

NPS-GSBPP-06-019



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

**Lean Six Sigma for Reduced Cycle Costs and Improved
Readiness**

30 September 2006

by

Dr. Uday Apte, Naval Postgraduate School

Dr. Keebom Kang, Naval Postgraduate School

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California**

Colonel David A. Smarsh
Acting President

Leonard A. Ferrari, Ph.D.
Provost

The Acquisition Chair, Graduate School of Business & Public Policy, Naval Postgraduate School supported the funding of the research presented herein. Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

The report was prepared by:

Uday Apte, Professor
Graduate School of Business & Public Policy

Keebom Kang, Associate Professor
Graduate School of Business & Public Policy

Reviewed by:

Robert N. Beck
Dean, Graduate School of Business & Public Policy

Released by:

Dan C. Boger
Acting Dean of Research

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGEForm approved
OMB No 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 30 Sep 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical Report; 01 Oct 05 – 30 Sep 06	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Lean Six Sigma for Reduced Cycle Costs and Improved Readiness			5. FUNDING	
6. AUTHOR (S) Dr. Uday Apte, Naval Postgraduate School Dr. Keebom Kang, Naval Postgraduate School				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME (S) AND ADDRESS (ES) NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC POLICY 555 DYER ROAD MONTEREY, CA 93943-5103			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NPS-GSBPP-06-019	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME (S) AND ADDRESS (ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT <p>In general, during the lifecycle of a weapon system, a significantly larger amount of money gets spent in operating and maintaining the system than acquiring it. Hence, efficient logistics systems, including transportation, inventory management, modifications and maintenance activities, are critically important for containing the lifecycle costs of weapon systems and for maintaining the highest level of military readiness given the extant fiscal constraints. This paper will describe Lean Six Sigma (LSS), a strategically important and proven logistics initiative for both reduced lifecycle costs and improved readiness.</p> <p>With aging weapon systems, the US Department of Defense is facing ever-increasing military expenses to maintain military readiness. Hence, the Department of Defense is keenly interested in implementing Lean Six Sigma in all the services. In this paper, we present an overview of Lean Six Sigma methodologies, describe Lean Six Sigma implementations with a focus on military applications, and discuss managerial guidelines for successfully implementing Lean Six Sigma. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the issues that military planners should take into account in implementing Lean Six Sigma in the military.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Lean Six Sigma, Lean Production, Six Sigma, Military Logistics, Lifecycle Costs			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 39	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT: UNCLASSIFIED			18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE: UNCLASSIFIED	
			20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT: UNLIMITED	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Abstract

In general, during the lifecycle of a weapon system a significantly larger amount of money gets spent in operating and maintaining the system than acquiring it. Hence, efficient logistics systems, including transportation, inventory management, modifications and maintenance activities, are critically important for containing the lifecycle costs of weapon systems and for maintaining the highest level of military readiness given the extant fiscal constraints. This paper will describe Lean Six Sigma (LSS), a strategically important and proven logistics initiative for both reduced lifecycle costs and improved readiness.

With aging weapon systems, the US Department of Defense is facing ever-increasing military expenses to maintain military readiness. Hence, the Department of Defense is keenly interested in implementing Lean Six Sigma in all the services. In this paper, we present an overview of Lean Six Sigma methodologies, describe Lean Six Sigma implementations with a focus on military applications, and discuss managerial guidelines for successfully implementing Lean Six Sigma. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of the issues that military planners should take into account in implementing Lean Six Sigma in the military.

Keywords: Lean Six Sigma, Lean Production, Six Sigma, Military Logistics, Lifecycle Costs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Acknowledgements

The research was supported by NAVSEA PEO SHIPS, PEO IWS (Integrated Warfare Systems) via the Naval Postgraduate School Acquisition Research program, and by the USTRANSCOM (U. S. Transportation Command) via the Stanley Arthur Chair funding. The authors are greatly thankful to RADM Jim Greene, USN (Ret), the NPS Acquisition Research Chair, for securing the sponsor funding for this research. We also wish to acknowledge Keith Snider for his efforts on behalf of the Acquisition Research Program in the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy of the Naval Postgraduate School.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

About the Authors

Uday Apte is Professor of Operations Management at the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA. Before joining NPS, Uday taught at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, and at the Cox School of Business, Southern Methodist University, Dallas. He is experienced in teaching a range of operations management and management science courses in the Executive and Full-time MBA programs.

Uday has served as a founder and President of the College of Service Operations, Production and Operations Management Society (POMS), as a board member of POMS, and as guest editor of *Production and Operations Management* journal. Areas of Uday's research interests include managing service operations, supply chain management, technology management, and globalization of information-intensive services. He has published over 30 articles, five of which have won awards from professional societies. His research articles have been published in prestigious journals including *Management Science*, *Interfaces*, *Production and Operations Management*, *Journal of Operations Management*, *Decision Sciences*, *IIE Transactions*, *Interfaces*, and *MIS Quarterly*. He has co-authored two books, *Manufacturing Automation* and, *Managing in the Information Economy*.

Uday holds Ph.D. in Decision Sciences from the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. His earlier academic background includes MBA from the Asian Institute of Management, Manila, Philippines, and Bachelor of Technology (Chemical Engineering) from the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, India.

Uday Apte, Ph.D.
Professor of Operations Management
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road
Monterey, CA 93943-5197
Tel: (831) 656-3598
E-mail: umapte@nps.edu

Keebom Kang, Associate Professor, joined the Naval Postgraduate School in 1988, where he teaches supply-chain, logistics engineering and computer simulation modeling courses for the MBA program. His research interests are in the areas of logistics and simulation modeling in various military applications. He received his PhD in Industrial Engineering from Purdue University. Prior to joining NPS, he was on the faculty of the Industrial Engineering Department at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida (1983-1988). He had held visiting professor positions at Syracuse University (Summer, 1985), Georgia Institute of Technology (Fall, 2003), Asia Institute of Technology in Thailand (Winter, 2004), and Pohang Institute of Science and Technology in Korea (Spring, 2004).

Dr. Kang has published many theoretical and applied papers in *Operations Research*, *IEEE Transactions in Communications*, *IIE Transactions*, *Telecommunication Management*, *Naval Logistics Research*, and other technical journals and conference proceedings. He was the Co-Editor of the *1995 Winter Simulation Conference Proceedings* and the program chair for the 2000 Winter Simulation Conference. He served as an editorial board member for *IIE Transactions*, an associate editor for *IMA Journal of Mathematics for Management Science*, an associate editor for *IIE Transactions Special Issue on Computer Simulation*, and as a referee for many professional journals including *Operations Research*, *Management Science*, and *Naval Logistics Research*. He also served as a proposal review panel member for National Science Foundation (1990, 1992, 1994) He is currently an Associate Editor for the *Naval Research Logistics* (2006-present).

Keebom Kang, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road
Monterey, CA 93950-5197
Tel: (831) 656-3106
E-mail: kkang@nps.edu



ACQUISITION RESEARCH SPONSORED REPORT SERIES

**Lean Six Sigma for Reduced Cycle Costs and Improved
Readiness**

30 September 2006

by

Dr. Uday Apte, Naval Postgraduate School

Dr. Keebom Kang, Naval Postgraduate School

Disclaimer: The views represented in this report are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy position of the Navy, the Department of Defense, or the Federal Government.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. Military Logistics	3
Levels of Maintenance	5
Readiness and Inventory Management.....	6
3. Lean Six Sigma.....	9
Lean Production	10
Six Sigma	11
Lean Six Sigma	14
4. Examples of Lean Six Sigma Implementations in the Military	17
Army Implementations.....	17
Navy Implementations.....	18
Air Force Implementations	19
5. Managerial Implications.....	21
List of References	25
Initial Distribution List	39

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Executive Summary

In general, during the lifecycle of a weapon system a significantly larger amount of money gets spent in operating and maintaining the system than acquiring it. Hence, efficient logistics systems, including transportation, inventory management, modifications and maintenance activities, are critically important for containing the lifecycle costs of weapon systems and for maintaining the highest level of military readiness given the extant fiscal constraints. This paper describes Lean Six Sigma (LSS), a strategically important and proven logistics initiative for both reduced lifecycle costs and improved readiness.

With aging weapon systems, the US Department of Defense is facing ever-increasing military expenses to maintain military readiness. Hence, the Department of Defense is keenly interested in implementing Lean Six Sigma in all the services. We begin this paper by providing an overview of military logistics and discussing the critical concepts of readiness and cycle-time. Thereafter, we present an overview of Lean Six Sigma methodologies including its component methodologies of Lean production and Six Sigma, and describe the experience in implementing Lean Six Sigma in Army, Navy and Air force. The paper ends with a discussion of the managerial guidelines for successfully implementing Lean Six Sigma.

Keywords: Lean Six Sigma, Lean Production, Six Sigma, Military Logistics, Lifecycle Costs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. Introduction

Three essential factors to maintaining strong military power and readiness are well-trained troops and well-educated officers, reliable high-tech weapon systems, and the logistics systems to support troops and improve the readiness of the weapon systems. In purchasing weapon systems, program managers widely use acquisition costs as the primary, and at times the only, criteria for decision making. However, in general, during the lifecycle of a weapon system, a significantly larger amount of money gets spent in operating and maintaining the system than in acquiring it. Hence, efficient logistics systems, including transportation, inventory management, modifications and maintenance activities, are critically important for containing the lifecycle costs (LCC) of weapon systems and for maintaining the highest level of military readiness given the extant fiscal constraints. This paper will describe Lean Six Sigma (LSS), a strategically important and proven logistics initiative for both reduced lifecycle costs and improved readiness.

Two major components of the LCC are the *Acquisition* costs and the *Operations and Maintenance* (O&M) costs. The acquisition costs include such items as research, development, test and evaluation, program management, engineering design, initial spare parts, manufacturing and production, facilities and construction, and initial training. The O&M costs, on the other hand, include such cost categories as labor, materials, and overhead, operations, scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, training, replacement and renewal, transportation, system/equipment modification, technical data collection, documentation and database management, energy and facility usage, and disposal costs. Without question, the logistics systems have a great deal of influence on the size of O&M costs.

It is difficult to generalize the percentage of money spent on operations and maintenance of a typical weapon system. Some literature points out that the O&M costs contribute to 60% of the total lifecycle cost on average (DAU, 2006), while other sources estimate these costs to be as high as 80% of the total (Cost Analysis Improvement Group, 1992). In any event, with the Service Extension Program

(SEP) that many weapon systems are experiencing these days, the percentage of the total lifecycle cost spent on O&M is simply becoming larger. Most weapon systems were originally designed for a lifecycle of 20+ years, but some have been stretched to last as long as 50 years. In the case of B-52 aircraft, for example, the lifecycle is expected to extend to 80 years, in which case the O&M costs expect to form as much as 90 percent of its lifecycle cost (Parker, 1999).

With aging weapon systems, the US Department of Defense (DoD) is facing ever increasing O&M costs. The DoD is therefore keenly interested in applying Lean Six Sigma methodologies to cut down O&M costs. Experiences of the private sector in implementing Lean Six Sigma illustrate that the methodology is as effective in improving business processes as it is in improving the manufacturing processes. Thus, successful implementation of LSS methodologies would also reduce acquisition costs by improving acquisition and contracting processes. Hence, in this paper we will discuss Lean Six Sigma and its application in the military. This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we provide an overview of military logistics and discuss the critical concepts of readiness and cycle-time. In Section 3, we describe background material for LSS methodologies. Section 4 includes examples of LSS implementation in the US Army, the US Navy and the US Air Force. In Section 5, we conclude the paper by presenting managerial guidelines and by discussing the challenges present in implementing LSS in the military.

2. Military Logistics

Military Logistics support deals with *everything* required to provide war fighters with the *right stuff* at the *right time* at the *right place* at the *right cost*. The goal of military logistics support is to maintain the highest possible level of readiness, commonly expressed as operational availability:

$$Ao = \frac{MTBM}{MTBM + MDT} = \frac{uptime}{uptime + downtime},$$

where MTBM is the mean time between maintenance, and MDT is the maintenance down time, which includes repair time and administrative and logistics delay times. Intuitively, operational availability is the fraction of time a weapon system is operational or mission capable. Clearly, operational availability can be improved by increasing MTBM (i.e., increasing reliability) or decreasing MDT (i.e., reducing repair or cycle-time). Thus, the two key issues to improve weapon systems readiness are reliability improvement and cycle-time reduction.

From Little's Law (Little, 1961), reducing repair or cycle-time reduces pipeline inventory directly, and leads to significant savings in inventory costs. The relationship between repair or cycle-time and inventory levels is critically important (yet, troublesome) in the military because it crosses physical, organizational, and financial barriers. Inventory managers strive to consolidate and minimize stocks of piece-parts to free-up resources for other priorities. They also seek to get quick turnaround on repairable components in order to minimize pipeline inventory. However, stockout of spare parts or consumable components results in delays in repair processes and eventually serious readiness degradation. Cycle-time reduction in a military logistics channel (repair depots, intermediate-level maintenance, inventory control points, and supply centers) also means that more weapon systems are available in the field or fleet. On the other hand, increased cycle-time causes a vicious cycle of deteriorating military readiness. For instance, poor logistics support (e.g., lack of spare parts, personnel, and/or training) increases the cycle-time, which in turn decreases readiness, Ao . Therefore, the warfighters are

forced to satisfy mission requirements with a fewer number of mission-capable weapon systems, resulting in stress on those fewer mission-capable systems. Due to this stress, more system failures occur, which in turn generate more workload at repair facilities. Thus the repair turnaround time can become even longer. And the vicious cycle can go on.

The following simple example explains the importance of cycle-time reduction in military logistics. Suppose that the US Navy has 800 F/A-18 Hornet aircraft, each of which costs \$50 million, and that the Standard Depot Level Maintenance (SDLM) is done every 4 years. If the MDT is one year, the readiness, A_0 will be $4/(4+1) = 0.8$. Thus, only 80% of 800, or 640, aircraft will be mission-capable on average since an aircraft would be available for mission for four years (and at the depot for one year) out of every five years. This also means 160 aircraft will be non-mission capable at any given time. If the MDT can be reduced to 6 months, A_0 will be 0.889, or only 89 instead of 160 aircraft will be at the depot for maintenance at any given time. It is equivalent of having 71 additional aircraft (worth more than \$3.5 billion) in the fleet. On the other hand, if having 640 mission-capable aircraft available is adequate, it would mean reducing the fleet size by 80 aircraft and freeing up \$4 billion expenditure for other purposes. See Kang, Gue and Eaton (1998) for a cycle-time reduction case study at a Navy depot.

The Department of Defense and its services have many on-going initiatives to cut down maintenance cycle-time to improve military readiness. The Navy has been working on the *Sea Based Logistics* to cut down distribution time by supporting “customers” on shore directly from the sea by eliminating “Iron Mountains,” or middlemen, in the supply-chain management context. Likewise, since 1995, the US Army has implemented *Velocity Management* (Dumond et al., 2001) which focuses on improving the speed and accuracy with which materials and information flow from factories to fox holes. The US Air Force has implemented *Agile Logistics*, and the US Marine Corps, *Precision Logistics* for cycle-time reduction.

More recently, all branches of the US military, Army, Navy and the Air Force, are actively applying *Lean Six Sigma* methodology to its various activities to reduce cycle-time and to reduce maintenance expenses. We will describe the details of current initiatives of Lean Six Sigma in the military services in Section 4.

Levels of Maintenance

In this section, we use the US Navy's aviation maintenance system to explain how military maintenance logistics are conducted. The Naval Aviation Maintenance Program (NAMPP) divides maintenance into three levels: organizational level (O-level), intermediate level (I-level), and depot level (D-level), which are similar in structure to multi-echelon logistics support systems of commercial firms (e.g., Blanchard, 2004) or other services. To achieve economies of scale in maintenance equipment and personnel, levels of maintenance are progressively more capable, with D-level being the most capable. However, the longer turnaround time at D-level also increases the work-in-process and requires more spare parts to maintain the desired readiness level.

O-level maintenance is performed at the site and typically involves simple repairs or the replacement of modular components. I-level maintenance involves more difficult repairs and maintenance, including the repair and testing of modules that have failed at the O-level. I-level maintenance for Navy aircraft is done at Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Departments (AIMDs) ashore in naval air stations, or afloat in aircraft carriers. D-level maintenance activities, called Naval Aviation Depots (NADEPs), ensure the continued flight integrity and safety of airframes and related flight systems throughout their service lives. This involves performing maintenance beyond the capabilities of the lower levels, usually on equipment requiring major overhaul or rebuilding of end-items, subassemblies, and parts. The Navy operates three NADEPs in the US (North Island, CA; Cherry Point, NC; and Jacksonville, FL) and fleet repair facility sites in Italy and Japan.

The repair cycle begins when an unserviceable repairable is turned for maintenance, and it ends when the item is recorded on the inventory control point

records as being ready-for-issue (RFI). Repair cycle-time includes shipping and processing time, accumulation time, repair time, time awaiting parts, and delivery time. Unserviceable items may remain in storage for extended times for various reasons.

Readiness and Inventory Management

Aviation readiness is measured by computing fully mission-capable (FMC) rates. The FMC rate indicates the operational availability of the aircraft in a unit—that is, the fraction of aircraft that are mission capable at any arbitrary time. When aircraft are partially mission capable or not mission capable, it is because of either maintenance or supply problems.

Aviation items, especially repairables, are very expensive to maintain. For example, each aircraft carrier carries onboard an Aviation Consolidated Allowance List (AVCAL) consisting of consumable and repairable items and subassemblies required to support the Air Wing for 90 days of wartime operations. A typical AVCAL consists of tens of millions of line items valued at hundreds of millions of dollars. Repairable items represent only 10 percent of the total line items, but 90 percent of the total value of the AVCAL (USS Independence Shipboard Uniform Automatic Data Processing System Report 008, 1991, July 26).

Material readiness demands spare parts, but fiscal constraints have put pressure on the Navy to reduce inventory levels at AIMDs and stock points. The two-part solution is easier said than done: select a “better” mix of spares **and** reduce repair cycle-time. Both tend to improve readiness for a given cost or achieve the same readiness for lower cost.

The relationship between spares/inventory levels and cycle-time is a key to understanding how to achieve higher readiness at lower cost. Kang (1993) shows the diminishing marginal utility of spare parts, implying that additional spare parts beyond certain threshold level will not improve readiness. Those additional spare parts, once they are turned in after failure, will simply increase the work-in-process

or inventory at repair facilities. Spares levels and repair cycle-time must be considered together when attempting to improve material readiness (see Kang & Gue, 1997).

During the past 30 years, the military has been implementing spares methodologies based on the readiness-based METRIC models such as that described in Sherbrooke (1992). Rather than the traditional approach to inventory problems that minimize holding and ordering costs for individual items subject to a service level, readiness-based models seek to maximize *Ao* for multiple items directly and simultaneously, subject to a budget constraint. It is possible to measure *Ao* for a specific component, such as an aircraft engine, as opposed for the aircraft itself. An improvement in *Ao* for the engine will provide some marginal improvement in *Ao* for the aircraft. But this improvement will not be one-to-one: large improvements in engine availability may yield only trivial improvements in aircraft availability, depending not only on the failure rate of the engines, but on the performance and availability of all the other critical components of the aircraft. The readiness-based models are important to military systems because they treat all of the critical components in a weapon system together in order to achieve the singular objective of maximizing the *Ao* of the weapon system. Implementation of these models requires detailed, accurate information about the reliability of components, but the rewards have been worth the effort in many systems. For example, Sherbrooke (1992) reports inventory investment being cut nearly in half with no degradation in readiness during a test for the Air Force. Hale (1994) also shows significant inventory savings in the Navy after implementing readiness-based models.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3. Lean Six Sigma

Penchant for process improvement is inherent in human nature; even our distant ancestors discovered a better way to start fire, make arrowheads and spears, or build shelters (Dershin, 2004). Early improvements probably came about through trial and error and took hundreds (if not thousands) of years to become part of the human skill set. Almost up to the modern times, such improvements were the carefully guarded secrets of the select few. However, the fast pace of modern commercial/industrial economy has given rise to the structured problem-solving methodologies for process improvement that are well understood by and can be implemented by all.

Two major approaches for structured problem solving emerged separately in the 20th century and have come to be known as “Lean” and “Six Sigma” methodologies. Lean improvements focus on process speed and waste removal while Six Sigma, like its predecessor Total Quality Management (TQM), focuses on the removal of process defects and the reduction of process variability. Ironically, Six Sigma and Lean have often been regarded as rival initiatives. Lean enthusiasts note that Six Sigma pays little attention to anything related to speed and flow, while Six Sigma supporters point out that Lean fails to address key concepts like customer needs and process variation. To some extent, these are valid arguments. Yet, they have been more often used by the practitioners to promote the choice of one versus the other approach. However, today’s need for an even higher level of competitiveness than that achieved through implementing either methodology has now convinced practitioners that these two approaches are synergistic, and there is benefit to be realized by blending the two. Therefore, in the new millennium, we are witnessing the emergence of Lean Six Sigma (George, 2002; Nash et al., 2006).

Lean and Six Sigma are two different bodies of knowledge. The Six Sigma is all about locating and eliminating root causes of process problems. The Six Sigma tools, such as the “the five whys,” are designed to find the root cause/s of the

problems and build models of cause and effect. The process is then redesigned with the root cause/s eliminated.

Lean is different. As popularized by Womack and Jones (2003), the Lean roadmap is one of successive refinements to improve the overall process through the following steps (Apte & Goh, 2004):

- Specify value in the eyes of the customer
- Identify the value stream and eliminate waste
- Make value flow at the pull of the customer
- Involve and empower employees
- Continuously improve in the pursuit of perfection.

Since Lean Six Sigma is a synergistic blending of Lean Production and Six Sigma methodologies, we will present a brief overview of these two methodologies.

Lean Production

Lean can be defined as a set of principles and tools that helps us eliminate process activities that don't add value, and create "flow" in a process (Dennis, 2002). A Lean process is defined as one that uses only the absolute minimum of resources to add value to the service or product. Lean manufacturing can also be viewed as a management philosophy focusing on reduction of the eight types of wastes (Human Talent, Over-production, Waiting time, Transportation, Processing, Inventory, Motion and Scrap) in manufacturing or service processes ("Lean Manufacturing," 2006). By eliminating waste (muda), quality is improved, production time is reduced, and cost is reduced. Lean "tools" include continuous process improvement (kaizen), "pull" production process (by means of kanban) and mistake-proofing (poka-yoke). Lean, as a management philosophy, is also very focused on creating a better workplace through the Toyota principle of "respect for humanity."

Origins of Lean Production can be traced to the Scientific Management principles of Frederic Taylor (1911) and to the practical genius of Henry Ford (Levinson, 2002). But the principles of Lean Production were more fully embodied in its recent incarnations: Just in Time Systems and Toyota production System (Ohno,

1988). The term Lean Production was coined by Womack, Jones and Roos (1991) in their best seller, *The Machine that Changed the World*. The book chronicles the transitions of automobile manufacturing from craft production to mass production to lean production.

At the heart of Lean is the determination of value. Value is defined as form, feature or function for which a customer is willing to pay. The processes that do not add value are deemed waste. The Lean framework is used as a tool to focus resources and energies on producing the value-added features while identifying and eliminating non-value added activities. Processes in Lean are thought of as value streams. Lead-time reduction and the flow of the value streams are the major areas of focus in Lean. *Value-stream mapping* helps teams understand the flow of material and information in creating and delivering the product or services being offered to the customer by the organization.

In summary, the Lean methodology:

- Focuses on maximizing process velocity,
- Provides tools for analyzing process flow and delay times at each activity in a process,
- Emphasizes *Value-stream Mapping* which centers on the separation of "value-added" from "non-value-added" work with tools to eliminate the root causes of non-valued activities and their cost,
- Recognizes and attempts to eliminate 8 types of waste/non-value-added work: defects, inventory, overproduction, waiting time, motion, transportation, processing, and human talent, and
- Creates workplace organization through *Five S* methodology consisting of sort, straighten, sustain, sweep, and standardize.

Six Sigma

Six Sigma is a management technique that aims to develop and deliver near-perfect products and services. The primary goal of Six Sigma is to improve customer satisfaction (and, thereby, profitability) by reducing and eliminating defects. In this case, the defects may be related to any aspect of customer satisfaction: product quality, delivery performance, and product cost. Six Sigma is targeted at reducing variation in a business processes. It can also be a great way to permeate the culture of continuous improvement in an organization.

The term "Six Sigma" refers to a statistical construct that measures how far a given process deviates from perfection. A level of Six Sigma (about 3.4 defects per every million items) represents the highest level of quality: virtually all products and business processes are defect-free. It should be noted that most companies today function at only a three or four sigma level and lose 10-15% of their total revenue due to defects. Thus, a typical company stands to benefit significantly from implementing Six Sigma.

Six Sigma originated in 1986 with the efforts of Bill Smith, a senior engineer and scientist at Motorola (McCarty, 2004). It was originally used to improve manufacturing processes at Motorola. While Six Sigma has its roots in the total quality management (TQM) approach of the 1980s, today it is much more than that. It is now being used across a wide range of industries including banking, insurance, telecommunications, construction, healthcare, and software. Interestingly, the methodology gained industry-wide acceptance in mid-90s when Jack Welch, CEO of GE, successfully launched it within the entire company (General Electric, 2006) and began vouching for the billion-dollar benefits realized by GE through the use of Six Sigma methodology. For instance, in 1999 alone, GE reported that it saved \$2 billion using Six Sigma principles.

In Six Sigma applications in non-manufacturing sectors, Six Sigma implies going beyond the highest quality level targeted in manufacturing process. For example, an average of 3.4 errors in every one million financial transactions would not be acceptable to a financial institution. Six Sigma now has much broader meaning. Simply put, Six Sigma:

- Emphasizes the need to recognize opportunities and eliminate defects as defined by customers,
- Recognizes that process variation hinders our ability to reliably deliver high-quality services,
- Requires data-driven decisions and incorporates a comprehensive set of quality tools under a powerful framework for effective problem solving, and
- Provides a highly prescriptive cultural infrastructure effective in obtaining sustainable results.

In any improvement project, utilization of a well-defined improvement procedure is critically important. The most commonly used standard improvement procedure in Six Sigma is DMAIC (Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve and Control). DMAIC is a structured, disciplined, rigorous approach to process improvement consisting of the five phases, where each phase is linked logically to the previous phase as well as to the next phase. A detailed description of these phases can be found in Stamatis (2004) and Rath and Strong (2006).

In terms of the tools and techniques used for process improvement, there is only a marginal difference between Six Sigma and the Total Quality Management approaches. But what sets Six Sigma apart from TQM, which is perhaps the most important reason behind the success of Six Sigma, is the establishment of organizational infrastructure for ensuring continuous process improvement. Thus, Six Sigma should be ideally viewed as a management system that integrates strategic objective and measurement systems development, and provides the guidance for project prioritization and governance. It is a performance management system to drive a more focused execution of the overall business strategy. The essential premise of the Six Sigma Management System is that there is a leadership team in place whose members are willing and capable of engaging in a disciplined, team-based process of continuously monitoring real-time organizational performance metrics and then taking action in the form of project reviews. The team engages in frequent dialogue regarding performance related to customer and market requirements as well as performance related to critical improvement projects. As a result of these efforts, an organization-wide dialogue is created that drives top-to-bottom focus on daily execution and culture of continuous improvement.

Six Sigma identifies five key organizational roles for its successful implementation ("Six Sigma," 2006):

- *Executive Leadership* includes CEO and other key top management team members. They are responsible for setting up a vision for Six Sigma implementation.
- *Champions* are responsible for the Six Sigma implementation across the organization in an integrated manner.

- *Master Black Belts*, identified by champions, act as in-house, full-time, expert coaches for the organization on Six Sigma initiatives.
- *Black Belts* operate under Master Black Belts to apply Six Sigma methodology to specific projects. They devote 100% of their time to Six Sigma. They primarily focus on Six Sigma project execution, whereas Champions and Master Black Belts focus on identifying projects/functions for Six Sigma.
- *Green Belts* are the employees who take up Six Sigma implementation along with their other job responsibilities. They operate under the guidance of Black Belts and support them in achieving the overall results.

Please note that there exists a large variation in the way the above roles are defined and utilized within the Six Sigma implementations in different enterprises and that specific training programs are available to train people to fulfill these roles.

Lean Six Sigma

As noted earlier, the process improvement methods of Lean and Six Sigma have been practiced separately for many years. However, in recent years, practitioners have come to realize that the two methodologies are in fact dependent on each other for greater success. For example, it is impossible to run a process with minimum waste or at a dependable capacity if individual process steps are highly variable. On the other hand, one can carefully study the complex processes, looking for root causes using elegant statistical techniques, and never make improvements in cycle-time or productivity that can be obtained from value-stream analysis.

To the extent Lean and Six Sigma approaches have their own strengths and weaknesses the specific action plan to be followed in effectively implementing Lean Six Sigma (for example, Lean first followed by Six Sigma later or vice versa) is dependent on the nature of the situation at hand. The problems related to accuracy and/or completeness are usually addressed best by the tools of Six Sigma; consequently, those tools should be introduced first. However, if the customer needs quick results, and if the problem is related to timeliness or productivity, Lean should be implemented first with an understanding that deep and complex problems will be solved only by the subsequent use of the Six Sigma tools.

In summary, Lean and Six Sigma are rich bodies of knowledge and are mature methodologies for solving a broad variety of process-related problems. Each methodology has its own approach to process improvement and its own tool set. Although Lean and Six Sigma methodologies can be mastered independently, they can and should be implemented together to realize the full benefits of process improvements by any organization.

THIKS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4. Examples of Lean Six Sigma Implementations in the Military

The combination of Lean Thinking and Six Sigma has proven to be a very effective tool in the private sector. The success realized by top companies such as Toyota and GE has inspired the use of Lean Six Sigma in the US Department of Defense (DoD). Although the DoD has implemented a number of process improvements methodologies with varying degrees of success in the past decade, it has begun to explore the potential of implementing Lean Six Sigma throughout the entire DoD only recently. The early results are very promising. As the lean Six Sigma mindset continues to grow among the DoD community and both the Lean and Six Sigma practices become more commonplace, the equipment and personnel available to the DoD will provide considerably more capability per taxpayer dollar than ever before. We discuss below some examples of Lean Six Sigma implementations in the US Army, Navy and the Air Force.

Army Implementations

Faced with the expectations of a shrinking defense budget, the Secretary of the Army Francis Harvey signed an order in March of 2005 that would implement Lean Six Sigma across the entire service. Currently, several organizations within the Army are implementing Lean Six Sigma and having remarkable results.

The Red River Army Depot Repair Facility is one such organization (Donnelly, 2006). In implementing Lean Six Sigma, the Red River Depot has made many changes to its HMMWV repair line, such as: forming an assembly-line process, using time-managed intervals to control the flow of work, organizing employees based on experience and proficiency, cleaning up and improving the overall work environment, stocking more and better quality parts to reduce stock-outs, and training employees to ensure there is no break in continuity on the assembly line. Improvement efforts have resulted in the ability to turn out 32 mission-ready HMMWV's a day, compared with three a week in 2004. The Lean process has also

lowered the cost of repair for one vehicle from \$89,000 to \$48,000. Some of the biggest improvement ideas have come from the front-line employees themselves.

Other Army facilities boast similar progress as the result of Lean Six Sigma methodologies. Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas reduced its repair recycle time by about 90% and increased its production rate by about 50% on M-40 protective gas masks. Letterkenny Army Depot in Pennsylvania has saved \$11.9 million in the cost of building the Patriot air-defense missile system. In the Corpus Christi Army Depot, the overhaul time for one T700 helicopter engine was reduced by 64%. The depots improved the consistency of their repair operations by increasing the mean time between the engine overhauls from 309 hours to over 900 hours and improved the return to field accuracy to above 90% (Moorman, 2005).

Despite these early successes, the long term future and the resulting benefits of Lean Six Sigma are far from certain. Ultimately, the key ingredient for the successful implementation of Lean Six Sigma is not simply an order from the top, but the ability of commanders to change the organization's culture and convince the soldiers and employees that Lean Six Sigma does work and that it is worth the effort. The Red River Depot has taken a small, yet interesting, step to change the culture of the organization by posting a black cutout figure of a soldier with a helmet and rifle with a sign affixed to it that reads, "We build it as if our life depends on it. Theirs do!" This is to serve as a reminder that their job is about more than a paycheck, and the better they can do their job, the more lives they can save.

Navy Implementations

The *AIRSpeed* program is the US Navy's implementation of Lean Six Sigma. As stated by the Secretary of the Navy Donald Winter in a memorandum in May 2006, "Lean Six Sigma (LSS) is a proven business process that several elements of the Navy and Marine Corps have initiated including training over 500 Black Belts and 1500 Green Belts who have facilitated 2800 events and projects. These activities have averaged a 4:1 return on investment." The following examples demonstrate some success stories in the implementation of AIRSpeed.

- a. In October 2005, Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) accounting practices yielded an annual savings of \$176.9K with an additional anticipated saving of \$146.3K in waste elimination.
- b. Since April 2004, Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Division (AIMD) Whidbey Island reduced J-52 aircraft engine repair time from 468 hours to 233 hours and reported significant inventory and operating cost savings. Since February 2006, AIMD Patuxent River has seen increased savings due to a 10% inventory reduction and a reallocation of 166 hours of full-time employees.
- c. In June 2006, Naval Aviation Systems Command's (NAVAIR) PMA offices began replicating successes of other PMA offices, including one office that saw an estimated \$163K/year savings due to reducing processing time from 240 days average to a predicted average of 15 days.

The successes are due, in large part, to the training received by the employees that emphasizes the use of DMAIC (Define, Measure, Analysis, Improve and Control) methodology for process improvement. *AIRSpeed* attempts to create an enterprise-wide, continuous process-improvement environment through the incorporation of commercial business practices. The goal of *AIRSpeed* is to operationalize cost-wise readiness across the Naval Aviation Enterprise.

There are five anticipated long-term benefits of *AIRSpeed*:

1. Reduce total cost of Naval Aviation by reducing inventory, manpower and operating expenses.
2. Support the Fleet Response Plan by providing aircraft Ready for Tasking (RFT).
3. Integrate Maintenance and Supply Support System to provide seamless support to the Fleet.
4. Improve logistics and maintenance response by reducing cycle-time and the logistics footprint.
5. Place ownership and accountability at the appropriate levels.

Air Force Implementations

Over the next several years, the Air Force (AF) is expected lose approximately 40,000 personnel. This loss of manpower means airmen must work

smarter and leaner. Senior AF leadership has decided to utilize the Lean Six Sigma strategy to accomplish this. Accordingly, the USAF has created a new program office, Air Force Smart Operations 21 (AFSO21), at the Pentagon with Brig. Gen. S. Taco Gilbert as the Director of the AFSO21 Office (Lopez, 2006).

The AF already has several examples of AFSO21 at work. AF Materiel Command has applied AFSO21 and returned 100 aircraft to duty, as well as reduced C-5 maintenance time by 50%. USAF Europe (USAFE) applied AFSO21 practices—they reduced the number of telephone operators by approximately 16% and saved the command \$2.4 million (Lopez, 2006). The AF has also begun implementation of Lean Six Sigma concepts to their contracting activities. The goal is to reduce the cycle-time required to award a contract in support of new operational requirements. The Global Hawk team followed the Lean Thinking concepts to break down the contracting process into a value stream. They identified steps that do not add value and eliminated them. By eliminating those unnecessary steps, their three process times were cut by 37%, 40% and 73%!

5. Managerial Implications

The experiences in implementing Lean Six Sigma in the military have uncovered several valuable lessons and managerial guidelines. They are briefly presented below.

Active support of senior leaders is a must for a successful implementation of Lean Six Sigma.

- The need for change must be clearly articulated.
- Commit to the change—make it last through leadership turnover.
- Change and accountability should be driven from the top.
- Actions speak louder than words—.participate in the effort.

Initial successes are critically important in launching Lean Six Sigma.

- Carefully choose initial projects.
- Assign high-potential employees to those projects.
- Provide financial and personnel resources to ensure success.
- Initial successes turn the skeptics into believers.

Emphasize continuing education and training.

- Deploy 1% of workforce as full-time Black Belt plus Green Belts, Champions, etc.
- Black Belts should be selected from “future leaders of the organization.”
- Create Master Black Belts to take over training at all levels.
- Senior organization leaders must be trained and engaged in project selection.
- Include Productivity Improvement Training in Leadership Development Programs.

Monitor the Lean Six Sigma projects.

- Assign concrete goals to project leaders and hold them accountable for

project results.

- Provide stable funding to ensure long-term success.
- Demand validated return on investment; Keep score in public.
- Promote a philosophy that it is OK to save a dollar and give it up—it's not your money.
- Middle management is likely to provide the most resistance—actively manage their participation (increase the ratio between those that get it and those that don't).

The LSS methodology was developed in the private sector. To the extent the competitive environment, the organizational culture and the nature of operational challenges are considerably different in private sector firms than in the Department of Defense, it is necessary that the LSS methodology be suitably modified in its implementation in the military. We discuss below a set of issues that must be addressed in implementing LSS in the military.

Experience indicates that the success of Lean Six Sigma depends on employee empowerment and participative management. Since the military is traditionally organized and managed as a strict hierarchy, implementing LSS is a challenging task. Also, frequent rotation and movement of officers in their assignments is a common practice in the military. This creates a possibility that the procedures and culture created by one officer in implementing LSS can be disrupted when s/he is replaced by another officer.

In the military, the employees may enthusiastically embrace LSS implementation initially, but it is difficult to maintain that enthusiasm towards LSS in the long run without proper incentive systems. Private sector organizations can give financial incentives to employees to reward their contributions to process improvement efforts. However, it is almost impossible to give such monetary incentives in the military due to the governmental rules and regulations. Hence, an alternate non-monetary incentive system, for example, for career enhancement or for better promotion opportunities, must be investigated.

Another area to be carefully studied regarding implementing LSS in the military is to understand the fundamental nature of military operations. Lean Six Sigma methodologies were originally designed for manufacturing assembly systems where the demands are known or predetermined. As we move closer to a *foxhole* from a *factory*, the magnitude of uncertainty in demand, supply, and environment as a whole increases significantly. Military planners must fully keep in mind that the demand and supply are uncertain in many military applications; hence, LSS must be selectively implemented in different parts of the military in different ways. For example, supply officers may be *encouraged, but not incentivized*, to apply lean and just-in-time concepts to reduce inventory in military operational environments because of the inherent nature of uncertain demand and potential heavy penalty of stockout that would cause readiness degradation and potential losses of human lives.

Finally, we wish to point out that while the issues identified above are important and must be carefully analyzed by military planners, approaches for dealing with them can be developed. Moreover, the benefits of reduced lifecycle costs and improved readiness that can be realized from implementing Lean Six Sigma are simply too great. Hence, we believe that implementing Lean Six Sigma in the military is a strategically important logistics initiative and recommend that it be undertaken under full steam.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

List of References

- Apte, U. M., & Goh, C. H. (2004, Fall). Applying Lean Manufacturing Principles to information-intensive services. *International Journal of Service Technology and Management*, 5 (5/6), 488-506.
- Barringer, H. P., & Weber, D. P. (1996). Lifecycle cost tutorial. In, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Processing Plant Reliability*. Retrieved October 3, 2006, from <http://www.barringer1.com/pdf/lcctutorial.pdf#search=%22life%20cycle%20cost%20tutorial%20barringer%20weber%22>
- Blanchard, B. S. (2004). *Logistics engineering and management* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Coale, S. (2006). Expanding Lean beyond the manufacturing floor. *Air Force Link*. Retrieved September 12, 2006, from <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123020397>)
- Cost Analysis Improvement Group. (1992). *Operating and Support Cost-Estimating Guide*. Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, USA.
- Defense Acquisition University. (2006). Question and answer detail: Logistics/sustainment. Retrieved September 12, 2006, from <http://akss.dau.mil/askaprof-akss/qdetail2.aspx?cgiSubjectAreaID=24&cgiQuestionID=14729>
- Dennis, P. (2002). *Lean Production simplified: A plain-language guide to the world's most powerful production system*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Dershin, H. (2004, August). Lean and Six Sigma—The twain have met. *EuropeanCEO*.
- Dumond, J., Brauner, M., Eden, R., Folkenson, J. R., Girardini, K. J., Keyser, D., Pint, E. M., & Wang, M. Y. D. (2001). *Velocity management: The business paradigm that has transformed US Army logistics*. RAND Corporation. Retrieved October 3, 2006, from <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1108/>
- General Electric. (2006). Commitment to quality. Retrieved August 8, 2006, from <http://www.ge.com/en/company/companyinfo/quality/quality.htm>
- George, M. L. (2002). *Lean Six Sigma: Combining Six Sigma quality with Lean Speed*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hale, A. (1994). Analysis of USS America's readiness-based sparring aviation consolidated allowance list. Research Memorandum 94-140, Washington, DC, Center for Naval Analysis (CNA),
- Kang, K. (1993). Spreadsheet decision support models for Naval Aviation Logistics. Technical Report NPS-AS-93-029. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.

- Kang, K., & Gue, K. R. (1997). Sea-based logistics: Distribution problems for future global contingencies. In, *Proceedings of 1997 Winter Simulation Conference*. Retrieved October 3, 2006, from <http://www.informs-cs.org/wsc97papers/0911.PDF>.
- Kang, K., Gue, K. R., & Eaton, D. R. (1998). Cycle time reduction for Naval Aviation Depot. In, *Proceedings of 1998 Winter Simulation Conference*. Retrieved October 3, 2006, from <http://www.informs-cs.org/wsc98papers/122.PDF>.
- Kilpatrick, J. (2003). *Principles of Lean*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Manufacturing Extension Partnership.
- Lean Manufacturing. (2006). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved August 8, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lean_manufacturing
- Levinson, W. A. (2002). *Henry Ford's Lean vision: Enduring principles from the first Ford Motor plant*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Little, J. D. C. (1961). A proof of the queueing formula $L = \lambda W$. *Operations Research*, 9, 383-387.
- Lopez, C. T. (2006, May 11). Smart Operations 21 office formed at Pentagon. *Air Force Link*. Retrieved September 12, 2006, from <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?storyID=123020236>.
- McCarty, T. (2004, September-October). Six Sigma at Motorola. *EuropeanCEO*.
- Moorman, R. W. (2005, July 1). Implementing Lean. *Overhaul and Maintenance*, 11(6).
- Nash, M., Poling, S. R., & Ward, S. (2006). *Using Lean for faster Six Sigma results: A synchronized approach*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Ohno, T. (1988). *Toyota production system: Beyond large-scale production*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Parker, T. (1999, Summer). Logistics test and evaluation: An overview—weapons system testing. *Acquisition Review Quarterly*. Retrieved September 12, 2006, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0JZX/is_3_6/ai_78177458.
- Rath & Strong. (2006). *Rath & Strong's Six Sigma pocket guide* (New Revised Edition). Lexington, MA: Rath & Strong Management Consultants.
- Sherbrooke, C.C. (1992). *Optimal inventory modeling of systems: Multi-echelon techniques*. New York: Wiley.
- Six Sigma. (2006). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved August 8, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six_Sigma
- Stamatis, D.H. (2004). *Six Sigma fundamentals: A complete introduction to the system, methods, and tools*. New York: Productivity Press.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management* (paperback reprint, 1998). Mineola, NY: Dover.

Womack, J. P., Jones, D. T., & Roos. (1991). *The machine that changed the world: The story of Lean Production*. New York: Harper Collins.

Womack, J. P., & Jones, D.T. (2003). *Lean thinking*. New York: Free Press.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2003 - 2006 Sponsored Acquisition Research Products

Acquisition Case Series

NPS-PM-06-041 Boudreau, Michael. Acoustic Rapid COTS Insertion: A Case Study in Spiral Development. October 2006

NPS-AM-06-008 Apte, Aruna U., and Eugene (Joe) Dutkowski. Total Ownership Cost Reduction Case Study: AEGIS Microwave Power Tubes. May 2006.

UMD-CM-05-019 Lucyshyn, William, Rene Rendon, and Stephanie Novello. Improving Readiness with a Public-Private Partnership: NAVAIR's Auxiliary Power Unit Total Logistics Support Program. July 2005.

UMD-CM-05-018 Lucyshyn, William, and Stephanie Novello. The Naval Ordnance Station Louisville: A Case Study of Privatization-in-Place. August 2005.

NPS-CM-04-008 Lucyshyn, William, Jeffrey Cuskey, and Jonathan Roberts. Privatization of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis. July 2004.

NPS-PM-04-010 Lucyshyn, William, Keith F. Snider, and Robert Maly. The Army Seeks a World Class Logistics Modernization Program. June 2004.

NPS-CM-03-005 Lamm, David V. Contract Closeout (A). September 2003.

Sponsored Report Series

NPS-AM-06-046 Ludwig, Walter S., and Alexander M. Moore. Analysis of Naval Facilities Engineering Command's (NAVFAC) Contracting Processes Using the Contract Management Maturity Model (CMMM). December 2006

NPS-AM-06-045 Hagan, Joel J. and William G. Slack. Employing Organizational Modeling and Simulation to Reduce F/A-18E/F F414 Engine Maintenance Time. December 2006.

UMD-LM-06-040 Gansler, Jacques S., and William Lucyshyn. Evaluation of Performance Based Logistics. August 2006.

UMD-CM-06-039 Dunn, Richard L.. Contractors Supporting Military Operations. September 2006.

NPS-FM-06-037 Kang, Keebom, Susan M. Sanchez, and Kenneth H. Doerr. A Design of Experiments Approach to Readiness Risk Analysis for Performance-Based Logistics. September 2006

NPS-FM-06-036 San Miguel, Joseph G. and Donald E. Summers. Public-Private Partnerships for Government Financing, Controlling Risk, and Value for Money: The UK Experience. September 2006.

NPS-AM-06-035 Naegle, Brad. Developing Software Requirements Supporting Open Architecture Performance Goals in Critical DoD System-of-Systems. September 2006.

NPS-FM-06-034 San Miguel, Joseph E., and Donald E. Summers. Using Public Private Partnerships and Energy Saving Contracts to Fund DoD Mobile Assets. August 2006.

NPS-LM-06-033 Apte, Uday, and Keebom Kang. Lean Six Sigma for Reduced Cycle Costs and Improved Readiness. September 2006.

NPS-AM-06-032 Apte, Uday, Geraldo Ferrer, Ira Lewis, and Rene Rendon. Managing the Services Supply Chain in the Department of Defense: Opportunities and Challenges. July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-031 Hudgens, Lt Col Bryan, Capt Carey Petit, Col Rita Jordan, and Lt Col Leon Mable. Development of Measures of Success for Corporate Level Air Force Acquisition Initiatives. July 2006.

NPS-LM-06-030 Apte, Uday M., Nicholas Dew and Gerald Ferrer. What is the Right RFID for your Service? July 2006.

NPS-FM-06-029 McCaffery, Jerry, and Larry Jones. Reform of Budgeting for Acquisition: Lessons from Private Sector Capital Budgeting for the Department of Defense. September 2006.

NPS-LM-06-028 Ferrer, Geraldo, Uday Apte, and Nicholas Dew. What Is the Right RFID for Your Process? July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-027 Bowman, Dan, Lt Col Timothy S. Reed, Lt Col Bryan J. Hudgens, Maj David Searle. DoD is Not IBM: The Challenges of Implementing Strategic Sourcing in Defense Acquisition. July 2006.

NPS-PM-06-026 Thomas, Gail Fann, Erik Jansen, and Susan Page Hocevar. Building Collaborative Capacity in the Interagency Context. July 2006.

NPS-CM-06-25 Donahue, Capt Kimberly A., Capt Joshua M. Parsons. Government Imposed Constraints and Forecasting Analysis of the M.J. Soffe Corporation. December 2004.

NPS-LM-06-024 Lask, LCDR Gregory R. Advanced SEAL Delivery System: An Analysis of Product Support. July 2006.

NPS-CM-06-023 Pigeon, SMSgt Nanci R., Lt Col Bryan J. Hudgens, Lt Col Ellen C. England, Lt Col Leon A. Mable, USAF (ret.). The Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques in United States Air Force Environmental Conflicts. July 2006

NPS-PM-06-022 Mark Nissen, Mark, Frank Barrett. Changing Major Acquisition Organizations to Adopt the Best Loci of Knowledge, Responsibilities and Decision Rights. July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-021 Uchytel, Capt Joseph S. Assessing the Operational Value of Situational Awareness for AEGIS and Ship Self Defense System (SSDS) Platforms through the Application of the Knowledge Value Added (KVA) Methodology. July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-020 Buchanan, Cap Steven M., Capt Jayson W. Cabell, Capt Daniel C. McCrary. Acquiring Combat Capability through Innovative Uses of Public Private Partnerships. June 2006.

NPS-FM-06-019 Jankowski, LCDR Patrick, LT Matthew Lehmann, and LT Michael P. McGee. Financing the DOD Acquisition Budget: Innovative Uses of Public-Private Partnerships. June 2006.

NPS-PM-06-018 Barnum, Usher L., Jr. Business Process Re-Engineering: Application for Littoral Combat Ship Mission Module Acquisition. June 2006.

NPS-AM-06-017 Mun, Johnathan, and Thomas Housel. A Primer on Return On Investment and Real Options Analysis for Portfolio Optimization. July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-014 Hatch II, William D. CDR, USN, Charles Gowen, AmerInd/FC Business Systems, and James Loadwick, AmerInd/FC Business Systems. Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Civilian Aviation Alternative Support Study: Report of Findings and Recommendation. July 2006.

NPS-AM-06-012 Meyer, Jacqueline M. and Sefa Demirel. A Comparative Analysis of the Department of Defense (DoD) Passive Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Policy and Perspective in Terms of Site Implementations. June 2006

NPS-AM-06-010 Rendon, Rene G. Using a Modular Open Systems Approach in Defense Acquisitions: Implications for the Contracting Process. January 2006.

NPS-LM-06-009 Apte, Uday M., Nicholas Dew and Gerald Ferrer. What is the Right RFID for your Process? January 2006.

NPS-LM-06-007 Mullins, Captain Michael, US Marine Corps, Captain Troy Adams, US Marine Corps and Lieutenant Robert Simms, US Navy. Analysis of Light Armored Vehicle Depot Level Maintenance. December 2005.

NPS-CM-06-006 Cortese, Captain Casey A., US Air Force, First Lieutenant Heather Shelby, US Air Force and Captain Timothy J. Strobel, US Air Force. Defining Success: The Air Force Information Technology Commodity Council. December 2005.

NPS-LM-06-005 Hernandez, Captain Emeterio V., US Air Force and Lieutenant Christopher A. Thomas, US Navy. Investigating the Department of Defense's Implementation of Passive Radio Frequency Identification (RFID). December 2005.

NPS-FM-06-004 Rios, Jr., LCDR Cesar G., US Navy. Return on Investment Analysis of Information Warfare Systems. September 2005.

NPS-AM-06-003 Komoroski, Christine L. Reducing Cycle Time and Increasing Value through the Application of Knowledge Value Added Methodology to the U.S. Navy Shipyard Planning Process. December 2005.

UMD-AM-05-021 Gansler, Jacques S., and William Lucyshyn. A Strategy for Defense Acquisition Research. August 2005.

UMD-CM-05-020 Dunn, Richard. Contractors in the 21st Century "Combat Zone." April 2005.

NPS-PM-05-017 Brianas, Christopher G. Department of the Navy Procurement Metrics Evaluation. June 2005.

NPS-LM-05-016 Doerr, Kenneth H., RADM Donald R. Eaton and Ira A. Lewis. Impact of Diffusion and Variability on Vendor Performance Evaluation. October 2005.

NPS-CM-05-015 Johnson, Ellsworth K. III, Bryan H. Paton, Edward W. Threat, and Lisa A. Haptonstall. Joint Contingency Contracting. June 2005.

NPS-CM-05-013 Schwartz, Brett M., Jadon Lincoln, Jose L. Sanchez, and Leslie S. Beltz. Update of the Navy Contract Writing Guide Phase III. June 2005.

NPS-PM-05-012 Jenkins, Glenn E., and William J. Snodgrass, Jr. The Raven Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (SUAV): Investigating Potential Dichotomies between Doctrine and Practice. June 2005.

NPS-AM-05-011 Apte, Aruna U. Spiral Development: A Perspective. June 2005.

NPS-FM-05-009 Jones, Lawrence R., Jerry McCaffery and Kory L. Fierstine. Budgeting for National Defense Acquisition: Assessing System Linkage and the Impact of Transformation. June 2005.

NPS-LM-05-008 Kang, Keebom, Kenneth Doerr, Michael Boudreau, and Uday Apte. A Decision Support Model for Valuing Proposed Improvements in Component Reliability. June 2005.

NPS-PM-05-007 Dillard, John T., and Mark E. Nissen. Determining the Best Loci of Knowledge, Responsibilities and Decision Rights in Major Acquisition Organizations. June 2005.

NPS-AM-05-006 San Miguel, Joseph G., John K. Shank, and Donald E. Summers. Navy Acquisition via Leasing: Policy, Politics, and Polemics with the Maritime Prepositioned Ships. April 2005.

NPS-CM-05-003 Rendon, Rene G. Commodity Sourcing Strategies: Supply Management in Action. January 2005.

NPS-CM-04-019 Lord, Roger. Contractor Past Performance Information (PPI) In Source Selection: A comparison Study of Public and Private Sector. December 2004.

NPS-PM-04-017 Matthews, David. The New Joint Capabilities Integration Development System (JCIDS) and Its Potential Impacts upon Defense Program Managers. December 2004.

NPS-LM-04-014 Apte, Aruna. Optimizing Phalanx Weapon System Lifecycle Support. October 2004.

NPS-AM-04-013 Frank, Raymond (Chip). Business Case Analysis and Contractor vs. Organic Support: A First-Principles View. September 2004.

NPS-LM-04-006 Doerr, Ken, Donald R. Eaton, and Ira Lewis. Measurement Issues in Performance Based Logistics. June 2004.

NPS-CM-04-004 Espine, Lieutenant Commander Joseph C., and Lieutenant Commander Chong Hunter. Update of the Navy Contract Writing, Phase II. June 2004.

NPS-CM-04-002 Burger, Major Kenneth A., Captain Brian . Marine Corps Contingency Contracting MCI. Revised Manual. December 2003.

NPS-CM-04-001 Dean, Captain Chad E., and Second Lieutenant Nathan P. Vosters. Update of the Navy Contract Writing, Phase I. December 2003.

NPS-CM-03-006 Tudor, Ron B. Auto-Redact Toolset for Department of Defense Contracts. September 2003.

NPS-AM-03-004 Boudreau, Michael W., and Brad R. Naegle. Reduction of Total Ownership Cost. September 2003.

NPS-AM-03-003 Dillard, John T. Centralized Control of Defense Acquisition Programs: A Comparative Review of the Framework from 1987-2003. September 2003.

NPS-CM-03-001 MBA Team. Transformation in DoD Contract Closeout. June 2003.

Working Paper Series

NPS-LM-06-013 Dew, Nicholas. Cookies for the Real World: Assessing the Potential of RFID for Contractor Monitoring. May 2006.

NPS-PM-06-002 Dillard, John T. When Should You Terminate Your Own Program? November 2005.

NPS-AM-06-001 Naegle, Brad. Developing Software Requirements Supporting Open Architecture Performance Goals in Critical DoD System-of-Systems. November 2005.

NPS-AM-05-010 Zolin, Roxanne V., and John T. Dillard. From Market to Clan: How Organizational Control Affects Trust in Defense Acquisition. June 2005.

NPS-AM-05-005 Boudreau, Michael. Cost as an Independent Variable (CAIV): Front-End Approaches to Achieve Reduction in Total Ownership Cost. June 2005.

NPS-AM-05-002 Yoder, Elliott Cory. The Yoder Three-Tier Model for Optimizing Contingency Contracting Planning and Execution. December 2004.

NPS-AM-05-001 Yoder, Elliott Cory. Engagement versus Disengagement: How Structural & Commercially-Based Regulatory Changes have Increased Government Risks in Federal Acquisitions. November 2004.

NPS-CM-04-016 Stevens, Brett. An Analysis of Industry's Perspective on the Recent Changes to Circular A-76. October 2004.

NPS-CM-04-012 Rairigh, Beth. Air Force Commodity Councils: Leveraging the Power of Procurement. September 2004.

NPS-CM-04-011 Engelbeck, R. Marshall. Using Metrics to Manage Contractor Performance. September 2004.

NPS-LM-04-009 Eaton, Donald R. Improving the Management of Reliability. August 2004.

NPS-AM-04-007 Naegle, Brad R. The Impact of Software Support on System Total Ownership Cost. July 2004.

NPS-LM-04-003 Eaton, Donald R. Enablers to Ensure a Successful Force Centric Logistics Enterprise. April 2004.

NPS-CM-03-002 Parker, Christopher and Michael Busansky. Transformation in DoD Contract Closeout. June 2003.

Acquisition Symposium Proceedings

NPS-AM-06-011 Acquisition Research: Creating Synergy for Informed Change. April 2006.

NPS-AM-05-004 Acquisition Research: The Foundation for Innovation. May 2005.

NPS-AM-04-005 Charting a Course for Change: Acquisition Theory and Practice for a Transforming Defense. May 2004.

Technical Reports

NPS-GSBPP-03-003 Dillard, John T. Centralized Control of Defense Acquisition Programs: A Comparative Review of the Framework from 1987-2003. September 2003.

NPS-GSBPP-03-004 Boudreau, Michael W., and Brad R. Naegle. Reduction of Total Ownership Cost. September 2003.

Presentations, Publications and External Forums

Rendon, Rene. "Commodity Sourcing Strategies: Supply Management in Action." Published as "Commodity Sourcing Strategies: Processes, Best Practices, and Defense Initiatives." *Journal of Contract Management* 3, no.1 (2005): 7-21.

Doerr, Ken, Ira Lewis, and Donald Eaton. "Measurement issues in Performance Based Logistics." *Journal of Public Procurement* 5, no. 2 (2005): 164-186.

Eaton, Donald, Ken Doerr, and Ira Lewis. "Performance Based Logistics: A Warfighting Focus." *US Naval Institute Proceedings*. (In Press).

Doerr, Ken, Donal Eaton, and Ira Lewis. "Performance Based Logistics." Presented to the International Defense Acquisition Resource Management Conference. Capellen, Luxembourg, 2004.

Kang, Keebom, and Ken Doerr. Workshop: Metrics and Performance Evaluation in Performance Based Logistics. Presented at Future Naval Plans & Requirements Conference. San Diego, CA. October 2005.

Boudreau, Michael, and Brad Naegle. "Total Ownership Cost Considerations in Key Performance Parameters and Beyond." *Defense Acquisition Research Journal* 38, no.2 (2005): 108-121.

Boudreau, Michael, and Brad Naegle. Workshop: Setting up Acquisition for Total Lifecycle Supportability Performance. Presented at the Institute for Defense and Government Advancement Conference: Total Lifecycle Systems Management. Arlington, VA. 2005.

Kang, Keebom, Ken Doerr, Uday Apte, and Michael Boudreau. "Decision Support Models for Valuing Improvements in Component Reliability and Maintenance." Submitted to the *Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation* in July 2005 for possible publication. Currently the article is being reviewed by referees.

Franck, Raymond (Chip). "Business Case Analysis and Contractor vs. Organic Support: A First-Principles View." Presented at the Western Economic Association International Annual Conference. San Francisco, CA. 5 July 2005.

Dillard, John, and Mark Nissen. "Computational Modeling of Project Organizations under Stress." In review.

Dillard, John. "Centralization of Defense Acquisition Programs." Accepted for publication in the *Defense Acquisition Research Journal* (2005).

Nissen, Mark E., and John Dillard. "Computational Design of Public Organizations." In review.

IS4710 - Qualitative Methods. This research-seminar course has integrated the results of the FY05 Dillard-Nissen research into the students' course project.

Dillard, John T. "Centralized Control of Defense Acquisition Programs." IAMOT 2004 - New Directions in Technology Management: Changing Collaboration between Government, Industry and University. 3 -7 April 2004.

Dillard, John T. "Centralized Control of Defense Acquisition Programs: A Comparative Review of the Framework from 1987-2003." BPP Research Colloquium. 25 November 2003.

Copies of the Acquisition Sponsored Research Reports may be printed from our website www.acquisitionresearch.org

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Initial Distribution List

1. Defense Technical Information Center 2
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944; Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218
2. Dudley Knox Library, Code 013 2
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5100
3. Research Office, Code 09 1
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5138
4. Robert N. Beck 1
Dean, GSBPP
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
5. Keith F. Snider 1
Associate Professor, GB/Sk
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
6. James B. Greene 1
Acquisition Chair, GB/Jg
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
7. Bill Gates 1
Associate Dean for Research, GB/Gt
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
8. Uday Apte 1
Professor, GB
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
9. Keebom Kang 1
Associate Professor, GB/Kk
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000
10. Karey L. Shaffer 1
Program Manager, Acquisition Research Program, GB/Ks
555 Dyer Road, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000

Copies of the Acquisition Sponsored Research Reports may be printed from our website www.acquisitionresearch.org