

Executive Overview – January 2003

Fleet Modernization Program Policy Implementation Conference San Diego, CA. January 28-30, 2003

FMP Web Site at <http://www.fmp.navy.mil>

The following is provided as an Executive Overview of the 28–30 January 2003 FMP Policy Implementation Conference. Detailed FMP Policy Implementation Conference minutes will be posted to the FMP website within the next few weeks. In summary, the major achievements of the Conference are listed below:

Agreement to align FMP ESC with SHIPMAIN Cross Functional Team (CFT) Four.

Agreement to pursue ADM's Sullivan and Dwyer as supporters of the FMP process and its integration with SHIPMAIN.

Agreement for the FMP ESC to review the periodicity and attendance at the Conference.

Agreement to continue to move towards a common electronic JCF, based on the Proposed Alteration module now in NDE-NM.

Agreement that the SPMs would maintain control of shipalt data once the shipalt has been submitted into NDE.

Conducted NDE training to over 80 users.

Agreement on development of a NDE-NM Functional Working Group/CCB to manage minor enhancements.

Agreement to continue efforts for the community to collect metrics data elements identified by Metrics Subcommittee and blessed by CFT4.

COMNAVSURFOR VADM LaFleur provided the following comments:

Need exists to get more efficient and effective.

Streamline efficiency and effectiveness on how we modernize ships

The Navy cannot afford all the alterations that have been developed. Currently there are 40 distinct alt groups. This needs to be cleaned up and made simpler. The Navy cannot afford to let the alts die on the vine once the decision is made to develop an alteration. The Paradigm must change to a common commitment between fleet and program managers to get an alteration done as soon as possible once approved. The target completion for alterations is set at three years from the commitment date.

Executive Overview – January 2003

CNSP completed an alteration review for FY02 to identify alterations that can be passed to history.

- 3549 alterations were passed to history as a result of the review.
 - o 82% of D-alts, 54% of AER's.
 - o Estimated average costs to develop an alteration - \$50,000
 - o Total expended developing alterations that were not implemented \$177 million, which is an unacceptable number.
 - o The average age of outstanding alterations is unacceptably high leading to the conclusion that the alteration was not all that necessary.
- END STATE DESIRED - Spend money on the important alterations. Once developed a SHIPALT is to be installed within three years.

FMP database – must have one common database and are heading down that road.

Fleet FMP vision – want the fleet to be able to access and view the database, see that alterations and know when they are programmed for installation.

SHIPMAIN – Ship Maintenance

- Re-engineer the ship maintenance process
- Government has a cost control vice profit motive
- Challenges:
 - o Culture – Expect a 4 year process in order to make the change permanent;
 - o Paradigms
 - o Remove barriers

Alterations

- Apply filter to the alteration “In basket”
 - o Looks at return on investment
 - o Feasibility, Other criteria.
- Once an alteration is approved then an end-to-end commitment is made to get it installed on the ship ASAP - within 3 years.

C5RA – 93% of hits are ships force capable repairs.

- Not changed significantly over the years.
- Need to have an attitude of making things better. Look at other ways to improve; PMS revisions, Training.....

Over-Maintenance of ships – In the past more money is viewed as better. Metrics do not support this position, for example:

1997 – \$500M spent on 330 ships and that was 100% of requirements.

2002 – \$750M spent on 310 ships and that was 80% of requirements

“Convinced that more maintenance is not better”

We over test in OTE

- Get fully tested product from industry. Not necessary for war-fighting

Executive Overview – January 2003

Churn – problem partly in ineffective ship checks – results not fed back to plans.

Kitting at planning yard for an example

Started out saving money on mass buys but has evolved into a detailed kit. This appears to be too much material that requires shipping, staging and storage costs not originally accounted for. Current concept based on an incomplete metric and is costing more than it is saving. Not necessary with multi-ship multi-year contracts.

CFT₄ – Alteration Oversight will be in place by June 2003.

COMPACFLT N43 RADM Brooks provided the following comments:

Maintenance and Readiness - What is going on today could be described as transformational, revolutionary and aligned.

Peacetime vs. Wartime maintenance strategy

- No longer able to maintain ships overseas in any ports easily
- Need to have a surge capacity of available Battle Groups.
- Need to find a balance between current readiness and future readiness.

INSURV Results – Demonstrates a requirement to strike a balance between ships crew operation and maintenance requirements. INSURV findings have not changed much over the years.

- CSMP not valid
- Ships force does not do a satisfactory self assessment
- PMS is not getting done

Maintenance metrics are required to adequately measure the maintenance output. Maintenance expenditures should result in an increase in either:

- Mission effectiveness
- War fighting effectiveness

OI&D Repair Organizations – With only 2 tenders and a reduced shore Active Duty maintenance community... does this distinction really apply anymore? Requirement to determine how much ships force will be able to accomplish and what the right balance is between repair organizations.

Maintenance and SHIPMAIN

- Budget adequate; results inadequate
- Everything is up for grabs
- Realignment of the waterfront maintenance activities to all work for the fleet is in process. Currently too many stovepipe organizations exist on the waterfront.
- Maintenance budget for FY04 and beyond is being reduced and we will be forced to do a better job no matter what.
- Process discipline – Will be forced in everything we do.

“ If you are not linked with CFT₄ and SHIPMAIN you are headed in the wrong direction”

- RADM Brooks

Executive Overview – January 2003

NSLCPAC Dan Jensen provided an update on the status of the Navy Data Environment (NDE)
– Navy Modernization

The system went live 2 Dec 02. Deficiencies are reviewed on a daily basis, rated for criticality and corrected as appropriate. Initial problems with roles and permissions and printing have been corrected. Two more servers were just added to the system and helped performance and two more are on order.

ESC Meeting – Where are we going

Issue – Alignment of group to CFT₄

- How to transition to CFT₄
- Generate presentation for PIT and let them decide
 - o Can ESC be part of the Barrier Removal process?
- FMP is a process for all NAVY while SHIPMAIN is for surface ships only.

Issue – Determine if ADM's Sullivan and Dwyer are willing to sponsor the FMP process. Prepare a brief as to how it can be integrated in the SHIPMAIN program.

Next Conference

- Tentatively set for July
- ESC needs to review periodicity
- ESC needs to review attendance
- FMP Sub-committee's may be moving to slowly to solve problems
 - o Consider reorganizing sub-committees around smaller problems and disbanding upon producing solution.
- Re-asses value added
- Seek direction from CFT₄

PLANNING Sub-Committee

CONOPS #3 Common Process – all current actions completed with the exception of software management which will meet in February. Committee decided to clean slate with expectation of action items as a result of SHIPMAIN.

TMA-TMI – FMP Manual June02 now includes a field on JCF form to signify if an alteration was developed as the result of a TMA-TMI issue. Additional explanation drafted for inclusion in next update of Section 4 of the Manual.

JCF/SAR – Agreement reached on a few updates to the June 02 JCF form.

- One new field added for “other systems impacted”
- Check box fields condensed to one with a drop down box and free text. These include stowage, aviation, calibration....
- Agreed to move toward an electronic JCF (E-JCF)

Executive Overview – January 2003

- Carriers have been looking at this process and have an initiative on going.
- Subs – usually start design before JCF because of the difference in the funding verses execution cycle. (They converge at a-12)
 - ACTION ITEM – Review and align process.
- Discussion as to the statutory requirement for signature on weight and moment impact.
 - ACTION ITEM – Review statutory signature requirement for JCF/SAR and determine method of satisfying requirement electronically.
- Agreement that the SPMs would maintain shipalt data once the shipalt has been submitted into NDE.
 - Action Item – develop a formal SHIPALT title change process
 - New capabilities should be a new alteration
 - Back-fit should be a separate alteration
 - Agreement reached on enhanced definition of service estimates.

Proposed alteration process

E-JCF – all agreed to move towards

- Only one data element missing which was routed to AIS committee for inclusion.

Temp-alts

- Package to be retained
- Allow for advance approval prior to package development
- JCF requirement
 - ACTION ITEM – look at requirement to have a JCF for TEMPALT approval.
 - ACTION ITEM – modify NDE to include “TEMPALT” as a type of new alt.

Authorization letters

- Goal - Format the same for all
- Proposed standard authorization letter to be submitted for next monthly ESC.
- ACTION ITEM – Update FMP manual with the revised authorization letter once approved by ESC.

AIT

- TYCOM should track exceptions
- Reference to standard items is to be included in the technical specifications.
- Concur with proposed 04X comments to 9090-310D.

Software group

- To meet in February

AIS Sub-committee

Goal - fully implement NDE

- Configuration control is becoming an issue
- Training provided at conference
 - 8 sessions with 63 total attendees

Executive Overview – January 2003

- 20 scheduled in the next few days
- Expanded functionality of the AUTOSIR process to include e-mail to originator that bug/enhancement has been completed.
- Automated release process for upgrades
 - Still releasing an avg of one per day but expect this to slow
 - Allows for online visibility

Configuration Control Board

- Established in order to begin to manage enhancements to the system.
- Purpose
 - Collect functional concerns
 - Adjudicate issues
 - Set priority for resolution
 - Provide a means for users to get involved in the process.
- Proposal to change name to NDE-MN Functional working group to more accurately reflect its mission.
- Composition
 - Option one – AIS subcommittee
 - Option two – the 4 functional program managers, one senior knowledgeable user and a select group of users based on the enhancement area(s).

ACTION ITEMS:

- Incorporate AMPS and SIDE in AUTOSIR process
- Document and post AUTOSIR process
- Develop configuration management plan
- Reorganize use cases on NDE website
- Bring proposal to ESC for Configuration control board including membership, procedures and charter,

LOGISTICS Subcommittee

Goal #3 Common process

- Transition from ILS policy to implementation in NDE
- ILS cert forms comments adjudicated and incorporated
 - Action – determine impact on ILS milestones and certification process
- Recommend equipment alts (ordalts, machalts) be excluded until policy can be written.
 - ACTION – ESC to provide clarification to scope of coverage in message
 - ACTION – update FMP manual to reflect policy
- ILS deficiency report to be included in NDE
 - ACTION - Policy to be added to section 8.
- Tracking ILS impacts as a result of LARS

TEMP-ALTS

- Draft ILS policy reviewed and passed to planning committee
- ACTION – 04L5 to determine CDMD-OA timeline and data requirements.

Executive Overview – January 2003

ACTION ITEMS

- Incorporate ILS policy for software configuration changes
- Incorporate change in funding and management of TYCOM alts
- Add functionality of additional databases to get SSR/SRD tracking.

ACTION ITEM – FMP changes proposed for approval by ESC

- COP to be provided by A-4
- CDMD-OA – loaded by A-2

Material working group

- MOA target date is 28FEB03
 - o Applies to PEO ships and subs
 - o Carriers just received and in process of reviewing
 - o SPAWAR not participating
- DLA now buying DHA coded material
- DLA now using PBL support in commercial sources.
- ACTION ITEMS
 - o DLA to determine documentation required for repairables
 - o SPAWAR to develop material verification process.

METRICS

Draft letter presented implementing data reporting requirements to support the dashboard indicators.

- ACTION ITEM – ESC to review, provide guidance and/or approve.
 - o Issue “data input sheets” for dashboard indicators - March 03
 - o Develop metric baselines and targets – March 03
 - o Coordinate loading metrics into “My Metrics” with 04M5
 - o Select what Battle Group to begin data collection for

Quality of design changes between public and private yards (was an open item)

- Agreed on template for data collection
- Action - begin data collection process

Funding required - \$190K to complete modification to NDE-NM and update of all of the applicable use cases.