

# Competitive analysis – general dynamics

Business



Report Prepared by: Report Prepared by: General Dynamics – Through the Lens of a Strategy Consultant General Dynamics – Through the Lens of a Strategy Consultant EXECUTIVE SUMMARY General Dynamics (GD) has realized a long-standing history of success delivering product and service solutions since being formed in 1952. They have purposely divested themselves of technology, product and service offerings in an effort to remain focused on their core competencies and primary customer; the United States Department of Defense. While GD's primary customer remains the DoD, they have diversified their offerings to adjacent markets within the DoD (e. g, Information Technology and Cybersecurity solutions). GD has also acquired Gulfstream and Jet Aviation, both companies that deliver aircraft and support services within the privately owned aircraft industry in an attempt to diversify their customer base.

The supporting information and recommendations focuses, primarily on GD's involvement in the Defense industry and further concentrates on the Land Systems and Information Technology business segments; two of four business segments which GD operates. Within the land systems, or combat vehicle customer base, GD retains the majority market share and, thus, creates a oligopolistic condition within this niche community. While there are manufacturers that are capable of delivering product solutions, GD owns and retains the design and production rights to the M1 Abrams main battle tank and the Stryker combat vehicle platforms. While the diversification into the sale of private aircraft industry, the market is more cyclic and volatile due to a perfect competition condition.

Primary competitors being Cessna, Hawker, Bombardier and Dassault Falcon. I recommend conglomerate diversification for expanding product and service offerings for new customers, possibly within the DoD. By leveraging the robust customer base, relationships and track record of delivering superior combat vehicle solutions, GD can capitalize on emerging opportunities within the information technology, cybersecurity and cloud computing domains.

This also allows GD to bring technology spin-offs or variants to new customers, creating value and decreasing their reliance on a single customer community. Table of Contents

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS1 EXTERNAL

ANALYSIS2INTERNAL ANALYSIS3 MATCHING ANALYSIS4 SELECTION5

IMPLEMENTATION6 QUALITY AND CONTROL7 COMPETITIVE DYNAMICS8

Appendices BackgroundA-1 Porter's Competitive Forces AnalysisA-2 External

factors evaluation (EFE)A-3 Internal factors evaluation (IFE)A-4 SWOTA-5

QSPMA-6 QSPM RationaleA-8 GE MatrixA-9 Industry Attractiveness – Land

SystemsA-10 Industry Attractiveness – AerospaceA-11 Industry

Attractiveness – Information TechnologyA-12 Business Strength – Land

SystemsA-13 Business Strength – AerospaceA-14 Business Strength –

Information TechnologyA-15 INDUSTRY ANALYSISGD and its business units

operate to provide products and services, primarily, across the Defense industry.

While the Defense industry remains relatively cyclic, it has experienced steadily increasing growth since the war on terrorism began more than nine years ago. GD is one of the top five Defense contractors within the Aerospace and Defense Industry (NAICS 336992 – Military Armored Vehicle, Tank, and Tank Component Manufacturing). To distribute their products and

services, GD relies primarily on the Program Executive Office for Ground Combat Systems (PEO GCS) located in Warren, MI. Across the portfolio of programs that PEO GCS manages, GD produces and services more than 50% of the platforms used in combat today. These platforms comprise the majority of the combat vehicle fleet density, considering the M1 Abrams main battle tank, STRYKER and Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) variants fielded today.

While the current defense spending is estimated to be 4% of the Gross Domestic Product, this figure is misleading. When compared to spending during the Vietnam War, spending is 4.9% less, but is attributed to the research and development efforts executed during peacetime. Specific to land systems, GD competes against platform providers such as BAE Systems. The barriers to entry are cost prohibitive and the technology and intellectual capital owned by GD negates any threat of competition.

The lack of competition is borderline monopolistic, however an oligopoly is a better characterization since there is a credible competitor within the combat vehicle market. The outlook for the defense industry remains strong.

Continued technology insertion programs, development of next-generation ground combat vehicle platform and reset of legacy fleet will provide steady revenue and opportunity for GD. Sales to foreign militaries and coalition forces are expected to grow to offset budget deficits and get rid of excess capacity attributed to ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. EXTERNAL ANALYSIS Entering the combat systems market is a difficult task that is capital intensive and requires a unique, game changing solution that can be proven safe, reliable and effective in short order and superior to industry

<https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>

leaders such as GD. Though the steady growth within the industry and the large contract award values entices new entrants to explore entry, most will find that it is ultimately not feasible to compete against such industry leaders.

The Defense industry, as a whole is faced with increasing regulation and fixed profit (margin) for vendors. The reform experienced within the acquisition community has resulted in changes to contract mechanisms, favoring firm fixed price or cost plus incentive fees for bidders. Use of these contract terms promotes incentivizing providers based on achievement of program milestones, delivery of capabilities and technology within the agreed upon time and price and evasion of overrun programs as we continue to see in the news (Joint Strike Fighter is a prime example). Combat Systems spending has increased \$6B over the past 6 years. This increase is directly attributed to the increase in demand caused by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

With the current political climate and increased pressure to withdraw from these areas of conflict, it is expected to see a decline in spending for new platforms and technology. The increased emphasis being placed on balancing the budget and reducing the deficit may result in a strategy that maximizes sales to foreign militaries. This will also reduce surplus inventory of combat systems assets and aid in funding the conflicts. The level of sophistication that GD delivers, with respect to their combat vehicle and information technology offerings, mitigates the risk to potential new entrants. The DoD has made risk management an integral part of their decision making process and having a reputable, proven performer that may

<https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>

be slightly higher in cost is deemed an overall lower risk than that of a new entrant attempting to penetrate the market by creating a price war.

INTERNAL ANALYSIS GD has separated itself into the four business units as a result of the acquisitions and divestures it has made through its 59-year history. Since 1997, GD has acquired more than 50 companies to aid in their growth and strengthen their value proposition within the specific industry the business unit, and gaining unit from the acquisition, faces. As a result of these acquisitions, they have had to manage separate and disparate organizational structures while simultaneously integrating/transitioning the newly acquired company and employees into the organizational framework GD employs. This framework is one that is stovepiped. Because of these acquisitions, I recommend GD leverage a matrix support structure to minimize redundancy and increase efficiencies.

To a degree, GD has already centralized support functions, but each business unit still maintains an amount of redundancy that could be reduced, if not eliminated in its entirety. Insight into the culture GD strives to create can be gleaned from an excerpt of its corporate philosophy. “ General Dynamics values ethical behavior and promotes a culture of integrity throughout all aspects of its business. This culture is evident in how the company deals with shareholders, employees, customers, partners and the communities in which it operates. ” While further investigation The resources available to GD include the brand name, awareness and past performance they command when exploring and penetrating markets.

Within the combat systems market, GD is known for the cutting edge technology used in their platform offerings, specifically adaptation of drive-by-wire and networked communication systems that were once only in high-priced fighter aircraft. The skilled workforce and knowledge of advanced armor technologies is a further resource to be leveraged throughout conglomerate diversification. Because of the resources GD possesses, they are able to reconfigure the value chain by making technology development a core competency or primary function vice a supporting function. MATCHING ANALYSIS Being heavily vested in a single customer base (79% of GD's revenue comes from the DoD), I recommend a diversification strategy that extends beyond privately owned jet aircraft. Initially, concentric or horizontal diversification seemed to be two viable options, allowing GD to leverage their existing customer base and simply expand the portfolio of offerings within.

Further examination and exploration proved that these strategies were less strategic and more transactional. This also continued the reliance on the United States government as the primary customer. Through completion of the SWOT analysis and GE Matrix, conglomerate diversification emerged as one of the clear choice for building on GD's successful past. While GD continues to maintain strong financial performance, posting \$32.5B in revenue for 2010, an increase of \$0.

5B when compared to 2009. Leveraging this strong financial performance and the free cash flow available, GD should diversify their customer base to minimize reliance on the Presidential budget and DoD spending. This will reduce the risk associated with potential program cuts, withdraw of <https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>

personnel from Iraq and Afghanistan and mitigate organizational conflict of interest. Organizational conflict of interest is also becoming an area of concern and focused attention across the DoD. Product suppliers are no longer able to provide services to their government customers without significant justification, separation of personnel and controls in place.

Based on the GE Matrix, the existing technology base of information technology and the private aircraft product and service offerings should be expanded. The private jet industry has experienced a 22% growth in the past year and GD is currently capitalizing on this growth. By diversifying the information technology services and products, mainly through the development of a cloud computing hardware or software based security solution. There are currently no competitors within this market space beyond traditional mechanisms such as firewall and virtual private network tunnels. SELECTION Conglomerate diversification is the strategy that GD should exploit for diversifying its customer, service and product offerings.

Specifically, I would recommend expanding information technology services and products into the private sector. With the recent compromise of personal customer information in multiple instances, it is clear that there is a need for a more stringent cybersecurity solution and internal controls than what is currently being provided across multiple industries. The diversification should be done organically. That is, use the internal intellectual capital to create a new organization, or a matrix organization that draws on the experiences of subject matter experts across the four business units GD operates. Only if capability or knowledge gaps are found to be in existence should new hires be brought in.

<https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>



This minimizes the initial capital investment required for the diversification and creates a more efficient team with less time to market. This strategy was selected in an effort to reduce dependency on the DoD and the tumultuous Presidential budget and war supplemental funding. Additionally, this allows GD to draw on expertise across the information technology, engineering, logistics, human resources, finance and accounting domains. Organizational conflict of interest is also mitigated through this approach, as the conglomerate introduces services and products to new customers. GD will need to identify a specific product or family of products that can be brought to bear for a target client to identify a service or product oriented operating model. Concentric diversification was another identified and feasible strategy, but was one that presented significant limitations.

GD is currently providing lifecycle support and management for their product offerings. This minimizes the opportunities on which GD could capitalize to offer related products and services. Additionally, this concentric diversification was a strategy that was utilized when GD acquired Jet Aviation as their aircraft fleet services provider. IMPLEMENTATION Through conglomerate diversification, the strategic vision and development of a one and five-year plan/goal will be identified. This will provide the framework for implementing control for overseeing the diversification of customer and product/service offerings.

Initially, a stakeholder analysis will be completed to identify the specific business group resources that can be tapped to contribute intellectual capital. This will not only identify the personnel that will be responsible for the execution of the diversification and development of new products, <https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>

technologies and customers, but also provides the executive leadership team a specific person (or persons) whom will be held accountable for the cooperation and success of the diversification efforts. The identified stakeholders will be identified internally as well as externally. External stakeholder analysis will align the product development lifecycle to that of the target customer's vision and funding profile. In addition to the management and resource identification, the impact on operations from a financial and capacity perspective will need to be considered. Expanding the information technology and security solutions into the private sector will require a change in accounting systems, workforce training and accreditation programs and compliance initiatives.

To ensure that the new business venture is sustainable, up front coordination and buy-on should be solicited from the business development and marketing personnel. This will allow for the launch of the new portfolio of offerings and a reintroduction of GD to potential customers and shareholders. Annual revenue goals and a break-even analysis will be completed to aid in the establishment of sales goals. **QUALITY AND CONTROL**

To ensure the success of the new venture, GD should approach new engagements with a consultative approach. Before beginning any new project, the requirements and objectives will be clearly defined with objective and threshold values established as measures of performance and efficiency (when applicable). Specific to the example of cybersecurity solution development for the private sector, GD should first ascertain the number of threats, vulnerabilities and attacks on the client's network on a weekly basis.

From this baseline, they can present the customer with a proposal for reducing the frequency of each of these metrics by specific percentages, identifying objective and threshold conditions. This allows the customer to see the value up front and provides a solution for measuring results beyond “ we will make your network more secure. “ Through the first year, weekly leadership meetings will be held to assess the performance, health and growth of the newly formed group. The business group managers that were charged with resourcing the initiative will be responsible for the daily oversight of their personnel and the client interaction. Monthly visits with the customer will be conducted with the leadership team to gauge progress and customer satisfaction.

To ensure candid feedback is being received, a third party vendor will also be involved to monitor GD and their performance according to the customer. A monthly survey will be provided to the customer by the third party vendor to ensure GD is delivering in accordance with the proposed standards and meeting all threshold requirements. Should these standards not be met, or are in danger of not being met, GD’s executive leadership will become more engaged with the daily management and additional reporting burdens will be placed on the business unit’s manager. Two negative reports or interventions by senior leadership will be grounds for immediate dismissal. To protect the customer entity, should there be shortcomings or deficiencies throughout GD’s project execution, they will have the option, following three unsatisfactory weekly reports/surveys, to hire a new firm to complete the work product at the expense of GD.

COMPETITIVE DYNAMICS I further suggest employing a hybrid approach of multi-domestic and global strategies. A multi-domestic strategy should be used to capitalize on foreign military sales of legacy combat vehicle platforms and for conglomerate diversification and providing emerging technologies within the information technology domain. A global strategy should be used for domestic sales, centralizing common resources that are used to supplement adjacent organizations through a matrix organizational structure approach. In practice, this would mean that the core hardware, software, logistics and supporting entities (human resources, accounting, compliance, etc. ) would be centrally located. At each satellite location, a single point of contact that is empowered to make decisions and aid the workforce on behalf of their function should be resident.

This will provide a certain level of autonomy and efficiency at the local level, allowing functions within the headquarters to be unadulterated. Through this global strategy, economies of scale through centralized production and reconfigurable production lines to adjust to market demands and technology advances will be achieved. This centralized environment will also promote collaboration and teamwork across the development teams charged with developing the products or services for conglomerate diversification.

Appendices Background General Dynamics (GD) is a company that was founded in 1952 through the combination of the Electric Boat Company, Consolidated Vultee (CONVAIR) and several other companies. As they were established through a conglomerate formed via mergers and acquisitions, they continue to diversify and expand using this same methodology.

Since 1997, they have acquired more than 50 companies, diversifying their service and product offering portfolio across the information technology arena, the commercial aircraft and the business jet services industries. Though GD maintains a diversified portfolio of product and service offerings, they are primarily a defense contractor within the Aerospace and Defense Industry. More specifically, their primary NAICS code is 336992 – Military Armored Vehicle, Tank, and Tank Component Manufacturing. Through their focus, they have increased their revenue from \$4 billion to more than \$32 billion since 1997. Along with the increased revenue growth, their workforce has grown from 29, 000 employees to 90, 000+ employees. Through this growth, they have attained Fortune 500 status and are continually ranked in the Top 10 of the annual defense contractor rankings, published by Washington Technology.

They have realized double-digit margins since 2005 and posted \$2. 4 billion in net earnings for 2009. Their mission statement: “ General Dynamics focuses on creating shareholder value while delivering superior products and services to military, other government and commercial customers. The company emphasizes excellence in program management and continual improvement in all of its operations. This mission statement is integrated across the four business groups that GD operates; Aerospace, Combat Systems, Information Systems and Technology and Marine Systems. Undoubtedly, the most common and widely recognized product that GD manufactures is the M1 Abrams Main Battle Tank, which delivers the sound of freedom on battlefields across the world.

Porter's Competitive Forces Analysis Potential entrants| Low| The capital requirements and the access to specialized materials and technologies increases the barriers to entry and thus the threat of potential entrants is low. Power of buyers| Moderate| General Dynamics' primary customer is the United States government. While they have begun diversifying their customer base, the bulk of their revenue comes from the support and goods provided to the tank, automotive and information technology segments within the Department of Defense. | Rivalry among existing firms| Moderate| With the increased of cyber security and cloud computing, General Dynamics has become the company to beat due to incumbency. Also, General Dynamics' diversification into the commercial airline industry, many commercial competitors vie for potential margin and revenue. Threat of substitutes| Low| General Dynamics is the prime contractor for multiple combat vehicle platforms, offensive capabilities (weapon systems) and information technologies unique to the protection of the government's computing infrastructure.

| Power of suppliers| Low| Leverage economies of scale and long term specialized material suppliers. General Dynamics is a preferred customer to nearly all suppliers. | Other stakeholders| Moderate| To avoid organizational conflict of interest, General Dynamics must choose the industries that they will provide services as opposed to goods and vice versa, due to increased government regulation. Conclusion: As one of the top ten contractors providing services and goods across the Aerospace, Combat Systems, Information Systems and Technology and Marine Systems industries, General Dynamics' competition is deemed to be moderate. | External factors

evaluation (EFE) External Opportunities:| Weight| Rating| Weighted Score|

Ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan| 0. 20| 4| 1.

4| Foreign military sales| 0. 15| 3| 0. 9| Reset of legacy equipment used in 9+ years of continued conflict| 0. 10| 2| 0. 4| Increased dependence on information technology driving need for continued security improvements| 0.

5| 3| 0. 3| Capitalize on increased growth in private jet industry (full ownership and timeshare programs)| 0. 05| 3| 0. 15| | | | External Threats:| Weight| Rating| Weighted Score| Reshaping of Presidential Budget| 0. 15| 3| 0. 45| Political climate| 0.

10| 2| 0. 20| Drawdown of armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan| 0. 10| 3| 0. 30| Organizational conflict of interest| 0. 10| 2| 0. 20| Total:| 1| | 4.

30| Conclusion: General Dynamics has diversified itself sufficiently and delivers niche products to maintain its position as a market leader within the aerospace and defense markets. This is true for both commercial and military applications. They have managed the threats they face sufficiently to maximize capitalizing on the opportunities that they are presented. |

Internal factors evaluation (IFE) Internal Strengths:| Weight| Rating| Weighted Score| Strong financial performance| 0. 20| 4| 0. 80| Sole provider of main battle tank and next generation STRYKER platforms| 0.

15| 3| 0. 45| Primary builder of nuclear class ships and submarines| 0. 15| 2| 0. 30| Recognized leader in private jet industry| 0. 05| 3| 0. 15| Internal Weaknesses:| Weight| Rating| Weighted Score| Reliance on government contracts as primary source of revenue| 0.

20| 3| 0. 60| Fixed margins due to government contract regulations/requirements| 0. 15| 2| 0. 30| Disparate organization through mergers and acquisitions| 0. 05| 2| 0. 10| Diversification into markets outside of core competencies| 0.

05| 2| 0. 10| Total:| 1| | 2. 8| Conclusion: Reliance on government contracts in a time when the budget is in turmoil makes General Dynamics susceptible to reduced operations and revenue. The proper management and steady, controlled growth has balanced these risks adequately for continuity of operations in the near term. SWOT | Internal Strengths| Internal Weaknesses| | 1.

Strong financial performance| 1. Reliance on government contracts as primary source of revenue| | 2. Sole provider of main battle tank and next generation STRYKER platforms| 2. Fixed margins due to government contract regulations/requirements| | 3. Primary builder of nuclear class ships and submarines| 3.

Disparate organization through mergers and acquisitions| | 4. Recognized leader in private jet industry| 4. Diversification into markets outside of core competencies| External Opportunities| | 1. Ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan| Concentric Diversification Offer reset/refurbish solutions as part of up front sales(S2, S3, O1, O3) Market Penetration Increase market share through alliances/sole source provider agreements with fractional ownership companies (e. g.

Netjets)(S4, O5)| Divestiture Sell Gulfstream and Jet Aviation to focus on Land Systems and Information Technology(W3, W4, O4, O5) Joint Venture Form LLC  
<https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>



with BAE Systems to capitalize on reset and foreign military sales(W1, W2, O2, O3)| 2. Foreign military sales| | 3. Reset of legacy equipment used in 9+ years of continued conflict| | 4. Increased dependence on information technology driving need for continued security improvements| | 5.

Capitalize on increased growth in private jet industry (full ownership and timeshare programs)| | External Threats| Conglomerate

DiversificationDevelop game changing information technology solutions for new customers (e. g.

cloud computing security solutions)(S1, T1, T2, T3)|

RetrenchmentConsolidate redundant combat vehicle production plants in AL,

MI, IL and VA(W1, W2, T1, T2, T3)| 1. Reshaping of Presidential Budget| | 2.

Political climate| | 3. Drawdown of armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan| |

4. Organizational conflict of interest| | QSPM | | Conglomerate

Diversification| Concentric Diversification| Opportunities| Weight| AS| TAS|

AS| TAS| Ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan| 0. 20| 4| 0.

80| 2| 0. 40| Foreign military sales| 0. 15| 5| 0. 75| 1| 0. 15| Reset of legacy equipment used in 9+ years of continued conflict| 0.

10| 2| 0. 20| 4| 0. 40| Increased dependence on information technology driving need for continued security improvements| 0. 05| 5| 0. 25| 1| 0. 05|

Capitalize on increased growth in private jet industry (full ownership and timeshare programs)| 0.

05| 4| 0. 0| 2| 0. 10| Threats| | | | | Reshaping of Presidential Budget| 0. 15|

5| 0. 75| 1| 0.

15| Political climate| 0. 10| 4| 0. 40| 2| 0. 20| Drawdown of armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan| 0. 10| 4| 0. 40| 2| 0.

20| Organizational conflict of interest| 0. 10| 5| 0. 50| 1| 0. 10| Strengths| | | |  
| | Strong financial performance| 0. 20| 3| 0.

60| 3| 0. 60| Sole provider of main battle tank and next generation STRYKER platforms| 0. 15| 1| 0. 15| 5| 0. 75| Primary builder of nuclear class ships and submarines| 0. 15| 2| 0.

30| 4| 0. 60| Recognized leader in private jet industry| 0. 5| 4| 0. 20| 2| 0. 10| Weaknesses| | | | | Reliance on government contracts as primary source of revenue| 0. 20| 5| 0.

10| 1| 0. 20| Fixed margins due to government contract regulations/requirements| 0. 15| 4| 0. 60| 2| 0. 30| Disparate organization through mergers and acquisitions| 0. 05| 3| 0.

15| 3| 0. 15| Diversification into markets outside of core competencies| 0. 05| 2| 0. 10| 4| 0. 20| Grand Total Attractiveness Score| 6.

45| | 4. 65| Conclusion: General Dynamics should implement a conglomerate diversification strategy. | QSPM RationaleO1| As platforms are damaged in battle or do not provide sufficient protection, GD can aid through further development efforts| O2| To reduce excess inventory, aid in financing the price of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts and contribute to the overall deficit| O3| If existing inventory/fleet density levels will be maintained, reset of the fleet to “like new” standards is going to be required upon complete withdraw | O4| As software and enterprise level IT systems are further used,  
<https://assignbuster.com/competitive-analysis-general-dynamics/>

so will their vulnerabilities for espionage| O5| Experiencing tremendous growth (22%) and GD has current backlog funding of \$17b | | | T1| Presidential budget is focused on balancing as opposed to further spending and deficit| T2| Turmoil over length of wars and tangential conflict engagements (Syria)| T3| Nearly a monopolistic environment – GD tried to acquire Northrop Grumman Newport News but acquisition was blocked to avoid monopoly| T4| GD cannot provide services and products to same customer – need to diversify| | | S1| Fortune 500 company and continually ranked in top 10 of Defense contractors annually| S2| GD owns technical data and developed platforms and armor solutions for crew survivability| S3| Nearly a monopolistic environment – GD tried to acquire Northrop Grumman Newport News but acquisition was blocked to avoid monopoly| S4| Experiencing tremendous growth (22%) and GD has current backlog funding of \$17b| | | W1| Vulnerable to funding programmed for Defense industry – previously experienced growth ; steady revenue through supplemental funding for war efforts| W2| Increased regulation dictates contract terms and conditions, including fixing profit margins (typically around 8%)| W3| Continually integrating new companies, employees within their portfolio as part of their growth through acquisitions strategy| W4| After divesting their aerospace business, re-entering to provide private aircraft in a receding economy| GE Matrix | Business Strength| | High| Medium| Low| Industry Attractiveness| High| Grow | Grow| Hold| | Medium| Grow| Hold| Harvest| | Low| Hold| Harvest| Harvest| Information Technology Aerospace Land Systems Industry Attractiveness Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Competitive pressure| . 2| 4| . 8| Growth potential| . 3| 2| .

6| Technological know-how| . 4| 5| 2| Demand variability| . 1| 2| . 2| Profit potential| . 5| 3| 1.

5| Industry Attractiveness| | | 5. 1| Industry Attractiveness – Land Systems Industry Attractiveness – Aerospace Industry Attractiveness Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Competitive pressure| . 2| 2| . 4| Growth potential| . 3| 4| 1.

2| Technological know-how| . 1| 3| . 3| Demand variability| . 5| 1| . 5| Profit potential| .

4| 4| 1. 6| Industry Attractiveness| | | 4| Industry Attractiveness – Information Technology Industry Attractiveness Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Competitive pressure| . 2| 1| . 2| Growth potential| . 5| 5| 2.

5| Technological know-how| . 3| 3| . 9| Demand variability| . 4| 4| 1. 6| Profit potential| . 1| 4| .

4| Industry Attractiveness| | | 5. 6| Business Strength – Land Systems Business Strength Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Market Share| . 5| 5| 2. 5| Technological know-how| . 2| 5| 1| Product Quality| . 3| 5| 1.

5| Customer Loyalty| . 4| 4| 1. 6| Lifecycle| . | 2| . 2| Business Strength| | | 6.

8| Business Strength – Aerospace Business Strength Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Market Share| . 5| 2| 1| Technological know-how| . 2| 4| . 8| Product Quality| . 4| 5| 2| Customer Loyalty| .

3| 3| . 9| Lifecycle| . 1| 1| . 1| Business Strength| | | 4. 8| Business Strength – Information Technology Business Strength Criteria| Weight| Rating| Score| Market Share| . 5| 3| 1.

5| Technological know-how| . 4| 4| 1. 6| Product Quality| . 3| 3| . 9| Customer  
Loyalty| . 2| 2| .

4| Lifecycle| . 1| 4| . 4| Business Strength| | | 4. 8|