PROGRAM MANAGER INTERVIEWS JOSHUA GOTBAUM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

Which Defense Firms Will Survive — Meet the Man Who Helps the Pentagon Decide

A large white banner is the first thing you notice upon entering the reception area of Joshua Gotbaum's third-floor Pentagon office. In foot-high red letters, it reads "Please Mr. Gotbaum, Save Natick [Mass.] Labs" (referring to the Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] recommendation to close Natick). Secretary Gotbaum, a former Wall Street investment banker, achieved the status of Washington insider in 1 short year. He is respected both by the Pentagon brass and defense industry officials. He influences key decisions ranging from BRAC to which defense industries will survive.

Secretary Gotbaum is the right man for the job at the right time. A 44-year-old lawyer, Secretary Gotbaum is at home in the world of mergers, acquisitions, and restructurings. He heads the new 260-person Pentagon Office of Economic Security and has won the confidence of many defense industry and military officials for helping educate the Pentagon brass on their decisions which impact the nation's troubled defense industry. And so far, both sides appear pleased with his efforts on their behalf.

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Economic Security Joshua Gotbaum (above), fields questions from Program Manager's *representative, Mr. Gibson LeBoeuf, Navy Chair, DSMC Executive Institute (next page).*

Program Manager's representative, Mr. Gibson LeBeouf, recently spent an hour interviewing Secretary Gotbaum — a thought-provoking interview that revealed a man who cuts quickly to the issues and gets his facts straight. Nor did he skirt the tough issues posed during this interview. We left the interview with the impression that Joshua Gotbaum, though low key and soft-spoken, is a man determined to follow the mandates of

Mr. Gibson LeBoeuf, Navy Chair, DSMC Executive Institute, conducted the interview with Secretary Gotbaum on behalf of the DSMC Press.

his position in a manner that is best for the nation, best for government, and ultimately, best for the nation's defense industrial base. Given the budgetary and regulatory constraints under which he must make those decisions, his is a heavy burden indeed. One he is shouldering remarkably well. *Program Manager* is pleased to present Secretary Gotbaum's remarks in their entirety.

Program Manager: As Under Secretary of Defense for Economic Security, would you please describe your job for our readers, and let everyone get an appreciation for the role your office plays in maintaining the nation's defense posture?

Photos by Greg Caruth

Mr. Gotbaum: The job was created on the notion that it would be useful for the Department of Defense to have a commercial perspective as it restructures. As the defense industry itself restructures, companies that have been our suppliers for years are combining; they are restructuring, combining plants, laying off employees, etc., so there is an industry restructuring. Similarly, as the defense budget declines, the Department of Defense is itself restructuring.

Admiral Owens, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is fond of noting that we are going through four revolutions simultaneously. One is that our budget is dramatically lower than what it was 10 years ago, and in many accounts, it will continue to decline. Regarding the procurement accounts, although we hope that we have seen the bottoming out of the procurement accounts, it is by no means certain that we have. And it is certain that although our budget authority has hit bottom, our actual outlays for procurement will decline for another year or two. And as a result, the defense industry, necessarily, must respond — but also the Department of Defense has to respond. Which means we need to change the way we do business.

Program Manager: By "changing the way we do business," is acquisition reform a part of that effort?

Mr. Gotbaum: Acquisition reform is one example. My office assists Colleen Preston [Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition Reform] and Paul Kaminski [Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology] in parts of acquisition reform by working through the specifications and standards reform effort. But there are lots of other areas in which the way we do business clearly needs to be rethought in light of changed resources and changed circumstances.

For example, infrastructure. We have policy oversight over the BRAC process in addition to policy oversight over the reuse of bases. Our office also has responsibility for assisting international cooperation efforts to develop weapons on a cooperative basis with other governments. And that has led in some instances to involvement in general international economic sorts of concerns; what should expert control policy be (although that's not formally in my mandate at all). So the way I think about the job is, we know in a great many ways the Department of Defense needs to change the way it does business. In economic security, we try to provide a commercial perspective as to how that can be done.

The second mission is that it is our job to be sensitive to the defense industry — to the economic and business concerns that affect the Department of Defense. So one job is to help the Department do its business better; another is to understand the concerns of business: financial, commercial, procedural, etc. So that's why we are working through issues like specifications and standards reform. That is why we work with a series of industry advisory committees where we can to establish more open communications about the concerns that business is having with the Department of Defense.

Program Manager: Is your office going more toward performance goals rather than the specifications

Hon. Joshua Gotbaum is the first Assistant Secretary of Defense for Economic Security. The position was created to help the Department of Defense manage commercial and economic concerns in its programs and policies.

Secretary Gotbaum is the primary advisor to the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology for matters pertaining to the defense industry, dual-use technology, and international cooperative programs. He also directs the Department's efforts concerning infrastructure, including housing, base closure, property disposal and reuse, and economic adjustment.

In these capacities he is responsible for: Developing policies and programs to determine and preserve critical industrial capabilities; responding to defense industry concerns; responding to industry restructuring, mergers and acquisitions; encouraging greater reliance upon commercial and dual-use products and processes; managing the Department's infrastructure budget and policies, including military construction and base closure; assisting international cooperative development efforts between governments and industry; encouraging reinvestment and reuse of defense facilities for commercial and economic development.

His office also reviews and analyzes programs that balance national security and economic objectives, including export control policies and programs, trade initiatives, and related matters. Economic Security serves as DoD's liaison to the National Economic Council, the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, and other economic agencies.

Prior to his confirmation in May 1994, Gotbaum was general partner with the New York investment bank, Lazard Freres & Co. His work in the firm included financial advice and assistance to corporations, trade unions, and governments on corporate finance, mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, bankruptcies, and restructurings. He became a general partner in 1990. From 1990 through 1992, Gotbaum was resident in London as a managing director of Lazard Freres & Co., Ltd.

Before joining Lazard Freres, Gotbaum served in 1981 as legislative assistant to U.S. Senator Gary Hart for economic and budget matters. During the Carter Administration, he was Associate Director of the White House Domestic Policy Staff for economic issues. In 1978 and 1979, Gotbaum served as Executive Assistant to Alfred Kahn, President Carter's advisor on inflation. In 1977, he worked in the White House Office of Energy, Policy and Planning. When the Department of Energy was established, he joined the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Policy.

Gotbaum is a graduate of the Kennedy School of Government and Harvard Law School. He received his undergraduate degree from Stanford University.

Originally raised in Evanston, Ill., Gotbaum now resides in Washington, D.C. He is married to Joyce Thornhill, a vice president at J.P. Morgan & Co. They have three children.

and standards that were used in the past?

Mr. Gotbaum: Yes, and we're also moving toward understanding when departmental policy affects the health of the industry that supplies us. There is one thing we do know that has not changed. And that is that we need the best technology in order to maintain the preeminent fighting force in the world. We need that technology at a more affordable price than we've ever had before. But that means that we are going to have to rely on private industry to provide it, as we have in the past.

Another change is the dual-use revolution, which is that many of those technologies upon which we rely are now done more actively, more aggressively, in a wider range of applications throughout the civilian sector than they are in the defense sector. So one of the challenges for the Department of Defense in the future is how to take advantage of technologies like communications, computers, and computations that are absolutely essential to warfighting in the future, when most of the research, most of the investment, most of the development, will be done primarily in the commercial sector? And the answer to that is we need to change our own practices, our own ways of doing research business to take advantage of dual-use applications.

I have an office that is involved in just those sorts of activities as well. That's really how I think about our mandate. Our mandate is to involve commercial concerns, to help the Department of Defense be more business-like in its own business, always recognizing that this is *not* just another business. What we do is not like, for instance, making cars or delivering other services. But that doesn't mean we can't learn about and apply commercial techniques to do our own business better. And then secondly, to make sure that there is open communication between the businesses on

which we depend and the Department of Defense in its own policy, budget, and program management decisions. That's how I really think about the job.

Program Manager: Would you mind giving our readers a little bit of background on yourself — the credentials that you bring to the new Economic Security office that serve you well in your position?

Mr. Gotbaum: I was originally trained as a lawyer at Harvard University's law school and as a student of government at the Kennedy School of Government. I went into the government and did energy and economic policy work 15 plus years ago. This was during the Carter administration. Actually, it began before then. I worked as a consultant during the Ford administration, and then went full-time during the Carter administration.

I had been concerned that people who made economic policy in the Federal Government all too often lacked actual business experience. When the Carter administration ended, I resolved that I was going to go into private industry — and I did. I joined Lazard Freres & Co., a New York-based investment bank as an associate, and spent the next 13 years doing mergers, acquisitions, corporate restructurings, corporate finance, etc., in a very wide variety of industries.

The job essentially was providing financial advice to companies or providing negotiating services for fund raising for companies in the context of change. And that range of transactions on which I worked covered things from the acquisition of RJR Nabisco by Kohlberg, Kravitz and Roberts, to the acquisition of Weirton Steel Plant [W. Va.] by employees, plus a lot of other transactions, both here and in Europe. So my work was primarily giving advice to corporations about mergers, acquisitions, and restructurings.

Program Manager: Mergers, acquisitions, and restructurings — exactly what's going on today throughout the Department of Defense.

In sector after sector, they have undertaken studies to identify answers to important concerns, e.g., am I causing a problem here; am I putting an industrial capability that I need at risk?

Mr. Gotbaum: Yes, and what we've discovered now is that in some respects the defense industry is undergoing the restructuring that other manufacturing industries and other service industries began, in some cases, 10 or 15 years ago, but in many cases, more than 5 years ago. And yes, I spent a lot of time in mergers; I spent a lot of time in restructurings.

Program Manager: Is educating the Pentagon about how its decisions affect the defense industry a tough job, and in what respects?

Mr. Gotbaum: One of the things that the outside world does not appreciate enough about the Department of Defense is the extraordinary competence and dedication of the people that work here — both military and civilian. I've found that the issue is not, "Can these people take commercial concerns into account?" And the issue is not, "Are they sensitive to the need to take commercial concerns into account?" What we have found in case after case is that we need to teach language, convention, techniques, so that more than in the past, people in the Department of Defense and people in industry can understand each other — recognizing the fact that both of them are undergoing massive change.

Let me give you a "for instance." The U.S. Army and the Army Materiel Command have, for several years, undertaken a set of industrial-base studies. And their concern is precisely the right concern. They know that they are buying less; they recognize that they are going to have to do so; but they want to make sure that they don't lose any industrial capabilities that are really important. In sector after sector, they have undertaken studies to identify answers to important concerns, e.g., am I causing a problem here; am I putting an industrial capability that I need at risk?

This was something that was going on before I was confirmed in this job. We have, since my confirmation, been able to help the Army refine their analysis to focus more tightly on the financial indicators that best reflect financial health, for example. But the basic impetus was already there; the basic interest was already there; and the basic competence was already there.

Program Manager: As you mentioned earlier, the defense budget is going down, and since you've pretty much taken the reins here in the Economic Security office, Secretary Perry has announced $7.7 billion in cuts to weapons programs. Was your hand in

this decision, and do you believe these cuts are necessary? Why?

Mr. Gotbaum: I don't think there's anyone in the Department of Defense who wouldn't be happier if the defense budget were higher. I think we all are learning to live with the realities of a lower budget. The role that Economic Security plays within that is trying to make sure that the effect of that lower budget is not to lose industrial capabilities that we depend on. We have two issues. One is that many of our suppliers are facing reduced revenues. Many of our suppliers are facing lower levels of profits. Some of those suppliers are actually at risk. Some of them will choose to leave the defense business, or to do other things, or to close down lines we want.

The real issue for us though is separating the wheat from the chaff. We cannot afford to help every one of our suppliers who has lost business. The procurement budget has been cut by over two-thirds in real terms. So the task is determining what capabilities we really need, what capabilities are genuinely at risk, and then what's the best and most effective way to deal with the government.

It may be that we have circumstances in which we have a capability that is genuinely at risk, but we don't want to simply continue low-rate production. It may make sense to buy the technical data rights and to mothball the ability to produce this particular system. It may be that the most effective way to deal with this situation is to qualify another supplier or to accept a substitute product which is similar. Those are the areas in which we try to be helpful.

Program Manager: What about the risk involved in purchasing the technical rights, and then putting them aside until we need them again? In other words, if we keep the technical rights, yet lose the quality of people who perform this technical work — the so called artists and magicians — doesn't that involve considerable risk?

Mr. Gotbaum: There are absolutely risks. The issue is, are they risks that the Department of Defense chooses to undertake? Let me give you another "for instance." One study that we just completed was a study of what we called the Bomber Industrial Base Study. This was a study commissioned at the request of Congress which essentially said, if the Department of Defense is not going to buy any further B-2s, is the Department comfortable that they will be able to procure bombers effectively in the future.

Based on that, we commissioned a study to look at the nation's true capability to produce bombers. And we learned some very important things. First, we learned that there is no bomber industry per se. What we learned, however, is that there is an aircraft and aerospace industry that, from time to time, is called upon to produce bombers. In the last 40 plus years, three separate companies have been made primes on bombers. No company has gotten successive awards. What that tells us is that we're really not looking at the capability of an individual company or an individual plant. We're really looking at the capability of an industry — an industry that is practical to use, that is working for the Department of Defense, and is working for the commercial sector as a whole.

The other thing we learned is that, in fact, there are several other circumstances in which we have started up production lines of bombers by doing a "smart shutdown." Clearly, there are risks, but those risks are in some circumstances manageable. Therefore, the Department of Defense can choose to undertake that level of risk. And that in fact is what we concluded when we looked at the bomber industrial base area — that we could, if it made sense to do so, start up production, even on a system as complex and as intricate as the B2, if that made sense over the course of the next decade.

Program Manager: We'd like to go back to the subject of mergers. We know that one of your duties is to examine planned defense mergers such as the one between Martin Marietta and Lockheed. Did you support that venture? How do you think this merger would benefit the defense industry?

Mr. Gotbaum: Let's start with the facts. The defense procurement budget is down by more than two-thirds over the course of the last decade. There is not an industry in the world that would see revenues go down by two-thirds without restructuring or consolidation. So it is entirely expected, in fact it is inevitable, that the defense industry will consolidate, that it will combine. The issue for the Department of Defense is, "Where is this consolidation in the interests of the Department of Defense?"

We see one plus and one minus here. The plus in consolidation is that in the Department of Defense we pay for the overhead. If two companies are producing the same missiles for DoD on a cost-plus basis, and each of them has a plant that is operating at 20 percent of capacity, an organization is paying for the 80 percent that is fallow in each plant — in this case the Department of Defense or the taxpayers of the United States. So, in cases like that, if two companies combine, and take two plants working at 20-percent capacity and create instead one plant that's working at 40-percent capacity or better at 50- to 60-percent capacity, then we as taxpayers and the Department of Defense are better off. That happened in Lockheed Martin. We estimated on a preliminary basis before the transaction that savings to the taxpayers ought to be in excess of a billion dollars. Since that time, Lockheed Martin have done far more detailed studies in that respect, and they've concluded that the numbers were three times that.

The other consideration is that as companies consolidate, we run the

risk that we might end up being dependent on a single supplier. And that poses competitive risks because competition is the juice that lowers costs. Competition is the juice that encourages innovation. And so we are mindful that in any combination, there is a risk that we will end up being at the mercy of a single supplier. What we find, however, is that the Department of Defense is the most powerful customer in the world. If you or I want to buy a Caravan, we can't really turn to Chrysler and say, "by the way, I want the spare tire inside the cabin." But the Department of Defense, when we want to design a ship or an airplane or even a truck, has the capability to say, "this product is for us — we want it to look like this." We have more influence over our suppliers than most other customers and more flexibility in contracting, we have more flexibility in design, and that means that we can undertake product development in a way that encourages new entrants, in a way that encourages competition that might not otherwise take place.

Those are our two concerns as a result of consolidation. One is the benefits from cost reduction, and the other is the risk is that we might be at a competitive disadvantage. But what we found in the case of Lockheed Martin is that we have ample tools to handle the competitive risks, and the cost savings to the taxpayers and the Department of Defense were in the billions.

Program Manager: Have you worked with the Clinton administration on what amounts to an industrial policy with the defense sector in which federal contracts are used to sustain key companies and technology? Can you tell us how your office is involved in helping distressed industries who have been hurt by the two-thirds budget cut you mentioned that has been occurring in military procurement funds over the last decade?

Mr. Gotbaum: I'll be frank and tell you that I think that's a red herring. When General Motors goes to its suppliers and says, "I want to work with you to make sure that you deliver products reliably at an affordable cost," nobody says that's industry policy. That's what the Department of Defense is doing. That's what the Department of Defense did before this administration, and that's what the Department of Defense will do after this administration is gone.

I view our job, in essence, to be smart buyers — to recognize where we need to be helpful to our suppliers, and to make sure that we have all the capabilities we need over the next 5 years and over the next 25 years.

Because we rely on the defense industry for our technology. I view our job, in essence, to be smart buyers — to recognize where we need to be helpful to our suppliers, and to make sure that we have all the capabilities we need over the next 5 years and over the next 25 years. And I think characterizing the debate as either pro or con industrial policy, to my mind, frankly misses the point. It has always been in the interests of the Department of Defense to make sure that it has the best technology in the world. It has always been in the interest of the Department of Defense to make sure that we invest in those technologies which will support the warfighters of the next generation. That was true 5 years ago, it's true today, and it will be true in 2001.

Program Manager: How do you decide which defense industry sectors are so crucial that the nation cannot afford to let them go under? Is there some type of criteria?

Mr. Gotbaum: Actually, it turns out that the Department of Defense, for years has spent time defining those platforms which are critical, and those technologies which are critical. Each year, for example, this past year the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Anita Jones, just published the Science and Technology Strategy Report (which is worth reading if you have not), essentially outlining those areas of technology which the warfighters believe are essential. Similarly, as part of the acquisition process, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), Dr. Kaminski, is in the budget, setting the priorities for platforms, systems, and equipment. So deciding what is necessary is the first step. That's something we do.

The second step is deciding from those things that are necessary, whether there are any that require special programs beyond your basic investment and procurement. And that's where we have become more systematic and more consistent. That

is where over the last year or so we've said, "If you want to support the industrial base, you ought to meet the following tests. It ought to be a critical capability, you ought to know that it's genuinely at risk, and then you ought to know that you're applying the most cost-effective measure." But the former test, i.e., what's central to the Department of Defense, the Department has been focusing on, in my view, quite carefully and quite thoughtfully for a very long time.

Program Manager: Without getting into any specific firms, does fraud ever surface as an issue when you review a contractor's claims that they will go under unless they receive additional work?

Mr. Gotbaum: To my knowledge, it has not yet. That doesn't mean that we aren't mindful that we are the fiduciaries of the public's money. We are. But I think that the fairest thing that can be said is that the Department of Defense and the Federal Government have spent a considerable amount of time learning to ask questions, to check facts, before we engage in programs of support.

There is another risk which people don't talk about as often, which is that the fear of fraud will lead us to avoid doing the things we ought to do to run the Department more efficiently. It is possible to put in place oversight systems and review systems, all of which have costs, that result in us not undertaking actions that are necessary. And it would be very unfortunate if in our zeal to protect the taxpayer's dollars, we ended up spending more than we should to get the systems we need.

Program Manager: Let's discuss some areas that we understand your office is either responsible for or plays a role in monitoring: closing military bases, improving military housing, developing new policies for weapons sales overseas, reducing administrative and accounting burdens on military contractors, and helping defense firms make more commercial products. Would you care to elaborate on some of these or any of these, please?

Mr. Gotbaum: The BRAC is another arena in which the Department of Defense is reconciling itself to the new realities. The way we fight wars is changed; the way we are organized is changed; and our budget is changed. If we don't reduce our infrastructure commensurate with our reduction in budget, we're going to spend dollars supporting tail that ought to be in the teeth. So we consider base closings to be necessary — but very painful.

Everyone in the Department of Defense is mindful of the fact that when we close or realign a base, we're affecting communities that have supported the armed forces, in some cases for centuries. But for us, there really is no alternative.

What we have done over the past couple of years is that we've taken the next step which is to say, "let us reform the process by which we reuse bases to encourage new job creation," and so we follow the painful BRAC process with a more streamlined base-reuse process.

We now have the authority to transfer property on flexible terms to encourage discount, to encourage job creation on those bases — an authority which we did not have 2 years ago. We now have people on-site, base transition coordinators, to serve as ombudsmen. We now help communities more effectively than I think we did before, to plan for reuse, to take advantage of economic development potential. So this is another economic security area where we've been able to make some improvement, essentially recognizing economic development reality.

Housing is a different matter. The Secretary of Defense last year made it very clear that the conditions under which we housed our troops are not satisfactory. They had not been satisfactory for a long time. In essence, he wanted to put a mark on the ground and say that quality of life mattered, that quality of life was essential to readiness, and that unless we did something about quality of life, the finest weapon systems in the world would not be helpful if we couldn't retain the troops that use them. But he had a problem, which is that in an era of declining budgets, we did not have in any one year the billions of dollars that were necessary to refurbish family housing and barracks. So what the Secretary said is, "Can we not use commercial techniques here too? Can the Department of Defense not, like other people, use private developers and private capital to refurbish our housing stock, and then pay for it over time?"

So what the three Services have done, in cooperation with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is to develop the legislative proposal that would permit us to act like a private business. That would permit the Department of Defense to acquire and procure housing on a commercial basis, using commercial developers, and using commercial financial markets. That legislation is before the Congress now, and one of the things that is most gratifying is that the Congress too recognizes this is an issue that must be dealt with. Members from both Houses, both parties have said, "we know that we have a problem here, and we want to solve it for the troops." So we are hopeful that we will get this legislation, and we're going to implement it.

The size of our housing problem is so large — it's taken us 30 or 40 years to get to this point — it's not something that will be solved in a year or two. But we are hopeful that what we can do is lay the groundwork so that over the course of the next decade, we could in fact refurbish our basic housing.

Program Manager: Would you care to comment somewhat on policies for weapons sales overseas?

Mr. Gotbaum: This is an area where a changed national security situation and a changed budget led to changes in policy priorities. The fact is that these days when we fight, we fight far more often alongside the armed forces of other nations. And as a result, interoperability and coordination matter more. The fact is also that these days the funds we have for weapons development and the funds our allies have for weapons development have declined. Therefore, there is leverage to be obtained by sharing developmental costs by trying to develop certain common systems.

As a result of this, the Secretary of Defense has said, "I want a greater focus on international arms cooperation and systems development." While no one would pretend that the tasks are easy because they require allies with different requirements, procurement systems, time tables, and budgets to develop a common program, nonetheless it is important. And we are prosecuting it aggressively, working on the Medium Extended Air Defense System with our European allies, working on certain kinds of communications and ground surveillance, and other areas of cooperation. All of these things on which we work involve change; even with the best good will, it's not easy. My standard line on almost all of them is, "none of this is easy, none of this is quick, and none of this is smooth, but it turns out that it all is important, so we are doing it. And we are...

Program Manager: If you could describe the best advice you ever received related to your job, what would that be?

Mr. Gotbaum: The best advice in this job was given to me by [then] Under Secretary John Deutch. What he said was, "There is a wealth of talent here; there is a great deal of good will here. In order to succeed, you must join forces with the Services to develop a common set of objectives, and then go execute them."

'HANG TEN' AS YOU 'SURF' THE INTERNET ON DSMC'S NEW HOMEPAGE

James H. Dobbins

If you are out 'surfing' the Internet, why not 'hang ten' on our new DSMC Homepage. You can find us at http://www.dsmc.dsm.mil. We went on-line officially on September 11, 1995, and are providing you with a tool for acquisition research as well as a source of information about DSMC.

When you enter our Homepage, you will see a graphic of the College and an entry to our table of contents. In the table of contents you will find the riches you need for your acquisition tasks. You will find the complete *Program Managers Notebook* to browse through. You will also find the schedule of classes and, soon the *DSMC 1996 Catalog*. You will also find links to the DoD Deskbook and the Acquisition Reform Network.

As you continue to browse through the contents, you will see other items we are preparing to offer and their proposed availability. These include the DSMC Guidebooks that have been so popular, the *Program Manager* (*PM*) Magazine, and the *Acquisition Review Quarterly (ARQ)*. The *PM* Magazine will initially offer the current issue at the time it goes on-line, but our plan is to provide back issues to January 1994. We will do the same for the *ARQ*, but will add all back issues since the journal is relatively new.

In coming months we will be making the entries on our Homepage as usable as possible by establishing hot-links between them. For example, we plan to have hot-links placed within our *PM Notebook* so the user can link directly to chapters or sections of the DSMC Guidebooks that address the same topic. As we add or discover them, we will also provide additional links to other sources within DSMC as well as in DoD, other federal agencies, and industry.

Future plans include a place for accessing Best Practices and Lessons Learned. These, and other useful items, will be added over time, and the objective is to make this Homepage a useful tool for you, our user community. It is really *your* Homepage. If you have comments, suggestions, or become aware of features or other sites we should have, or have links to, on the DSMC Homepage, please let me know. I can be reached via e-mail at dobbinsj@dsmc.dsm.mil. We are here to serve you. We look forward to doing so, and we hope you find your new Homepage useful in your assignments.

Editor's Note: Professor Dobbins is Associate Dean for Information, Research, Consulting, and Information Division, DSMC.