,

the -- look my PhD is in natural language processing.

I am unbelievably excited about the state of science

right now with respect to AI. This is the best it's

ever been in my career. I'm super excited.

But the state of the sciences here, and the state of the promises or the hype is here, and there's a gap in between. And it -- we take it as CDAO's responsibility to characterize that gap. And what I mean by characterizing the gap.

Well, we're having a symposium -- symposium on February, you're all invited, where we're bringing all of industry together. The whole community is coming together to actually ask the question, "How do we decide when something -- when a generative AI model is sufficient for a particular use case?" So we really believe this is use case driven.

So, for example -- so think about the -- the autonomous -- the autonomous' vehicle maturity model. There's a level one, level two, level

three, level four, level five. What we -- what was
the value of that maturity model? Well, it allowed
for industry and consumers to talk the same language.

2.1

It allowed for industry to make offerings that they know another company wasn't going to out-hype them on because there were objective criteria that said level three, level four, level five.

And it allowed us to do things like catch and ask questions of cruise. Was cruise really level five? Well, you know they had some folks interacting so it's not level five, but is that level four? But it allowed us to have a rational conversation about the technology being offered and about the demand signal.

So what we've done is first gather over 200 use cases across the department. We're categorizing those now; we're going to present them in February. And that will be the demand signal for the department.

We'll have levels of use cases and then we're working with industry to -- to -- and

they've -- we've had over 33 submissions from Google,
from Microsoft. Microsoft's actually was the most
robust. But from -- from all of the major companies
arguing this is what a maturity model should look
like, and we want to be able to knot those together so

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

that we can say --

You know, Admiral Mullen, you might ask for something. You know -- you know, last time we talked, there was some demands that you had for -- for when you were CNO. Well, great, I would then be able to say: "Sir, that is a level four demand, but the technology is only at level two, so you can't have that. But here's some level two things, would these be effective for you?"

So if we can build out that maturity model, we can start to rationalize that gap. And so then we can say to Congress: "Well, Congress, industry is at level three. Here's some really strong demand for level four and level five, and let's fund that. Let's see if we can get the research to move the technology up."

But we're not there yet, so let's not

allow for a -- I'm -- as the gatekeeper here, I'm not going to allow the department to buy purported level four solutions if there aren't level four solutions available. So we're really excited about this February symposium exactly for this reason. To

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

characterize this gap.

And I just want to -- just -- just back to something I just said. Industry has jumped in with both feet on this. We -- we talked with everyone, and when "everyone," I mean, we talked -- the deputy and I talked with Satya. The secretary and I talked with Sundar. Like, we talked with everyone, and we talked with -- I had a conflict with Amazon, but I don't anymore, so we're about to go out to Amazon.

And everyone says, "We would love a characterization like this because it would -- it -- it essentially allows for a more rational marketplace." So the -- the response we've gotten and the energy that industry has put into helping us build this maturity model, it's very exciting.

DR. ROPER: Craig, one thing. I think

you've got a lot of, like, a lot of momentum where

I've been following this trying to build the internet

for the military from before there was even a cloud in

this department.

2.1

This is one area that leadership after leadership have kept momentum and kept putting the next step in. And I think you've done a lot to take the focus off of the -- the kind of AI widgets at the end and really build the required infrastructure and inner operability.

But my recommendation to you is don't lose sight of the economy and the data economy. And that while you're also thinking about maturity models, there needs to be a value model that gets distilled into contractual language that should be standard so that industry that owns the platform that others are doing things with the data, they're benefiting from those.

If they're not benefiting financially and that language isn't in the contract, there are just too many ways a platform owner can make it difficult to get the 10 percent of the data you're

1 wanting.

2.1

So my recommendation is don't lose sight of the economy and equally be aggressive to reward industry when they give you the access to the data that you want so that monetizing data from their platform becomes the equivalent of, like, the App Store for them.

And maybe it's a different set of companies that are making money directly on the contract, but they get a percentage, so it's replacing the cash flows they would normally get from repairing old systems. Now, they can repair less of the old system and benefit with predictable cash flow from their data being, you know, monetized by others.

I know we've discussed that, but I think it's so, so --

DR. MARTELL: We have, yeah.

DR. ROPER: -- important that the money is aligned with the -- the intentions.

DR. MARTELL: Well, number one, thank you for the energy you've already given me just diving in and helping me -- like, like, by default --

DR. THORNBERRY: 1 Hey, Craiq, 2 just -- just quickly. And I know I'll probably get cut off here, but, you know, the building's pretty 3 4 famous for ignoring COCOMs and, actually, for ignoring 5 CDAOs, or whatever other, you know, specialty we've had historically. 6 7 It seems to me just to listen to you, 8 that that in a way you've -- you may have overcome that, and -- and I'm -- I'm curious as to how you see 9 10 Because typically the services will not pay a 11 lot of attention to COCOMs, and where they can resist 12 what's going on the third deck, they'll do that as 13 well. 14 So each service has got a CDAO as well. 15 How -- how is that all coming together, and then how do you -- how do you connect that to the COCOMs where, 16 17 you know, in our hearts we really want to support them 18 but, you know, from the building, that's just really difficult in this area? 19 DR. MARTELL: So, yeah, that -- I'll 20 talk to yours first and then I'll go back to the other 2.1 22 question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Page 62

Kathleen Hicks is the start of this; right? That -- her leadership in preparing the ground for my coming was remarkable. I actually believed that my biggest job when I arrived would be to generate demand signal. That was not true at all. Whatever happened prior to me, the demand signal to be data-driven was unbelievably It was just a how. So my job became, "Let me show you how to do it, " which is a significantly easier job than actually the generation of the demand signal. So there was already really strong demand signal. And, sir, I just believe -- I believe that every component realizes the weakness they're at by not understanding their own data. That, on top of Dr. Hicks just driving our being data-driven, and the value of our being data-driven. And actually, I think it goes back much further. When was the start of Ivana? I forget which deputy secretary, I apologize, for that. Ivana started, I believe when you were in the building, sir. And so the -- the drive towards having

our data so that we can do the right thing, so we can measure where we are, that began way -- way before I arrived.

2.1

Now, your concern, I read your concern as: "How long will this runway last for me? When will that goodwill peter out? That's my real concern." And so there, I believe, it's really effective governance.

So we have a CDAO Council. Every CDAO across the departments comes to that council where we leverage problems that they're -- that they're facing and, sure, we push down -- we push down policy. But if -- if my sole job is to write memos, I will be ignored. So what we really do is try to help people solve problems. They're helping them win their fights right away.

And -- and that's -- we absolutely have to build the right long-term solution, but we're only going to be successful if -- right long-term solution by helping with immediate problems now. That's my hope.

But I -- what you just said keeps me up

at night. And what keeps me up at night is that I

have momentum now, I'm delivering value. We have our

pacing adversary who's giving us the kind of pressure

that everybody focuses on into PACOM, so that really

helps me focus attention. But if the world changes,

how do I maintain this going -- going forward? That's

a fear.

MR. BLOOMBERG: Reid, do you want to add anything?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

MR. HOFFMAN: Look, I think the commentary, the discussions are very good as per earlier, like, Will's stuff saying, like, the focus on infrastructure and the continuation of things. But I think that the question around how do we essentially leverage what is amazing data for the DoD mission, is I think, very important.

And then the focus on commerce because, you know, there's a ton of obviously -- of like this whole networking co-system or investment going in commerce and making sure those parallels are right.

So I think all the discussion is -- is extremely good.

And the only thing I would add is that

we are in -- within the industry context continuing to see, you know, kind of innovation that -- that works on the order of magnitude of small and months.

2.1

The leasing of more large-scale models, of different ways of doing it, I think it's going to hit like drug discovery and a bunch of other things within that -- probably within small and years.

And -- and so just also that the -- the continuing of consulting with the various industrial things which we have been for that expertise given the pace of that. Given that, you know, I think the discussion has been good and robust.

DR. MARTELL: So, Reid, just a quick comment there. There's no way we could keep up with that pace and so we're not trying. What we're trying to do is regardless of the -- the innovation that that industry brings to the table, our not having quality data would be a mistake; right?

No matter what, we need to have quality data to be ready for that. Plus that's our IP. We should own our own IP. And so there's -- there's sort of a business case for it as well.

2.1

Page 66

But if we don't have that data ready,
we are going to be more stove-piped than ever. And so
we keep our eye on, we have very strong industrial
connections. As I've said, everybody has been
remarkably fully engaged.

And as people come to us and say,

"Here's a solution," again, I am not stopping the

deployment of any solution. The only difference I'm

doing is saying that's -- "Note that that incurs tech

debt." We're going to have to eventually transition

that to the new way of thinking.

And as long as I can get that in the habit, and then to go back to the -- Dr. Roper's question, and we can think about contracting that allows for that transition, both paying back the tech debt and changing the way the economy is done, I -- I think we're going to have something sustainable. But I say this in a hand -- hand waiving way, all of these things are really hard.

From a -- from an economy perspective, well, I -- I think the answer is something like instead of your owning of the stovepipe and being able

to resell us the stovepipe, how about you own
the -- whatever IP you put into generating that data
mesh, you get to monetize that.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Maybe -- maybe we pay you per API call.

Maybe we change the contract so it's actually

beneficial. If we do it per API call, and we require

you to open it up to -- to other vendors, well, then

you have two markets. You have the market of selling

me the app, and you have the market of selling the

data to other app builders; right?

So we're working -- that might not be the right answer, I don't know, but this is the kind of discussion we're having in part driven by the conversations that we had, Will.

MR. BLOOMBERG: Gilda, do your students have an interest in going into AI trying to address the things that Craig's been talking about?

DR. BARABINO: Absolutely. AI is so pervasive now that I believe --

MR. BLOOMBERG: A little louder --

DR. BARABINO: So AI is so pervasive now that students regardless of what they're studying,

want to be a part of understanding how to use AI appropriately. And at Olin where I am right now, we are actually infusing it throughout the entire curriculum and -- but also to help the students understand how to use it responsibly. So, yes, I think the interest is only going to increase.

2.1

And I was curious, Craig's point from a people perspective, how do you make sure that from a training point of view, people aren't always adequately prepared to embrace concepts, like, data mesh and AI scaffolding? Like, what -- what's your recommendation to make sure we're -- we're prepared to use the best frameworks?

DR. MARTELL: Hey, that -- awesome question. We built -- one of the things I did when I first got here, is build a data management team.

Sorry, a data talent management team. We have a couple of threads about the way we're thinking.

You asked, "How do I ensure?" I can't ensure yet. We're trying to figure that out. So let me just tell you the threads that we're thinking about.

1 Number one, stop thinking about hire to 2 retire within the government. You know, industry -- industry produces massive value knowing 3 4 that their people are going to stay eighteen months to 5 two years. So they've learned how to manage that term. We need to as well. During that eighteen 6 7 months to two years, how about we help transform 8 careers? 9 Here's another thread we're thinking 10 about. How about we go to HBCUs for example, or just 11 in general the universities that Silicon Valley 12 doesn't by default recruit from? And how about we 13 say: "Come work with us, we'll pay for your 14 education. Come work with us, we'll transform you so 15 that industry is going to want you. 16 We'll give you some of the hardest 17 problems on the planet, and we'll give you some of the best experience so on the other end industry will come 18 19 knocking." Now, imagine I can create a pipeline of 20 2.1 diversity of data-literate diverse candidates. 22 pretty sure industry is going to be knocking on that

door. So that's -- that's a pipe we've been -- we've been thinking about.

2.1

We've been thinking about how do we change JPME and -- and anybody's had to go through JPME, I haven't, but Professional Military Education knows that gets overloaded. Everything gets thrown in there.

But we really have to think about when someone's an O3 or an O4, what do they need to know about managing technology like this? How do we make sure -- because every leader is going to have to go through PME throughout their career, how do we -- how do we ensure that that's the case?

And we are also the functional community manager for 11 new job titles which are data engineers, data scientists, all of the new titles that we need to actually drive this data-driven transformation.

CDAO is the functional community manager, and so the first thing we're doing are very boring things. Like, we're just re-coding jobs. And we're saying, "That's actually not a software

engineering job, that's a data engineering job."

2.1

those are longer term.

And once we get those re-coded, which is a monumental task because we have to drive the whole department to do it, we can then say -- we can at least then characterize that here's the gap.

Here's -- here's what's missing. And then -- but

For short-term wins, we have embedded talent teams in every combatant command. And we -- we call them AIDA. AI and Data Accelerator. And those AIDA teams are in every combatant command and the CDO of the combatant command gets to task them. We pay for them, but the CDO gets to task them. And we specifically tell the team, your job is to support the CDO for mission commander success.

And so whatever data they need, just even, like, just building a data pipeline, building an AI app. So at least at the combatant commands, we are seeding the talent to start to build the -- the muscle of leadership to depend upon this talent.

If we have leadership demanding this talent, we'll -- we'll have billets [ph] and

we'll -- and we'll -- and people will come in the
door, and we'll do our best to fill them. But we have
to have that demand signal as well as the supply.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- So, I don't have -- I mean, your question was, "How do we ensure?" I don't know the answer to, "How do we ensure?" But these are the ways that we're tackling it.
- MR. BLOOMBERG: Mary, you get the last word before Ryan, I hope, is going to recommend that we vote on --
- DR. MARTELL: I vote yes, by the way.

 12 It's a good report.
 - MR. BLOOMBERG: Can you add something to -- a lot of this stuff is right down your alley. Who is going to do -- how's the private sector work with the -- with the military?
 - MS. MEEKER: Well, since the first time we met, Craig, you've -- you've made, you know, leaps and bounds of progress it appears. And it feels like the data economy study that Ryan really spearheaded so well fits. And I love the idea of the dashboard that -- that is rolling out and love the idea that you

- have the symposium in February and --
- DR. MARTELL: Please come.
- MS. MEEKER: He knows this very well.
- 4 | The innovation in artificial intelligence of the
- 5 United States of America is off the charts. And in my
- 6 career as an investor, I've never seen this many
- 7 companies with a valuation in excess of a trillion
- 8 dollars. Never seen it before, it's never happened
- 9 before.

1

- 10 Most with their founders still involved
- 11 | innovating for this big prize of artificial
- 12 | intelligence with the capital to put behind the
- infrastructure because it is the most expensive
- 14 rapidly changing innovation we've ever seen from a
- 15 | funding perspective.
- And if there's anything we've learned
- 17 | about innovation and technology, when you have great
- leaders who are founders who don't want to lose the
- 19 next battle, great stuff can be created.
- 20 Reid brought up the -- if -- if we
- 21 | can -- if we can create new drugs with this kind of
- 22 | speed which we'll see, Reid, you said in years. I

	Page 74
1	think it's I'll just say single digit, looks good,
2	sooner rather than later. If we can do that, we can
3	do a lot of things in a lot of areas.
4	And the fact that you're bringing those
5	companies together and you're going to create,
6	hopefully, new bidding, and new new business
7	practices that are faster, better, cheaper, more
8	efficient, can unleash a lot more innovation.
9	So, I guess, Craig and Reid, you may
10	add to that but
11	MR. BLOOMBERG: Mark, and Frank, and
12	Craig, thank you very much for
13	Ryan?
14	MR. SWANN: Yes.
15	MR. BLOOMBERG: You do, I assume,
16	recommend that we vote on this?
17	MR. SWANN: Yes.
18	MR. BLOOMBERG: And I will give you the
19	first vote.
20	MR. SWANN: Absolutely. Aye.
21	MR. BLOOMBERG: You're an aye.
22	Sue?

	Page 75
1	MS. GORDON: Wholeheartedly, aye.
2	MR. BLOOMBERG: And Gilda?
3	DR. BARABINO: Aye.
4	MR. BLOOMBERG: Will?
5	DR. ROPER: Aye.
6	MR. BLOOMBERG: Mary?
7	MS. MEEKER: Aye.
8	MR. BLOOMBERG: Mike?
9	MR. MULLEN: Aye.
10	MR. BLOOMBERG: Reid Hoffman?
11	MR. HOFFMAN: Aye.
12	MR. BLOOMBERG: And I will vote last.
13	An aye also.
14	Oh, I'm sorry, Mac, I just jumped over
15	you. I apologize.
16	DR. THORNBERRY: Aye.
17	MR. BLOOMBERG: We can't do this
18	without your vote. Way to go.
19	Thank you, everybody. That concludes
20	the second study for today.
21	DR. MARTELL: Thank you, team.
22	MR. BLOOMBERG: Thanks, Craig.

MS. MEEKER: Thanks, Mark.

MS. THEODOTOU: Thank you to our

3 speakers.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

And yes, Mr. Chair, now we're shifting over to the public comments. As we mentioned earlier, we received 77 comments. And they're grouped -- we grouped them in three areas so feedback and inquiries on the previous studies or current studies.

So we have Nancy asking, "How is the DIB going to lower barriers to entry for start-ups and small businesses?" And I would recommend to Nancy to read the study as soon as it's published on our website.

We also have Timothy who is asking,

"How can I support the studies in how we optimize

innovation with allies and partners?" That's leading

up to our next -- or studies.

We also have a new study focus suggestions. We have recommendations on data and analytics and so you've covered all of that in our current study. The way -- economy, so I recommend that -- to our citizens and readers here to review the

Data Economy Study. Also, that will be published on our website later today.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

And we also have some DIB procedure inquiries. And Amanda is asking -- she would like to know, "What metrics do we use for impact when considering these studies and recommendations and how do we know it worked?" That's a great question because I want to make sure that our studies are not only recommending but also being implemented.

And that's the work -- that's why we have speakers here and have representatives from -- from the stakeholders across the department to make sure that when our studies are published, we further publish, our stakeholders are engaged early and often so that we have a --

So when we study -- when we publish the studies, we can then turn them loose and have them in place and implement and adopt and adapt the recommendations into their practices.

And with that, Mr. Chair, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. BLOOMBERG: Thank you. The last

item of business is to inform the public of the board's work going forward. We are starting two new studies. The first covers how we are innovating with our allies and partners, and Charles Phillips is going to coordinate that effort.

2.1

And the second stems from a previous recommendation made by this board, and its focus is to align and send notes across the acquisition and tech adoption pipelines. And that's going to be coordinated by Admiral Mike Mullen.

Both of these topics have come out a lot in our conversations with people across the defense department and, hopefully, we can provide some valuable insights in the coming months.

Any member want to add anything near the end of our public part of our meeting?

Okay. Well, that includes

our -- concludes our public meeting for today. And I

wanted to thank Secretary Lloyd Austin and Defense

Secretary Kathleen Hicks, and Under Secretary Heidi

Shyu, and the entire Defense Innovation Board team for organizing such a productive day.

	j
1	And let me remind everybody, you can
2	put it on your calendar. You can tune into our next
3	public meeting on Wednesday, April 17th. So thanks
4	again, and we will see you all in the Spring and
5	hopefully, it will be a little bit warmer across the
6	country. All the best, everyone.
7	DR. THEODOTOU: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
8	And thank you to all of our speakers
9	today, and all of our members of our teams, and
LO	everybody who joined us. Thank you, and this meeting
L1	is now adjourned.
L2	(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at
L3	11:17 a.m.)
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	

CERTIFICATE

I, JEAN S. TOMPANE, the officer before whom
the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby
certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing
proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn;
that the proceedings were recorded by me and
thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified
transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of
said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the
best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am
neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
of the parties to the action in which this was taken;
and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of
any counsel or attorney employed by the parties
hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the
outcome of this action. Jun S. Tompone

JEAN S. TOMPANE

Notary Public in and for the

State of Maryland

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, SHANNON GALLINA, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

SHANNON GALLINA

Thomas Gillina

[10 - advisory]

1	58 3:11	academia	61.4 62.2 10
1	_	20:11 24:13	61:4 62:3,10 62:17 67:5
10 43:15,19	6		
59:22	6 3:4	accelerate 18:10 24:10	68:3 70:17,22
10:00 1:9	60 43:16		acumen 28:9
11 70:15	60s 18:6	accelerated	adapt 77:18
11:17 79:13	61 3:9,12	25:6	adaptive 51:5,6
12 3:6	6344988 1:18	accelerator	51:11 53:13
16 3:7	64 3:13	71:10	add 4:6 16:3
17th 79:3	65 3:9	access 10:8,9	64:9,22 72:13
1947 14:2	67 3:14	27:8 28:17,17	74:10 78:15
2	68 3:9	33:21 60:4	additional
200 14:9 22:12	7	accessibility	27:18
56:17	70 37:18	33:21	address 17:14
20088 80:16	700 37.18 700 22:12	accessible	67:16
2018 38:7		33:13 36:2,7	adequately
	700,000 14:7	45:19	68:10
	72 3:15	accurate 80:9	adjourned
20301 1:14	76 3:4	81:5	79:11
21st 18:8	77 3:3 7:5 76:6	achieve 9:9	adjusted 18:7
22 3:3	8	11:18	admiral 2:7
23rd 6:22	8 3:5	achieving 9:5	3:10 17:6
24 3:8	9	acquisition	46:11 57:7
26 1:8	95 14:22	9:13,22 22:7,8	78:10
29 3:3		78:8	admiralty
29952 81:14	a	act 6:20,20	22:15
3	a.m. 1:9 79:13	15:13	adopt 11:1
30 3:9	ability 10:12	action 11:12	77:18
32 21:14	33:15,17 35:22	17:18,21 20:21	adopted 17:14
33 57:1	37:10 50:3	80:12,16 81:8	adoption 78:9
3e188 1:13	80:10 81:7	81:12	advance 7:5
4	able 26:22 27:3	actionable 9:16	advantage 8:13
4 3:3	27:20 28:16,17	actions 13:9	27:21 30:5
49 3:10	43:4 57:5,10	actually 10:5	adversaries
	66:22	20:20 26:17	13:4
5	absolutely 17:7	27:12 33:18	adversary 13:9
50 3:3,9 24:12	51:1 63:17	36:16 37:1	64:3
54 3:3,9	67:18 74:20	43:19 47:22	advisory 6:19
		55:16 57:2	6:19

[afford - back]

afford 10:16	aligned 11:1	anyways 12:9	assigned 45:2
africom 48:14	60:19	aor 48:6	assist 53:7
agency 6:11	alley 72:14	api 28:14 36:1	assistant 12:9
12:11	allies 76:16	45:18 67:4,6	association
agenda 7:2	78:4	apologize	20:3,5
aggressive	allow 6:9 9:11	62:20 75:15	assume 74:15
14:10 15:12,20	10:9 31:7,10	app 60:7 67:9	attend 6:9
60:3	32:9,16 47:14	67:10 71:18	attendees 2:2
agile 5:14	58:1,2	appears 72:19	attention 61:11
ago 14:6 17:3	allowed 56:2,4	approaches	64:5
31:6 46:9	56:9,13	8:17,19,20 9:3	attorney 80:14
agree 36:9	allows 10:6	appropriately	81:10
38:20 42:19	41:1 58:17	68:2	audio 80:8 81:3
agreements	66:15	approve 5:17	austin 78:19
10:21	amanda 77:4	apps 47:13,14	authority
ahead 5:21	amazing 64:15	april 79:3	10:15 11:11
39:4,8	amazon 58:13	area 9:2 48:6	automated
ai 14:11,13,18	58:14	59:5 61:19	15:1
15:10,13,21	america 73:5	areas 8:15	autonomous
24:10,21 26:2	analogous 52:3	11:18 48:15	55:21,21
26:22 28:9	52:4	74:3 76:7	auvsi 20:5
29:12 31:19,20	analytics 37:3	argue 53:15	available 30:4
38:5,17,19,21	37:13 39:11	arguing 57:4	47:13 58:4
40:3 41:4,11	42:21 76:20	army 35:17	awesome 68:14
41:14,14 42:21	analyze 37:10	arrived 62:4	awful 30:2
42:22 50:9,15	andrew 48:21	63:3	awry 52:20
50:18 52:6	anew 10:17	artificial 30:16	aye 23:9,11,13
54:8,19 55:5	announced	73:4,11	23:15,18,20,22
55:17 59:8	6:21	asked 21:18	24:1 74:20,21
67:16,18,21	answer 7:8	31:6 44:9	75:1,3,5,7,9,11
68:1,11 71:10	66:21 67:12	68:19	75:13,16
71:18	72:6	asking 76:9,14	b
aida 71:10,11	anybody 30:4	77:4	back 7:12
ain't 4:4	37:19 47:22	asset 10:10	11:21 12:6
air 35:16	48:1 50:16	21:13 34:19,19	46:22 53:7
airplane 12:15	anybody's 70:4	34:20,20 35:1	58:7 61:21
align 11:4 27:6	anymore 58:14	36:22	62:18 66:13,15
78:8			02.10 00.13,13

background	believe 10:4	16:2 22:11	brigadier 2:13
14:21	17:18 19:22	23:10,12,14,16	3:7 12:13 21:2
backgrounds	55:18 62:13,13	23:19,21 24:1	brilliant 21:9
4:9	62:21 63:7	29:17 30:19	21:18
backlogged	67:19	33:6 38:21	bring 4:8 6:13
14:7	believed 62:3	49:16 50:7	22:10 27:12
bag 54:13	believer 31:1	54:4 64:8	33:20 38:9
balance 31:12	belongs 40:19	67:15,20 72:8	43:16,21
ballgame 39:9	40:19	72:13 74:11,15	bringing 36:2
banking 11:3	beneficial 67:6	74:18,21 75:2	55:14 74:4
barabino 2:4	benefit 60:13	75:4,6,8,10,12	brings 65:17
3:14 23:11	benefiting	75:17,22 77:22	british 22:15
67:18,21 75:3	59:17,19	board 1:1 2:4,5	broad 25:2,3
barely 21:15	best 4:4 13:19	2:6,7,9,10,11	broader 11:7
barriers 8:5,12	41:2 55:5	2:17 6:4,7,13	28:3,3
13:15 76:10	68:13 69:18	6:15,18,19 7:4	broke 14:3
base 9:4 25:6	72:2 79:6	7:8,10 8:4,7	broken 31:16
based 11:17	80:10 81:6	37:16 78:7,21	brought 31:20
37:18,22 38:1	better 4:5,8	board's 78:2	73:20
44:12,12	7:15 15:20	boiling 43:14	build 28:9 31:7
basement	29:12 35:3	book 18:6,9	32:13,15 35:18
25:10	39:18 74:7	22:12,13	37:8 47:13
basically 41:11	bid 11:10	boring 70:21	49:2 57:15
basin 25:3	bidding 74:6	born 14:2	58:20 59:2,9
battle 22:14	big 16:1,10	bottom 15:3	63:18 68:16
73:19	18:18 48:20	33:8 37:6	71:19
battles 30:2	73:11	45:10,13	builders 67:10
40:3	bigger 48:21	bounces 53:7	building 24:6
battleships	biggest 43:20	boundaries	31:11 35:15,22
22:14	62:4	48:6,6,7,10	37:12 38:21
began 63:2	billets 71:22	bounds 72:19	39:22 40:2,15
beginning	bit 79:5	brakes 15:7	40:18,20 47:1
46:13	blockers 24:18	brave 22:4	49:4 54:1
behaves 51:10	bloody 54:11	break 25:4	61:18 62:22
53:1	bloomberg 2:3	brief 21:14,17	71:17,17
behavioral	3:3 4:2 5:19	47:22 48:1	building's 61:3
51:16,16 52:11	7:13,14,20 8:1	briefly 10:2	built 32:11,11
53:19	11:20 12:4	37:17	45:2 68:15

[bunch - code]

bunch 17:5	car 15:7,8 51:4	cdo 71:11,13	71:5
31:16,19 65:6	53:5,13	71:15	characterizing
bureaucracy	card 13:16	centcom 48:12	55:11
5:20 18:13	care 44:6	center 29:18	charles 23:16
bus 40:8,9	career 55:6	centralized	78:4
business 29:19	70:12 73:6	35:13,15,21	charts 73:5
29:21 42:4	careers 5:3	38:12,16	cheaper 74:7
65:22 74:6	69:8	centricity 24:8	check 13:18
78:1	case 13:19,20	century 18:8	chief 30:15
businesses	43:12 44:1	certificate 80:1	chiefs 11:3
76:11	45:8,9,22 46:4	81:1	choose 51:5,5
button 19:17	47:19 55:18,19	certify 80:4	chosen 43:3,11
buy 46:10 58:2	65:22 70:13	81:2	chunk 43:20,21
c	cases 40:10	chair 2:3 7:13	circumstances
c 2:1 3:1 4:1	42:5 43:3,11	76:4 77:20	54:14
c2 49:20,20	43:12 48:16	79:7	citizens 76:22
cabo 21:19	56:17,21	challenge 9:4	cjadc2 46:4,5,9
cac 13:16	cash 60:11,13	challenges	46:9,20
calendar 79:2	cat 54:12	25:18	clarkson 21:8
call 22:15	catalog 45:20	chance 21:6	classify 27:10
40:11 67:4,6	catch 56:10	change 13:3	clear 29:7,21
71:10	categories	16:10,20 17:14	34:2 39:10
called 18:9,13	26:12	17:15 18:6	50:16
22:13 40:22	categorized	22:9 29:3,6,6	clearance 13:6
calling 37:3	26:11	31:11 45:7	13:7
38:19	categorizing	67:5 70:4	cleared 10:9
camp 21:7	56:18	changed 42:17	clearly 50:4
candidates	cavalier 11:14	changer 14:16	close 12:17
69:21	cdao 25:12,14	changes 7:1	53:4
capabilities	27:14,20 28:3	16:1 22:10	closest 35:10
8:16 48:18	31:12 35:22	42:5,6 64:5	cloud 10:15
capability	38:6 61:14	changing 8:14	59:3
10:19 48:11	63:9,9 70:19	27:1 66:16	cno 57:10
capital 10:1	cdao's 35:14	73:14	cocoms 61:4,11
73:12	55:10	characterizati	61:16
captains 21:10	cdaos 25:15,16	58:16	code 21:20
21.10	27:17 36:4	characterize	22:3,17 28:8
T. Control of the Con	61:5	55:10 58:6	50:17 53:17

[coded - corps]

coded 71:2	commanders	complex 52:11	continuation
coding 70:21	46:22 47:2,6	53:16	64:13
colleagues	48:12	component	continue 32:10
29:15	commands	62:14	32:11
collect 29:22	21:7 27:18	components	continued 39:5
collecting	71:18	36:5,5 44:19	39:6
29:19	comment 65:14	44:19	continuing
combatant	commentary	concepts 68:10	65:1,9
25:16 27:18	64:11	concern 63:4,4	contract 59:20
46:21 47:2,6	comments 7:4	63:7	60:10 67:5
47:12 48:5,12	7:5,7,9 27:10	concerns 54:22	contracting
71:9,11,12,18	29:16 76:5,6	concluded	66:14
combined 46:5	commerce	79:12	contracts 10:18
come 11:21	64:17,20	concludes	26:17 27:2,4
12:6 16:13	commercial	75:19 78:18	32:20,21
41:1 44:16	11:10	confidence	contractual
66:6 69:13,14	committee 6:20	51:9 52:1,22	59:15
69:18 72:1	commoditized	53:8	contributes
73:2 78:11	40:4	confident 53:2	49:12
comes 17:10	commodity	53:22	control 30:13
25:21,21 63:10	40:1,2	conflict 58:13	46:6,7,11,13
comfortable	community	congress 54:11	46:15 47:15,16
23:7	13:22 55:15	57:17,17	49:21 50:3
coming 55:15	70:15,19	connect 61:16	controlling
61:15 62:3	companies	connections	30:1
78:14	30:3,11 39:7	66:4	convene 6:15
command 21:3	57:3 60:9 73:7	connects 27:9	conversation
25:16 46:6,7	74:5	consider 7:4	56:14
46:11,12,15	company 56:5	8:16,18,19	conversations
47:14,15 48:5	compete 41:2	considering	67:14 78:12
49:21 50:3	competency	77:6	coordinate
71:9,11,12	19:3	constitutes	78:5
commandant	competition	38:6	coordinated
19:13	10:20	consulting 65:9	78:10
commander	complain 5:2	consumers	coordination
21:3 47:12	completely	56:3	48:5
53:2 71:15	42:18	context 51:19	corps 20:22
		51:19 65:1	21:3,14,22

[corps - demand]

22:2	cross 48:5,10	29:12,19,20	dau 16:6 17:14
correct 46:11	cruise 51:5,6	30:3 33:8,9,10	18:1,22 19:1
could've 20:18	51:11 53:13	33:18,19,20	day 47:22
council 63:9,10	56:10,10	34:2,3,4,4,4,4	78:22
counsel 80:11	cruisers 22:14	34:6,7,7,7,10	days 13:19,20
80:14 81:7,10	culture 4:12,14	34:13,13,14,14	dcsa 13:1
count 37:20	16:19,19,20	34:19,21,22	deal 50:21
41:13	19:18 22:9	35:1,4,5,6,8,9	debt 32:12,18
counterintelli	curious 61:9	35:10,10,12,13	48:19 66:10,16
12:10 13:8	68:7	35:16,17,17,20	decide 35:4
country 4:7	current 40:3	36:1,6,8,10,11	50:17 55:16
79:6	76:8,21	36:12,15,18,19	decision 11:18
couple 68:18	curriculum	36:22 37:9,10	45:12 47:16
covered 76:20	68:4	37:11,11 39:13	53:2
covers 78:3	cusp 27:22	39:14,15,15	decisions 46:22
craig 2:16 3:9	customer 36:13	40:6,17,18	51:12
21:8 30:16,17	36:14,19	41:1,17,18	decisive 16:22
49:16 50:2	customers	42:2,18 43:5	deck 61:12
58:22 61:1	34:15,16 36:13	43:14,16,21	deeply 29:10
72:18 74:9,12	cut 61:3	44:7,15,18,20	default 60:22
75:22	cycle 43:22	45:1,2,2,11,14	69:12
craig's 67:17	d	45:15,17,19	defense 1:1 6:4
68:7	d 4:1	46:21 47:1,4,9	6:7,11,12 7:9
create 26:22	d.c. 1:14	47:11,11,14	12:10,18 33:11
27:21 29:3	dashboard	48:8 49:3,4	43:10 78:13,19
69:20 73:21	35:18 44:1,3	59:12,17,22	78:21
74:5	72:21	60:5,5,14 62:7	definitely
created 73:19	dashboards	62:15,16,17	24:14 43:8
creating 8:13	37:13 44:4	63:1 64:15	definition
29:6 50:15	data 10:21,22	65:18,20 66:1	39:10
creative 26:16	13:3 24:6,7,7	67:2,10 68:10	deliver 49:1,10
creators 9:14	24:10,20,21,22	68:16,17 69:21	49:11
crisis 15:12	24:22 25:15	70:15,16,17	delivered 31:17
crist 17:9	26:2,17,18,19	71:1,10,16,17	31:20
criteria 56:7	27:2,4,6,8,10	72:20 76:19	delivering
critical 13:3	27:11 28:5,9	77:1	34:15 64:2
25:13	28:17,20,22	dataflow 46:20	demand 56:15
	, ,		56:19 57:11,19

62:5,7,10,11	describe 10:2	81:3	dmags 47:5
72:3	description	dilatants 11:15	dod 10:10 24:7
demanding	39:15	dinner 4:14	25:6,14 26:17
71:21	designated 6:6	direct 10:13	27:15 54:2
demands 57:9	desk 33:14 44:2	direction 49:8	64:15
denominator	44:3,4	directly 60:9	doing 4:8 5:4
43:18	desperate 12:5	director 2:12	12:21 18:1
department	develop 8:21	6:6 12:9	21:12 22:20
8:8 10:10	developed	discipline 4:21	24:18 49:12
12:18 24:8,11	50:12	5:13	59:17 65:5
24:12 25:1,7	developing	discover 33:15	66:9 70:20
27:9 29:1,4,8	51:22	discoverability	dollars 42:9
29:11 32:3	device 37:5,5,6	35:14,15	73:8
33:10 34:19	53:20	discoverable	domain 46:6
36:6,11 37:19	devices 47:8	33:9	domains 9:21
39:1 43:10	devoted 4:7	discovery 65:6	50:5
44:5 48:17	dib 1:5 2:12	discretionary	door 70:1 72:2
56:17,20 58:2	76:10 77:3	6:18	dove 44:14,15
59:4 71:4	diego 20:9,13	discussed	dr 1:5 2:4,9,11
77:12 78:13	difference 5:1	60:15	2:12,14,16 3:4
department's	9:7 22:20 66:8	discussion	3:6,9,11,12,14
30:15	different 4:9	64:21 65:12	5:18 6:1,5
departments	8:17,18 30:10	67:13	11:22 12:22
28:5 31:5 36:5	32:22 34:8,22	discussions	23:9,11,13
63:10	34:22 41:19,21	4:13 64:11	30:18 49:18
depend 71:20	42:1 50:14	distilled 59:14	50:22 54:18
deploy 41:19	52:13 60:8	distinct 13:1	58:22 60:17,18
deployed 41:16	65:5	distributed	60:20 61:1,20
42:1	differentiate	33:11,12,12	62:16 65:13
deploying	34:6	35:10	66:13 67:18,21
41:21	differently	distributing	68:14 72:11
deployment	46:18,18 51:3	29:20	73:2 75:3,5,16
66:8	difficult 33:16	distribution	75:21 79:7
deputy 44:2,6,9	41:7 59:22	30:1 42:16	drive 15:12
44:21 45:3	61:19	diverse 69:21	38:2 42:20
58:10 62:20	digit 74:1	diversity 69:21	43:3,22 53:5
deputy's 44:2	digital 28:4	diving 60:21	62:22 70:17
	30:15 80:8		71:3

[driven - expected]

driven 10:19	76:21 77:1	en 53:17	especially 8:7
44:7 55:19	ecosystem 9:14	enable 28:14	essential 25:13
62:7,16,17	18:21	encourage 26:8	essentially 31:3
67:13 70:17	education	29:9 32:16	58:17 64:14
drives 45:10	69:14 70:5	endless 54:8	establish 10:13
49:7	effective 11:8	endorses 18:10	evaluate 42:10
driving 29:6	46:19 57:14	ends 41:15	evaluating
35:8 51:4	63:8	energy 58:19	52:11
62:16	efficiency 11:8	60:21	event 6:13
drove 34:1	efficient 29:13	engaged 10:11	eventually
44:11	74:8	17:1 66:5	22:16 66:10
drucker 16:15	efficiently 9:19	77:14	everybody 30:6
16:15,18	effort 19:1 20:8	engagements	50:4 64:4 66:4
drug 65:6	20:10 37:18,22	24:12	75:19 79:1,10
drugs 73:21	44:12 78:5	engineer 28:19	evidence 20:21
duly 80:5	eighteen 69:4,6	engineering	29:7
dunford 16:21	element 13:18	71:1,1	exactly 7:20
16:22	15:2	engineers	53:18 54:3
dv 47:22	elements 9:13	70:16	58:5
e	13:5	engines 24:11	example 35:19
e 2:1,1 3:1 4:1	eliminate 11:8	ensure 30:8	40:7 45:18
4:1	embedded	68:19,20 70:13	51:3 55:20
earlier 64:12	44:14 71:8	72:5,6	69:10
76:5	embrace 14:13	enterprise 11:6	excellent 51:21
early 36:21	14:19 28:22	26:21	excess 73:7
77:14	68:10	entire 14:22	excited 55:4,6
easier 5:9 9:12	emphasizes	68:3 78:21	58:4
41:7 62:10	17:16	entities 11:7	exciting 15:16
easy 11:14 20:1	employed 19:6	entry 76:10	22:7 58:21
40:16	80:11,14 81:8	envelope 51:15	excuses 22:22
echelon 27:11	81:11	51:16	executive 1:5
echo 42:18	employee 80:13 81:10	environment 22:8	2:12 6:6 45:11
echoing 33:4	employees 12:6	equally 60:3	expect 19:15 54:6
economy 24:7	employees 12.0 empower 28:4	equipped 16:13	expectation
24:7 25:15	28:10	equipped 10.13 equivalent 60:6	21:5
59:12,12 60:3	empowered	es 80:4	expected 21:22
66:16,20 72:20	25:14 27:15	6 5 00.T	expected 21.22

[expecting - four]

expecting	factory 22:1	financially	fly 22:3
21:19	fairness 11:16	59:19 80:15	focus 28:22
expedite 13:22	famous 61:4	81:11	59:8 64:5,12
expensive	fantastic 17:7	find 26:21	64:17 76:18
73:13	far 39:4,8	35:21	78:7
experience 4:9	fascinating	fine 40:11,12	focused 9:1
12:19 69:18	22:17 37:15	41:20	focuses 64:4
experienced	faster 9:12	finest 4:3	focusing 47:19
19:19	15:9,11 29:13	finishes 17:21	folks 20:15,16
experiment	74:7	first 6:16 7:17	20:18 56:11
18:18	fault 53:12	7:19 8:6 10:3	following 31:4
expert 6:12	fear 64:7	24:2 28:15	59:2
expertise 40:13	february 55:13	31:5 33:9 37:9	force 28:4
65:10	56:19 58:5	43:12 44:1	35:16
experts 8:7 9:8	73:1	45:8 47:19	forcing 11:3
24:15 28:5	federal 6:6,19	56:16 61:21	foregoing 80:3
explain 54:15	6:22 7:2 14:22	68:16 70:20	80:4 81:4
explainability	feedback 52:19	72:17 74:19	forget 62:19
52:5,7	76:7	78:3	form 42:22
explode 52:17	feel 7:15	fish 45:16	formulated
explore 19:1	feels 53:2 72:19	fits 72:21	19:2
extension	feet 58:9	five 15:16,18	forth 53:7
47:10	field 9:15 21:12	15:20 56:1,8	forward 15:3
extremely 31:9	22:3	56:11,12 57:19	32:16,20 34:1
33:15,21 64:21	fighter 39:16	fix 37:5	42:11,20 43:3
eye 66:3	39:18 40:14	fixed 14:3	52:3 54:1 64:6
\mathbf{f}	46:4,12,16	flags 22:16	78:2
fabric 34:4	49:11	fleet 20:11,12	foster 19:10
fabrics 34:7	fights 63:15	flew 12:15	found 44:18,20
face 50:20	figure 20:14	flip 44:12	45:1
52:17	33:19 44:13	florida 17:4,5	founders 73:10
facebook 14:17	68:20	flow 47:9 48:14	73:18
facilities 13:7	figured 20:18	60:13	four 13:1,5
facing 63:11	figuring 24:9	flowed 48:8	14:6 25:11
fact 17:16 31:1	fill 30:17 72:2	flows 45:2	56:1,7,13
74:4	finally 28:21	60:11	57:11,19 58:3
/ 1. T	33:20 38:4	flush 18:16	58:3

[frameworks - grunt]

frameworks	71:5	33:18 37:21	72:12 74:1
68:13	gatekeeper	47:1,6 58:14	goodwill 63:6
frank 2:13 3:7	58:1	61:21 66:13	google 14:17
12:12 16:2	gather 36:19	69:10 70:4,11	39:5 43:8 57:1
74:11	41:18 42:2	75:18	gordon 2:5 3:5
fray 7:22	56:16	goal 9:16	7:19,22 8:3
freedom 18:17	gathering	goes 52:20	12:3 75:1
friday 1:8	36:22 41:17	62:18	gotten 32:5,5
friend 14:15	general 2:13	going 5:15,17	58:19
friendly 9:19	3:7 12:13	7:21 14:12,13	governance
fruit 43:21	16:22 17:6	15:2,20,21,22	63:8
frustrations	19:13 21:2	17:17 23:4	government
48:4	28:7 69:11	24:20,21,22	6:20 13:21
fudge 5:11	generate 62:5	26:7,9,9 30:2	14:22 15:5
fully 66:5	generating	32:15,15,16,18	20:10,15,18
functional	67:2	32:19,20,20	38:14 41:7
70:14,19	generation	33:4 35:21	69:2
functioning	62:10	39:2,17,22	governor 17:5
18:13	generative 40:3	40:4,14 42:11	17:8
fund 57:19	54:19 55:17	43:4,6,9,13,16	grain 40:11
funding 73:15	getting 10:17	43:21 46:10	grained 40:12
fungible 34:21	21:4 46:21	47:3,8,9,12	grant 10:8
34:21	gilda 2:4 3:14	49:6,7,19 50:4	grassroots
further 62:18	23:10 67:15	50:8,20 51:11	18:17
77:14 80:13	75:2	52:3,5,12 54:9	
81:9	give 11:15	54:16 56:5,18	20:21,22 21:11
future 14:12	18:17 19:14	58:2 61:12	24:16 25:3
41:13	28:10 43:5	63:19 64:6,6	28:11 30:7
futuristic 4:11	51:3 60:4	64:19 65:5	32:15 51:1
fy25 26:15	69:16,17 74:18	66:2,10,17	57:10 73:17,19
g	given 60:21	67:16 68:6	77:7
g 4:1	65:10,11	69:4,15,22	green 45:6
gallina 81:2,15	giving 64:3	70:11 72:9,15	ground 62:2
game 14:16	glad 7:14 33:4	74:5 76:10	grouped 76:6,7
22:13	go 5:21 7:17,19	78:2,4,9	groups 4:18
gap 55:9,10,11	13:17,20 15:9	good 15:22	grunt 21:20
57:16 58:6	15:10 26:10	20:17 30:13	28:8
	29:14 32:16	64:11,21 65:12	

[grunts - inconsistencies]

4 22.2	41.0.40.10	1. (0.1	• 1 (2.14
grunts 22:2	41:8 42:12	hire 69:1	ignored 63:14
guess 74:9	48:7 53:18	historically	ignoring 61:4,4
guest 2:13,14	66:19	61:6	imagine 69:20
2:16 11:22	hardest 69:16	history 46:14	immediate 38:9
29:14	harvard 18:4	hit 53:12 65:6	48:17 49:10,11
guidance 52:18	hat 36:13	hoffman 2:6	63:20
52:18	hbcus 69:10	3:13 23:21,22	immediately
guns 52:16,16	hear 10:22	64:10 75:10,11	9:17 38:10
guy 21:8,16	30:15 38:13	hole 11:2	impact 9:18
h	heartening 9:6	honest 47:3	77:5
habit 66:13	hearts 61:17	hope 49:14	imperatives
haircut 20:17	heidi 78:20	63:21 72:9	9:13
half 31:6 37:17	help 4:6 11:19	hopefully 4:6	implement
45:7	22:10 27:5	5:15 74:6	17:19 77:18
	29:12 38:13,15	78:13 79:5	implemented
hallucinates 54.0	38:15 63:14	house 20:22	9:17 77:9
54:8	68:4 69:7	how's 72:15	important
hallucination	helper 48:20,21	huge 25:22	20:12 26:5
54:20 55:1	helping 17:8	26:1	27:19 31:9
hand 42:13	48:22 58:20	human 5:5,5	33:22 60:18
66:18,18	60:22 63:15,20	10:1 15:2	64:16
hang 21:15	helps 19:10,10	46:13	impressed 33:5
hanging 43:20	64:5	hundred 38:20	improve 9:18
happen 10:5	hereto 80:15	40:19 42:19	inability 48:5
18:19 54:16	81:11	54:5,7	incent 5:13
happened	hey 18:5 61:1	hundreds 42:8	incentives 27:4
46:13 53:19	68:14	hype 55:8 56:6	27:6
62:6 73:8	hi 30:21	i	incentivize
happening	hicks 62:1,16	_	27:8
24:17 25:1,2,3	78:20	ic 13:18	incidentally
48:13,13 50:17	hierarchical	idea 34:17	23:6
happens 46:16	18:14	36:10 43:18	incites 24:15
happy 47:21	hierarchy	72:21,22	include 26:15
48:1	18:11 19:9	ideas 28:12	27:4
hard 31:15,15	31:18,21 33:3	30:13	included 30:9
32:7 35:8	· ·	identify 8:10	includes 78:17
36:17 37:14	33:7 37:2,4	9:16 24:18	inconsistencies
38:2 40:6 41:6	highly 21:15		
			25:19

[incorrectly - kathleen]

incorrectly	inner 26:18	institute 45:14	issues 22:21
34:20	59:10	integration	29:18 50:20
increase 68:6	innovating	47:2,4	item 78:1
incurring	14:8 73:11	intel 13:21	ivana 62:19,21
48:19	78:3	21:19	j
incurs 66:9	innovation 1:1	intelligence	jaic 38:5,7
independent	4:10 6:4,7,13	30:16 73:4,12	january 1:8
6:18	7:10 8:5,12,15	intentions	6:22
individual	9:22 11:18,19	60:19	jean 1:17 80:2
32:10	13:14 16:11	interacting	80:17
indopacom	18:16,20,21	56:12	job 1:18 4:8
32:14 47:20	19:2,3,7,11,16	interest 67:16	17:4 18:18
48:3,13	21:4 22:19	68:6	27:20 29:12
industrial 13:6	25:1 65:2,16	interested	30:7 54:13
25:6 27:5	73:4,14,17	80:15 81:12	62:4,8,10
39:22 65:9	74:8 76:16	internal 12:8	63:13 70:15
66:3	78:21	internally 27:7	71:1,1,14
industry 11:1	innovation's	31:4	jobs 4:20 27:18
19:22 20:10,15	22:21	international	54:6 70:21
24:13 25:5	innovation.d	20:6	joe 16:21
27:3 40:20	7:11	internet 14:16	john 18:2,3
41:8 55:14	innovative	59:2	joined 79:10
56:3,4,22	28:10,11	interpret 51:13	joining 4:2 6:4
57:18 58:8,19	innovators	investigations	12:11
59:16 60:4	28:6	14:21	joint 46:6
65:1,17 69:3,3	input 52:8	investigative	joke 50:19
69:15,18,22	inquiries 76:7	14:2	jpme 70:4,5
inferences	77:4	investment	jump 7:17
42:16	inside 8:8	64:19	jumped 16:16
inform 78:1	25:10,10 51:11	investor 73:6	58:8 75:14
information	52:13	invited 7:3	justified 51:9
10:1	insider 13:8	55:14	52:1,22 53:8
infrastructure	insight 8:9	involved 19:1	jutland 22:14
37:12 59:9	insights 78:14	73:10	k
64:13 73:13	insignificant	ip 10:21 39:13	
infusing 68:3	50:1	65:20,21 67:2	kathleen 62:1
ingredients	install 9:3	issue 13:12	78:20
17:2		46:20 50:1	

[keep - look]

keep 15:16	52:19 53:18	leader 25:15	lieutenants
50:13 53:7	54:20 56:5,11	29:11 70:11	21:10
54:13 65:14	57:7,8,8 60:14	leaders 12:18	life 16:16
66:3	60:15 61:2,3,5	46:16 73:18	light 25:22
keeping 4:7	61:17,18 64:18	leadership 10:3	27:12
keeps 18:12,12	65:2,11 67:12	17:1 18:18	lights 18:12
63:22 64:1	69:2 70:9 72:5	20:22 21:8	likely 50:11
kelley 2:13 3:7	72:18 77:5,7	22:9 49:7 59:5	51:18,19
12:12 16:4	knowing 35:20	59:6 62:2	likes 38:13
28:7	69:3	71:20,21	line 15:3 36:16
kept 59:6,6	knowledge	leading 17:15	54:6
key 24:18,19	80:10 81:6	18:6 76:16	linkedin 39:4
44:5,21,22	knows 28:8	leads 14:11	list 2:2
46:6	37:20 38:22	leaning 15:3	listen 61:7
kid 21:17	50:19 70:6	leap 7:22	literacy 28:9
kind 4:15 15:6	73:3	leaps 72:18	literally 12:7
16:16 24:11,21	kotter 17:15	learn 36:6	33:13
25:2,14 26:11	18:1,2,3	learned 30:11	literate 69:21
26:12,20 27:9	1	69:5 73:16	little 5:9 67:20
28:13,22 29:2		leasing 65:4	79:5
50:19 59:8	labeled 39:13	leave 39:14	live 6:8
64:3 65:2	labeling 39:14	48:11,18	lives 4:7
67:12 73:21	40:6,16	led 18:19	livingston 2:14
knew 7:20	lake 34:4	left 39:21 40:5	3:6 12:1,22
21:20	lakes 34:6	41:4	22:6
knocking 69:19	lane 53:6	level 14:8	lloyd 78:19
69:22	lanes 53:8	18:17 25:15	location 34:12
knot 57:5	language 55:3 56:3 59:15,20	27:15,17 41:11	lock 35:1,2
know 4:3 8:13	large 65:4	55:22,22,22	logic 28:19
15:21 16:18	largest 48:4	56:1,1,7,7,7,11	long 49:12,13
18:13,19 19:1	lastly 13:10	56:12,12 57:11	52:20 63:5,18
19:7 20:1,8	layer 37:2 47:2	57:12,13,18,19	63:19 66:12
22:6,7,9 33:17	47:4,8 49:3,5	57:19 58:2,3	longer 42:10
35:11 36:8,8	layers 37:8	levels 25:8	71:7
37:4 38:12	lays 27:14	47:17 56:21	look 8:21 25:20
40:14 43:18	lead 17:17	leverage 26:22	37:11 41:14
44:10 48:9,12	11.11	63:11 64:15	42:15 46:8
48:13,20 49:22			50:15,16 51:10

[look - mentality]

52:5 53:16,19	made 37:22	marine 16:8	mayor 30:19
55:3 57:4	47:16 72:18	20:21 21:3,14	33:6 38:21
64:10	78:7	21:22 22:2	mctssa 21:7
looked 9:21	magically 43:5	mark 2:14 3:6	mean 14:4
31:15,15	magnitude	11:22 12:11,20	19:22 33:8
looking 13:8	65:3	74:11 76:1	34:3,11 41:11
43:15,19 50:9	maintain 64:6	market 67:8,9	43:7 54:7,12
looks 41:9 74:1	major 48:22	marketplace	55:11 58:10
loop 52:4 53:4	57:3	58:18	72:4
loop's 52:19	make 5:14 6:16	markets 67:8	meaningful 9:7
loose 77:17	10:5 12:6 14:1	marquee 43:3	29:3
loosely 24:21	15:22 19:6	43:11,12 45:9	means 26:4
24:22	23:6 27:17	48:16	39:16 41:12
lose 59:12 60:2	32:21 36:1,7	marriage 22:8	42:13
73:18	40:15 45:19	martell 2:16	measure 44:10
lot 12:18 15:1	49:9 56:4	3:9 30:16,18	63:2
30:2,10,11	59:21 68:8,12	49:18 50:22	media 6:11
32:5 59:1,1,7	70:10 77:8,13	54:18 60:17,20	meeker 2:17
61:11 72:14	making 27:15	61:20 65:13	3:15 23:18
74:3,3,8 78:12	42:17 45:12	68:14 72:11	72:17 73:3
lots 15:15	51:12 53:2	73:2 75:21	75:7 76:1
22:22 50:5,5,5	60:9 64:20	mary 2:17 3:15	meet 17:4
louder 67:20	manage 69:5	23:17 72:8	meeting 1:2 6:5
love 58:15	manageable	75:6	6:8,10,21 7:6,6
72:21,22	14:8	maryland	17:8 45:3
low 43:20	management	80:19	78:16,18 79:3
lower 8:11	68:16,17	masse 53:17	79:10,12
13:15 31:21	manager 70:15	massive 45:6	meeting's 7:1
76:10	70:20	47:20 69:3	meetings 37:21
lowering 8:5	managers 4:19	matter 30:12	37:21
m	45:18	65:19	member 2:4,5
ma'am 17:18	managing	matters 21:1	2:6,7,9,10,11
mac 2:11 3:12	70:10	40:17	2:17 78:15
23:8 75:14	marching 31:3	maturity 55:22	members 6:9
machine 28:18	marina 1:5	56:2 57:4,15	7:4 79:9
33:14	2:12 3:4 6:5	58:20 59:13	memos 63:13
	16:4 18:22	maximize	mentality 35:9
		10:20	53:14

[mention - new]

mention 31:22	mine 14:15	money 29:22	ndaa 26:15
mentioned	minutes 45:22	60:9,18	ndia 20:2
76:5	misfire 52:16	monitoring	near 78:15
mesh 34:2,3,4,8	missile 52:18	41:9 42:13	necessarily
35:9 45:15	missing 71:6	months 65:3	39:16 52:12
47:11 67:3	mission 8:14	69:4,7 78:14	need 4:20 8:20
68:11	10:18 64:15	monumental	10:7,13,18
messages 12:8	71:15	71:3	11:1,6,8 14:9
met 16:15	missions 13:2	morning 15:14	14:18 15:3,10
54:21 72:18	mistake 38:11	morse 22:17	15:11,11 17:2
metaphorically	38:12 65:18	mos 21:18	18:7 19:14,16
43:15,17	ml 14:14	move 5:11 32:2	19:21 32:20,21
metric 35:4	model 14:2	48:9 54:1	37:8,9,10
metrics 37:3,14	17:15 18:1,11	57:20	45:10 47:1
37:18 38:1,1	18:15,22 19:3	mtm 14:13	51:2 65:19
39:11 42:21	19:5 29:21	mullen 2:7 3:10	69:6 70:9,17
44:5,12,21,22	39:21,22 40:2	17:6 23:19,20	71:16
45:5 77:5	40:5,18 41:3,4	46:11 49:17,20	needs 14:3
michael 2:3,7	41:5,8 42:6,9	57:7 75:9	31:18 33:3,7
3:3,10	42:11,13,15,15	78:10	37:3,4 47:12
microsoft 39:5	55:17,22 56:2	multiple 41:1	59:14
57:2	57:4,16 58:20	murder 54:11	neither 80:11
microsoft's	59:14	muscle 71:19	81:7
12:2 57:2	modelo 40:2	n	network 18:15
mid 18:6	models 41:2	n 2:1 3:1,1 4:1	19:9
mike 8:3 23:19	42:9 59:13	name 6:5 34:11	networking
24:5 49:17,20	65:4	names 23:5	64:19
75:8 78:10	moderated 1:5	nancy 76:9,11	never 11:20
military 4:4 5:1	modern 46:17	natali 17:7	16:15 19:18
5:6,10 50:13	moment 38:2	nation's 13:2	26:2,2 52:5
51:7,20 59:3	momentum	national 13:1	54:9 73:6,8,8
70:5 72:16	59:1,6 64:2	20:3	new 4:11 8:15
miller 19:13	monetize 67:3	natives 28:4	11:11 13:17,17
millions 42:9	monetized	natural 55:3	19:21 22:4
51:12	60:14	navy 16:7	40:3 66:11
mind 11:20	monetizing	35:17	70:15,16 73:21
mindful 9:12	60:5		74:6,6,6 76:18
			78:2

[newspapers - people]

newspapers	okay 5:21	orlando 17:4	parallels 64:20
29:18	44:15 78:17	osd 38:13	part 22:7 31:14
night 4:14 64:1	old 52:15 60:12	outcome 8:14	38:5 41:3
64:1	60:12	9:8 10:19 38:1	67:13 68:1
nightmare 50:8	olin 68:2	44:12 80:16	78:16
non 49:2	once 15:5	81:12	participate
nontraditional	47:15 71:2	outpaced 25:7	10:6,12
11:9	ones 35:11	output 52:9	particular 32:1
normally 60:11	open 29:15	outside 8:8	32:14 38:17
notary 80:18	67:7	50:12	41:3 55:18
note 66:9	operability	overcome 61:8	particularly
notes 78:8	26:18 59:10	overloaded	54:20
notice 6:22 7:2	operate 10:15	70:6	parties 80:12
notion 34:1	operated 6:19	overwhelming	80:14 81:8,11
ntsa 20:2	10:19	49:15	partners 76:16
number 12:7	operators 9:15	own 40:16	78:4
25:7 37:20	opinion 54:21	62:15 65:21,21	partnership
45:22 50:14	opportunities	67:1	12:17
60:20 69:1	27:2	owned 32:1	parts 31:21
0	opportunity	owner 59:21	53:5,6
o 3:1 4:1	8:4 14:20	owners 35:11	past 14:5 41:13
o3 70:9	19:15 25:9,9	35:11 36:1	pathological
o4 70:9	25:22 26:1	ownership 45:2	32:6
object 40:12	optimize 76:15	owning 39:12	pathologies
objective 56:6	order 26:4	66:22	36:21
obviously	28:20 41:13	owns 33:17	pattern 53:20
64:18	65:3	59:16	patterns 52:12
occurs 50:7	orders 31:3	p	pause 46:1
ocean 43:14	organization	p 2:1,1 4:1	49:14
offered 56:14	25:13 31:10	pace 65:11,15	pay 61:10 67:4
offerings 56:5	38:16 43:8,9	pacing 64:3	69:13 71:12
officer 1:6 6:6	organizations	pacom 64:4	paying 66:15
21:19 30:16	4:17 19:6	page 3:2 22:12	peg 11:3
	50.14	Puge 8:2 22:12	nondistan 01.7
80:2	50:14	palantir's	pendleton 21:7
80:2 officers 5:12	organizing	palantir's 48:20	pentagon 1:12
	organizing 78:22	palantir's	pentagon 1:12 30:12
officers 5:12	organizing	palantir's 48:20	pentagon 1:12

12:5 13:20	ph 71:22	68:7,9	principles
15:7,8 16:19	phase 27:5	pointed 35:7	45:15 47:11
17:11 18:17	phd 55:3	50:11	52:6
19:15,16 21:5	phillips 78:4	polemical 37:5	prior 62:6 80:5
26:12 27:13	phone 18:3	policies 8:22	prioritize
28:2 35:5	phrase 47:4	policy 63:12	26:17
36:17,18,18,21	pick 41:2 52:15	positioned	private 5:1,7,8
37:20 50:8,14	picking 18:3	25:16	5:11 9:14 30:9
54:4,11 63:14	piece 17:22	possible 40:16	30:10 38:22,22
66:6 68:8,9	pipe 70:1	possibly 50:13	39:17 50:12
69:4 72:1	piped 31:22	posted 6:22 7:2	72:15
78:12	49:2 66:2	7:9	prize 73:11
percent 14:22	pipeline 69:20	potential 29:5	probably 61:2
37:18 38:20	71:17	practiced 51:6	65:7
40:19 42:19	pipelines 78:9	practices 30:9	problem 15:5
43:16,16,19	piping 32:4	74:7 77:19	39:11 41:3
54:5,7 59:22	pitch 15:14	praise 36:17	problems
percentage	place 20:2	predict 41:13	38:17 63:11,15
60:10	77:18	predictable	63:20 69:17
perfect 4:5	places 20:2	60:13	procedural
perform 13:1	planet 69:17	prepared 4:4	6:16
periodically	platform 59:16	68:10,12 81:3	procedure 77:3
52:16,16,17	59:21 60:6	preparing 16:9	procedures
person 12:12	platforms	62:2	8:21 9:10
17:7 23:5	26:19 28:15,20	present 44:4	proceeding
33:18 52:3	play 39:9	56:18	81:4
personnel	players 48:22	presented 49:5	proceedings
12:10 13:6	playing 4:15	president	80:3,5,6,9 81:6
perspective	please 43:5	13:13 16:6	process 11:11
22:5 28:2,14	73:2	press 46:8	26:12,14
66:20 68:8	plug 47:8	pressed 19:17	processes 9:11
73:15	plus 24:12	pressure 64:3	9:11 11:2,19
perspectives	65:20	pretty 21:16	processing
8:9	pme 70:12	42:17 53:21	55:3
pervasive	point 14:1,6,11	61:3 69:22	produces 69:3
67:19,21	17:18 20:14	previous 76:8	producing
peter 16:15	36:13 38:8,17	78:6	38:17 39:20
63:6	40:1 48:11		

[product - record]

product 10:14	purpose 24:9	rapidly 73:14	47:10 49:22
28:22 34:14	push 36:17	rather 74:2	50:17 52:15,21
35:9 36:10,12	37:22 63:12,12	rational 56:13	53:17,19 55:18
37:8 45:18	pushed 37:13	58:18	56:10 57:18
46:9	45:13 47:16	rationalize	58:4 59:9
productive	put 9:12 16:17	57:16	61:17,18 62:11
78:22	36:1,7,13	read 23:5 26:8	63:7,14 64:4
professional	58:19 67:2	29:9,17 63:4	66:19 70:8
70:5	73:12 79:2	76:12	72:20
professionals	putting 15:7	readable 28:18	reason 38:11
8:8	59:6	readers 76:22	58:5
proficient	q	readiness	rebuild 32:3
15:11	qualified 80:7	16:11 19:5,13	received 7:5
progress 72:19	quality 33:8,8	19:14 35:19	76:6
progression	37:9 42:18	reading 7:16	recently 14:15
5:10	43:5 44:10	22:12	20:4
promises 55:8	65:17,19	ready 13:20	reciprocity
promote 19:2	question 7:8	16:1 19:7	10:13 13:12
19:10,11 36:17	11:21 49:17	65:20 66:1	recognizable
properly 27:16	51:1 55:16	reagan 13:13	9:18
proposal 11:2	61:22 64:14	real 9:18 22:19	recognize
protect 13:2	66:14 68:15	30:4 37:22	32:11,18,19,21
prove 11:9	72:5 77:7	38:21 63:6	recommend
provide 13:10	questions 46:2	realizes 62:14	18:2 72:9
78:13	56:10	really 4:12,14	74:16 76:11,21
providing 6:12	quick 13:12	4:18 8:6 9:1	recommenda
psas 44:14 45:4	43:1 65:13	20:14,22 21:1	59:11 60:2
public 1:2 6:5,9 6:15 7:3,5 76:5	quickly 9:19	24:7,12,16,19 25:7,10,14,16	68:12 78:7 recommenda
78:1,16,18	61:2	27:1,5,9 28:21	9:17 10:2 24:4
79:3 80:18	quite 16:12	29:3,10,18	26:8,11,15,16
publish 36:7	41:21	31:12 32:7	27:14 29:2
77:14,16	r	33:5 35:8	76:19 77:6,19
published	r 2:1 4:1	36:17 37:4,6	recommending
76:12 77:1,13	radio 22:17	37:13,15 38:2	77:9
purchase 11:6	rail 14:18	38:7 40:6 41:6	record 80:9
purported 58:2	raising 19:19	42:4,5,12	81:5
F F		45:10 47:3,5,5	

[recorded - san]

recorded 6:9	remember 17:3	resist 61:11	46:14,21,22
80:6	17:6	resourced	47:11,17 52:2
recording 80:8	remind 79:1	27:16	53:22 55:5
81:4	reminded	resources 4:20	62:2 63:1,16
recovering	16:14	respect 48:7	63:18,19 64:20
16:6	reminder 7:7	55:5	65:18 67:10,12
recruit 69:12	repair 60:12	respected 5:5	68:2 72:14
red 45:6	repairing	response 20:9	rights 26:18
reduced 80:7	60:11	58:18	risks 15:4
reengineer	repeat 49:16	responsibilities	road 33:1
28:19	repeatability	4:18	robust 57:3
reform 10:7	11:16	responsibility	65:12
refreshing	replacing	10:4 48:6,15	robustly 32:22
24:16	60:10	53:11,12 55:10	role 29:10
regardless	replicator 20:9	responsible	35:14 39:20
65:16 67:22	20:20	52:6	rolling 72:22
register 6:22	report 26:8	responsibly	room 1:13
7:2	27:14 29:10,16	68:5	roper 2:9 3:11
reid 2:6 3:13	30:10 31:1,2,3	retain 18:11	23:13 58:22
23:21 30:20	33:4 35:7	retire 69:2	60:18 75:5
39:3 64:8	42:19 49:6	retired 12:13	roper's 66:13
65:13 73:20,22	72:12	16:8,8	round 11:3
74:9 75:10	reported 1:17	retrain 42:14	rules 22:13
reinforces 5:5	reports 7:16	reverse 28:19	running 21:8
related 80:11	44:8	review 7:6 45:5	runway 63:5
81:7	representatives	76:22	rushing 46:1
relations 5:6	77:11	reward 5:9	ryan 2:10 3:8
relative 80:13	require 11:11	36:18 60:4	23:14 24:3
81:10	11:12 67:6	right 7:17	54:15 72:9,20
relevant 10:5	required 59:9	13:18 18:5	74:13
30:8	requirement	21:3 25:8,17	S
remarkable	11:9 26:16	26:5 32:7,9,13	s 1:17 2:1 3:1
39:7 62:3	requirements	33:14 34:4	4:1 80:2,17
remarkably	28:16 50:6	35:18 38:14	safe 4:8 28:10
66:5	requires 8:14	39:21 41:5,10	sail 22:15
remarks 6:17	research 57:20	41:13,20 42:8	san 20:9,12
7:13	resell 67:1	42:13,20 45:1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		45:9,9,21 46:4	

[satya - slightly]

		I	
satya 58:11	sector 5:1,7,8	sent 12:7	side 18:14,15
saw 31:16,19	5:12 9:14 30:9	separated	19:9,10 20:22
36:21	30:10 38:22,22	29:20	26:14 27:13
saying 38:14	39:17 50:12	sergeants	34:7 42:14
40:8 52:21	72:15	21:10,11	sides 19:9
64:12 66:9	secure 54:6,7,8	service 10:14	sight 59:12
70:22	secured 50:10	12:14 23:1	60:3
says 34:11 37:7	securely 26:20	25:15 27:17	signal 56:15,19
58:15	security 9:22	40:6 61:14	62:5,7,11,12
scaffolding	10:7 11:16	services 44:17	72:3
38:19 41:4	12:10,11 13:1	44:20 50:5	signaling 22:16
42:22 68:11	13:6,7,10	61:10	signature
scalable 38:18	15:17 50:8,20	session 6:16	80:16 81:14
scale 26:2	54:5	7:8	significant 7:1
28:12 41:12	see 19:12 21:22	set 24:6,9 41:11	significantly
65:4	24:16 26:6	60:8	39:18 42:17
scenario 41:18	27:2 29:5 30:2	seven 9:21	46:17,18 62:9
41:21 42:1	35:8 37:11	13:19	silicon 69:11
schema 36:7	39:20 42:16	seventy 15:19	silos 25:2,4
school 17:15	44:22 45:1	shannon 81:2	similar 41:16
40:8,9	46:20 55:2	81:15	simply 13:18
science 55:4	57:20 61:9	share 27:11,11	simulation
sciences 55:7	65:2 73:22	shared 8:10	20:3
scientists 70:16	79:4	26:20	single 11:7
scifs 10:9	seeding 71:19	sharing 10:21	74:1
screaming	seeing 50:9	27:8	sir 6:2 12:22
54:11	seems 61:7	shift 51:2	53:15 57:11
second 10:7	seen 20:21 26:3	shifting 76:4	62:13,22
14:1 25:5 27:1	30:20 73:6,8	ship 42:9	situation 41:16
31:22 46:1,3	73:14	shoot 4:16,16	41:17
51:12 75:20	selling 67:8,9	shooting 31:13	six 17:20
78:6	senate 54:10	short 31:8,10	size 43:8,9
secretary 44:5	send 78:8	71:8	skills 80:10
44:6,9,22 45:4	senior 12:18	show 21:9	81:6
58:11 62:20	sense 48:19	39:10,12 62:9	slight 38:11
78:19,20,20	sensors 46:21	shows 25:8	slightly 41:19
secretary's	51:13	shyu 78:21	51:2
44:3,3			

[small - super]

ama all (5.2.7		~4~4!~4! ~~11	~4 J 0.4 0.1
small 65:3,7	specialty 61:5	statistically	study 8:4 9:1
76:11	specifically	52:9	10:22 23:3
smart 14:15	71:14	statistics 41:12	24:2,18 72:20
17:11 21:4,16	specifics 48:2	stay 69:4	75:20 76:12,18
30:12	speed 10:5 11:5	stems 78:6	76:21 77:1,16
software 10:14	73:22	step 59:7	studying 67:22
11:6 22:1 50:9	spend 10:17	steps 8:11	stuff 4:21
50:16 53:16	42:8	17:20	15:22 17:20
54:8 70:22	spending 13:19	stop 15:6,8,21	18:12 22:19
soldier 40:13	spent 21:14	69:1	64:12 72:14
soldier's 52:17	spring 79:4	stopped 14:8	73:19
sole 63:13	spun 14:16	stopping 66:7	subaru 53:6
solution 63:18	square 11:2	store 60:7	submissions
63:19 66:7,8	54:10	stove 31:22	57:1
solutions 9:11	stability 49:13	32:4 49:2 66:2	submit 7:3
38:8,17 58:3,3	staff 8:7 21:10	stovepipe 32:3	success 15:6
solve 63:15	stakeholders	66:22 67:1	71:15
somebody 18:2	77:12,14	strategy 28:22	successes 47:21
someone's	standard 59:15	stream 40:7,12	successful 4:17
33:14 70:9	stands 46:5	streamed 6:8	14:12 44:11
soon 76:12	stars 17:5	strength 9:2	63:19
sooner 74:2	start 12:20	striking 31:12	sucks 34:10,11
sorry 46:2	17:17 20:2	strong 22:9	sue 2:5 3:5
68:17 75:14	42:4,6 49:22	30:22 37:12	74:22
sort 4:21 32:4	57:16 62:1,19	49:5 54:21	sue's 27:10
53:13 65:21	71:19 76:10	57:18 62:8,11	sufficient 55:17
sound 20:1	started 10:3	66:3	sufficiently
sounds 47:7	22:11 38:7	strongly 36:9	41:16
49:5	62:21	structure 13:9	suggesting
space 28:11	starting 78:2	structured	19:19
speaker 2:13	starts 17:21	5:10	suggestions
2:14,16 29:15	45:5	stuck 14:5	76:19
speakers 11:22	state 33:1,2,3	students 67:15	sundar 58:12
76:3 77:11	55:4,7,8 80:19	67:22 68:4	sunet 40:22
79:8	states 4:3 73:5	studies 5:16	sunshine 6:20
speaking 52:9	statistical	76:8,8,15,17	super 17:11
spearheaded	51:14,15,16	77:6,8,13,17	55:6
72:20		78:3	

[supply - things]

supply 13:3	t	teaching 36:11	terms 16:9 34:3
72:3	t 3:1,1	45:16,17	50:2 51:7
support 6:12	t&e 54:1,2	team 6:13 33:6	test 21:13
61:17 71:14	table 17:12	44:13 54:1,2	testifying 80:5
76:15	36:3 65:17	68:16,17 71:14	thank 4:2 6:1,1
sure 14:3 16:5	tackling 72:7	75:21 78:21	6:3,11 8:6
19:6 20:17,17	take 15:4 23:4	teams 12:3	12:11,13 23:1
21:21 27:15,17	28:11 29:2	39:4 71:9,11	24:5,14 30:18
49:9 53:21	36:6 43:2 49:6	79:9	60:20 74:12
63:12 64:20	49:7 53:11,11	tech 25:6 32:12	75:19,21 76:2
68:8,12 69:22	55:9 59:7	32:18 48:19	77:22 78:19
70:11 77:8,13	taken 8:11 80:3	66:9,15 78:8	79:7,8,10
sustainability	80:12 81:9	technical 21:12	thanks 8:3,3
49:13	takes 40:13	21:15 28:16	75:22 76:1
sustainable	talent 68:17	techniques	79:3
31:11,11,14	71:9,19,20,22	4:11	theodotou 1:5
66:17	talk 5:16 8:4	technologies	2:12 3:4 5:18
swann 2:10 3:8	12:15 13:11	8:16	6:1,5 76:2 79:7
23:15 24:5	15:10,15 19:14	technology	theory 16:14
74:14,17,20	21:10 33:18	10:1 13:3	thing 4:10
switch 53:14	47:6 54:19	26:13 28:13,15	16:19 19:12,21
switched 38:18	56:3 61:21	51:20 52:14,15	20:1,12 27:16
sworn 80:5	talked 5:19 9:8	56:14 57:12,21	30:5 32:8,9
symposium	37:16,16 57:9	70:10 73:17	34:18,21 43:1
55:13,13 58:5	58:9,10,11,11	teletype 22:16	46:10,16 58:22
73:1	58:12,12	tell 12:14 20:7	63:1 64:22
system 11:17	talking 13:14	38:1 68:21	70:20
18:11 40:17	18:3 50:2	71:14	things 5:6,11
51:11 52:1,11	67:17	telling 12:20	5:12,15 8:20
53:1 60:13	talks 35:18	40:17	9:20 10:17
64:19	tangible 8:11	tells 37:11	11:4 13:12,15
systems 9:3	9:18	ten 13:20 45:22	14:17 16:10,14
16:7 20:6 21:3	tapping 22:2	tend 15:6	16:17 17:13
24:11 26:19	task 40:1 71:3	term 31:8,10	18:7,12 20:7
28:15 53:16	71:12,13	49:12,13 63:18	20:20 24:19
60:12	teach 16:19	63:19 69:6	25:21 28:14
	45:15	71:7,8	31:17,19 32:6
			48:9,14,14

[things - two]

50:18 56:9	61:1 75:16	together 4:19	transform 69:7
57:13 59:17	thought 4:22	13:2 16:17	69:14
64:13 65:6,10	8:2 21:16	20:19 29:2	transformation
66:19 67:17	30:14 38:10	35:18 55:15,15	16:11 17:22
68:15 70:21	41:22 45:7	57:5 61:15	70:18
74:3	thread 69:9	74:5	transition
think 4:17	threads 68:18	told 14:15 16:5	66:10,15
10:16 11:19	68:21	16:18	transparency
14:3,5,9,13,20	threat 13:8	tompane 1:17	11:16
15:7,8,19,22	three 8:15	80:2,17	treat 36:11,12
17:1 18:19	13:11,19 14:6	ton 64:18	36:18
19:4 20:2,19	16:10 17:5	tool 35:15,22	treated 36:21
22:6 29:10	26:12 56:1,7	41:15 53:3	36:22
30:8 32:7 33:2	57:18 76:7	tools 36:2	treating 34:17
33:3,10 34:9	thrown 70:6	39:21 40:15,21	trick 49:9
34:20 36:20	time 8:9 9:4	top 31:17,18,20	tried 8:10
37:7,16 38:11	10:16 15:16	37:2,6 38:4	16:13
45:9 46:3,5	18:22 19:15	42:20,21 47:13	trillion 73:7
51:1,1,2 52:2,2	22:7,19 24:15	62:15	truck 40:8,9
52:10,13 54:20	30:15 37:16	topics 78:11	true 46:11 62:5
55:20 58:22	42:7,14,15	torpedo 52:18	80:9 81:5
59:7 60:16	43:2 49:10,22	tough 22:21	trust 53:6
62:17 64:10,14	50:9 52:20	towards 62:22	try 18:17 43:13
64:16,21 65:5	54:21 57:8	trace 53:18	63:14
65:11 66:14,17	72:17	traceability	trying 13:22
66:21 68:6	timothy 76:14	52:8	38:2 59:2
70:8 74:1	titles 5:12	trained 51:7	65:15,15 67:16
thinking 11:14	70:15,16	training 13:10	68:20
11:15 13:16	today 5:16 6:4	16:20 20:3	tune 79:2
38:7 41:6,8	6:14 13:11,14	51:21,21,21,21	tuning's 41:20
42:12 59:13	14:7 16:10	51:22,22,22	turn 7:12 53:10
66:11 68:18,21	22:2 23:17	53:1 68:9	77:17,20
69:1,9 70:2,3	25:18 29:8	transcriber	turning 24:3
third 14:11,18	32:6 75:20	81:1	tweak 32:20
20:12 25:12	77:2 78:18	transcript 81:3	twitter 14:17
28:1 61:12	79:9	81:5	two 5:16 7:16
thornberry	today's 6:8,21	transcriptionist	11:4,22 16:17
2:11 3:12 23:9	7:5	80:8	17:1 18:11

[two - warehoused]

19:8,8 43:11	unpredictably	32:2 33:20	w
46:9 48:16	54:9	34:14,15,15,22	wait 15:12
55:22 57:12,13	ups 76:10	35:4 36:15	waiving 66:18
67:8 69:5,7	urgency 17:17	37:1,1,20,21	walls 25:11
78:2	17:21	38:9,21 39:2	walsh 21:2
type 27:16	urgent 26:5	39:15,18 41:22	want 5:13 7:17
typewriting	use 8:20 9:12	42:7,10 43:17	8:6,19 9:5
80:7	10:5,18,21	43:22 48:17	12:20 13:14
typically 61:10	13:14 18:1	49:1,10,11	16:2 19:12
u	24:10,20,22	56:2 59:14	24:14 27:3
unbelievably	35:5 40:10	62:17 64:2	30:17 33:1
55:4 62:7	41:15 43:3,11	69:3	34:2,2,6 35:2
under 6:19	43:12,12 44:1	various 65:9	36:16 43:2
15:16 21:7	45:8,9,18,21	vehicle 20:5	57:5 58:7 60:5
26:12 33:14	46:4 47:19	55:21	61:17 64:8
54:13 78:20	48:16 51:5,5	vendor 32:1	68:1 69:15
underlying	53:2,11,13	39:18	73:18 77:8
49:3,4	55:18,19 56:17	vendors 11:9	78:15
understand	56:21 68:1,5	41:1 67:7	wanted 9:9,10
24:7 39:17	68:13 77:5	versus 4:15	13:11 14:1
47:7 51:14	used 19:5,14	viability 11:10	15:15 30:21,22
52:8 68:5	34:13	vice 16:6	32:2 78:19
understanding	useful 30:14	video 40:7,12	wanting 5:4
62:15 68:1	user 9:19	videoconfere	60:1
understands	uses 36:14	2:6,8,15,16	wants 10:11
50:4	using 10:17	view 6:10	44:22 45:1
uniform 20:16	14:4	36:14 44:4	war 39:16,18
unifying 16:13	usury 10:21	68:9	40:13 42:3
unit 13:17	utilized 25:19	virtually 6:10	46:4,12,15
united 4:3 73:5	25:20	virtuous 43:22	49:11
universities	V	visit 21:6	warehouse
69:11	valley 69:11	vote 23:2,4,5,6	34:5,10
unleash 74:8	valuable 78:14	24:1 72:10,11 74:16,19 75:12	warehouseable
unlock 26:1	valuation 73:7	75:18	34:18
27:5,21	value 26:1,21	/3.10	warehoused
unmanned	26:22 27:2,5		34:12,13
16:7 20:5	27:21 31:12,21		

[warehouses - zoom]

warehouses	weakness	working 18:22	65:7 69:5,7
34:7	62:14	20:8,19 29:7	73:22
warfighting	website 7:10	30:8,11 41:15	yellow 45:6
50:5	76:13 77:2	54:2 56:22	Z
warmer 79:5	wednesday	67:11	
washington	79:3	works 12:17	zoom 12:1,5
1:14	week 48:1	42:3,5 65:2	
way 7:15 10:6	welcome 6:3	world 4:4 8:14	
17:3 21:4	went 17:14	22:4 42:5,6	
25:17 26:6	22:15,18 37:18	46:17 48:10	
28:18 31:7	44:13,17,18,19	64:5	
32:19,21 33:13	wholehearted	worry 4:12 5:3	
37:7 39:1,8	75:1	5:4	
42:20 43:13	wide 10:10	worst 13:20	
47:21 48:7	widgets 59:8	19:15	
49:2,12 50:3	will's 64:12	wow 21:21	
50:13 51:2,13	win 32:13,14	wrap 24:2	
51:17 52:2,22	32:14 63:15	write 21:20	
53:22 55:2	wins 31:8,10	63:13	
61:8 63:2,2	32:10 71:8	writing 22:3	
65:14 66:11,16	witness 80:4	written 7:4	
66:18 68:18	word 24:21,22	wrote 18:9	
72:11 75:18	72:9	X	
76:21	work 4:19	x 14:17 51:18	
ways 20:20	10:10 12:4,6		
34:9 59:21	13:2,21 19:21	y	
65:5 72:6	21:11 24:16	y 51:19	
we've 4:13 14:7	25:3 36:4 43:6	yeah 23:22	
15:6,18,19	43:7,9,14	30:18 49:21	
17:13 22:2	44:10 54:4	54:18 60:17	
31:3 35:7	69:13,14 72:15	61:20	
37:13,22 38:18	77:10 78:2	year 10:17 31:6	
40:5 43:2,11	worked 14:4	37:17 45:7	
44:8,9 49:21	17:16 32:6	46:9	
56:16 57:1	39:3 40:6 44:8	years 14:6 15:18 17:3	
58:18 60:15	47:4,5 77:7	21:14 39:3	
61:5 70:1,1,3	workforce 28:3		
73:14,16		46:9 49:6,7	