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Briefing Purpose

• Describe Army G-4 Individual Chemical Equipment Management Transformation Initiative
• Discuss Army’s use of Air Force’s Mobility Inventory Control and Accountability System (MICAS) and automatic identification technology (AIT)
• Provide current initiative status
• Present initiative programmatic:
  - funding
  - initial fielding schedule
  - outstanding issues
• Discuss proposed initiative transition to AMC
• Discuss CDE Go-to-War Score Card question
IPE Management Transformation Initiative

What, Why, & How?

Vision for IPE Management

Centralized program Mgmt
Depot-Centered Storage
Dedicated Central Funding
Centralized Readiness Reporting

Decentralized funding & management
Early Deploy Less Ready
Later Deployers More Ready
Limited Asset Visibility
Centrally funded & managed

Proactive logistics “push”
Depot centric storage

Mission focused
Total Asset Visibility
Centralized funded & managed

Requirement focused
Reactive logistics “pull”
Centrally funded & managed

Requirement focused
Reactive logistics “pull”
Centrally funded & managed

Transformation

Single Army Program
Dedicate IPE systems
Integrate IPE systems
Deposit automation enhancements MICAS and AIT at unit/installation

PHASES
1. Preparation / Pilot
2A. MICAS Fielding / Implementation
2B. Business Process Reengineering
3. Implement ICEMP

Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army
Chemical Defense Equipment Go-to-War Program

Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army

Blue Grass Army Depot

Installation/Unit Managed Stocks

Fort Hood

Force Support Package 2&3

Fort Lewis

Force packaged 1 units

Fort Bragg

Other Installations

Wholesale

Go to war stock

Established February 1998

Request via AEPS

Local Inventories and home grown management information systems

Force Packaged 2&3

Go to war stock
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Problems with CDE Go-to-War Program

- Based on outdated Force Packaging
- Policy establishes a divided program
- Early deploying units lack resources to effectively manage IPE
- IPE funds for early deploying units not dedicated to IPE purchases
- Army leadership is not getting an accurate readiness status
- Lack of asset visibility of IPE inventories at installations
  - GAO; AAA; Congressman Shays, etc.
  - Issues manifested during OIF deployment
IPE Asset Visibility

• Current standard automated information systems (STAMIS) cannot handle IPE management needs:
  – Shelf-life management; surveying of stock for approaching inspections
  – Resulted in local home-grown software solutions to fill need
• Initial versions of future STAMIS do not include capability to handle IPE management needs
• Army needs an immediate interim solution that can transition to integrated systems under Enterprise Resource Planning
Current Management of Army CDE Readiness Stock

Future Individual Chemical Equipment Management Program (ICEMP)

- Minimizes burden on installations and units
- Deploying Units
- Reduced logistics footprint
- Centrally funded & managed
- Army IPE Depots
- Single Army program manager
- Depot centric storage

- Increase overall readiness
- Increased asset visibility
- Better management of stock rotation
- Improved industrial base management
- Flexibility of shifting assets/cross leveling
- Increased accountability/tracking of assets
- Centralized recovery/certification of redeployed assets

A single inventory managed through a standard suite of Automated Information System(s)

Blue Grass Army Depot

Wholesale

Force Packaged 1

Go To War Stock

Depot Packed

Other Installations

Fort Hood

Fort Lewis

Fort Bragg

Flexibility of shifting assets/cross leveling

Centralized recovery/certification of redeployed assets

Flexibility of shifting assets/cross leveling

AIIT-enabled material transfer

Increased accountability/tracking of assets

Fort Hood

Fort Lewis

Fort Bragg

Other Installations
Transformation Initiative

Background

• Envisioned centrally managed / funded concept in 2001
• Partnered with Logistics Transformation Agency
• Initiated Logistics Management Institute study
• Published vision document November 2002
• Briefed Generals Johnson and Waterman ... told to execute
• Initiative supports senior leader guidance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HQDA G-4 focus areas</th>
<th>CSA priorities</th>
<th>SecDef streamlined logistics initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streamlines/integrates IPE global supply chain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes single IPE proponent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides end-to-end visibility</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables priority to units deploying and deployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports joint integration</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employs technology to track status of IPE stocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Army Principal Staff Guidance

- LTG Cody (HQDA G-3) ... use MICAS to fix IPE management and explore other uses toward managing the soldier as a system

- LTG Christianson (HQDA G-4) ... need a central DoD IPE manager to manage requirements and priorities ... ensure DLA is an integral part of the solution
Centralized Management of Army IPE Roles and Responsibilities

Army-Wide IPE Manager

Streamlined and integrated IPE supply chain
Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army

Integrate CONUS IPE systems

Depot automation enhancements, MICAS and AIT at installations

Asset visibility of IPE stocks

Focus

Centralized program management

Depot-centered storage

Dedicated central funding

Centralized readiness reporting

Single Army Program

Business process reengineering

FY 2003 to 2004

FY 2004

FY 2004

FY 2005

FY 2005

2nd Depot

The Triad

Asset Visibility

Manager

IPE Depots

Installations
Interim Information System System Alternatives

• Modify SARSS and SDS to meet installation- and depot-level IPE management needs
  – Would take years to modify and field
  – Low priority with replacement systems under development
• Include IPE in Army’s Single Stock Fund
  – Relies on current logistics systems pending fielding of GCSS-Army and LMP
• Adopt available IPE-capable non-STAMIS system
  – Marine Corps’ Defense Equipment Management Program (DEMP) did not support AIT, track issued assets, nor provide asset visibility roll-up capability
  – Mobility Inventory Control and Accountability System (MICAS) tracks IPE shelf-life data; supports use of AIT; tracks issued assets, and can roll-up asset visibility to higher levels
Army Installation Solution

Mobility Inventory Control Accountability System (MICAS)

- Is an USAF inventory management system operating at 185+ locations throughout the Air Force
- Tracks shelf-life visibility of stored and issued assets down to an individual soldier
- Can verify serviceability of assets prior to issue
- Provides capability to roll-up asset visibility to higher levels
- Can download IPE surveillance data via the web to automatically update expiration dates and condition codes
- Provides full suite of barcode production and scanning
- Runs on a standard PC and is Microsoft compatible
- Is Government owned and freely distributed to DoD users
How Will We Use MICAS?

• Initial application will focus on inventory management and asset visibility at installation/unit warehouse and depots (Initial fielding)

• Future applications may include individual issue and CIF management ... exploring during Fort Hood pilot

• Has potential for other applications ... toward managing soldier as a system
MICAS Relationship to Enterprise Resource Planning and Joint Staff

- CASCOM acknowledges effort and will include requirement for IPE management and asset visibility in GCSS-Army
- AMC AIT Workgroup acknowledges effort and will develop requirement and functionality for LMP
- JPEO-CBD has:
  - Identified Joint Program Manager and assigned to JPMO-CBD Information Systems. MICAS program has been formalized with Air Force and Army providing sustainment funding
  - Provided funding for data warehouse to provide OSD-level IPE asset visibility
  - Providing funding for early fielding of MICAS EUSA/USFK
  - Working vendor applied AIT on IPE
- GAO has acknowledged effort as positive towards fixing documented systemic issues
Joint Total Asset Visibility Reporting Warehouse

OSD

$ Reports

JPEO-CBD

Reports

Feedback

Congress

Joint Total Asset Visibility Reporting Warehouse

MICAS

Army

MICAS

Air Force

MICAS

Navy

CBR-D RIP

Marines

EAM

Responses to GAO and DoDIG audits highlighting issues with asset visibility and Congressional interest

JPEO-CBD directed all Service IPE AIS have MICAS roll-up function

Note: CBR-D = Chemical Biological Radiological-Defense; EAM = Enterprise Asset Module; MICAS = Mobility Inventory Control and Accountability System; RIP = Readiness Improvement Program
IPE Management Transformation Initiative

What, Why, & How?

Vision for IPE Management

Transformation

CDE Go-to-War Program

Single Army Program

Integrate IPE systems

Depot automation enhancements

Centralize MICAS and AIT at unit/installation

Depot program management

Total Asset Visibility

Centralized funded & managed

Mission focused

Depot-centric storage

Proactive logistics "push"

Total Asset Visibility

Manager

IPE Storage

The Triad

Asset Visibility

Units

Individual Chemical Equipment Management Program (ICEMP)

PHASES

1. Preparation / Pilot
2A. MICAS Fielding / Implementation
2B. Business Process Reengineering
3. Implement ICEMP

Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army
IPE Management
Transformation Pieces

Funding

Business
Processes

Readiness
Reporting

Management
Structure

Automation
& AIT Support
Phase 1

Fort Hood Pilot Objectives

• Validate asset visibility through AIS and AIT
• Validate MICAS in an Army operating environment
• Apply standard IPE marking (item, package, pallet)
• Establish menu of standard installation processes
• Establish standard AIT COTS packages
• Determine baseline fielding and sustainment costs
Fort Hood Pilot Evaluation

Third party independent evaluation (January 2004)

- Lead by Logistics Transformation Agency
- Team members include FORSCOM, XVIII Airborne Corps, Southwest Region, and TACOM-SBC representatives assisted by Mike Cress, Natick Soldier Support Center
- Evaluated warehouse management and asset visibility and CIF issue to individual soldiers using MICAS and AIT ...20 – 30 January 2004
Fort Hood MICAS Pilot Results

• MICAS provides a comprehensive shelf life management capability which is not currently available in any of the STAMISs.
• Manual systems are ineffective and require exhaustive resources.
• Use of AIT significantly improves efficiency and effectiveness in receipt, COSIS, and issue operations.
• MICAS enables vertical and horizontal total asset visibility
• MICAS’s ability to download surveillance data and perform inventory assessment improves inventory reliability and Soldier confidence.
• Facilitates automated reporting.
• MICAS must be enhanced with Army document register format.
• Has potential to manage other commodities and serve as requirements template for GCSS-A.
• MICAS is sustainable at installation level when used in a warehouse management role; installations may require additional resources/support/enhancements to utilize MICAS to issue to individual soldiers.

Recommendations: (1) Field MICAS as an interim solution; (2) enhance MICAS w/ document register; (3) Continue to explore individual issue and the potential of MICAS as a Soldier management system at Ft Hood.

Bottom Line: The “Triad” Works
Before

214 pallets of questionable IPE identified

Serviceable and unserviceable items mixed
“I guess you have about 98% Confidence in your inventory…
No Sir, more like 100%”

Warehouseman, Ft Hood

After
Phase 1
Enhancing IPE Depot Operations

• Blue Grass Army Depot IPE management prototype
  ✓ Adapts existing depot ammo system (MTMS-FM*) to manage IPE
  ✓ Provides AIT capability compatible with MICAS
    - Incorporates standard IPE marking (item, package, pallet)
• Establish Pine Bluff Arsenal as the Second IPE depot ... focus on recovery mission
  ✓ Receive, inspect, categorize, repackage as required, store, and ship recovered IPE
  ✓ Implement MICAS to manage IPE - completed week of 15 Dec 03
  ✓ Place AIT on carton / box level
  ✓ Develop and refine standardized recovery procedures for each item of IPE – become the recognized DoD expert
    - Provide packaging improvement recommendations

✓ = Completed actions
Ongoing actions

* MTMS - FM = Munitions Transportation Management System - Field Module
Phase 1
Integrating Systems for IPE
Asset Visibility

- Decentralized operations
- Roll-ups via email to aggregate databases at higher manager levels
- Uses COTS hardware

SRS = Strategic Readiness System

CONUS Depots

The Triad
IPE Depots

Installation

CONUS Manager

Asset Visibility

NBCtrak

Future

Individu al Issue
CIF
Units
NBCtrak

CONUS IPE stockpile manager

SRS

FORSCOM G-4

HQDA G-4

Other MACOMs

Units / Installations

logistics staff

chemical staff

LAN

MICAS database

email database file

TACOM - SBC
Rock Island

warehouse manager

Blue Grass Army Depot
Pine Bluff Arsenal

SDS
MTMS-FM with MICAS roll-up and manifest files emulation capability
Shipping and receiving
Phase 2A
MICAS Fielding and Implementation

• Army MICAS program manager designated
• Standard AIT COTS packages
• Establish standardized installation processes
• Field by Corps and then by Installation Management Agency region
• Phase fielding in CONUS and then OCONUS
Tentative MICAS Fielding Schedule

- Pine Bluff Arsenal (completed week of 15 December 2003)
- U.S. Army Forces Command G-4 (2nd quarter, FY04)
- HQDA G-4 (2nd quarter, FY04)
- Afghanistan (2nd quarter, FY04)
- Combined Forces Land Component Command, Kuwait/Iraq (3rd quarter, FY04)
- EUSA, Korea (3rd quarter, FY04; front-end analysis 24 January 2003 through 5 February 2004)
- U. S. Special Operations Command (pilot at Fort Bragg during 2nd quarter, FY04)
- White House (demonstration in February 2004)
- CONUS installations (2nd quarter, FY04 through 1st quarter FY05)
  - Identified 31 installations
  - Power Projection Platforms followed by Power Support Platforms
Phase 2B
Business Process Reengineering
Approach

• Establish Integrated Process Teams (IPT) to work business process reengineering:
  - Program management structure, organizational location, and staffing
  - Inventory requirement and distribution
  - Assessing redirection of Training Resource Model (TRM) dollars
  - Identify funding mechanisms
  - Readiness reporting mechanism

• Draw on wide range of expertise from:
  - DoD AIT Office
  - PEO Chemical Biological Defense
  - Installation Management Agency
  - PM Clothing and Individual Equipment (CIE)
  - PM Automatic Identification Technology (AIT)
  - TACOM – Soldier Biological Chemical (SBC)
  - Army G-3 (Training Resource Model)
  - PM Single Stock Fund lessons learned
  - Combined Arms Support Command (CASCOM)
  - Army Materiel Command (AMC)

205 plus Tasks
Phase 3
Transition to ICEMP

Implement when conditions for success are met:

• MICAS fielded and asset visibility achieved
• Business process reengineering complete, validated, and documented
• Funding mechanism established
• Army-wide program manager in place
• Transition incrementally as with MICAS fielding
Estimated Timeline

- **Phase 1 - Preparation**
  - 4Q FY 2003: Coordinate fielding schedule with IMA

- **Phase 2A - MICAS Fielding**
  - 1Q FY 2004: MICAS installation pilot at Pine Bluff
  - 2Q FY 2004: MICAS Decision Briefing
  - 3Q FY 2004: USASOC Pilot at Fort Bragg

- **Phase 2B - Business Process Reengineering**
  - 1Q FY 2005: Convene business process reengineering IPT
  - EUSA Korea CFLCC Kuwait/Iraq

**Afghanistan**

- 2Q FY 2004: HDQA message
- 3Q FY 2004: FORSCOM
- 1Q FY 2005: MICAS fielding

**CONUS**

- Jul Aug Sep
- Oct Nov Dec
- Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun
- Apr May Jun
- Jul Aug Sep

**Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army**
Estimated FY04/05 Program Costs

- CONUS MICAS fielding and sustainment costs - $4.33M ($0.959M funded)
  - hardware: $0.934M ($0.309M funded)
  - program management: $0.530M ($0.1M funded)
  - fielding: $2.04M ($0.35M funded)
  - sustainment: $0.827M ($0.2M funded)
- AMC Program Manager GS 14/15 (reimbursable) - $0.25M (2 years)
- Program management contractor support - $0.45M
  - FY04 $0.25M (funded)
  - FY05 $0.20M
- DA PAM/Army regulations: $0.24M ($0.16M funded)
- Depot upgrade costs: $1.00M
- IMA execution costs: $3.10M
- Total FY04/FY05 costs: $9.37M
Funding Sources and Impacts

Estimated MICAS fielding & sustainment costs FY04/FY05 = $9.12M

FP2 & FP3 TRM $

FP1 TRM $ FY04

FP1 TRM $ FY05

$8.0M ASPB for MICAS

$142M RESET

800+ Connexes Recovery

Reduction in CENTCOM Requirement

($4.9M ASPB for CDE

AF MICAS Sustainment $)

(Cost avoidance)

(Cost avoidance)

(OSD JSLIST Buys

PREPO Sets

SOCOM $

JPEO-CBD $)
Transition to ICEMP
Outstanding Issues

• Vendor bar coding of IPE assets
• MICAS as interim IPE supply system of record
• Installation Management Agency headquarters participation
Phase 1a: Recovery of deployed IPE from OEF/OIF
  - Collect in theater. Ship to CONUS depot...inspect, certify, mark w/ AIT
  - Centrally manage to mitigate risk associated with reduced inventories
  - Establish in-theater prepositioned stocks

Phase 1b: Implement asset visibility at installations.
  - Implement AF Mobility Inventory Control Accountability System (MICAS)
  - Leverage reduced installation inventories ... reduces cost
  - Addresses issues from OIF, DS/DS, AAA, DoDIG, and GAO

Phase 2: Reset IPE inventories
  - Consolidate requirements / funding
  - Centralize procurement

Phase 3: Redistribution
  - IAW operational requirements / priorities
  - Incremental execution based on inventory adequacy

Phase 4: IPE management transformation
  - Transforms CDE Go-To-War Program to Individual Chemical Equipment Management Program
  - Incorporates centralized management, storage, and funding
  - Depot centric ... reduces footprint at installations

Bottom line: Institutionalizes the Initiative

Proposed Transition To Army Materiel Command

- Transition to AMC at HQDA execution decision point
- Establish Implementation Task Force at AMC HQ
- Transition to AMC major subordinate command when ICEMP implemented
- Implementation Task Force GS-14/15 program manager
  - Oversees current CDE Go-to-War Program
  - Manages MICAS and AIT fielding and business process reengineering
  - Continues linkages with HQDA G4 / DLA / JPEO - CBD
  - Transitions to AMC ICEMP staff proponent providing funding oversight, program priorities, and strategic vision
Discussion of

CDE Go-to-War Score Card question
OIF Impact on CDEGTW Program

Reset Strategy:
1. Centrally manage all IPE assets to meet operational requirements.
2. Centrally manage Reset
3. Implement IPE Transformation

CDEGTW

35 Bde Sets Issued

CONUS FP2&3 TRM $18M/YR

$142M Reset

42 Bde Sets

Start FY03: 52%

End FY03: 33%

Years

00 03 04 06 07

$ 26.2M ASPB
$13.6M USAR FP1 JSLIST Fielding

Sustaining The Transforming Army... Transforming the Sustaining Army
Incremental Steps to ICEMP

- **CONUS FP1**
  - TRM $18M/yr
  - Start FY03 new requirement: 35%

- **FP1 USAR**
  - FP1 ARNG
  - TRM $5M/yr

- **CDEGTW**

- **OIF**
  - Estimated MICAS fielding & sustainment costs FY04/FY05 = $8.99M
  - 800+ Connexes Recovery
  - (Cost avoidance)

- **End FY03 new requirement: 22%**

- **CONUS FP2&3**
  - TRM $18M/yr

- **Current TBP%**

- **ICEMP**
  - Bde Sets

- **Inventory Quantity**
  - Program Efficiencies vs Industrial Base

- **AF MICAS Sustainment**
  - $8.0M ASPB for MICAS

- **PREPO Sets**
  - (Cost avoidance)

- **OSD JSLIST Buys**
  - (Cost avoidance)

- **JPEO-CBD (Cost avoidance)**

- **CENTCOM Requirement**

- **Reduction in CENTCOM Requirement**

- **SOCOM $**

- **$142M RESET**
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Conclusion

• Transformation initiative addresses critical systemic problem
• Supports Secretary Defense streamlining of logistics, Chief of Staff, Army priorities, and HQDA G-4 focus areas
• MICAS is an interim solution pending functionality in future enterprise systems
• Uses spiral development and phased implementation ... executed aggressively at low cost
• Transition program management to AMC at HQDA execution decision point
• Current risk associated reduced inventories of CDEGTW program is being mitigated through centralized management
QUESTIONS?
Contact Information

Major John Ensor
Army G-4 Chemical Logistics Officer
Phone: (703) 614-0919 (DSN: 224)
Email: john.ensor@hqda.army.mil