Q: I always hear the term “rack and stack” and I describe it to my Sailors, as far as that, there is not too much transparency with the method. Is it more than just an algorithm and system based, is every single application taken into account or is it strictly algorithm based?

A: CDR Garrison: There are two different “rack and stacks” but for reenlistment purposes, so C-WAY reenlistment, it is a computer generated “rack and stack.” There is an algorithm; the first requirement is CO’s recommendation for retention. That’s binary, yes or no. If the answer is “does not have that,” than they don’t play in C-WAY, effectively. But as long as the CO said you were eligible for retention, then we go in and look at paygrade. So, generally speaking in any rating, the more senior person in the year group in the paygrade is going to get the quota first. For those of you that don’t know, E6s have been auto approval for quite a while for several years in C-WAY, this year we also turned that on for E5. So we are working our way down the pier. So right now, only the E4s and E3s are competitive in C-WAY. So from there you look at the most senior in paygrade first and frocked, so paid comes before frocked, and then you step down to the next paygrade, beyond that, you, it’s looking at evals primarily. There are a few things that I would call tie breakers, like NECs, and I will tell you that this is one of those places that we’ve taken some fleet feedback. So, when the C-WAY algorithm was first developed, the circumstance we had was occasionally a Sailor that had a critical NEC as defined by Fleet Forces Command but was let’s say a “P” Sailor, was getting a C-WAY quota over an MP or EP in the same rating, same year group, same everything, who didn’t hold a critical NEC. And the question was, “is that really fair, is that what we’re trying to do?” So, the answer was “no” so we changed the focus of the algorithm and so know it becomes a tie breaker. So if you have two otherwise equal Sailors, one holds a critical NEC and another doesn’t, then generally speaking, the critical NEC gets it. So that’s how the algorithm works, we have slides that show that, it doesn’t give the math behind it but it shows the criteria and how they’re ranked. Now for PAC Sailors it’s similar but there are a few other things we take into account. I’ll give you an example, we have APAC Sailors sometimes end up TAD on an aircraft carrier and so they’re working in security. As an APAC Sailor, MA has not historically been a rating you can go into. It’s not one of the standard “A” ratings, however if I have an APAC Sailor who’s been TAD to security for 15 months and has a whole group of qualifications, and this example is one that was brought up at last year’s Career Development Symposium by a Master Chief MA who came to me and said, “my APAC Sailors are better qualified after a year onboard than any of my MA Seaman are, but I can’t make them MAs.” And I said, that’s a problem, that’s not the way it should be. So, what I’m telling you is when it comes to APACs, same rating rules apply.
Paygrade is less of an issue for APACs, but certainly the eval scores. I talked about that earlier, please don’t give them “Ps” as a rule of thumb, and give them what they deserve. The next thing is it doesn’t look at qualifications earned, necessarily, because how do we know what qualification an APAC is going to get, how do you build an algorithm that can numerically “rack and stack” that. So that’s where my ECM tech guys have to use the human touch to look and say “ok, this Sailor is a little bit further down the “rack and stack” but they’ve got these six qualifications that are required to become an MA that these other folks don’t have so maybe though numerically they’re not at the top, they have a lot of things going for them that are valued experience. They are probably a better fit as an MA.

A: CNP: Correct me if I’m wrong but this transparency word that you used with C-WAY is not lost on us that this is a big dissatisfier for our Sailors. A year ago, roughly, is why we published that C-WAY user’s guide. In that user’s guide that posted on our website, we’re going to do a much better job about taking those things that are buried on tab 47 of the NPC website and bringing them up to the front of My Navy Portal, but in there all the elements of the criteria that goes into the algorithms are in that C-WAY users guide for transparency. The rules are out there we just need to get them out so they are easier to find so you don’t have to go digging for them.

Q: CNP: We’ve had this leader development framework in place a little over a year now. Other than we are going to overhaul the way we in which we are training our Navy’s leaders from junior enlisted all the way up to flag officers; so, they’ll be some process changes, very fleet centered. We’ve also taken a new area to focus on, we’ve always done well at technical competence and tactical competence and focus on the leadership aspect of leader development, but we’ve taken it for granted when we focus on character at boot camp or at the Naval Academy, OCS, NROTC, that one-time inoculation was enough. The new leader development framework challenges us to go exercise that muscle more periodically. Is there a sense that our leaders today are maybe lacking in that area, have there been some instances that we need to focus on that or is this just an area of emphasis as we move forward into more independent operations and the unique challenges we have ahead?

A: VCNO: I think clearly the discussion that we have, I'm sure many leaders here who've had command here recently in the Fleet would tell you that a lot of our junior Sailors really have a strong desire to want to talk about how to be a better leader. I'm looking at a bunch of you guys right now, right? You want to learn, there's a skill to this, leadership, it's not just a given. You can learn to be a better leader. And a lot of them want to learn about what it takes. What did we learn as we came up, and what did my chief learn and all that kind of stuff. And sometimes we just don't have time in the Fleet to spend the amount of energy thats needed to really develop leaders. CNO's effort here was, first, let's build, let's describe what that is, and so he built this leader roadmap, and it's not just for the uniformed side but the civilian side, as well. And it's the
two paths, one road, right? Two paths are character and competence. We're pretty good at the competence side, you know we've got training, we give you OJT; we give you a lot of opportunities and experience out there to go be competent in what you're supposed to do. We could do better, and we are aiming to do better on the training side to build that competence. But what we don't really spend a lot of time on is talking about character and what are our expectations and how do you develop better character? I had a Master Chief that I worked for when I was a Junior Officer who used to tell me all the time, he says, "character's just who you are when nobody's looking." How do you act when nobody's looking? Today you could expand it into what do you say and how do you act on social media when the presumption is nobody's looking? And yet everybody's looking. I have dumbed it down even more than that, character is just the ability to know what the right thing is, and the courage to do it. That's character. So, if you combine and you weave together, you braid together character and competence, now, you suddenly become somebody who can inspire and motivate everybody that's working on a team with them. If you build character, you build what in an organization? Trust, right; I trust people who do the right thing all the time no matter what. I'm ready to lean in with that person, that leader. So, that was the concept behind CNO's Framework for Leader Developments, build character and competence. Now, what we have not done well as the Navy, is on the enlisted side, is building opportunities into our pipelines to talk about this more, and to instruct more. We used to have Petty Officer Indoc. How many Chiefs in the room remember doing that back in the day, right? You used to go to a schoolhouse, used to be sometimes near the waterfront, sometimes other places, and then we got so busy, we said you know we could probably do that on the ship and in the unit and save time and save money and save effort. And then so we brought it back to the unit level, Chiefs took it on and then we got through a series of manpower decisions that were optimal manning, top six roll down, you remember all those dark days of, you know, everything was pressurized into manpower counts? And, suddenly things that were really important to us as an institution called Petty Officer Indoc faded. And, then when we brought back CPO365 you started to see a lot of interest by First Class Petty Officers around the Fleet to try to better their skills at leadership, and that turned into in some cases, and I know on your two ships, your carriers that became First Class Petty Officers taking second classes and third classes and turning a 365 effort at that level, because the demand signal by our junior sailors was so high. So, this effort, this framework was designed to build in very structured opportunities for leader development in our junior Sailors, to include junior officers and all the way through. And, I think that's the effort, that's the path we're on, and I think it's absolutely the right thing to do, so, we're going to move in that direction. But, I think how we do it and where we do it is largely taken from feedback from the Fleet, so, I look forward to hearing from you all on that.

Q: My question is in regards to the current Petty Officer Leadership course, the future leadership course that we are referring to here today, Sir. The requirement is kind of difficult on us; schools that have people that get promoted to E4 upon graduation to
complete that requirement. Is that going to change with this new course, or how is that going to work?

A: FLTCM Smith: So, one of the things I was going to talk about is the Enlisted Leader Development Framework. We've had a team of about 11 very senior Master Chiefs working on this on behalf of MCPON to present to the CNO, we've got some proposals about where we're going to put some of this training. Training is going to be more carefully tied to time in the service. The difference between us and officers is that we, you, can have a First Class Petty Officer who makes it at four years, you can have a First Class Petty Officer that makes it 13 years. And, so the disparity between the two, the experience level, when you need those injects of training we've always tied it to something that said PO3 Leadership course. Meaning because you're a third class, now you need this. So the idea, which we have not yet fully briefed and gotten approval for, but the idea we're driving towards is Foundational Leader Development course which is taught at a time frame, which gives a larger aperture of when we can give it to you, which means it's going to be more carefully targeted to the audience that we need it, and it gives the Fleet more flexibility as to when they present that training. If you need it between two and four years of service, you'll get it at two and four years of service, it doesn't have to be tied to a promotion in order to establish eligibility. In fact, that's really a wrong-headed way of going about it. So, Foundational Leader Development course, Intermediate Level Development course, Advanced Leader Development course, and then the Senior Enlisted Academy, the CMC/COB course and so on. So, that's part of the way we want to re-engineer the way we do this in alignment with this Leadership Development Framework, and getting after character and competence as they're tied together.

Q: Currently we're seeing a lot of personnel coming into the Navy, and then going to these schools and the schools are getting shorter, and personnel are getting back to the Fleet, and they're more computer based, as well. And, the personnel are getting out to the Fleet and when they're getting to the actual function of doing their job the computer-based instruction is not helping them, and we're having to spend more time training than we are operating, in a sense as AT's their doing more computer-based welding than instead of actual welding, so now when they're getting into the field they don't have as much technical expertise, and that's what we're running into right now at the Arco. So trying to figure out, how can we expand the training instead of limiting the training, and getting more hands-on training and getting away from computer-based training?

A: VCNO: You got to strike the right balance between giving them enough training that they can do their job when they show up, but not so much training that they forget half of what they learned in the process of going through all that training. My favorite, do I have any Fire Controlmen in the room? Okay, how long was your school? - Seven months, Sir. - A school? - Oh A school was three months. - And then seven months at Dahlgren? – No, Sir; I was at Dam
Neck Seawinds. - Okay, Fire Controlman? How about you, how long? - A total of two years, and then this next time I had to go to sea another six months and I'm about to go to Aegis Ashore, Poland so I'll be spending another year in training. – Okay, so that three and a half years, how long you been in the Navy? - Eight years, Sir. - Eight years. There's a problem there isn't there? – Yes, and no, it's significantly better training than I feel the rest of the Fleet gets, and it's needed and I'm delighted that we have it, although I have spent a lot of time in school. - And how much of that time in school was spent not doing training? - Only in Great Lakes probably about nine, ten months on hold. - So the nine to ten months on hold is, again by the time you get to the Fleet, And, you're half way through your commitment, and so there's not a lot of payback on that ship or the Navy at large, so those are some of the issues that we're trying to deal with, the question that was asked, are we getting enough training? We're trying to tune this thing so that we have sufficient training to get you to sea where you get to see what the gear actually does at sea, and then take you back through training to help you become better at what you learned. So, every rate's going through this review right now, right? I think we're got 89, 90 rates that are going through a review process to try and fine tune it. I'm not sure on the welding side or some of the other rates that were mentioned here, whether we've been through these yet or we're just living off of where we were five, 10 years ago and now we're trying to make those better. So, that's the kind of feedback that we need through the TYCOM staffs to this effort to modernize the way we train. Computer-based training, I think everybody understands that computer-based training by itself is not adequate, not even close; we've tried that before, but we ought to be taking advantage of gaming, we ought to be taking advantage of virtual reality, we ought to be taking advantage of things that allows Sailors to do lots of reps and sets before we put them on that gear, and then blend that in with real time on gear, so that they're learning in with both methodologies. So, that's the effort that's going on

Q: I'm stationed at Naval Base Point Loma. And, earlier you brought up our fallen shipmates from the McCain and the Fitz, and because of those events it brought up a specific subject that I want to bring up. Specifically, the issue of fatigue in our Fleet, and it has to do with us doing our job and manning the watch. In our job, we have the unique task of manning a watch. I'm a CS, I'm used to doing long hours, but unfortunately we do these long hours and then we're expected to man a watch. Unfortunately, and it happens throughout the Fleet, I'm sure everyone in this room has experienced it, we have to man a watch for many reasons. Someone else isn't qualified, or we don't have enough people, or we just got to do it, and we've already worked an 18, perhaps 20-hour work day. No one is capable of manning a watch properly with that many hours of a work day, Sir. I'm sorry, but it's unhealthy and even with someone fighting the sleep, it's dangerous. And, unfortunately we learned that recently. So, I'm not one to complain without solutions, so my suggestion, and I'm asking your opinion on this, there are specific ratings that are trained to man watches, specifically OS's, Quarter Masters, perhaps we can train them, or
I don't know maybe open the rate, or maybe even make a rate that specifically mans these watches. That way the rest of the ratings can concentrate on doing their job, because this is a real issue, Sir. I don't want to see any more shipmates dying like this, and I'm sure everyone can agree with me on that. This is dangerous, Sir. What is your opinion on this?

A: VCNO: First of all, thanks for having the courage to stand up and let all of us know your concern, and I think it sounds like you're speaking on behalf of a lot of Sailors out there who are manning the watch and doing their normal jobs, environments where sometimes your ship or your unit is undermanned at that moment because of TAD requirements, you know other shore requirements that have been laid upon that unit when they are ashore, and I think we all understand that. Fatigue is always going to be a contributing factor to under performance, okay? I would caution all of us to hypothesize what caused the mishaps we're referring to here. Causal factors are different from contributing factors. I don't mean to lawyer you up here, I'm just saying that we've got to give the investigations the time to complete so that we fully understand what occurred. - I understand Sir. - Okay. But there's no question what we're hearing from Sailors through a variety of different means, but mainly through our goat locker and our Chiefs mess is that we're working awful hard in places, and it surges doesn't it, it's not always there, and when it surges is when you feel the stress of whatever manning level you're at. And, so I think we all understand that as you know or at least maybe you've read that Admiral Davidson has embarked on a comprehensive review across the entire Fleet to look at a whole series of things, and in there is this issue of fatigue. I've seen ships that have deployed under something other than circadian rhythm watch bills, not the best way to approach it perhaps, right? I mean, if you're not getting steady, consistent sleep opportunities, and you're switching it around cause you're on a five and dime or something other than a circadian rhythm, you're going to have issues. So, he's going to look at all that, and he's going to hear from lots of Sailors about how to approach it. In the meantime, it's on us, this organization right here to once again assess workload in different parts of the Navy where maybe that stress is too high, okay?

Q: My question is in regards to the new evaluation process, I know many of us in here are excited about the changes that are going to come about. But, my question is more specifically about if we eliminate the write-up, I think there was an insinuation that we would eliminate the write-up, how do we go about the board process for making Chief, making LDO, because right now one of the things that they tell us when we are preparing for the Board is that the write-up is the biggest aspect of the eval. It doesn't matter if you have P, MP or EP because the write-up is really key in what it is that they take into consideration.

A: CNP: That's a great question, but fundamentally the reason why that write-up is so important is because everyone's got something jammed in between 4.5 and 5.0, the entire Navy does. So there's no way to differentiate between them. So, depending on what community you come from
those 28 lines of code, and each community has a different code, and you have to be able to encode and decode according to your community rule sets are absolutely key. And today on a Chief's Board 27 lines are about collateral duties, and line 28 is about what you can actually do in terms of your warfighting skill, which is also bassackwards and we’ve got to turn that around too. And, next year’s precepts are going to address that a little bit differently, back to our core competency types of things. So, insinuates probably not the right word, outright said it, there's going to be few to no words on the new evals and fit reps. I am considering the need for some words. One of the things that we see a lot of value in, one, I think that BUPER’S 3’s team talked about it this morning; today's fit reps and evals are absolutely useless to a detailer in terms of talent matching. There's data on there, but you know I can't tell if Johnny the mechanic needs to turn wrenches for the rest of his life, or should go be the instructor unless the CO had the wherewithal to write that in the write-up somewhere. I also don't know, unless we have a conversation with Johnny whether Johnny wants to turn wrenches longer or be the instructor. So, there's that whole conversation, so we do all that by a sneaker net, it's a conversation, it's a little too black bookish; it's a little too informal right now. So, I think we need a member’s desires portion on there; here's where I want to go with life, with my career in the Navy, education, personal and professional growth; there's got to be a little piece on there from the command of, this is yeah, roger what Johnny says about being an instructor, but picks his nose too frequently, until he corrects that, probably not. Whatever had that harsh feedback, hopefully CO said that to Johnny before he writes it that's what we would like. But you know what I'm saying that kind of discussion has to take place. And, then, we also need a community specific piece as well. Cause we're going to use these fit reps and evals on statutory Boards, the one's required by law for promotion, we're also going to use them for screening, so selection for department head, XO, CO, for Command Master Chief, Command Senior Chief, all those sorts of things that are administrative boards, but I'd like to have a section where we can write things there that don't get considered in the Boards required by law so there's extra material on there. Say a surface warfare officer department head screening Board, boy I'd really like to know how they did on underways and landings and also the deck, I'd really like to know their maneuvering board skills, or how they did as TAO, for those types of things. For an aviation department head screening board I'd like to know several fundamental things about traps and landings, or if they're a maintenance officer what they did there, that sort of stuff. So that's not necessarily pertinent to the overall officer or enlisted development profile that would determine a promotion, but additional data that's there. So, there's probably going to be some writing, but it’s got to be short and sweet and to the point. So, we take the subjective coding and decoding out of it. And it might even be in the form of a drop down menu, and pick kinds of things so that we can keep reporting seniors from bad behavior which has driven us to where we are today. If we don't do that I'll be changing the fit reps again in 10 or 15 years I guarantee you, because if there's a way to game it first the aviators will figure it out, come on you guys, you're smart you'll do it, and then everybody else will follow suit in about a year, as soon as they all get victimized by the aviators. So, that's exactly how it has happened 51 times in past history. So, we’ve got to figure out how to do this
smarter for the long haul. That's a great question and I think the reality is we'll have something
on there as we work through this; it's probably going to be dynamic as we grow into this new
process, but great question. Thank you

**Q:** Also, there was a mention of instead of moving Sailors from different platforms, train
that Sailor in a specific platform and the NEC so we can better utilize their talent instead of
retraining them as they move. Has there been given any consideration in the advancement
limitations if we only have so many NEC's available in certain platforms, to me, my opinion
is that it kind of limits the Sailor in, number one professional development and number
two, advancement opportunities?

**A:** CNP: Well that comes back to that needs of the Navy thing, right? We're probably not going
to let a lot of submariners, submarine sonarmen, and transfer to PAW's unless we have a need for
that. So, that's always going to drive how many we're going to allow. But where there is a need,
we'll open up the funnel, we'll figure out the way to do the training, we're going to talk a lot more
about that in terms of the rating monetarization effort this afternoon. We'll allow some numbers
to go in many directions, but going large numbers, it'll have to be needs of the Navy driven,
because fundamentally that's what we're about.

**Q:** We were discussing the initiative for Bias and Intervention and Chart the Course as it
relates to sexual assault and sexual harassment. Being a woman in the Navy, have we
considered as a solution, not as a permanent solution, but as an alternative to offer self-
defense courses for not just women but both men and women in the service?

**A:** RDML Thomas: So, I think that self-defense courses tend to be something that is taught when
you have folks that have some skill, and I've been on carriers where we've offered because we
had the talent. I don't know that we've looked at that as a service mechanism, certainly I'll take it
back to my team and we'll discuss it. You did mention Chart the Course, Bias and Intervention,
Full Speed Ahead is what we're doing this year just as an opportunity to get this out here, we're
working on the curriculum for Full Speed Ahead 2.0 which is going to harken back to that social
media discussion, we're trying to write it up so we can kind of give an inoculation on social
media, I forgot to mention that earlier. But I'll certainly take your thoughts back and discuss it
with my team.

**Q:** My question is about a detailing process, I'm the training coordinator for my squadron,
and one of the issues that we run into is when Sailors report to our command out of A
school, but they haven't completed all of their training yet for their detailed NEC, is there
any way that we could work around that to be able to get these Sailors through their school and when they report to us their ready to turn wrenches or get into the helicopter?

A: CNP: I'm going to start and then let Oscar (RDML Meier) finish this one. Remember, I was talking about Sailor 2025 and getting into NEC fit? Fundamentally, I don't have a demand signal in the personnel system; I'm taking a stab in the dark at producing sailors with the right NEC's. And, some communities are particularly challenging because even the same aircraft type model series, or the same ship classes depending on the platform and the state of modernization, different NEC's for different equipment right? We don't have that demand signal unless it gets designated as a critical NEC. There's not enough critical NEC's designated. And, I don't decide that, I'm working with the type commanders to get a better picture of that and the volume of that right now. I think we've been masking the magnitude and the severity of the problem by not designating more NEC's as critical so that we can get them to schools en route, instead of passing this problem off to the Fleet. But one of the FTNF deep dives that we did really kind of shed some light on this. But that's the root cause of what's going on. In the meantime, Oscar and his team are doing what I'll refer to as unnatural acts to work around the fact that we don't have the system geared right to do this while we fix the system, and Oscar I'll let you talk to that.

A: RDML Meier: if I could ask after this to talk to you with Captain Al Ross, we'd like to get the specifics on exactly what NEC's and type model series you're talking about. But, I will offer to you that Billet Based Distribution is a step in the right direction. It used to be that we didn't necessarily even track NEC's that much, but Billet Based Distribution is now linked some NEC's to a Billet with a Billet Sequence Code and it's going in the right direction. From a command perspective, my perspective was always different then what others might have thought were critical NEC's as well, so, if our system is saying that you've got to have an NEC for a particular BSC, I think we're probably providing that to you. It may require follow-on training in order to be a useful asset in your command, and that's really touching on CNP's point in that we're kind of just really scratching the surface, I think, on the critical NEC aspect of this. And, as command, I fully understand the burden that that places on you. I've been in those shoes, in that you get a Sailor that's got a partial NEC or some training, but you have to now, somewhere during that tour, invest the time and the energy, so that Sailors going to go away and get the NEC which means the rest of the team picks up the load; if it's a local school, that's great, if it's a school that's far away, it comes out of your pocket. Nobody else is paying for that. I got it, and it's especially critical for FDNF units as well, cause they have much less capacity on the waterfront for those NEC schoolhouses for the teaching of it, and it's much more disruptive to send them home, and more costly. So I got it, I'd like to get the details and see if there's something we can tighten up on that, okay?

A: CNP: We're working with the Aegis, we're going to put a fast band aid on this while we fix the system, but great point. Thanks for bringing it up.
Q: Recognizing that NAVMAC does a lot of work to identify valid billets, and DBD has increased visibility on those billets, on those valid billets, valid but unfunded billets, can you speak to the plan to fund those existing unfunded billets while working towards a larger Fleet with new billets?

A: CNP: So the question of validated billets but not yet funded is really the resource sponsors decision. One, it's a slow process, and it's a byzantine process. In your case, from NAVELSG it's N95 so there's other complications there, we're kind of bifurcated with the Marine Corps to some degree and other needs. But the bottom line is once it's been validated as we need them then at some point corporate Navy represented by that warfare sponsor's got to say yep we're going to pony up the money, and then once they pony up the money we got to go either find or make the bodies to go fill those billets. So, it's a long, a long process. That's all I got for you. Where we specifically are on those, you know it depends on the puts and takes of any specific warfare sponsor on any given day. We'll see what comes of this year’s budget; it was really encouraging what came out of the Senate the other day, it was like more than the President's budget asked for. Of course, that's the authorizers, the appropriators I think the guys that actually write the check are going to have a slightly different view of how much they can spend on this sort of stuff, but everybody’s been trying to do too much with too little money to go around, so have hard choices to make and that's what drives these sorts of decisions. Not a satisfying answer, I can imagine.

A: RDML Meier: I would tell you that puts a tremendous amount of pressure on the distribution piece, so when we do create or fund these new requirements as CNP eluded, let's say you create 10 Chief Petty Officer Billets, that doesn't mean there are more bodies fill those, you just created 10 holes. And, in order to create those jobs it takes 10 to 15 years to what, to recruit them, to assess them, to train them, to advance them into that position. It's not a very agile business model, so just creating the billet is part of the process, but really getting additional people into the program, more people to distribute, that's the part that really—And, we kind battle this on several levels, where we try to be agile as a force and we'll stand something up either by creating new billets, or even before the billets get created and it's a high priority fill, well, we fill that but we fill that out of hide, cause you're not creating more people so we just have to basically kind of slosh what we got to fill the priorities better so-- - Thank you, Sir. – Thanks, for the question.

Q: My question to you was, you did bring up technology, and about how it is utilized more in today's Navy, especially with cell phones, and apps, and all the different ways to connect to each other? How do you feel about, especially, upper chain of command, using that as a way to task, or as a way to give directives? And, I don't mean just from an email standpoint, like, oh, well, I can send out a mass email to make sure everyone's in the know. I mean, individual texts or messages.
A: FLTCM Whitman: Okay, so, actually, great question. When I was Force Master Chief at SURFLANT, the Battenberg Cup winner, their skipper sent a text to their Sailors every morning. And, it wasn't long, because once you start getting past two sentences, everybody just turns you off, oh, my God, it's too long, right? He actually texts them every morning, and then, he tried... He didn't text them one morning, and everybody was freaking out. They were like, where's the text from the skipper? So, they looked forward to it. Whether it was motivating, herding the cats, however you want to call it. I think it's a wonderful tool. I think the best thing that I believe is great for our Sailors is the apps. Unbelievable, long overdue, and holy cow, when I went to the table back there, my God, there are so many apps. And, there was a question yesterday about pregnancy? That pregnancy app is out there. Or parenthood, pregnancy and parenthood. So, I think we're just heading in a direction that we just need to keep going, and skyrocket. I think, the future ... I think there's other places out there are far beyond where we're at, and we need to just catch up, and keep moving along with them. We're a little bit behind, but when I came in, we're not as far behind then, right? So I think it's great. To push tasks, to be like an email tasker, you push an email, and a tasker, and you slap your hand, and you go to the next... I don't believe in that. I think there's times and places for that, but I think the good old get up, get out of your seat, go walk around the deck plates, go find that Sailor, that chief, that officer, and have a conversation, is good also. So, I'm good with the apps, I think they're phenomenal. I think it's great, so, thank you.

Q: It seems like there's been a lot of talk of getting the Navy ratings to be gender neutral. Has that been a reaction to there being such a sense of heritage to the names, the rating names, or is that something that's actually going to occur in the future?

A: FLTCM Whitman: No, I think we're... First of all, I'll say the rating modernization piece, when the rating modernization came out, I called it “drop the mic Thursday.” And, pretty much, that's what I called it. But here's what I will tell you. Leadership listened, and they understood that we were being... Like, our bandwidth was sucked up about why the rating changed, and why we're a number, and some Sailors said their identity's gone. And so leadership went back and said, okay, probably not the right decision, so number one, kudos to leadership, because at the end of the day bringing our ratings back was the right decision. With the word “man” at the end, I don't see any changes. When we did go through the ratings modernization, and we had the word man at the end, we have taken some of those out. But I think it's died down. And I know phone-a-friend back there, Fleet Smith, I always said if I didn't have the full story, I'd phone a friend, so I got Fleet Smith back there, and he'll add some to it.

A: FLTCM Smith: CNO said it best; rating names became more of a distraction. Rating modernization continues. The efforts by N13 and PRS are going to fundamentally change the way we do everything with regards to Sailors. And, you heard Admiral Meier speak about detailing. There's so many aspects that this plays into. So, it's continuing. We just stopped talking about the names, for now. And maybe someday in the future, that'll... And, I don't even want to say that, because somebody'll take that out of context. We're not going to revisit that at this time, that hasn't really been an issue that Sailors have come forward with saying, no, seriously, please, take man out. We're marching forward with rating modernization as an effort to overhaul the way we do Navy ratings, and give Sailors greater opportunity to stay with the company.
Q: As far as women at sea, as recent as maybe three months ago, I had to turn a female away because she could not get a rack on a ship. Is there any initiatives to kind of even out that, so females aren't able to go to sea are more able to get to sea, just like our male counterparts are?

A: Yes, because that deals with the competitiveness. Everybody knows, sea sailors make rate a lot faster than shore duty sailors. So, when you have to turn a female away because I don't have a rack for you, that kind of impedes their advancement process. Well, the first question I'm going to ask you, was it a Pac fleet ship? - Like I said, I'm old, I don't remember. But I want to say it was-- - [Whitman] You can email me-- - I want to say it was an East coast, if I'm... But I know it was an aircraft carrier, so we're having that issue on our big decks. I can only imagine on the small decks. - Let's talk women at sea, women at sea. If you're not at sea, get out of your chair, go to sea. Go to sea. Couldn't get to sea until I was a first class , and I was so far behind the power curve, it was crazy. It took me about six months to figure out where I was going, and what I was doing. Go to sea, because the opportunities are there for you, so I'm a big proponent of women at sea. Okay, number one. Number two, if there's not a rack, then there's something going on in that ship. Because the CMC, as I was the CMC of an aircraft carrier, we moved berthings. We actually moved males out of their berthing, because they were in a bigger berthing, but didn't have all the racks filled, to a smaller one, to open that berthing for more racks for females. So, I would say, it's not all a leadership thing, but are they following their racks, and do they understand how many females they have on board, and then how many are coming in with the strike group? Because that's very important, also. - [Dingle] Yes, absolutely. - And I would say it's... God, if it's me, reach out to me. I would have a conversation-- - [Dingle] I certainly will. - Yeah, because it is unbelievable... At sea is, God, I'm a sea girl, so I love being at sea. Came in the Navy 8% females in the Navy, got onboard Abraham Lincoln, we were at 12% females, and by two years later, we were up past 19% women onboard the ship. So it can be done. But it has to be a priority, and it takes some kind of innovation, who asked me about the innovation idea, earlier? Took some innovation on how we going to do it? Hey, you just move... you move berthings, and it's as easy as that. So, great question, and if you're not at sea, go to sea.

Q: My question is how is this going to affect our Reserve Sailors, vice versa. (Referencing billet selection and C-WAY)

A: CAPT Segars: That's a great question. I appreciate you doing that because what else do I do in C-Way? Reserve quotas. So, this is a total force concept. That's another way I'm going to bring more Sailors for distributable inventory for Admiral Meier. Because who started this concept of permeability? Very few people. Flag Officers always beat me up about it. Master Chiefs heard it; she's like, what in the world. Here's the idea. Who knows where we're going with our retirement? Blended retirement. You think that's not going to impact things how we do business? Right now, if I got you to 10 years, you think I got you? Right now, this blended retirement, I don't know, I might not take that. I'm going to take my 401K, I'm going to go over here. But, you might not like it. So, you might stay in the Reserves. I might want to bring you
back in. With this new marketplace, if you're out in the Reserves, or you're out-- We just might email you, and go, "Hey, you want this job because I need somebody to do it." I mean, that's what companies would do. They'd go after that talent. I think we could do that too. So, it really will be a total force. It's how you're going to do conversions; it’s how you're going to do component changes. So, if you're an active, and you want to go SELRES, you're going to have to apply and align yourself to a SELRES billet. That's important. If you're in the SELRES, and you want to go from the RC to the AC, you're going to need to apply and align yourself to a billet. I think that makes sense, it's not hard. Today, we make those decisions, and I don't even know if he can use them, or when he can use them, a lot easier to align up to the billet as we're making those decisions.

Q: I have a question in supportability for the Ready Relevant Learning and how the fleet is going to be able to support that in which at the current state, we're not able to support OFRP manning, because, essentially, a lot of these moves that you're talking about, are happening last minute to fulfill the deploying squadron, or ship’s needs. So, if we then move that school requirement to a command that's now back on shore, not deployed at that time, that's taking more manpower from them that they're still getting manpower taken for the deployers at the last minute.

A: CAPT Segars:  Now, that's a totally different brief. But, you know, your point is a valid concern. It really is. I mean, it's easy to talk about how we're going to break up training, and we're going to, but it is a burden on the Command. I've been there. That's something that we're still working through.

A: CNP: One of the tenants here, in Ready Relevant Learning, and we haven't talked much about this today, but there's still this, there's a lot of folklore and legend out there. So, E2 type Commanders is writing their own respective books on how Ready Relevant Learning is going to work for their community. So, this isn't something that N1 is jamming down anybody's throat. Ultimately, you know, the big piece of this is we're breaking up the schools, right stuff at the right time, that folks go to school en route to sea assignments. There will be, for some ratings, in some cases, a little bit of additional school that is designed to happen in the sea tour, a first tour, a block zero will be, essentially, pieces of what we call A-school today. Block one is anything extra that somebody needs to pick up as they move from a junior operator to a senior operator on that journeyman tour. A surface sonar one would be a good example. They're going to need about three extra weeks of training in the course of a 60-month sea tour, three weeks. So, in the end state, when we get to the final 2023, everything's done with Ready Relevant Learning, that training will be available at every waterfront. So, we're not going to have to fly somebody back to trainers and at the training meccas for the different communities, Pensacola, Groton, Great Lakes, or anywhere. It'll be at the waterfront. You won't need a course convening quota. You're going to go into, a basically, virtually trainers, and I'm not talking digital trainers, like we did in
2007, going into these virtual worlds with virtual tutors, where it's reps and sets on the equipment to get better. It's something that the Sailor's already trained on, they're just honing their skills in particular situations, doing it over and over again, getting better at specific aspects of systems. We have these now. They're cheap, they're plentiful, just a matter of time getting them out to the waterfronts. But, even that depending on how many Sonarmen the ship has, depending on what they're doing in the maintenance phase. How active are your Sonarmen, security watches? They're doing all kinds of crazy things that big Navy has thrust upon us. So, they're manning in-port watchbills. We have never manned ships by in-port requirements. It's always based on at-sea requirements, and there's a pretty complicated formula for that, and it's pretty good. So, to make sure that we're not screwing this up, we just initiated with US Fleet Forces an in-port manning study, and we just finished the-- it's not signed out yet, but we did DDG's first because some of those ratings like Surface Sonarmen, for example, we think it's going to have the biggest impact on. Guess what it showed? Engineering departments and all the HM and E rates way overloaded in port. Other rates less so. Folks that are standing a lot of security watches, we need more of them. You need an entirely different mix of ratings in port than you do at-sea. Something we've all known intuitively. Now, we've got the analysis behind it, and we know the (eaches?). So, now it's going to go to a decision before we get to that phase and implementation. Are we going to augment crews with, sort of, extra folks that are pool? Probably not a recipe for success. Or do we buy extra billets and extra manpower for each ship. Use that extra manpower for each ship to rotate other folks ashore for other training and other things that we're asking them to do, even while you're deployed. We actually did this as a subset on the reactor departments on aircraft carriers. We're having a lot of significant issues with reactor department retention because we're working them like dogs, and the availabilities, then would go deploy for nine months, then would turn around and work them like dogs again. So, we plussed up the reactor department significantly so that during deployment, the reactor department folks could go out and do schools, do leave, but we had enough folks to support that. Guess what? Retentions going back up because they can do everything we're asking them to do, because there are enough people. So, that's where we're heading with it. I think there's going to be a people aspect to this. The key is going to be the transition between when we initiate this for enough ratings that close watchbill management in port by the ship, you, the XO, the CO, the Senior Watch Officer, and Command Master Chief, stuff like that isn't enough to do it. So, we're working really close with each of the type Commanders to make sure we don't implement before we get to the point where we can safely execute. We want to do everything, make contact before we break anything. We want it all to work right. It's a really good concern and something that the analysis is just starting to roll in on. On the DDG's we've found out about 13 additional people, which is a lot, it's a huge bill. Admiral Boxall, N96, is trying to figure out where he's going to find that money. There might have to be some compromises. Do we do it for everybody, or do we do it slightly differently? So, we'll get through that though. We got a supportive CNO and Vice Chief on how to do this right so that we don't take it out of people's hides.
Q: Is there any chance that, even though retention's going up, like CNP said, for reactor department Sailors to maybe cross rate towards the 12 month until they're EAOS of something like that? That way, the Navy doesn't lose Sailors towards the Civilian Sector. They just go on to do something else, and they still remain a benefit to the Navy.

A: CAPT Segars: We definitely want to keep Sailors that we've invested in, like you, who've had so much training and investment in. That really is the idea of what we're getting at. Today, under the conversion process, one, because your rating's undermanned, I would probably never even allow, give you any quotas to convert out.

Q: Even if that meant the Sailor hitting his EAOS, and going to the Civilian Sector? You would lose them anyway, sir.

A: CAPT Segars: Right, that's the problem. That's the whole point. You're making my point of why we have to change and modernize our system, because I'm playing chicken with you right now. That's what we call it. Is he really going to do that or is he really going to take some orders? I don't really know that, I'm just hoping, and that is not a good strategy. If I allowed you to play in the marketplace, you would probably be applying for other billets and given me a clear signal that—And, not applying for a Reactor Department, and telling me-- Because if you do that, what else are you walking away from? SRB, bonus, right? Because I'm not going to pay you an SRB to be a CS, right? It's a good point. I can't make that decision today very well because I don't allow you to kind of have the dialogue that a marketplace would allow because you would enter these rounds each month, or two months, or however we do it. I think we'll be able to do it each month, and I think Admiral Meier agrees too. We'll have better systems. But, to tell us that, because I'm like, man, he didn't put anything down, Admiral Meier. What do you think about that? I think he's serious. Maybe we'll let him cook another month and see what he says. Or we'll offer him only that and he says no. Can you say no today to orders? How do you say no today? [Man] Don't OBLISERV or reenlist. - Right, you walk out on us. You see what I'm talking about? We're not having a negotiation conversation. This system will allow us to have a negotiation conversation because you might say no, and it might mean I need to give you a different type of-- a better offer, and so we can do that. I know he wants to do that. I want that to happen so we can keep the best Sailors. So, it might feel like I didn't really answer your question, but I do think this new system is going to allow you to be able to have that negotiation. Because today, under our current industrial serialized approach, I just cut you off at the knees, and it'd be over. Unless you have a good Chief, or someone else who comes and talks to us, and really starts pleading your case, and making us really think about it and do the right decision. Our Sailors, who are at MPT and E, will always try to make the right decision. We're committed to that, because we're a part of you, we're a part of the same team. We want to do that, but often, our systems today don't allow us even to have that interaction to really make that happen, and that's another benefit of this marketplace, it'll allow us to have some of that interaction in a huge scale, but to be able to tell us, back and forth, how serious you really are. We would figure that out.
fairly short after a couple of cycles of this, and you’re not putting in for those billets. Oh, he's
serious. So, we might need to offer you that to keep you because we want to keep you.

Q: My question is regarding the marketplace. Your previous slide showed a system that
looked very simplistic. Is there any-- I know it's in draft. Has the question of resolving
suitability-- So, overseas, or sea-duty screenings. So, a Sailor goes through all of that, clicks
here, so to serve, and then falls out.

A: CAPT Segars: I give you a C-Way quota, and Admiral Meier gives you a billet, and then we
go, "Go see the doctor, see if you can do this." Is that not stupid? (audience laughs) How about
you go see the doctor and do your PHA, and you're ready to go, full-up round, and then you
come talk to us. Does that make a little more sense? Now, life happens. We know things are
going to happen within a negotiation period, but that's really what we're looking at, using that
PHA that we try to do before each PRT, really make it mean something, so we're really working
hard with BUMED. Those are hard things that we're trying to get at. We want that stuff to mean
stuff. When you come in, we want you a full-up round, ready to go. World-wide deployable or
not. If you're not world-wide deployable, I need to know that because, guess what? How many
more billets you gonna see? I can't find a billet. Well, whose fault is that? (laughs) We have to
work through that. It benefits people who are ready and full-up round. Today, we actually
disadvantage them, in my opinion. Thanks. Really good question.

Q: Earlier, someone eluded to the fact that we aren't taking all these college courses and
may not be doing our job, which actually the case in some instances, but has there been any
discussion to raise tuition assistance from 16 credit hours per semester to any other
number?

A: LCDR Turner: I won't talk specific numbers, but we're looking at various different ways to
make the tuition assistance program as best we can for everyone, for all the Sailors, the best
program it can be. So, numbers-wise, not going to get into specifics, but know that all the
decisions that we're looking at, that we're trying to make with how we're automating, how we're
changing the NCPACE program, they're done with Sailors in mind, what's going to be best for
the Sailor, how's it going to fit in to their workflow, their work day, their deployment schedule,
what can we do to help you guys since we're not standing there in front of you, how can we help
you with our services and with our programs?

Q: With all these programs going in, more web-based, more online stuff, is there a plan to
get the infrastructure set up so we can have the Sailors use these computers more?
Currently in our shop, two computers for six, eight people and it doesn't make it economical for them to get online to do all these programs. And out-to-sea, limited bandwidth doesn't make it economical for them to sit here and wait an hour for a webpage to load to get these services.

A: CNP: To answer your question, I am not optimistic that we are going to get government-owned computers in sufficient quantities to enable that. Having operated government-owned computers for some 20 years now, I don't want to operate them very much more. I'd rather do it on my own phone, my own handheld mobile device, my own iPad, or whatever. So, we're making everything oriented towards that. Every Sailor in here has a state-of-the-art handheld phone. Higher technology than the government will ever furnish them. They're not going to need a CAC card reader, because we're going to identity access management. We got to do that anyways for retirees and family members to access the system, but we have a mechanism, and we're the first in DOD to do this. That's going to take your PKI certificates and equate it with your thumbprint on your smart phone. You get a new phone, you're going to have to go through that process every time you get a new phone, but that's a small pain in the ass relative to having to go operate a government computer every time you want to do something. You'll be able to do it from your smart phone every time, all the time, even when you're at-sea, within cell phone range, or Wi-Fi range. A lot of our ships now have Wi-Fi, and more are getting them. We're really working through the details on low bandwidth options. Our (belt?), we actually are about to release the low bandwidth version of My Navy Portal, it just doesn't have the pictures. It loads pretty quick, even on submarines. Although, as a Submariner, I would not want to stay at PD doing personnel functions. We haven't done that ever in submarine force, and I don't anticipate we ever will. We'll cache those transactions for when it's operationally prudent to do that and we know how to do that. I think surface combatants and aviation Squadrons, when you're in EMCON, we'll deal with that. What we haven't decided is whether we're going to cache it on Sailor's smart phones, so they do it with the phone in airplane mode, it just stays on their phone until it can transmit, or whether it gets cached in a central system on a ship or on a Squadron. Kind of what we're coming to the realization is it might depend on what the transaction is because the ship might be able to transmit sooner. If it's some vital paperwork and we want that thing to register sooner, it might be a Sailor choice thing, where I want this one posted now, can I give it to the ship, and put it in their system, and let them transmit, rather than leave it on my phone. If it's a, hey, whenever it gets in, it gets in, I'll deal with it, then fine, we'll let it go that way. So, it's probably going to be a mixed solution there. We're still working through the mechanics of that, but I am not going to try and solve the government computer thing. I got too much on my plate as it is right now, but thanks for the question.

Q: When will we be able to see a pilot program, possibly for these new evals that we keep hearing about for the last two years?
A: On the new evaluation system. So, we did a round of pilots in January, February timeframe. It was about a couple hundred evals. This was the reports that gave us the nice distribution as compared to the old mechanism. We assigned in late June timeframe a number of UICs that were going to generate us about in a neighborhood of eight to 10,000 more reports. Really sometime late this month, that data should start rolling in. So, those went out fleet-wide, around the world, that test UICs were doing reports both ways. We also have groups kind of visiting fleet concentration areas helping us with those value statements, test driving what's today, still a fairly clunky share-point version of this model that we're testing out right now, working through the bugs on it, but when we get all those 10,000 reports in, we'll have a much more statistically significant test set. We're going to run some mock boards on it, as well as compare a lot of data, and then, sort of the roll-out plan would be make sure there's no issues, you know, we don't want to break anything. That's the first thing. If we find there are no issues, and we make all the tweaks we want to make on this, we would initiate this in sort of a phased manner. Something that, unfortunately, is going to be complicated because you start with brand new recruits start on a new system, new Commissioned Officers start on the new system, but you're going to have to take gates. You just got selected for Chief, guess what? You're going on the new system. So, everybody from that point forward competing for Senior Chief is going to be on the new system. You don't want to have a mix up of people on the old system and the new system competing on a board because now that's really going to be apples-oranges kind of data. My worry is that it would disadvantage people, and that's the last thing we want to do. So, I sort of see a staggered implementation plan that's going to be over a period of time. My thinking might be too limited there. I got a lot of smart people working this. They may come up with something a lot smarter than that, but that's the way we see it going right now. I see probably April, May-ish next year we start rolling out specific pay grades starting at the junior levels, and then once you make certain milestones, transitioning over, but kind of next Spring-ish.

Q: When it comes to technology, we've heard a lot of good ideas and a lot of things that are very, very encouraging. I just wanted to get your thoughts on do you see the future in the Navy of people wanting to spend more time in IT a little bit more competitive and maybe trying to lead the IT industry a little more than we have, instead of maybe contracting out a lot of these things that we're doing? How do you see the IT infrastructure when it comes to people?

A: CNP: We're in the middle of this 100% business process review that Secretary of Defense Mattis directed. What we're doing in our MPT and E transformation really was exactly that, and we started this almost two years ago now, but it really directs the entire Department of Defense to go back and re-baseline the work that we're doing. One of the fundamental questions there is if there's something that we're doing that commercial industry could do better, faster, cheaper, then why are we even in that line of work? There's a lot of stuff that we do that falls into that category. For me, commercial personnel, or me maintaining 55 different personnel systems-- We
talked a little bit about those today. No two of them talk to each other. Some of them coded in FORTRAN 4 and COBOL, I got to hire the four people that are still alive on the planet that program in FORTRAN every time we do a pay structure change, and they extort me for many, many dollars, and those systems are costing hundreds of millions of dollars to keep in operation. Why are we in the Navy in the business of maintaining those personnel systems when I could go do kind of a smart phone version and do a fee for service, and rent that capability of having a big commercial company do all our personnel system services for us, which is exactly what we're doing. We're not going to own this new system. I'm doing fee for service, and with that fee for service, every time that company does an update, the app gets an update, and I get a download, and I don't have to pay for it. I don't pay to maintain the servers, I don't pay to maintain the facilities, I don't pay for technology, and I'm not going to have to go through this transformation again. I may have to adjust my process, as the technology approves that sort of stuff. So, that's an example of where I think we ought to get out of the business of us doing it better. The flip side though, is, and more to your point, I think, is, if you've heard the CNO talk about where we're going in this 355 ship capability that we have coming down the road, whether it's 355, or the capability of 355 ships, the one thing is certainly true, the reason we've always prevailed in combat before, if you think about the OODA loop, observe, orient, decide, act. We have always reigned supreme in maritime battle, really, for since World War II, and middle World War II on because observe and orient things, we dominated. We got great sensors, and because of that, great world-wide today sensory network that we have, we orient fast. Well, most other folks are catching up to that. Now, what we have to rethink about in our brains, and with the technology that no commercial industry is going to develop; we're going to have to work in partnership with them to help develop our needs. We got to start working on that O-D part. Everyone's going to have the same sensory picture. How do we orient and decide quicker than everybody else so that you can immediately act? So, that's where the new kind of emphasis is on the new battle. It's a little bit different way of thinking about it, but I think it's a good way of talking about the way ahead. So today, we've got a networked fleet, but what about if tomorrow we had weapons as a service, sensors as a service? Yeah, that sensor may launch from an aircraft carrier, but it goes up, and now it's providing a service to multiple fleets, multiple strike groups, and any one of those assets can task that service. Same thing with a weapon, we don't think about it in those terms right now. In today's terms, it's hard to think about it. The closest thing would be like a T-line. You put it up in the air, it's in an orbit, and you wait until the right opportunity comes along, and anyone of those combinations of sensors and platforms whenever that weapon becomes the optimum payload for a target of choice, those combinations hit, and now you've got that weapon as a service drawn out. Different way of thinking about things, so how do we develop that? There are probably some commercial examples of that, like for stock market decisions and stuff, sort of the A.I., but also with human in a loop type of stuff, but we're going to have to get our brains wrapped around that as we look at rules of engagement, as we look at command and control, of big things like strike groups, and inter-fleets, pretty exciting stuff coming.
Q: Recently, the Tomahawk community had a convening where they discussed some of the relevant issues. One of the issues was the level of technology versus the level of education our Sailors have. So, right now, we have technology, at least in our community, and I'm sure in others, that are far exceeding the amount of education that are Sailors are receiving. These Sailors are going to ships, and they don't know how to operate the equipment, and they don't know how to fix the equipment, but they're getting real good at writing CASREPS, asking for a tech assist. During this meeting today, I hear about this block training, getting brought up again. I know I heard about it a few years ago at Fleet ASW. I guess my concern is that our civilian counterparts, my civilian counterparts, have Bachelors and Masters Degrees. I have an entire six months of training from the United States Navy to do my job. Is there any concern that we're going to get to a point where our Sailors are obsolete, and we're relying on civilian tech reps to constantly come onboard and fix everything?

A: CNP: I think that's exactly the problem we're trying to address with Ready Relevant Learning because what happens right now, you know, a Sailor-- We're training the vast majority of our Sailors today, we're giving them entire career’s worth of training up-front. They'll go to an A-school, which not exactly true, but for the most part, A-schools are the operator school. Then, we're giving a good portion of Sailors the C-school, which are the maintainer schools. Then, they go to a tour, an operational tour, and for the most part, that journeyman tour is operator, junior operator to less junior operator, on a cusp of doing some maintenance. Maybe they do some maintenance, maybe they don't, depends on the community, depends of the equipment, but, by and large, if they're doing maintenance, it's not yet the complex maintenance that really taps in those skills we've trained them on. Then, two things happen, one, 50% of them get out of the Navy. So, we got zero return on investment of that C-school training we did. Then, the other thing that happens is 70% of the equipment gets modernized, and the 50% that did stay, got training on irrelevant equipment. So, that's why you see what you see. What Ready Relevant Learning will do, is they're going to go back to training in a schoolhouse. Some of it might be virtual, but it's going to be a schoolhouse, and there's gonna be plenty of hands-on, whether it's virtual or actual, probably both, before they go back to sea so we can get out of this vicious circle that we've been in. We've got to get out of that. Then, there's the maintenance side of this too. The maintenance side has been-- You know, we have gotten ourselves out of the business of, we contracted out the lion’s share of our maintenance to civilian organizations, and they've done a great job, but then what we haven't been doing then, is developing those maintenance skills for the shipboard repairs, and ultimately, if you're thinking about the battles to come, and the battles that made the United States Navy what it is today, our ability to fight hurt. We’ve got to be able to fix our stuff and keep on fighting. So, we are-- The budgets for the next couple of years have significant plus ups of Sailors going back to maintenance organizations, which has an added side benefit of it helps with sea shore flow, gives shore organizations shore duty opportunities for engineering intensive billet ratings, and things like that. There are a lot of other positive side benefits, but when you really come down to it, it's about war fighting capabilities, because we
got to be able to fight hurt. All those things are being looked at, and they're moving, but it's going to be a couple years before you start to see those benefits, but I'm with you on all those thoughts. We got to fix it and we're working to do that.