

Quadrennial Defense Review

Logistics Participation

Edgardo T. deGuia

P W C

QDR 1997 - Logistics Experience

- DoD in search of modernization funds
- Logistics Task Force examined issues that could provide improved performance as well as cost reduction
- Final outcomes based on meeting savings bogey
- Broad-based Logistics recommendations in official QDR report
 - Loosely based on Logistics Task Force issue papers
 - 3 categories: reengineering, outsourcing, and consolidation
- Difficult to track accountability and implementation
- No strategic changes in Logistics from QDR 1997

QDR 1997 - In Retrospect

From Interviews With QDR 1997 Participants...

Preparation and Guidance

"Senior Levels provided feedback to the panels"

"Not enough guidance at the beginning...
lack of feedback during process"

Timing and Coordination

"QDR proceeded in logical sequence...
good communication between panels"



"Concurrence and isolation of panels
impeded linkages and trade-offs..."

Roles and Teamwork

"Right people participated on the
Logistics Task Force"

"Logistics Task Force did not contain
proper ratio of military and civilian...
too much OSD and field involvement"

Content and Scope of Review

"Alternative strategies and structures were
considered"

"Failed to examine variety of alternatives...
hindered by bickering and competition"

Outcomes

"Review of capabilities required to
fulfill the strategy was conducted"

"Instead of an insight into strategy, force
structure, and logistics requirements,
the QDR was a budget drill"

QDR 2001 - Logistics Game Plan

Clear relationships

- The outcome should provide leadership insight into the relationship among the national defense strategy, combat forces, and the forces support and infrastructure required to support them.

Link to funding

- The outcome should result in a defense program that funds logistics at a level consistent with its requirements to support the national defense strategy.

Strategy-based

- The outcome should result in compatible and coordinated logistics strategies and initiatives among defense components.

Fulfil requirements

- The outcome must meet requirements of the 2000 Defense Authorization Act as signed by the President

QDR 2001 - Logistics CPR Analysis Framework

- CPR is how to describe and present architectures
- Specific format and content must be coordinated early, e.g.,
 - the logistics cost baseline
 - performance metrics to use
 - risk assessment framework

Cost

Architecture Cost

The following table contains only those program elements that have cost changes from the baseline architecture. These changes represent the cost savings and additions from implementing the two alternatives in the description of this architecture. Cost figures in bold represent a decrease in funding from the baseline architecture, cost figures in italics represent an increase.

Program Element	FY03\$K				
	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07
Central Supply and Maintenance					
370112A Inventory Control Point Operations	117,702	117,686	117,667	117,685	117,683
Military Personnel	22,028	22,820	22,828	22,820	22,828
Other	95,672	95,699	95,667	95,695	95,663
370112F Inventory Control Point Operations	117,702	117,680	117,667	117,685	117,683
Military Personnel	22,028	22,820	22,828	22,820	22,828
Other	95,672	95,699	95,667	95,695	95,663
370112M Inventory Control Point Operations	117,702	117,680	117,667	117,685	117,683
Military Personnel	22,028	22,820	22,828	22,820	22,828
Other	95,672	95,699	95,667	95,695	95,663

Performance

Architecture Performance

Performance Metric	Option	Baseline
Approach: Mission capable rate (percent)		
F190	86	86
F160	81	81
F100 (Precedb)	76	76
F101 (Precedb)	78	78
F102 (Precedb)	80	78
F103 (Precedb)	84	77
F104 (Precedb)	87	77
F105 (Precedb)	89	77
Cargo lift capacity—Military and Civil Reserve Air Field (Million ton-miles/yr)		
F190	47	47
F160	46	46
F100 (Precedb)	46	46
F101 (Precedb)	47	46
F102 (Precedb)	48	46
F103 (Precedb)	50	46
F104 (Precedb)	80	50
F105 (Precedb)	80	50
Search volume capacity (Million square feet)		
F190	7.3	7.3
F160	7.7	7.7
F100 (Precedb)	8.7	8.7
F101 (Precedb)	8.8	8.8

Risk

Architecture Risk

Overall Architecture Risk Rating: Green/Yellow

Overall Implementation Risk: Green/Yellow

Overall Operational Risk: Green/Yellow

Type of Risk	Logistics Functions						
	Sustainability	Transportation	Maintenance	Storage	Distribution	Disposal	
Implementation Risk	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green
Cost	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Political	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Technical	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green
Operational Risk	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green
COMUS	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green
Threat	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Green
Preposition	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Other	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green

Logistics Considerations for QDR 2001

- Reshape...Resize the Supply Chain
- Leverage technology...but keep focus on fundamentals
- Economies of scale...national vs. regional vs. local
- Overdue enablers...shifting burden to customers
- Breakdown barriers to reform...organization, culture, policies, legislative