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Overview

- Identification and Elimination of Non-Value Added Requirements
- IG Inspection System Improvement Tiger Team
Identifying and Eliminating Non-Value Added Activities
Turbulence and Drag

- Sub-optimal “TOUCH” on a product within a process
  - Improved by “six sigma”, “TQM”, etc.
- WASTE within a process (8 Forms of Waste)
  - Improved by “lean”, etc.
- BUREAUCRACY (a 9th Form of Waste?)
  - Improved by ……?
Bureaucracy

- an administrative system, especially in a government, that divides work into specific categories carried out by special departments of nonelected officials

- complex rules and regulations applied rigidly
Bureaucracy

- a system whereby the risk-averse thinking and worst-case-scenario planning considered necessary in our national defense are mis-applied to the administrative activities needed to organize, train, and equip a military, leading to an excessive focus on objective detail and compliance, which creates more bureaucracy.
Causes of Bureaucratic Waste

• SUSPECTED CAUSES
  • Risk Averse Culture
  • Worst Case Scenario Planning
  • Pyramidal Hierarchy
  • Accountability and Compliance Oriented
  • Focus on Objective Measures vs. Subjective Virtue
  • Multiple stakeholders and functional communities distract from focus on enterprise priority and KISS
Bureaucracy (or bureaucratic waste) leads to the creation and preservation of activities which either do not add value to the product line from the outset or become non-value added at some point due to change in priorities, technology, culture, etc.

These activities become burdensome by the resources they require and they detract from our focus on our real priorities.

So what do we do about it?
Creating a Process

**Problem Statement:** In the AF Medical Service, bureaucratic burden distracts from value added activities.

**Objective:** Establish a culture that encourages and rewards the identification and removal of NVA requirements and activities.

1. Creation of a repeatable and transparent process that allows all AF Medics to challenge wasteful processes, without fear of retribution, risk averse practices, and worst case scenario thinking.
2. Formalize a structure with clear business rules whereby all can attack waste and have the ability to nominate best practices replicable throughout AFMS through a standardized knowledge management system.
4. Increase accountability and utilization of trained AFSO21 CPI practitioners

---
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**Category of Effort:** This Project will examine:


Informal Study on NVA

**Pareto Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency/Quantity</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBTs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHMRSI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHLTA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing/Base tasking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid medical records</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPRS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stovepipes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR/EPRs/Awards/Dec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasing GTC Payments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCO/Contract funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements not resolved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No alternative to cotton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable databases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to track train</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ Personnel hiring sys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post Deployment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple non-patient ca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI Inspections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a structure to pr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One offs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NVA by Theme

Pareto Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency/Quantity</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training - unfocused, dist</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHLTA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor IT Systems/Reliance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHMRSi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base and Below admin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stovepipes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing/Base tasking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPRS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ Personnel hiring sy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post Deployment v</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI Inspections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We Have Met the Enemy and . . .

**Pareto Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency/Quantity</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFMS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*total: 98*
Integrity - Service - Excellence

Bureaucracy Killing Machine

Continuous Process Improvement

Trigger (Cow ID'd) → Input into System → Local Review → Span of Control → Process Owner Evaluates → Change Process

- Yes: Owner Implements
  - Yes: Can we effect Change
  - No: Unable or Unwilling to Enact Change

- No: Process Owner
  - Yes: Implement Change
  - No: Measure Outcomes

Forward to Next Level

Feedback Loop → Change Process

Process Owner

CPI Portal

Process Metrics:
Timeliness (Input through Local Review)
Timeliness (Process Owner receipt through Resolution)
Timeliness (Local Review receipt through Resolution)

Outcome Metric:
Airman feedback on outcome

Local Processes

Higher Level Process
## Process Business Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Step</th>
<th>Rules of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trigger</td>
<td>Is Justification Patient Oriented? Perceived to be NVA? Anonymous submission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local CPI Process</td>
<td>How many times has it happened? Mitigating Actions? References? Who owns it? Forward Local Comments if Elevated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Process</td>
<td>Cross-functional team (Counsel of Heretics) How do we interpret requirements ROI of current Requirement? Is this a trend across AFMS? Conduct risk mgmt / risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Loop</td>
<td>Automatic email notification of receipt / status / results to originator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to Measure Outcomes</td>
<td>Continue to track / measure results of change (or lack of)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Integrity - Service - Excellence*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>POC</th>
<th>Due By</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Develop proactive process to weed out waste</td>
<td>AFMOA/CC</td>
<td>20 Nov 10</td>
<td>Maj Herman AFMOA Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Common system to receive / validate / pass on NVA</td>
<td>SG6 (Col Zarate) SGE/CAG (Col Anderson)</td>
<td>01 Jan 11</td>
<td>Infrastructure build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>On-ramp for new AFIs/Policy</td>
<td>SG3 (Col Collier)</td>
<td>20 Nov 10</td>
<td>Create the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Create model / process for virtual team</td>
<td>SG3 (Col Collier)</td>
<td>20 Nov 10</td>
<td>Create the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Education and marketing Plan</td>
<td>AFMOA/CC (System) SGE (Strategic)</td>
<td>15 Jan 11</td>
<td>Develop the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Follow-up on each Root Causes</td>
<td>SG3 (Col Collier)</td>
<td>20 Nov 10</td>
<td>Plan how to attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Test Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>01 Jan 11</td>
<td>ACLS, Self-Reporting Time, Printing of AHLTA Record of care (HSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Pilot test at 1 Clinic &amp; 1 Hospital</td>
<td>Col Roshetko Col Brown, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairchild / Lakenheath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principles for AF Inspection System Improvement
Problem

- SYMPTOMS:
  - Wing Calendar “whitespace”
  - Inspection frequency inconsistent

- PROBLEM:
  - AF Inspection System is ineffective and broken
  - Too many AF and Functional Inspections, assessments and evaluations are being conducted in an independent, segregated, and uncoordinated manner

- WHY:
  - No AF unity of effort for inspecting compliance, efficiency
  - Guidance to field missing or disconnected
  - Control mechanism not in place, not enduring
  - SAF/IG failed to provide/oversee/control Inspection System
Current Inspection System
735 Inspection Days over 5 Years

- Logistics Compliance Assessment Program
- Child & Youth Program
- Hennessy Awd
- Installation Level Review
- Pathologists
- Nuclear ORI
- Dorms
- Ground C2 Sys Staff Assessment
- ATSEP
- SEPWO
- AFIP Drug Testing Lab Inspection
- AF Eubank Award
- OSS Sex Assault Program
- MAJCOM NAF
- AABB
- UTAC StanEval Formal

- CINC Installation Excellence Awards
- 25 days
- 45 days
- 60 days

Does not include SAVs or MAJCOM-unique items

Integrity - Service - Excellence
BLUF

6 key HAF 2-ltrs met to discuss improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Inspection System (IS)

- Lt Gen Breedlove
- Lt Gen Reno
- Lt Gen Lord
- Lt Gen Miller
- Lt Gen Green
- Lt Gen Rogers

Developed guiding principles

All are committed to developing COAs in coordination with MAJCOM CCs to institutionalize these principles
The Challenge

- Current Inspection System is inadequate
  - The current IS consumes too much whitespace for field units as they prepare for and complete inspections, assessments and evaluations requiring 700+ inspection days every five years
  - Yet…the current IS is not adequately reporting readiness, compliance, efficiency, state of discipline or management effectiveness to the command chain or HQ Functionals

- Desired Outcome
  - Strengthen command function & improve command effectiveness
  - Inspire and promote improved performance, military discipline and management excellence up and down the chain of command, in units and staffs

Adequate reporting without being overly burdensome or disruptive…an important component of a disciplined military force
Desired Capabilities

- IS should give CC an independent assessment of:
  - Unit performance, leadership effectiveness, management performance, and aspects of unit culture and command climate (e.g., military discipline, respect, LEAN, safety, Wingman)
  - Unit ability to find, report, analyze and fix deficiencies

- IS should give MAJCOM & HAF Functionals an independent assessment of functional effectiveness in the field, and of the adequacy of organization, policy and guidance, training and resources

- IS should include capability for senior AF leaders to direct a targeted, deeper-dive inspection of specific programs, organizations, or issues (e.g., AFIA’s Management Assessment Program)
Inspector General created Inspection System Improvement Tiger Team (ISITT)

- Given guiding principles and made assumptions

Work began in December 2010

Goals:

- Increase White Space for units
- Re-invent Inspection System

Present COAs to CORONA in February 2011
Proposed Guiding Principles

- Every Wg, Gp and Sq CC gets at least 1 major IG inspection during his/her tour

- Balanced mix of scheduled & no-notice inspections

- Units will be inspected for Readiness and Compliance every 24 months

- Readiness Inspections assess a unit’s ability to execute tasked capabilities, mission-essential functions and military discipline

- Compliance Inspections assess a unit’s military discipline/culture and CC and supervisor effectiveness, as well as a unit’s compliance with law, policy and other authoritative programs
Proposed Guiding Principles

- Inspections should include interviews of Airmen at several levels to assess leadership/management effectiveness and discipline.

- With few exceptions, all inspections, assessments & evaluations in the USAF should be conducted by IGs, augmented by functional experts from staffs/other units.

- HAF/MAJCOM Functional Staffs execute their mission by planning, coordinating and providing functional management policy, process guidance and resources; Functional Staffs are enablers for field units, not “inspectors” or “graders”.

- Trained inspection augmentees provide expertise and have high value in USAF continuous improvement efforts.
Proposed Guiding Principles

- An IG assignment has high value to the USAF in developing future commanders and SNCOs.

- IS effectiveness is directly affected by the quality of personnel assigned to the IG—IG Personnel should be model officers and NCOs who are subject-matter experts; high-quality performers with future leadership potential and the ability to think critically.

- As the commander’s direct representatives, the quality of personnel assigned to the IG directly affects the credibility of both the commander and the IG system as a whole.

- IG Team Chiefs drive team effectiveness, are the most visible direct representatives of MAJCOM CCs & should be selected by CIP or a board with this role in mind.

- IG duty should be a special-duty assignment, or other management construct, to ensure highly qualified personnel are developed and assigned to IG.
Proposed Guiding Principles

- IS should be an **increasingly integrated measurement system**, assessing and verifying data from WG/CC’s reports, self-inspection program (SIP), metrics, databases, exercises and deployments
  - IS should evaluate areas that can be monitored/inspected through metrics/reports and **eliminate unnecessary on-site inspections**

- IS should **synchronize and, where possible, integrate all inspections by AF or external agencies**

- IS should **include two critical additional capabilities:**
  - Standardized AF-wide SIP and reporting tools for transparency from WG to HAF
  - Provide WG/CCs adequate ability to self-assess discipline, compliance and wing-wide readiness
Assumptions for COA Development

- COAs will be IAW the guiding principles
- COAs will improve unity of effort for inspecting unit performance, leadership effectiveness, management performance, and culture
- COAs will align the IS with the AEF Cycle, ensuring inspection frequencies are in 6-month increments to the maximum extent possible
- COAs will include control mechanisms to prevent recurrence of whitespace problem
- COAs will include actions to close the guidance gap
- COAs will be executable and evaluated against the following criteria at a minimum:
  - Suitability, feasibility, acceptability, supportability, agility
Assumptions for COA Development

- With few exceptions, all internal inspections, assessments and evaluations can be integrated into IG-conducted inspections.
- With few exceptions, all external inspections, assessments and evaluations can be synchronized with AF-owned events.
- COAs may require personnel realignment and/or minimal increases to manpower authorizations in order to be executable.
- Significant manpower increases are not available, however current manpower authorizations dedicated to conducting inspections, assessments and evaluations outside the IG system may be realigned.
- COAs will require changes to AFPC’s rule-set, and may require Development Teams to direct high-quality FGOs and SNCOs to IG, then back for command, supervisory or functional leadership positions.
What If Instead of This…

Integrity - Service - Excellence
Current IS requires 105 weeks every 5 years, (40% of the available whitespace)

Leaves only 155 weeks available for Training, Deployment & Mission Execution

10-15% for Inspections

75 more weeks available for Training, Deployment & Mission Execution

Indicates significant resources are being devoted to inspection across the AF

5 Years

Possible?

Integrity - Service - Excellence
Proposed Timeline

Phase 1: New Inspection System
- COA Development
- COA Creation
- Inspection System Improvement
- Tiger Team (ISITT)
- MAJCOMs and HAF 2-Ltrs
- COA Coordination
- IG Conference

Phase 2: COA Implementation
- COA Brief at CORONA SOUTH

COAs for improving the AF Inspection System to CORONA SOUTH for decision

Integrity - Service - Excellence
What I’m Learning

- Inspection system reflects the culture of the Air Force . . . can changing the inspection system change the culture or will the culture have to change before the inspection system can?

- The thoughts and actions that got us to where we are today will not get us to where we want to be tomorrow . . . yet, thinking “outside the box” is very difficult when you live inside the box.

- Disruptive and seemingly heretical thinking is required . . . how do you achieve that when a military career seems to develop the antithesis to those traits?

- We must leverage science and technology but they must remain a means to an end, not become an end unto themselves

- It’s complicated
Questions