

THE MONITOR AND MERRIMACK



Newsletter of the
Greater Hampton Roads Chapter
District 02 – Chapter 03
SOLE – The International Society of Logistics
December 2008
Copyright 2008 SOLE



Chapter Management Committee

Chapter Chairperson:

Carl Lilieberg

Vice Chair – Membership:

Charlie Littleton

Vice Chair – Admin:

Dan McLaughlin

Vice Chair – Finance:

Rick Treto

Vice Chair – Education:

Lee Morris

Vice Chair – Professional &
Technical Development

Vacant

Logistics Education Foundation
(LEF) Liaison

Vacant

Newsletter:

Carl Lilieberg

Web Master:

Charlie Littleton

District Director:

Jon Jay Buder DML

From the Chapter Chairman:



As we near the Holiday Season and year's end, I want to reflect on a highly successful year for our Chapter and stress the importance of aggressive plans in process by our Vice Chairs for energizing our presence in the Tidewater Area.

We had a wide variety of ILS presentations at our 2008 Luncheons - "Sparing – Buy Our Spares Smart" – our own **Lee Morris**; a Navy Operational Logistics Support Center Update- **Capt John Meir**, SC, USN; "Ship Equipment Configuration During Availabilities" – **Mike Grimes**; "SOLE Awards Program" – our own **Charlie Littleton**; a Joint Meeting with the Tidewater NDTA hosting **Jeff Keever** of the Virginia Port Authority – "Positioned for Growth"; "Containership Export Trade" – **Rick Miller** of CMA/CGM; "Maintenance and Supply Data Management" – **Ron Jolley** and **Bob Madel** of MARMC; and our own **Brandon Cholek** speaking on "Distribution-Based Logistics in Iraq". The Chapter also supported the highly successful SOLE Professional Development Workshop held in 26/27 March, featuring "Configuration Management: A Key to Logistics Sustainment", taught and coordinated by our District Director **Jon Buder** and supported and arranged by our SOLE Executive Director, **Ms. Sarah James**. **Dr. Catherine Elder** also gave

our chapter Luncheon attendees multiple updates on SOLE initiatives and acted as our conduit to the SOLE BOD, presenting us with summaries of plans, actions and initiatives. Our chapter chairmen are diligently working on plans for our upcoming luncheons, workshops and facility tours. The January and February luncheon plans are in this newsletter on page 5

We also successfully placed two sets of CML/CPL Library Textbooks at the Virginia Beach and Newport News Libraries – all coordinated by our Membership Vice Chairman **Charlie Littleton** of Life Cycle Engineering.

Chapter member, **Mike Grimes** was selected by SOLE HQ for a Field Award and our Chapter got its second straight Bronze Award for our newsletter.

I want to welcome our newest chapter member, Ms. **Holly Tatem** of Battelle-CBRN Acquisition Logistics, Maintenance and Logistics Command, Atlantic (MLCLANT). Welcome aboard!

On behalf of our Chapter Officers, I wish all our area logisticians a joyous holiday season! We are looking forward to an even more exciting and interesting GHRC SOLE New Year!

Carl Lilieberg
Chapter Chairman

In this Issue:

CPL Corner	2
Calendar of Events	3
Army Log News	4
Future Luncheons	5
Dec Business Mtg.	6
AF Logistician Art.	7-8
Chapter Page	9
SOLE 2009 Call for Papers	10
NOLSC Article	11-15

Certified Professional Logistician Corner



The next CPL Exam will be given in May 2009

1. Detailed decision begins with
 - a. development of the weapons system.
 - b. and includes a configuration with performance effectiveness, logistics support, cost, and other factors described in a system specification.
 - c. validation and ends in the disposal phase of the life cycle.
 - d. production and ends in the deployment phase.
2. Detailed design includes
 - a. a detailing of the parts requirements for a weapon system.
 - b. preparation of design documentation, development of computer, and Maintainability analysis.
 - c. redesign and test.
 - d. only provisioning analysis.
3. Detailed design requires the
 - a. identification of maintainability elements.
 - b. simplification of human factors analysis.
 - c. identification of specific elements of logistics support.
 - d. determination of life cycle costs throughout the planning process.
4. Detailed design criteria are Used to develop guidelines for
 - a. Accessibility, Packaging, human factors, and life cycle costs.
 - b. standardization, packaging, human factors, and mobility.
 - c. packaging, human factors, and disposal.
5. Detailed design requires
 - a. the performance of trade-off studies.
 - b. design for supportability.
 - c. an iterative analysis of all disposal factors before final Production commences.
6. Design for reliability includes
 - a. reliability allocation, reliability models, selection of component parts, and reliability prediction.
 - b. selection of components parts, models, and disposal analysis.
 - c. reliability analysis, models, components parts, and SMEA analysis.
 - d. None of the above.
7. Design for maintainability includes
 - a. Maintainability allocation and LSA.
 - b. Maintenance support analysis only.
 - c. Logistics support analysis only.
 - d. Deployment analysis.
8. Which of the following statements is true?
 - a. Detailed design is of no concern to the logistician.
 - b. Detailed design requires close interface between the contractor and the buyer.
 - c. Detailed design includes maintenance engineering analysis and cost overrun analysis.
 - d. Detailed design comes before conceptual design.
9. Detailed design requires
 - a. Reliability analysis and maintainability analysis only.
 - b. Reliability analysis only.
 - c. A careful consideration of all of the elements of logistics support.
 - d. None of the above

Please see answers on page 3



Calendar of Events

ASNE	Dinner Meetings:	Every 3 rd Tuesday, Springhill Suites, Newtown Road, Va. Beach, (1800-1900 Social Hour); 1900-2030 Dinner and Program; Reservations: Mary Morgan (757) 495-1970.
	21 January 2009	RADM Ron Rabago, USCG "USCG Deepwater Program Update" Dinner Meeting
SOLE	18-20 August 2009	SOLE 2009: "The Logistics of Global Security" Dallas, (Irving), Texas
GHRC SOLE	21 Jan 2009	Mr. Stan Walz, CEO verctorCSP, LLC "US Coast Guard Logistics Support Transformation" Luncheon (#1 Chinese, Wards Corner)
	19 Feb 2009	Mr. Warren Hammer, Va. Economic Development Partnership Luncheon (#1 Chinese, Wards Corner)
PEC	21 Feb 2009	Peninsula Engineer of the Year Banquet, Point Plaza Hotel, J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Hampton (tickets available from Carl Lillieberg after 6 Jan 09)



Answers			
1	b	6	a
2	b	7	a
3	c	8	b
4	b	9	b
5	a	10	c

**NEW CONDITION-BASED MAINTENANCE
TOOLS COMING TO ARMY AVIATION
(Reprinted from the Nov-Dec 08 Army
Logistician)**

Bell Helicopter and the Army Aviation Applied Technology Directorate have signed a 3-year agreement to develop and improve condition-based maintenance (CBM) technologies for Army aircraft. The agreement will include an integrated set of diagnostic, prognostic, and system health assessment tools to support Army operations support and sustainment technology objectives. The technologies will include corrosion detection electrical component prognostics, fatigue damage detection, and various rotor system prognostics. They promise to save the Department of Defense (DOD) money and man-hours by aiding DOD's initiative to transition the maintenance of weapon systems from time-based maintenance to condition-based maintenance plus (CBM+) by 2015.

Currently, aviation maintenance is performed on time Schedules that are based on operating hours or a set number of days. The maintenance may or may not be necessary, which can result in unnecessary man-hours and replacement of parts. CBM+ will emplace maintenance processes and capabilities to improve operational availability and reduce the maintenance burden.

By 2010, the Army aims to meet Science and Technology goals (measured against a 2005 fielded aircraft baseline) for aviation that include—

- Reducing inspections per flight-hour by 25 percent.
- Reducing maintenance labor per flight-hour by 8 percent.
- Increasing the component mean time between removals by 10 percent.
- Achieving a less than 10 percent false removal rate.

All of this will be done through advances in CBM technology that allow the reduction of inspections and preventive maintenance, expansion of serviceability criteria, extension of time between overhaul, and prediction of failure with sufficient fidelity to allow scheduling of maintenance.

Open system architecture and data standardization will allow the insertion of new technology into existing aircraft systems. These technologies will be added to the aircraft platforms through revisions and block upgrades and are compatible with the health and usage monitoring systems currently used on Army aircraft.

**TRANSCOM TESTING CARGO TRACKING
ABILITY OF SATELLITE TECHNOLOGY**

The U.S. Transportation Command (TRANS-COM) and Numerex Corporation of Atlanta, Georgia, signed a cooperative research and development agreement in May to determine the ability of Numerex's satellite tracking device, the Orbit One SX1, to monitor military cargo. As part of the agreement, Numerex will test its military-grade tracking module against a

range of operational environments, making sure that it is suitable for use in Iraq and Afghanistan. The company also will test the device to ensure that it meets the certification requirements for hazards of electromagnetic radiation to ordnance.

The reliable satellite technology could provide logisticians with real-time visibility throughout the distribution process—an imperative of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4, set in 2003. The SX1 is expected to be able provide visibility of supplies en route to forward operating bases—technology that has yet to be developed for the active radio frequency identification device (RFID) tag and interrogator system currently used by the Army. Right now, once supplies leave the RFID interrogator infrastructure, visibility is lost.

The SX1 research and development testing is taking place at UNICOR, a Defense Logistics Agency-certified testing facility in Colorado run by Federal Prisons Industries, Inc. Once testing is completed, a national stock number will be issued and the devices will be placed on the military's qualified product list.

(Reprinted from Jul-Aug Army Logistician):

**DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY
OFFERS PACKAGING TRAINING ONLINE**

The Defense Acquisition University (DAU) has a new continuous learning module outlining the basics of defense packaging. The module highlights why packaging is necessary and describes its importance to the acquisition and sustainment of weapons systems and associated parts.

The continuous learning module is entitled CLL013, DOD Packaging, and is intended as an introductory overview. To register, visit the DAU website at

<https://learn.dau.mil/html/clc/Register.jsp>.

The School of Military Packaging Technology, located at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, can provide additional information on packaging materiel for military distribution operations. Its website is located at <http://smpt.apg.army.mil/>.

2009 Luncheon Meeting Schedule

SOLE – The International Society of Logistics
Greater Hampton Roads Area Chapter



Wednesday January 21, 2009

Mr. Stan Walz

President and CEO vectorCSP, LLC.

“U.S. Coast Guard Logistics Support Transformation”

Wednesday 19 February, 2009

Mr. Warren Hammer

Virginia Economic Development Partnership

Both held at:

1 Chinese Buffet

Wards Corner

Norfolk, Virginia

December Management Committee Meeting



Greater Hampton Roads Chapter
SOLE – The International Society of Logistics

Chapter Business Meeting Minutes

Date: December 8, 2008

Location: Life Cycle Engineering office, 5301 Robin Hood Rd. Suite 108, Norfolk, VA

Meeting Convened: 5:30 PM

Meeting Closed: 6:30 PM

Attendees:

- Carl Lilieberg, Chapter Chairman
- Charles Littleton, Vice Chairman Membership
- Lee Morris, Vice Chairman Education
- Brandon Cholek, Member

Minutes:

The Chapter Chairman called the meeting to order.

The Chapter Chairman asked for comments on the minutes from the last business meeting and having had no comments asked for a recommendation to approve the minutes. The motion was moved and seconded and then approved by the attendees.

The Vice Chairman Treasurer was not in attendance. The Chapter Chairman will send to the Chapter Management Team the current Chapter budget information.

The Chapter Chairman asked for comments on the proposed 2009 Chapter budget; having had no comments asked for a recommendation to approve the budget. The motion was moved and seconded and then approved by the attendees.

Mr. Littleton reviewed the action items and discussion was made regarding the development of the brochure and introduction letter. Several action items were marked as completed and new items were added to the list. The action list will be updated and sent out to the Management Team and Mr. Cholek and Mr. Jett.

The Chairman discussed the PEC Engineer's Week Career Days Exhibition. It was agreed by all attendees that the Chapter cannot support this effort this year but will revisit this opportunity for the next year.

The Chairman opened the discussion regarding the luncheon location for January and February. The Chapter's goal is to find a convenient and affordable location for our members both Southside and the Peninsula. The current locations are convenient and affordable but are not the venue that the Chapter Management Team would like to use. Mr. Littleton is researching alternate locations and would like recommendations by the Chapter membership. The attendees all agreed to use the current venue for the upcoming months until we can identify and reserve a new location. The Chapter Management Team agreed to fix the costs for the luncheons to a price of \$15.00 per attendee for the current venue. The fixed price will pay for the member's lunch, the restaurant gratuity, the speaker's lunch and any room charges. Any excess funds will be added to the Chapter's general operating funds. This charge will start with the January luncheon.

The Chairman notified the Management Team about a new member: Ms. Holly Tatem. A copy of the newsletter has been sent to her as well as an invitation to our upcoming events.

Mr. Littleton discussed our plans for the upcoming meetings and the need to keep our planning completed in advance as much as possible. Mr. Cholek agreed and emphasized our reach out and introduction actions need to be completed as soon as possible. It was agreed to split the contact list into different categories and a person assigned as the lead for that category. Mr. Cholek has the lead for the commercial activities, Mr. Littleton the lead for the military activities, and Mr. Morris the lead for educational activities. Mr. Cholek will maintain the master list and updates will be provided to him for consolidation.

The Chapter Chairman asked for additional comments or business having had no comments asked for a recommendation to close the meeting. The motion was made and seconded and then approved by the attendees.

The Chapter Management business meeting was closed at 6:30 PM.

The USAF Tech Data Dilemma—How Much Tech Data to Buy and When

Mike Farmer, AFIT Acquisition Logistics Course Director

Bob Flagg, AFIT Technical Data Course Director

Guy Fritchman, AFIT Sustainment Course Director

Buying tech data for new systems has a few land mines to

watch for, but it does not have to be the *Nightmare on Elm Street* it all too often becomes. The nightmare usually starts with a very high price tag, causing a dilemma for program managers (PM). The PMs must make tough choices between meeting short-term acquisition budgets and schedules or providing for best value choices for the life cycle of the system. Years down the road, the nightmare unfolds when the readiness of aging weapon systems depends upon future program managers finding even more money to buy the data. At that point, the data has become essential, but the PMs simply cannot afford it.

Over the years, this issue has been explored by various government experts and key recommendations have been discussed. For example, a recent Government Accountability Office report recommended that PMs must "...emphasize the importance of having rights to the technical data needed to support the management of all logistics contracts." In describing an industry best practice, they found that, "every company visited told us they acquired the technical data necessary to support the equipment," whether they intended to support it in house or not. These companies described the data as, "essential to their own management and oversight functions."

Not only is it a best practice to acquire the data, Air Force PMs have been directed to do so "when needed." A 2003 Joint leadership memo (SAF/IL and AQ policy letters) calls data an essential corporate asset to support our systems and says it must be made available to those who need it. So how do PMs avoid the nightmare? What actions can PMs take to comply with this guidance? This article explores the tech data dilemma and offers a concise recommendation to navigate the technical data land mines without disaster.

How Do PMs Get Into This Dilemma?

Many examples *litter the road* of recent procurements where a previous program manager decided not to buy the data or put any provisions in place to buy it later. A newly assigned PM comes along, charged with taking the program to the next level or with making a change in the operating and support strategy, and quickly realizes the desired objective cannot be achieved without the tech data that was not bought previously. "No problem," says the new PM. "I'll just hammer out a deal with the vendor for the needed data." Unfortunately, the sticker price will often be a show stopper. "How can Company XYZ believe its data is worth that much! Who can I talk to?" The answer, in short, is nobody. This scenario has played out in government program offices for longer than anyone would care to admit.

A coherent strategy is needed to improve the situation.

It is not enough to blame the previous PMs—their decisions not to buy the data were often based on very reasonable arguments. It was expensive. It was not needed then, or expected to be needed any time soon. The contractor was not interested in releasing its proprietary rights or intellectual property. Budgeting and obtaining the funds then, would have delayed critical progress in the early phases. The projected need date for using the data was years out based on the current operating and support concepts. All of these seemed like real and valid reasons at the time.

Even when PMs buy the data early, it often becomes outdated over the years as the physical configurations for systems evolve. When the data eventually gets pulled off the shelf, a great deal more money is often required to get it up-to-speed with all the current configurations.

The early PMs were not evil, ignorant villains. Instead they were professional planners, juggling complex combinations of possible program plans. Eliminating the purchase of expensive data removed what was then a low priority, high expense factor. Their decisions immediately improved their *big three* metrics— cost, schedule, and performance. All three areas probably looked better the instant the purchase of data was removed from the equation. The decisions thus made perfect sense from their perspective. But years later, with new PMs in charge, far removed from those early decisions, the reality can be quite different! Why? Short and simple, things change— new plans emerge; leadership transitions; priorities evolve; Congress redirects funds; some partnerships grow and others die, and specific threats come and go. Real life is a living breathing animal—that isn't a bad thing, it is just reality. This new reality is magnified even further in DoD's new evolutionary acquisition environment. Air Force acquisition programs from the outset will now be designed to change from increment to increment, implementing the time- phased requirements of users taking advantage of maturing technology over time. Planned change is the new reality. The real question is not who is to blame, or how did this bind materialize, it is: "How can this dilemma be avoided?"

How Can the Dilemma Be Avoided?

The question policymakers must ask is what can the acquisition community do to reduce the likelihood that this dilemma will affect future systems? What can be changed about the acquisition process to reduce the chance of seeing unreasonably high costs, negative consequences associated with the delayed, late, or nonexistent purchase of tech data?

One fairly straightforward technique is available to do just that. This technique does not require hiring expensive consultants to reengineer the process, top to bottom, turning old ways on their ears, and requiring remedial education and training to make it happen. An excellent solution is for a PM to simply require the vendor to include a series of prepriced options to buy the various portions of all the data. The PM then uses the options as an important part of the evaluation process in competitively selecting the best vendors for the new program or program upgrade. A series of options means there are multiple contract options included that, when taken together, include all of the associated tech data. This generally includes operating and maintenance manuals, engineering

(Continued on Page 8)

(Continued from Page 7)

drawings, interface control documents, and specifications. If a data item is needed in the future, not only will there already be a contract vehicle in place to buy it, but the price paid will already have been established in a competitive environment. There will be no last-minute surprises, the price will be as low as possible, and informed planning can take place. That is about the best scenario to ask for.

For example, quite often in the Air Force, it is decided years after the initial fielding of a system to change the support strategy. The support providers will need the data to successfully implement the change and economically maintain the system for the remaining portion of its life cycle. In all too many cases the data was not bought, and now it is needed. The original source will likely be the only source for that information. The contractor knows it and so does the PM. The data rights are proprietary and at this point, even more valuable (read expensive). At this point, the new PM is over the proverbial barrel. Of course the contractor is going to value the data highly and price it accordingly. This is not evil or conspiratory. It is reality. It is the way of our capitalistic society.

So why does the solution include soliciting "...a series of options" rather than just one big option that includes all the data? Breaking the requirement down to its component parts gives the current and **future** PMs the flexibility to pick and choose only the data that is needed, when it is needed. All the data may not be needed simultaneously, so why pay for it all as one big package? If, for example, under a new support strategy, only the repair manuals are needed, why buy the design drawings too? Exercise the appropriate option and pay just the bill for the data that is needed. PMs must work closely with their procurement team to decide what makes the most sense and what is doable under applicable guidance.

Finally, PMs should use the data options and pricing as a principal piece of the proposal evaluation process when selecting the best original vendor for the new system. Meaningful inclusion in the evaluation factors will help ensure contractor prices are set at the best possible level. The data evaluation should not be the number one concern, but if these data options are not meaningfully included at all in the evaluation factors, then the price will not be set competitively. The hands of future PMs will be tied tightly behind their backs and their alternatives will be severely limited. Then, as systems progress through their life cycles and plans change (for whatever reason), future PMs may end up paying dearly to get the necessary data, if they can get it at all.

Conclusion

A good solution to the PM's tech data dilemma is to first bite the bullet and buy the data that is absolutely necessary to support current operating and support plans. For data not bought immediately, PMs should also put in place a series of prepriced options for all of the data on the original solicitation, and use those options as a meaningful piece of the proposal evaluation process.

Does this strategy eliminate all problems? Will it ensure that data will be cheap and readily available in all situations? Of

course not. Data rights will remain an expensive, complex, and vexing issue. The more time that elapses between the start of the program and the need for the data, the more complications can creep up, even with defined, prepriced options in place. Vendors can legitimately claim that the negotiated prices are only good for a limited period of time. Also, the data portion of one vendor's proposal probably would not be the sole reason to eliminate or select them in the original competition. The data portion, however, should be a meaningful factor that is considered as part of the overall, best value package.

The technique described in this article will help ensure PMs do not pay more than is absolutely needed. It doesn't guarantee the data will always be there or always be cheap. Further, it does not spell out exactly what to buy and when. Those decisions will always be determined on a case-by-case basis, dependent on risks, costs, trade-offs, and program peculiarities. The PM and his or her procurement team will have to analyze and work these issues out to determine what makes the most sense for the lifecycle operation and to support their individual program. The technique described herein is not the panacea, but it is a big step in the right direction.

Mike Farmer, Bob Flagg, and Guy Fritchman are course directors for several of the professional continuing education courses in acquisition and logistics at the Air Force Institute of Technology. All have a variety of credentials to include Program Management Professional certification and Acquisition Professional Development Program Level 3. Each holds multiple graduate and undergraduate degrees

Article Reprinted from the Air Force Logistics Journal, Fall 2006 Vol. XXX, Number 3

Historical Logistics Quotes:

In all war situations, the actions and decisions of command, whatever the level, are based on a blend of strategical, logistical, and tactical plans.

—Adm Henry E. Eccles, USN

Logistics sets the campaign's operational limits.

—Joint Pub 1, *Joint Warfare of the Armed Forces of the United States*

No form of transportation ever really dies out. Every new form is an addition to, and not a substitution for, an old form of transportation.

GHRC Executive Board Officers:

**Carl Lilieberg 757-896-5335
Chairman**

**Charlie Littleton 757-857-1311(4203)
Membership Vice Chairman**

**Rick Treto 757-578-3338
Finance Vice Chairman**

**Lee Morris 757-464-5252
Education Vice Chairman**



5200 W. Mercury Blvd.
Suite 250, Newport News,
Va. 23605

PHONE:
(757) 896-5335
FAX:
(757) 896-5237

E-MAIL:
Carl J.Lilieberg@ngc.com

We're On the Web!
www.ghrc-sole.org

SOLE Information

SOLE-The International Society of Logistics is a nonprofit professional society composed of individuals devoted to enhancing logistics technology, education, and management. For further information on SOLE or this chapter, contact any of the individuals listed on the front page of this newsletter.

CALL FOR PAPERS



SOLE – The International Society of Logistics

presents

SOLE 2009

The Logistics of Global Security

44th Annual International Logistics Conference and Exhibition

Omni Mandalay Hotel at Las Colinas

Dallas (Irving), Texas

16 – 20 August 2009

Workshops: 16 - 17 August 2009

Conference: 18 - 20 August 2009

SOLE - The International Society of Logistics (SOLE) presents the 44th Annual International Logistics Conference and Exhibition at the Omni Mandalay Hotel at Las Colinas, Dallas (Irving), Texas from 16-20 August 2009. With a conference theme of "The Logistics of Global Security," the symposium will offer three full days of exciting, educational and topical offerings designed to provide logisticians from all countries a unique understanding of the issues associated with security in logistics processes. Some of the world's leading subject matter experts will lead the conference attendees in addressing a broad spectrum of issues critical to understanding the significance of logistics in the emerging global security environment. Representatives from Government, the Armed Services, Industry and Academia – both nationally and internationally – will serve as keynoters, plenary and panel participants, and paper presenters.

SOLE 2009 will offer paper presentation sessions that address the many faces of logistics in global security, to include but not limited to: designing for security, security in the manufacturing process, security in humanitarian and disaster relief operations, multimodal transportation security, logistics technologies enabling global security, the role of space in economic security, and the security challenges of information technology. If you are interested in submitting a paper for consideration, please submit an abstract by 15 April 2009. If accepted for SOLE 2009, the paper must be submitted no later than 31 July 2009 – with the slide presentation to be submitted by 5 August 2009. For additional information and submissions, please contact either *John (Jay) Erb*, SOLE 2009 Deputy Chair, at (703) 246-0756 or SOLE Headquarters at (301) 459-8446.

Only electronic submissions will be accepted at john.erb@gdit.com.

Joint logistics at NOLSC

Navy Supply Corps Newsletter, July-August, 2006 by Joseph P. Hennessy, Philip A. Fahringer

"Logistics is traditionally an unglamorous and underappreciated activity. To generalize, when the battle is going well, the strategist and tactician are lionized; it is only when the tanks run out of gas that people go head-hunting for the logisticians." Lt. Gen. William G. Pagonis, USA

Long recognized as critical in warfare, logistics continues to gain recognition as a key enabler as threats to our national security continue to evolve and present an environment increasingly characterized by complexity, instability, and ambiguity. As we transform to confront the emerging threats, challenges, and opportunities of the 21st century, concepts of operation and doctrine are evolving to increasingly emphasize the necessity of a "joint" approach to current and future conflicts.

is within this context that we must continue to reexamine logistics support, ensuring that logistics systems, processes, and infrastructures possess the capabilities and wherewithal to satisfy the joint warfighter, as well as service requirements across the range of military operations. This article provides a brief overview of the Naval Operational Logistics Support Center's (NOLSC) role in synchronizing naval logistics with emerging joint logistics concepts and capabilities.

NOLSC, what we are doing

As a key player involved with the integration and synchronization of naval and joint logistics, NOLSC is not only leading the Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP) into joint logistics, but is in fact leading the Navy into joint logistics, as well. Based on the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Guidance for 2006, OPNAV N4 staff developed an action plan to support Navy's integration into joint logistics. Many of the tasks associated with this plan specifically call upon NOLSC's involvement with the development and evaluation of joint logistics capability initiatives. In response to its emerging role in leading Navy's joint logistics efforts, NOLSC has rapidly positioned itself within the joint logistics community as a productive source for naval logistics expertise, and has established joint logistics as one of its key mission areas.

In general, within the joint logistics mission area at NOLSC, we "advance alignment" between naval and joint logistics by providing a Navy perspective to the Joint Planning and Execution Community (JPEC). Such involvement provides a direct means to influence joint logistics processes, systems, and concepts. Additionally, NOLSC also provides feedback from the JPEC back to the Navy logistics community in order to shape Navy logistics processes, systems, and concepts, for better synchronization with developing joint initiatives.

Specifically, NOLSC has been, and continues to be involved with the following major initiatives within the joint logistics arena: Joint Logistics (Distribution) Joint Integrating Concept; Joint Seabasing; Joint Deployment Planning and Execution Systems and Processes; and Joint Theater Logistics C2 Structure and Authorities.

Although each effort has some unique aspects associated with it, there are significant overlaps among them. The value of NOLSC's involvement in these initiatives is twofold: 1) presenting a unified, single face, for Navy logistics to the joint logistics community and 2) serving as conduit from the joint logistics community back to the Navy, providing a means to further ensure integration among Navy and joint logistics.

(Continued on Page 12)

Joint Logistics (Distribution) Joint Integrating Concept

Supply chain effectiveness is critical in the ability of our logistics "pipeline" to move and sustain joint forces and the resultant capability of the warfighters to accomplish operational objectives across the spectrum of military operations. A recent joint initiative to enhance the supply chain, specifically the ability to "rapidly and effectively move and sustain joint forces in support of major combat operations or other joint operations," is development of the Joint Logistics (Distribution) Joint Integrating Concept (JL(D) JIC).

NOLSC was an active participant in the development of the JL(D) JIC, representing the Navy on both the JIC writing and analysis teams. The central idea of this concept is summarized in its hypothesis.

If we can:

- * Build a single unified joint deployment and distribution enterprise capable of rapidly delivering and positioning joint forces and sustainment from any origin or supply source to any joint force commander (JFC) designated point of need and back again;
- * Augment any JFC with additional, ready, scalable, and agile distribution capabilities; and
- * Network the entire system in near real-time with common operational views and shared knowledge, intuitive decision support and modeling tools, asset visibility and an enabling financial system.

Then the results will be:

- * Enhanced delivery of forces and sustainment to the JFC, enabling, not limiting, operational art and employment of forces;
- * Rapid introduction and integration of additional theater distribution capabilities to seamlessly link the joint force with the entire distribution system;

Improved trust and confidence that the entire distribution system will "deliver."

This effort provides a conceptual foundation for the future capability development activities to support joint distribution operations envisioned to be conducted in the 2015-2025 time frame. The JL(D) JIC details improved logistics support to the joint warfighter by providing an enhanced distribution capability--the movement or delivery of joint forces and sustainment--from point of origin to point of need. Joint Seabasing

(Continued on Page 13)

The primary goal of Joint Seabasing is to improve joint warfighting capability by providing a JFC with operational independence. While the focus of the Sea Base pillar from Sea Power 21 is on the ability to project operating forces, NOLSC's role, along with that of the naval logistics community, is to ensure that the sea base itself is capable of being logistically supported, and can also provide logistics support to forces ashore.

Some critical operational and logistics issues being considered are:

- * Who has command of the sea base, the joint task force commander directly, or the joint force maritime component commander (JFMCC), or will there be a designated sea base commander, and if so does that person report to the JFMCC or the JTF commander directly?
- * What specific force structure and for what length of time can the sea base reasonably be expected to support those forces afloat and ashore given current and planned capabilities, and under what scenarios is a sea base capability likely to be desired?
- * What types and quantities of logistics sustainment should be carried on board the CLF ships supporting a sea base, and how do we financially account for support to non-naval forces?
- * What role do High Speed Vessels play in sea basing?
- * What are the various technologies that will be required to rapidly transfer sustainment material to and from the sea base in high sea states?

Through our partnering relationships with OPNAV and the Marine Corps Combat Development Command (MCCDC), NOLSC is actively working on solutions to these questions. We are presently participating in a Navy/Marine Corps Sea Basing Capabilities Study that will run through the summer. This study will determine sea basing capability gaps and excesses, as well as provide insights into conducting future sea basing operations. Post-study analysis data will be used to feed into programmatic decisions about required future sea basing capabilities and to develop a base line expeditionary force structure.

Joint Deployment Planning and Execution (JDP&E) Systems and Processes

The primary goal of JDP&E efforts is to develop "a responsive knowledge-based process that enables decision-makers at all levels with the ability to make timely, accurate global force projection decisions." The goal is to integrate and synchronize the planning and decisions related to requirements sourcing, mobilization, deployment, and employment to generate the required operational effects to satisfy operational requirements deliver combat capability at the time and place required by the JFC.

(Continued on Page 14)

NOLSC's role has been to represent the Navy's joint deployment and distribution community to ensure that the Department of Defense approved joint processes and systems are being implemented across Navy units. Beyond simply ensuring compliance with the DoD directives, NOLSC has been working closely with the program managers and system users to make certain that these systems are both responsive to the Navy's unique requirements and also are interoperable with systems currently being used at the unit level.

One particular system that has been directed at the DoD level for implementation by all services is the Joint Forces Requirements Generator II (JFRG II) planning tool. Presently, there is no Navy organization that has been assigned responsibility to serve as the functional manager for the JFRG system. NOLSC is working with both the OPNAV and Fleet Forces Command staff to identify roles and responsibilities for all the relevant Navy players to ensure compliance with this mandated joint system. Additionally, as the joint processes and systems become doctrine and systems of record, NOLSC will further ensure Navy logisticians are familiar with the processes and are trained.

Joint Theater Logistics Command and Control (JTL C2) Structure

Another area of focus for improving logistics support to the joint warfighter is that of Joint Theater Logistics (JTL). The focus of the JTL initiative is to identify, and develop, the authorities, systems, and architectures (e.g., the "rules, tools, and processes") which will enable the JFC to synchronize theater logistics capabilities with warfighter logistics requirements to support operational objectives.

JTL will provide a scalable and flexible capability through which the JFC can prioritize, coordinate, synchronize, and adjudicate theater logistics capabilities, resources, and requirements in order to achieve logistics situational awareness and the ability to effectively anticipate and respond to emerging theater logistics and support requirements, ensuring that the right joint logistics capabilities are available, at the right place and time, to effect mission accomplishment. Unity of effort in joint logistics operations is enhanced through the flexibility of the JFC to select a logistics construct through which to best implement JTL. Based on the commander's intent, priorities, and the complexity of the operation, the JFC can tailor JTL to meet situational needs--"one size doesn't" fit all. Some of the options being examined include:

- * Aligning logistics authorities, responsibilities and resources under a single component commander. While this concept of a support component commander has some merit, it should be noted that the idea of adding an additional layer of logistics C2 to a JTF is still being evaluated and as of this writing has not yet been an optimal accepted as solution.
- * Linking planning, execution and analysis in a collaborative information environment (CIE) (using chat rooms to improve communication and information flow and increasing the planning horizon).

Linking inter--and intra-theater surface movement assets and processes for end-to-end distribution management and visibility to the joint force commander. (Much of this is being done within the Joint Deployment and Distribution Operations Center structure.)

* Consolidating the theater sustainment requirements determination processes and synchronizing subsequent sustainment requests.

Along the same line of thinking as JTL, NOLSC, following outstanding ground breaking work by the Pacific Fleet logisticians over the past few years, has recently embarked upon a bridging strategy aimed at improving logistics support to naval forces. This strategy is commonly referred to as Global Theater Logistics Support.

By partnering with COMFISCS, and more specifically the recently expanded FISC Yokosuka organization, which now includes detachments in Singapore and Guam, we are looking at ways to improve logistics support to naval forces operating in the Pacific Fleet area of responsibility. Through an analytical review process aimed at identifying various NAVSUP capabilities that can be aligned to more efficiently support theater operations ranging from normal peacetime operations, to crisis response, and ultimately warfare operations, we will build a template for support that is exportable to any theater of operations.

Whereas the operators are typically bound to the rules of the AORs to which they are "chopped," logisticians should be able to provide seamless support (read no "chop lines") to naval forces operating globally. Hence the name of this construct, "Global Theater Logistics Support." As this concept is further developed you can expect to see updates in subsequent issues of this publication.

Conclusion

DoD's response to the national security challenges confronting our nation have increased expectations for, and recognition of, the role of logistics readiness in enabling freedom of action for the joint force to achieve desired joint effects and operational objectives across the spectrum of military operations. The successful employment of fully integrated joint logistics capabilities will be the standard for the logistics readiness of the joint force through enhanced logistics situation awareness, authorities, and response capabilities. For the Navy, this requires that we are able to support the joint warfighter whenever and wherever called upon. This means we must have logistics capabilities that are interoperable with the joint community. We must also have trained supply officers who are experts in joint, as well as Navy, logistics systems and processes, to include joint doctrine, concepts, and terminology. Achieving this endstate will require a continuing commitment to forge ahead with efforts to align and integrate service, agency and combatant commander initiatives to enhance the logistics readiness and responsiveness of the joint force.

