





DISCLAIMER

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

The word "he" is intended to include both the masculine and feminine genders; any exception to this will be so noted.

Accession For UTIS COARL . Codes λ. 1. 1. 25 DTIC 23 COPY INSPECTED 2

EVALUATION OF STANDARD INTEGRATED SUPPORT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SISMS)

> LOGISTICS STUDIES OFFICE PROJECT NUMBER 035

> > FINAL REPORT MARCH 1981

> > > BY

HUNTER W. TYLER RICHARD MARTINKO

LOGISTICS STUDIES OFFICE US ARMY LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT CENTER FORT LEE, VIRGINIA 23801 ABSTRACT

The CG, DARCOM requested that the Logistics Studies Office, Army Logistics Management Center (LSO, ALMC) conduct an independent evaluation of SISMS to determine its value, need and compatibility with related DARCOM procedures. The study was accomplished through the use of a comprehensive questionnaire consisting of thirty-five (35) questions relating to SISMS. The questionnaire was directed to those activities within DARCOM with specific responsibilities for SISMS in current regulations. In addition to the guestionnaire, personal visits were made to US Army Tank Automotive Command (TACOM), US Army Aviation Research and Development Command (AVRADCOM) and US Army Troop Support and Aviation Materiel Readiness Command (TSARCOM). Project/Product managers within these commands were also contacted in connection with these visits. Evaluation of the questionnaire and personal visits coupled with a review of current regulations and studies completed on SISMS resulted in reaching the conclusion that the SISMS regulation currently in use should be eliminated upon establishment of a Joint Logistics Coordinating Panel with the responsibility to develop and implement a procedure for the standardized application of MIL STDS 1388-1/2 and 1552/1561 service wide.

and and the second second

Report Title: Evaluation of Standard Integrated Support Management System (SISMS) Study Number: LSO 035

Study Initiator and Sponsor: Joint Activities Coordinator US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Disclaimer	Back of Cover Sheet
Abstract	i
Table of Contents	ii
Executive Summary	1
 Authority for the Study Problem Statement Objective Scope of Study Methodology Findings Recommendations 	1 1 1 1 1 2 3
I. Background II. Objective III. Limits and Scope IV. Assumptions V. Methodology VI. Analysis and Discussion VII. Conclusions VIII. Recommendations	3 3 3 4 5 10 12

Appendix

i.

A. Bibliography A-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

 <u>Authority for the Study</u>. DF, DRCSA-JS, HQ DARCOM, 6 January 1981, subject: Implementation of the Standard Integrated Support Management System (SISMS).
 <u>Problem Statement</u>. All services are not in full compliance with the Standard Integrated Support Management System (SISMS). Each of the services agreed to have their respective staffs examine the value and need for SISMS and its compatibility with other existing logistics management procedures within their commands.

3. <u>Objective</u>. To conduct an independent evaluation of SISMS to assess its value, need and compatibility with related DARCOM procedures.

4. <u>Scope of Study</u>. The study investigation was limited to those activities/ agencies within DARCOM with specific responsibilities for implementing SISMS procedures as outlined in DARCOM R 700-97.

5. <u>Methodology</u>. Utilization of a thirty-five (35) question questionnaire and personal visits to selected commands. The questionnaire was sent to all commands/activities with assigned responsibilities for SISMS. Current regulations and study reports covering SISMS were also analyzed.

6. Findings.

a. Approximately half of the commands/activities responding had not implemented DARCOM R 700-97.

b. In a majority of cases no implementing instructions have been issued by commands/activities relative to DARCOM R 700-97.

c. SISMS procedures are duplicative of established Army and command procedures.

d. The majority of respondents feel that standardization of ILS, LSA and LSAR can be accomplished under SISMS if uniform procedures and standards can be adopted by each service.

e. The majority of the commands/activities had designated SISMS points of contact.

f. The majority of respondents did not feel that the elevation of DARCOM R 700-97 to a DA publication would increase its effectiveness.

g. SISMS procedures provide only general guidance and do not prescribe the detail necessary to accomplish comprehensive support planning.

h. Almost all commands/activities use standard SISMS contract items and related DIDS; however, these are modified to fit service needs, prevent duplication and to eliminate excessive cost.

i. The majority of respondents feel that formal instruction is needed for SISMS.

j. The majority opposed mandatory application of SISMS based on lack of standardized procedures within each service.

k. Costing procedures for SISMS have not been developed.

1. The majority feel that full implementation of SISMS would impose an increased workload.

7. Recommendations.

a. Establish a Joint Logistics Coordinating Panel with the responsibility to develop and implement a procedure for the standardized application of MIL STDS 1388-1/2 and 1552/1561 service wide.

b. Upon completion of the above, eliminate the SISMS regulation (DARCOM R 700-97).

MAIN REPORT

I. Background.

A. The Standard Integrated Support Management System (SISMS) is a standardized system for the planning, acquisition and management of logistic support for systems/equipments. It was originally developed during the 1967 through 1969 time frame for use on multi-service aeronautical systems; however, in 1970, the Joint Logistics Commanders (JLC) expanded its scope to apply to all weapon systems and equipment programs.

B. During a briefing by the Joint Policy Coordinating Group - Defense Integrated Materiel Management (JPCG-DIMM) to the JLC on 3 December 1980, it was revealed that not all services were in full compliance with SISMS procedures. As a result, each of the JLC agreed to have their respective staffs examine the value and need for SISMS and its compatibility with other existing logistics management procedures. The CG, DARCOM requested that the Logistics Studies Office, Army Logistics Management Center (LSO, ALMC) conduct an independent evaluation of SISMS to determine its value, need and compatibility with related DARCOM procedures. This evaluation will be briefed to the JLC at an appropriate time in conjunction with briefings from the other services.

II. <u>Objective</u>. To conduct an independent evaluation of SISMS to assess its value, need and compatibility with related DARCOM procedures.

III. <u>Limits and Scope</u>. The study investigation was limited to those activities/ agencies within DARCOM with specific responsibilities for implementing SISMS procedures as outlined in DARCOM R 700-97.

IV. Assumptions. None.

V. Methodology.

A. Because of the short deadline imposed on the completion of this study it was determined that the best approach to fulfilling requirements would be through the use of a comprehensive questionnaire consisting of thirty-five (35) questions. The questionnaire was directed to those activities within DARCOM assigned specific responsibilities for SISMS in current regulations. As a result the questionnaire was sent to selected directorates within HQ DARCOM, Project/Product Managers on a selected basis and to the DARCOM Research and Development and Materiel Readiness Commands. To reinforce responses received on the questionnaire, personal visits were made to US Army Tank-Automotive Command (TACOM), US Army Aviation Research and Development Command (AVRADCOM) and US Army Troop Support and Aviation Materiel Readiness Command (TSARCOM). Project/Product Managers within these commands were also contacted in connection with these visits.

B. Thirty-eight (38) questionnaires were dispatched in conjunction with this study. Thirty-two (32) activities responded while only six (6) failed to do so. (See Table 1 for questionnaire tabulation). The Thirty-five (35) questions in the questionnaire were reduced to fifteen (15) critical questions for analysis and review. These fifteen (15) questions were directly related to questions posed in the study directive. The evaluation was based on questionnaire responses, personal visits to both HQ DARCOM and the commands identified above, review of current regulations and analysis of two reports previously prepared on SISMS. The reports included a JPCG-DIMM Ad Hoc Group examination of Interservice Acquisition Logistics Management completed on 2 September 1980 and a Defense Audit Service report entitled "Report on the Audit of the Standard Integrated Support Management System" completed on 28 February 1978.

VI. <u>Analysis and Discussion</u>. An in-depth analysis of the thirty-two (32) responses to the thirty-eight (38) questionnaires dispatched to selected DARCOM commands/activities affected by SISMS produced the results listed below. The specific areas of responsibility addressed by the questionnaire are listed along with an analysis of each.

A. "Has DARCOM R 700-97 been implemented?"

1. Thirteen (13) of the commands/activities responding have implemented the regulation, thirteen (13) have not, and twelve (12) did not respond to the question.

2. Many respondents felt there was no need or requirement for the regulation since its content was incorporated into current DA/DARCOM documentation. Individual visits to the field indicated that the regulation is on file, it is seldom used, and personnel are generally not aware of its content.

B. <u>"If so, have command/activity implementing instructions/procedures</u> been developed?"

 Only five (5) respondents indicated that local command/activity had published implementing instructions, nineteen (19) had not, and fourteen (14) did not respond.

2. All responses and individual visits indicated, generally, that while there were no formal procedures specifically directed toward implementation of the regulation, the policies and procedures outlined therein were being fulfilled through adherence to the requirements of existing DA/DARCOM regulations and other documentation dedicated to its specific areas. Examples of this are AR 700-127 on Integrated Logistics Support, AR 700-51, Army Data Management Program, and numerous MIL STDS.

C. <u>"Are SISMS procedures an improvement over existing Army/DARCOM</u> procedures in effect?"

1. Twelve (12) respondents of the thirty-eight (38) contacted indicated SISMS procedures offered an improvement over DA/DARCOM procedures and regulations, eleven (11) did not, and twenty-three (23) did not respond. The extent of improvement was not indicated.

2. Although the respondents were about evenly divided, they felt generally that SISMS only provides general guidance and does not prescribe the detail necessary to accomplish comprehensive support planning. It was also felt that SISMS does not appear to offer anything unique that is not contained within existing DA/DARCOM procedures and regulations.

3. The respondents who indicated affirmative views in this regard only exceeded the negative view by one (1). The apprehensive feelings expressed regarding whether SISMS offers improved procedures creates doubt as to the need for SISMS.

D. <u>"Is it possible to attain complete or partial standardization of ILS,</u> LSA and LSAR under the provisions of Chapters 3 and 4, DARCOM R 700-97?"

1. A wide majority of respondents replying affirmatively (15), versus six (6) responding negatively and seventeen (17) not responding, indicates standardization of ILS, LSA and LSAR is possible. However, there were numerous statements indicating that standardization timing is contingent upon certain factors.

2. Generally, it was felt that standardization was not possible immediately or in the immediate future because of:

a. Different operating procedures and support structures between the services.

b. Services developing individual procedures based upon guidance contained in MIL STD 1388-1 and 1388-2.

c. Lack of standardization of forms used in LSA data collection.

d. Services not using the same maintenance, supply, and support concepts.

E. <u>"Are SISMS contract items and related data item descriptions (DIDS)</u> utilized?"

Affirmative answers (22), versus negative responses (1) and fifteen
 (15) no responses, indicate that standardized DIDS are being utilized by most commands/activities.

2. In most responses it was clear that the SISMS DIDS are modified to meet needs of the project at hand and to eliminate duplication of data furnished by a contractor. Cost avoidance was cited as the reason for modification of DIDS.

F. "Does your command/activity have a central point of contact for SISMS matters?"

1. Fifteen (15) respondents indicated officially appointed points of contact for SISMS, nine (9) did not, and fourteen (14) did not respond.

2. Responses to questionnaires and individual visits indicated few commands/activities had points of contact prior to receipt of the questionnaire.

G. <u>"Would elevation of DARCOM R 700-97 to a DA publication be more</u> effective in the application of SISMS procedures?"

1. Nine (9) responses were affirmative, thirteen (13) were negative, and sixteen (16) did not respond.

2. The majority of the respondents felt that the intent of SISMS appears to be adequately met by current DA/DARCOM regulations and procedures.

H. "Do SISMS procedures duplicate existing DA/DARCOM procedures?"

1. Eleven (11) responses were affirmative, seven (7) were negative, and twenty (20) did not respond.

2. The responses and personal visits indicated an inordinate amount of duplication of Army regulations, DARCOM regulations, DA/DARCOM pamphlets and MIL STDS. Examples of duplication and/or overlap of DARCOM R 700-97 procedures are with AR 700-120, DA Pam 700-127, DARCOM Regulations 700-15, 700-99, and DARCOM Pam 700-15. A close comparison of DARCOM Regulations 700-97 and 700-99 revealed that sixteen portions of DARCOM 700-97 are also cited in DARCOM R 700-99.

I. <u>"Are problems experienced with non-standard data items between the</u> services?"

1. Five (5) responses indicated problems were being experienced in this area, sixteen (16) had no problems, and seventeen (17) did not respond.

2. There appears to be no problem in this area. The five (5) responses indicating problems offered no specifics and the problems are considered isolated instances and were not significant.

J. "Would formal instruction in SISMS procedures be desirable?"

1. Thirteen (13) responses indicated that formal instruction in SISMS would be desirable, eleven (11) did not, and fourteen (14) did not respond.

2. Those inclined toward formal instruction in SISMS were mainly the readiness commands. The smaller activities such as project/product managers displayed little or no enthusiasm for formal instruction.

3. No formal instruction is presented in the ILS Course given at ALMC.

K. <u>"Should SISMS be made mandatory in the existing individual service's</u> logistics system?"

1. Nine (9) respondents felt that SISMS should be mandatory within each service, eleven (11) did not, and eighteen (18) submitted no response.

2. The majority of the nine (9) responding affirmatively based their responses on the need for standardized related procedures within each service.

L. <u>"Is SISMS guidance adequate to permit integration and implementation</u> within current Army/DARCOM procedures?"

1. Fourteen (14) respondents felt SISMS procedures were adequate for implementation/integration, six (6) did not, and eighteen (18) did not respond.

2. Qualifying remarks furnished by respondents indicate:

a. SISMS should be applicable to ILS procedures.

b. SISMS requires extensive updating prior to integration and implementation.

M. "Does other service cooperation exist in implementation of multiservice programs?"

1. Eight (8) respondents indicated other service cooperation, two (2) indicated lack of cooperation, and twenty-eight (28) did not respond.

2. The paucity of responses to this question provides little basis for analysis. However, the absence of negative replies would indicate few problems in this area.

N. "Have costing procedures for SISMS been developed?"

 All twenty (20) commands/activities responding to this question indicated no costing procedures had been established, nor was cost data available.
 There were eighteen (18) no responses to the question.

2. No cost effectiveness analysis is possible for SISMS.

0. "Would implementation of SISMS impose an increased workload?"

1. Thirteen (13) respondents indicated an increased workload would result from full implementation of SISMS, four (4) responded in the negative, and twenty-one (21) did not reply.

2. Questionnaire responses indicated that no contact or guidance relative to SISMS had been received from HQ DARCOM for quite sometime. Therefore, no emphasis had been placed on the program. During the individual field trips it was difficult to identify persons knowledgeable in SISMS. In most instances those who had been concerned with SISMS in the past had retired, moved to other assignments, or were deceased. There was no indication that SISMS had been observed or utilized for quite a period of time other than use of the DIDS. One readiness command did not list DARCOM R 700-97 (SISMS) on its list of active and applicable regulations or procedures.

VII. Conclusions.

A. Approximately half of the commands/activities responding had not implemented DARCOM R 700-97.

B. In a majority of cases no implementing instructions have been issued by commands/activities relative to DARCOM R 700-97.

C. SISMS procedures are duplicative of established Army and command procedures.

D. The majority of respondents feel that standardization of ILS, LSA and LSAR can be accomplished under SISMS if uniform procedures and standards can be adopted by each service.

E. The majority of the commands/activities had designated SISMS points of contact.

F. The majority of respondents did not feel that the elevation of DARCOM R 700-97 to a DA publication would increase its effectiveness.

TABLE 1

QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

QUEST	ION	YES	NO	*NO RESPONSE
1. +	as DARCOM-R 700-97 been implemented?	13	13	12
	f so, have implementing instructions been leveloped?	5	19	14
	Are SISMS procedures an improvement over existing Army/DARCOM procedures in effect?	12	11	23
s t	Is it possible to attain complete or partial standardization of ILS, LSA and LSAR under the provisions of Chapters 3 and 4, DARCOM-F 700-97?		6	17
	Are SISMS contract items and related Data Item Descriptions (DIDS) utilized?	22	۱	15
6. [Does your activity have a central point of contact (POC) for SISMS matters?	15	9	14
F	Nould elevation of DARCOM-R 700-97 to a DA Dublication be more effective in the application of SISMS procedures?	9	13	16
	Do SISMS procedures duplicate existing DARCOM procedures?	11	7	20
	Are problems experienced with non-standard data items between the services?	5	16	17
	Nould formal instruction in SISMS procedures be desirable?	s 13	11	14
	Should SISMS be made mandatory in the exist individual service's logistics system?	ing 9	11	18
	Is SISMS guidance adequate to permit inte- gration and implementation within current A DARCOM procedures?	14 rmy/	6	18
	Does other service cooperation exist in im implementation of multi-service programs?	8	2	28
	Have costing procedures for SISMS been developed?	0	20	18
	Would implementation of SISMS impose an increased workload?	13	4	21
BASIS	: 38 questionnaires dispatched 32 responses 6 no responses	questionnai	res.	not respond to Some responses ertain questic

C. SISMS procedures provide only general guidance and do not prescribe the detail necessary to accomplish comprehensive support planning.

H. Almost all commands/activities use standard SISMS contract items and related DIDS; however, these are modified to fit service needs, prevent duplication and to eliminate excessive cost.

I. The majority of respondents feel that formal instruction is needed for SISMS.

J. The majority opposed mandatory application of SISMS based on lack of standardized procedures within each service.

K. Costing procedures for SISMS have not been developed.

L. The majority feel that full implementation of SISMS would impose an increased workload.

VIII. <u>Recommendations</u>.

A. Establish a Joint Logistics Coordinating Panel with the responsibility to develop and implement a procedure for the standardized application of MIL STDS 1388-1/2 and 1552/1561 service wide.

B. Upon completion of the above, eliminate the SISMS regulation (DARCOM R 700-97).

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Department of Defense

MIL STD 1388-1, Logistic Support Analysis, 15 Oct 73

MIL STD 1388-2, Logistic Support Analysis, Data Element Definition, 15 Oct 73

MIL STD 1552, Provisioning Technical Documentation, 11 Nov 74

MIL STD 1561, Provisioning Procedures, Uniform DOD, 11 Nov 74

Department of the Army

AR 700-51, Army Data Management Program, 28 Feb 73

AR 700-120, Materiel Distribution Management for Major Items, 1 Feb 80

AR 700-127, Integrated Logistics Support, 11 Apr 75

DA Pam 700-127, Integrated Logistics Support Management Model (ILSMM) and Glossary, 15 Apr 79

US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command

DARCOM-R 700-15, Integrated Logistics Support, 26 Nov 79

DARCOM-R 700-97, Standard Integrated Support Management System, 27 May 77

DARCOM-R 700-99, Elimination of Duplication in the Management and Logistics Support of Multiused Nonconsumable Items, 30 Mar 78

DARCOM Pam 700-15, Army Logistics Readiness Evaluation System (A RCS DRCRE-3091), 23 May 78

Miscellaneous

JPCG-DIMM Ad Hoc Group Examination of Interservice Acquisition Logistic Management, 2 Sep 80

Defense Audit Service Report, "Report of Audit of the Standard Integrated Support Management System," 28 Feb 78

A-1

