

TRANSCRIPT

## Defense Writers Group

A Project of the Center for Media & Security  
New York and Washington, D.C.

---

**Major General Stephen Farmen**  
**Commanding General, USA Security Assistance Command**

**Oct. 12, 2017**

---

**DWG:** Thank you to everybody for coming in this morning. In particular, thank you to our guest, Major General Stephen Farmen, the Commander of U.S. Army Security Assistance Command, in town, obviously, for AUSA. And we all appreciate you making the time to sit down with us as well.

Sir, why don't you go ahead and take the first couple of minutes to just give us a quick overview of what's on your mind right now, and then we'll start the Q&A after that.

**Aa:** It sounds good. Thanks, Adam. Again, it's a real honor and privilege for me to be here.

I know General Milley, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Army team in general, the more we're out talking, he's encouraged us to get out and talk to the media. That's something we like to do and we want to do because it's important that we get the story out there. Especially what we're doing, how we're doing it, all of those kinds of things.

This is very timely. As you heard, I just came out of AUSA. There were over 75 international partners at the conference over the last three days. I had a lot of bilateral engagements with those partners. I hosted an international breakfast, spoke at that international breakfast, conducted a panel, Foreign Military Sales panel and that was with Lieutenant General Hooper, who is the Director of Defense Security Cooperation Agency. And also Assistant Secretary of the Army for Defense Exports and Cooperation, Ms. Ann Cataldo, and then myself.

So again, we've had a great opportunity to deal with our industry partners and our international partners over the course of the last three days. So if I sound a little hoarse, it's because I've been doing a lot of talking over the last three days, and more importantly, communicating and partnering with our international partners, strengthening that.

I've been told that, obviously, you're all very astute and savvy and you've probably read our mission statement, so I just want to give a little more context as to what we're doing.

You may have heard the term By, With and Through our International Partners. That's side by side, moving forward with our partners, trying to achieve, address the mutual threats that we all face. Our mission statement as it links to that in my view is very simple. It's Build, Support and Strengthen. What we do to operationalize By, With and Through is Build, Support and Strengthen with our international partners. And we do that in a variety of different ways. We do it out of Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Alabama; and we lead the Army Materiel Command Enterprise, Security Assistance Enterprise.

Our job, simply put, is really to be the conduit, the integrator, to synchronize and integrate and be the touch point from the country to the U.S. government to industry. So in other words, based on what the country desires, based on what the combatant commander's need, what the Chief of Staff of the Army's priorities are, what the State Department's priorities are, all those types of things, we mesh them together and if it's a Blackhawk, a tank, a Patriot, munitions, our job is to deliver that capability to the country in the time that they want it, at the cost that they wanted it, and all those kinds of things. And be effective at that. It has to be there at the right point in time in order to, you know, build trust, and we're trying to be transparent in that process.

Another key point that I think is very important before we get into the Q&A is my organization does execution. We don't do policy. So we don't write policy, we don't do policy. Our job is to execute based on the policies that are set for us, and they're set by OSD and they're also set by the State Department and Congress and all those types of things. So our job is to really take those policies, operationalize them, and execute and deliver capability to the countries. But we become that face to the country. We're the Army's face to the world. That's our motto. So we're the face that's going to do that, and we also deal with the ambassadors and the country teams in those countries and all those types of things to make sure we're delivering the proper security cooperation and assistance capabilities.

A few more points, and I know you've been reading a lot of the outputs from AUSA, but I think it goes without saying we're facing one of the most complex strategic environments that we've seen in decades. I've been serving for a certain amount of decades, General Milley, Secretary of Defense, Secretary Mattis have been serving for many many decades, and they stood on podiums and said this is probably the most complex strategic environment that they've seen in many many years, which means the priority for the Army is the same. It's readiness. That's the number one priority. There is no other priority.

What that means to us is strategic readiness.

So it's one thing for the U.S. Army to be ready, but it's even a better thing if our

international partners are strategically ready. Their readiness is on par with ours. So if we have to deal with a mutual threat that we all face, and this gets into sustainment that we'll talk about, we're on the same playing field with the right capabilities that are interoperable, and we can face those mutual threats together on a level, set playing field.

My boss, who's going to come here in a month, as you just heard, General Gus Perna, has a quote that I think frames this really well. What he says is, he says the difference between being ready and reacting is lives lost. We have to hold ourselves accountable to being ready. And I think that really frames what we're trying to do, certainly U.S. Army Security Assistance Command. We don't want to react to what countries need. We don't want to be reacting. We want to be operationalized, which is something that we're working very hard on, where we're inside the right decision cycles, we're looking for the leading indicators, we're chasing the right metrics, we're holding ourselves accountable to those metrics. And what's not about the dollars and the cents and the numbers, which I can share with you if you ask, it's about the effects. Are we truly building partner capacity? Are we getting the interoperability? Are we leading to the right mil-to-mil engagements? Are we working within the strategies in the combatant commands and with the countries that are all nested in there? That's what really matters to us. You know?

General Farnen's not running a business. I mean I'm not worrying about how much money we're going to make this year and how many cases we have. I can give you those figures, but the fact of the matter is, it's about the true relationship, it's about the partnership with our allies, and it's about the output.

I think the other point that was made very eloquently by Secretary Mattis and General Milley is, in their decades of service, I don't think they ever fought a battle with just Americans on the battlefield. It was always with an international coalition of some sort. So again, I think that amplifies how relevant our mission set is.

The number two line of effort for Secretary Mattis that he laid out as he spoke to us, was to strengthen our allies and partners. That's the number two line of effort for the Secretary of Defense.

So the downstream effects of that are pretty powerful when it comes to the Build, Support and Strength to enable By, With and Through.

So we're very much focused on the combatant commanders' requirements, the Chief of Staff of the Army's priorities, and we deliver our capabilities, Army capabilities and capacity through, in my view, four themes. One is enduring value of Army forces. Two is globally engaged Army. Three is equipping for 21<sup>st</sup> century warfare. And four is multi-domain battle. Three of those are in phase zero. Phase zero is what we call right now. When we're in combat operations, we're beyond phase zero. Phase zero is all the things we do now to not have to go to war. Being strong, and peace through strength, and having a lot of teammates -- 151 countries right now on our team. That's a big fertile

crescent of strength across a lot of very difficult terrain in the globe that gives us a lot of strength and power.

So if we're delivering on enduring value for Army forces it means we're preventing conflict, we're shaping the security environment.

Building partner capacity underpins all these themes. We're assuring our allies and we're deterring our adversaries.

If we're globally engaged, it means forward presence. We're doing those mil-to-mil engagements that further strengthen trust and teamwork out on the battlefield.

And if we're equipping for 21<sup>st</sup> century warfare, it means we're upgrading our weapon systems, we're increasing delivery of required capabilities, we're highly interoperable, and we're delivering the total package approach. Which means when we give you a shiny object -- an Apache or an M1 -- we don't just give you the shiny object and say see you later. Boy, I'm sure it's going to work great. We give you the total package. And that's what people buy into when they buy into Foreign Military Sales. The total packages -- the maintenance, the spare parts, the training, and the long-term handshake that goes into perpetuity to be an ally with us for a long, long time. Forever.

And if we get all that right in phase zero, God forbid if we have to go beyond phase zero, we want to be able to execute multi-domain battle, and that's what you've been hearing coming out of AUSA as well.

If we get those capabilities right and we can roll the right technology into them because we're sustaining them properly, we'll be able to do the multi-domain -- the space, the cyber, the air/land/sea aspects of that. But to me, the optimum word in multi is multinational. So our job is to make sure that everybody can execute multi-domain battle if we have to go down that path.

The four T's, I will give you a few numbers.

So again, a couple of other quick points. If we're providing our partners with that capability, it's interoperability, it's regional stability that we gain from that. And think about this, too. If we're getting the right capabilities to our partners, there's less things we have to deploy or power project as an Army because we have a lot of capability that already exists out there with our team. So we may not have to bring as much stuff to deal with the threat as we would have to in the past, and so on and so forth, because we're really empowering our partners with that strength.

So a couple of quick numbers. We have 5,000 cases in our portfolio; 151 countries on our team that we deal with every day, and that's about \$177 billion wrapped up in that portfolio that we manage as a command and work through the countries there. So it's important to get those numbers out there. But again, it's not about the dollars, it's not

about the numbers, it's about the effects, and that's what we really care about. We talk about that with industry and everybody else as well.

The four T's is something that we pay attention and that's Trust, Teamwork, Transparency and the Total Package Approach.

Transparency is big, because in many countries corruption is a problem. And what we tell folks, and that's another, that's the more value-added in buying into Foreign Military Sales, is you buy into a very open process. It's the same process we use. There's so many hands involved in it from government to everything else, to trust the integrity of the U.S., America and the U.S. government, backs up what we do. And we're free and open and very transparent. So if you're doing direct commercial sales, there can be some issues that occur in certain countries where they've gotten into some trouble there. And again, if you buy into the foreign military sales, you get the integrity and backing of the U.S. government in a free, open and very transparent process.

So if you look around the world, just some effects. I mean if you think about Ukraine, you think about Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria. You think about, you know, what we've been doing with Korea for 75 years. With our Japanese partners here for decades. There's a lot of positive effects that are being delivered to those countries, but all 151 are dealing with challenges. And in some cases, the capability we provide them is not just to go to war, it's to deal with humanitarian crises, it's maybe to support the Olympics in Brazil. When you see Blackhawks flying around over the Olympics, that was Foreign Military Sales. When you see Blackhawks of helicopters supporting an earthquake or a humanitarian crisis with things that are going on, and we've seen a few of those here recently, there's Foreign Military Sales, there's U.S. capabilities and capacities to the teammates involved that are being used to help deal with those circumstances.

So again, I think that's another important point. I mean lethality is obviously the essence of warfare, making sure that we have the right lethality with our partners and ammunition. But there's a whole host of other things that military equipment brings to bear. Even trucks. You know, even logistics support. We work those types of things. Medium tactical trucks delivering to countries. Or excess defense articles. How do we turn our U.S. Army excess into another country's combat power? Another country's capability and capacity? We have a process for that.

In a lot of countries, in Africa and in some other nations, they're very very savvy about taking our excess equipment and turning that into a capability and capacity they can use, at obviously, reduced cost and some other things.

So a few more points. Again, I'm not filibustering here or anything. I'm very interested in taking questions, but I think it's important, these are things that are on my mind, and certainly they're hot button items coming out of AUSA.

The organic industrial base. The industrial base. Foreign Military Sales is certainly an

engine oil for that. It is that, when we deliver capabilities to a country sometimes there's coproduction and other things that take place too, so it helps their economies as well as ours. It helps drive costs down in economies of scale, and it keeps us, our industrial base warm if we have to surge in the event of some catastrophic, God forbid a war or something of that nature.

We have a lot of wind at our back right now. Clearly, with Secretary Mattis being as savvy as he is as a former combatant commander and just understanding the national security spectrum and working closely with the State Department and everything else, it's being used as a tool of foreign policy to a certain degree. We have a lot, there's a term out there called threat-based security cooperation. This is trying to put the conversation when we talk to countries about, it's not about chasing the shiny object, it's about what are the mutual threats that we face and what are the right capabilities and capacities that we can provide you or converse on or get to you and collaborate on in order to deal with these mutual threats. And if I had to give you five threat bands right now, it would be nuclear, nukes; integrated air and missile defense, ballistic missile defense; cyber; counterterrorism; and maritime security would be five examples of mutual threats that we all face, certainly our team. So let's have the right conversations about what type of capability and capacity we need together to deal with those threats.

We're going to get into sustainment a little bit, but that's something I really foot-stamped hard, because it's been my observation in my first year in command that countries tend to under-invest in sustainment. We're working through industry and myself, our team and government, through the countries and, you know, talking to the countries and personal engagements that we have at all levels, we want to make sure that countries invest in sustainment up front. Because it's one thing to give you 20 Blackhawks, but in two years we don't want them to turn into a bird's nest or you know, a paperweight. We have to get the sustainment piece right because we're playing the long game. U.S. Army Security Assistance Command is about the long game. It's about 10, 15, 20 years of sustainment. What have we got to do to get that right? And we've got to address that up front. We can be more effective there and I think we're having some very meaningful, I know we're having some very meaningful conversations with all our countries in addressing those things in a very effective way.

And we're seeing ourselves better. We have a tool now where we can see each country's sustainment profile. We can show them performance and we can have the right dialogue with them, too, to see what they're paying into and what they're getting out of that.

A couple of other quick points before I wrap up here on why FMS is so vital. I think there's a combination of Secretary Mattis and Churchill type quotes would be: Nations with allies thrive, and those without allies decline. We do not fight in all-American formations, we fight alongside coalition partners. Those are two smart individuals, obviously, that have seen a lot of things, had seen a lot of things if you're Churchill, in

their day. And I think those ring true now in a very real way, especially with the complexities that we're all dealing with.

The good news is, we have a lot of people that want to join our team. Again, it's 151 and growing, is what I'm seeing. And that's a very powerful statement. That's how you deter aggression. It's about deterrence. If you're strong and you have a lot of international partners, that certainly dissuades anybody from wanting to do things they shouldn't be thinking about doing to begin with.

So our contribution is really strategic readiness. We want to do everything we can to provide the right capability and capacity to our allies.

I think this is, you're going to hear me say allies and partners, but I view them as one and the same. Allies is a very strong thing. Japan is an ally. Right? South Korea is an ally. These are, they're partners, but really it's one and the same. We grow partners, we build support and strength in allies. We grow partners, and it really blossoms into strong allies that become really strong in the face of these mutual threats that we all face.

I'll end with a couple of final points. One is, how do we operationalize By, With and Through? How do we Build, Support and Strengthen?

Another theme here, partnerships.

So always liken, and I think this is apropos in light of Columbus Day that we just had, right? When we come at things from a U.S. Army Security Assistance Command standpoint, we talk about the three ships -- relationships, partnerships, friendships. Relationships, partnerships, friendships. Like the Nina, the Pinta, the Santa Maria, Columbus. That's how we can discover new horizons together. We have to build that.

The thing that's not a tangible measurement is the true strength of those three ships that we get out of building partner capacity, because that's what we do.

We have a saying in our command too, that trust plus teamwork equals strength and cooperation. That's why we're the Army's face to the world. That's why we work hard on building the three ships and making sure that we have the right team of teams to deal with these mutual threats that we have out there and that we face.

So with that, I'll stop there, and I look forward to your questions. But I'm really, I feel very honored and privileged to be here, and I'm glad we have such a great group here. Good-sized group.

At least you got to enjoy some food while I talked, right?

**Qq:** Thank you, sir. I'll start, then we'll go to the larger group.

I wanted to ask you about Afghanistan specifically. So the Afghan Air Force is now in the early stages of taking delivery of a large and long-term purchase of Blackhawk helicopters. Previously owned Blackhawk helicopters. What was your role in bringing that to fruition? And how do you ensure that they sign up for the maintenance and training that will be necessary to keep those viable assets and not have them become birds nests or paperweights in the future?

**Aa:** We had a very large role in that. I think it was two or three days ago I caught an article in the Washington Post about it, about the Blackhawk deliveries that were taking place in Afghanistan. And I kind of grinned as I read it, because it felt good to see fruits of the labor. We worked for probably eight, nine months before those four Blackhawks got delivered. Just over the course of the last two weeks. The first four of what will total to be 159 that we're going to deliver to Afghanistan. Those are Blackhawks, UH-60 Alpha models.

Our role, it was a Foreign Military Sales case. It was a demand signal from General Nicholson who's the commander on the ground. Helicopters are incredibly important for success in Afghanistan. David served there, so he knows that being able to move around via helicopter in Afghanistan is essential. So we're moving off the MI-17s into the UH-60s over there, which, you know, the bottom line is that's a very long-term commitment of the U.S. to Afghanistan, because we're going to ensure that they do have the right sustainment support.

So when we do a case like that, we have a lot of swim lanes that we manage. Everything from how we're getting the equipment there, what configuration it's going to be in, what's the logistics, what's the training.

So we've mapped that out. In fact my organization is going to be involved early on in the training support with our security assistance training management organization. We work -- and don't get me wrong here, because this is not a USASAC that did this. There was an incredible team of teams that made this all come together. We were the conduit, we were the integrator and synchronizer that helped pull it together inside the scope of the Foreign Military Sales policies and all of those types of things. But I have to give credence to the program execution office, PEO aviation who's also at Redstone, Alabama; Aviation Missile Command, Major General Gabram, my partner, his team had a huge role in that. I could go down a long list. And most importantly, CSTICA in Afghanistan which is the Combined Training Command in Afghanistan with Major General Thurgood, had an incredibly huge role because they're the ones who set the demand signal; they're the ones that are giving us the requirements. So the synchronization meetings and everything that took place to deliver that as well.

The sustainment, that's the main reason we're moving in this direction, too. We can then support and sustain UH-60 Alpha helicopters. The MI-17s were getting difficult to sustain and by going to the UH-60 Alpha model, which is a base model that the Afghans



are very excited to fly, it will build good, we have the right sustainment support packages in our inventory to sustain that model of aircraft.

So we've accounted for that. There will be contract logistics support and some other things, and there will be a combination of organic maintenance support to support that as well.

So we're excited for what that's going to mean for Afghanistan, and -- did that answer all your questions?

**Qq:** The Secretary, the Chairman, the Joint Chiefs all talk now about transnational and transregional threats. And I'm just curious, how does that complicate what you do? So for SOUTHCOM and Africa, they have the same requirement. Do you merge those? How do you work with the combatant commands to provide --

**Aa:** That's a good way to phrase it. That is a main, the main thing that I do as the commander of this organization is I snap link I personally with the combatant commander J5, and the J5s in the combatant commands also have relationships with all the country teams, with the ambassadors in all the countries. And the security cooperation officers with those embassies all work for the J5s in those combatant commands.

So we work in a very collaborative way between the country team, the J5 requirements, the combatant commander prioritizes, you know, what they think is most important in their region. And we collaborate with the countries involved in those. In some cases the country comes up with a demand signal and we collaborate with the combatant commander and the embassy team to make sure that we get the requirement right and that we work to deliver it.

In some cases, again, it's economies of scale. So if we're doing something in one combatant command and then another combatant command happens to need the same thing, that demand signal goes up and it can drive costs down and things of that nature. Occasionally, clearly we will look for opportunities to do that if we can.

But our main focus in U.S. Army Security Assistance Command is combatant commander requirements, making sure those are fulfilled; and the Chief of Staff of the Army's priorities which are readiness, the future force, and people.

**Qq:** Some of the, the signal from some of these places are clearly unrealistic.

**Aa:** Right.

**Qq:** -- negotiating? I mean not everybody's going to need an F-35.

**Aa:** That's exactly right.

**Qq:** They're going to need UH-60s.

**Aa:** Those conversations definitely take place. We don't just say wow, a particular country wanted 20 Apaches. That's a, the question is, what do you need them for? Because maybe 15 Blackhawks is a better answer for you.

We want to match the right capability and capacity that we have in our inventory to the country's needs, and in some cases that can save them money. You know? We match it right and all those. So it's not about hey, 20 Apaches, that's a lot of money, we're just going to give them 20 Apaches, because --

**Qq:** Because [inaudible].

**Aa:** Absolutely. And there's a lot of conversations that take place between the country's militaries with the combatant command, with the Army service component command.

For example, Lieutenant General Hodges in Europe who has relationships with all these different militaries in different countries, they will communicate effectively with each other and usually sort those things out. And they'll come to a reasonable conclusion that no, you probably need a HIMARS or this type of artillery versus this. And so you can rest assured we're having those kind of conversations. They happen all the time.

And that gets back to the point I made about let's not chase the shiny objects. What are the mutual threats we face and what are the right capabilities based on our neck of the woods to deal with those threats that we can work together on?

**Qq:** I was hoping you could speak a little about the engagement with Ukraine and give some indicators of how large this program is, what [inaudible] sales and future [buildup] actually in sales, and direct grants. And since the White House announced in the spring its intention to switch from the direct grants to [inaudible], how will that [inaudible]?

**Aa:** A lot of this, we're providing a lot of non-lethal support to Ukraine, and I think, so we're obviously assisting them in that regard. I don't think it's, the dollar value and things of that nature don't matter at this point, and again, there's a combination of us, our funds, and a combination of national funds as well. So it's a hybrid approach, but it's currently in a non-lethal way that we're providing support to Ukraine.

**Qq:** And the [inaudible] switching from grants to [inaudible]? How will [inaudible]?

**Aa:** How will it affect?

**Qq:** Yeah.

**Aa:** I don't think it will be any difference from what we're doing.

**Qq:** I just wanted to go back to the Blackhawks being delivered to Afghanistan. So will it be Army personnel who are training the Afghans or will it be contract personnel?

**Aa:** Initially it will be Army personnel, and then it will morph into a combination. We wanted to be all military Army, but I think it's going to be a bit of a hybrid early on. We're going in initially with Army. It will probably morph into a hybrid, and it depends on our ability to see if we can't provide more forces over there to do that training. So we're actually working through that right now, but initially we're pushing with Army forces to do the training. But it could naturally morph into the contract solution.

**Qq:** And the Special Inspector General over there, the SIGAR, has brought up the issue of operational requirements potentially getting in the way of that training. Do you have assurances that we'll be able to do all the training we need without, you know, fighting season, operational requirements getting in the way?

**Aa:** Really, I think that's better for General Nicholson and General Thurgood to answer, but the leading indicators I get is you know, they're able to balance things at this point in time. That's the indicators I get in terms of the collaboration and coordination. But I think the details to that are best left to them on the ground to determine.

Right now our focus is really making sure they get the trainers, they get the capability, so that they have everything in their hands that they can do to execute the training. And then I think through their leadership they'll be able to figure out how to balance that.

**Qq:** I'd also like to ask about the Blackhawks to Afghanistan. Do you have a time line set for when the Afghans will be able to start fielding these and when the Afghans will be able to take over responsibility for maintaining them?

**Aa:** Again, the swim lane approach. Different lines of effort. But this will be a process from now over the course of the next three to five years that we'll be phasing this capability in.

**Qq:** And do you get the sense, is that going to include their being able to conduct how that mission in terms of Medevac, for example, --

**Aa:** Sure.

**Qq:** -- expected to [inaudible].

And what's happening with the current fleet of MI-17 pilots and maintainers? Are they staying with that mission and a new flock is coming on to take over the Blackhawks? Or are they being transferred over? How is that working?

**Aa:** As I understand it, talking to the commanders on the ground, essentially what that is is they'll become UH-60 Alpha pilots, so it's just a transition. So those that are flying MI-17s now are going to fly UH-60s.

**Qq:** Is there any concern that there will be fewer helicopter pilots operating in the Afghan military during the change?

**Aa:** Not that I'm aware of. I have not heard that.

**Qq:** One quick follow-up on the Afghan [inaudible].

I just wanted to go back over the sustainment of that, because you said you're going to kind of phase that in over time, and it could be a hybrid approach.

**Aa:** Uh-huh.

**Qq:** But I'm just trying to understand how the process works. Do you kind of bake that in when the sale is [inaudible] initially?

**Aa:** We do back it in. In fact with our -- again, like I mentioned before, it's a team of teams approach. So with Aviation Missile Command, the PEO for Aviation who is the one who's configuring these aircraft, you know, so they can deliver it. They're putting together the push packages that are going to support these aircraft when they get over there. And then the long term sustainment, you know, that buys us time to kind of sort through how that's going to shake out in terms of a contract logistics apparatus or some other means. But we're confident in the inventory that we have to be able to sustain that.

**Qq:** And then how do you ensure it doesn't fall into the birds nest?

**Aa:** Because we're going to be, we're committed for the long haul. We're going to have people on the ground. We're going to be involved from a leadership aspect, and we're going to make sure that that sustainment is provided for those aircraft. Because we have the inventory to sustain UH-60 aircraft and spare parts. So we'll make sure that we can sustain that in the long haul.

**Qq:** Which is different from the MI-17s because you didn't have that supply chain?

**Aa:** It was getting a little difficult to be able to do that, yes.

**Qq:** And then another question, at AUSA a lot of the countries that were there were trying to build partnerships with U.S. suppliers. Ukraine for example.

**Aa:** Right.

**Qq:** So how are you working with them to start that process?

**Aa:** Like any country, if they want to begin a process with us?

**Qq:** Yes.

**Aa:** The way that they work that, if it's a new country, it's not one of the 151, is that what you're getting at?

**Qq:** Well, yes.

**Aa:** Okay, if it's like the 152<sup>nd</sup> country that's going to come on board, whatever country that's going to be, usually that will be, we'll get the demand signal from the ambassador and the country team that there's interest in a specific country wanting a certain U.S. Army capability. That will then be conveyed to the combatant commander staff, the J5 that I talked about. And I have, not just me, but also my staff, at all layers, we have communications with the combatant commander team and with the country team to make sure we understand what that requirement is, and if they're very serious about it, you know, we will send people over there to sit down and have very meaningful conversations about what they're going to get into, how the process works. Especially if we're talking about a complex case with an immature partner. That's when we've got to be very, very careulf that we don't set them off on the wrong foot. So, you know, we take a very aggressive but not in like a real crazy aggrewssive stand. WE're proactive I guess is a better word, in terms of getting to that country and making sure we're laying things out so they're comfortable and they understand all the process.

# # # #

---

*Transcribed by: Professional Word Processing & Transcribing (801) 556-7255*