There are many unsung heroes that make help the Council of Logistics Engineering Professionals operate, function, and progress. These include the Board of Officers and the Advisory Committee of CLEP listed on the front page of this newsletter. All of these officers serve as volunteers to help further the objectives of our organization. And since CLEP has no paid staff, many of these individuals work extra hours to ensure the success of CLEP.

I would like to explain how our Advisory Committee helps to provide service to the CLEP leadership and our members. To aid in understanding this I’ve extracted the pertinent paragraphs from our Operations Manual and have included this information below:

4.2.1 An Advisor to the Council of Logistics Engineering Professionals (CLEP) serves on the CLEP Advisory Committee at the will of the President of CLEP and advises the CLEP Board of Officers (BoO) with regard to new trends within both government and industry and how the CLEP Board of Officers should tailor their programs to better serve the members of CLEP. After the election of a new President of CLEP, the new President shall designate any number of Board Advisors to serve on the Board of Officers and to serve at the same term as the new President plus one year. Once the President of CLEP has selected the proposed Advisors to the Board of Officers, the Board of Officers must approve the slate of Advisors by a simple majority. Members of the Advisory Committee serve in an advisory capacity only and are not elected to office and, therefore, shall have no voting rights on the BoO.

4.2.2 Members of the Advisory Committee provide guidance, recommendations and counsel to the BoO of CLEP. The Advisory Committee may provide guidance to the BoO, when asked by the BoO, on topics relating to technical programs for upcoming symposia and events and suggested speakers for upcoming symposia and events. The Advisory Committee might also be tasked by the BoO to assist the BoO, to advise the BoO on issues of continuity of

Meeting Minutes from the Board of Officers Meeting Report – October 29, 2009

1. The meeting was held by a telephone conference call on Thursday, 29 October 2009 with a call to order by the President at 7:05 PM, Eastern Time.

2. Roll Call:
   Present:
   • Jim Martin, President
   • Vic Poillucci, VP Administration
   • Mike Connor, VP Membership
   • Dan DiDomineco, VP Communications
   • Pat Dallosta, Interim VP Education
   • Ralph Harper, Advisory Committee
   • Bob Stein, Advisory Committee
   • Jan Hall, Advisory Committee

3. Motion made and seconded to accept the September Meeting Minutes as amended – motion carried.

4. Outstanding action items from the past meeting - None.

5. Report from Officers
   • President, Jim Martin
Keel laid for newest Navy aircraft carrier

Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding and the Navy marked the keel-laying of the newest aircraft carrier Friday in ceremonies at Newport News, Va. The ship is named after Gerald R. Ford, the 38th U.S. president. Ford’s daughter, Susan Ford Bales, is the ship’s sponsor and authenticated the keel when her initials were welded onto a metal plate.

The carrier, numbered CVN 78, represents the first new carrier design since the 1960s. The ship will have a smaller crew than previous flattops and incorporate new technologies, including an Electro-Magnetic Aircraft Launching System, advanced arresting gear and dual-band radar.

The new ship should join the fleet in 2015.

LMP moves AMC into the 21st century

By Felicia Thompson, AMC Public Affairs

The U.S. Army Materiel Command is bringing its logistics data collection system into the 21st century with the use of an Enterprise Resource Planning tool. The ERP tool, better known as the Logistics Modernization Program, will modernize the Army’s national logistics business practice and supporting technology to meet current and future military readiness requirements. It is the cornerstone for the Single Army Logistics Enterprise and is the first step to enabling end-to-end supply chain visibility for AMC, its depots, industry partners, and the warfighter.

“LMP will let everyone see the same data at the same time,” said Cathy Dickens, Army Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command project manager and integrator for LMP. “[AMC] is the Army’s sustainer, and as the Army’s sustainer, it is very important to have the accuracy and visibility of our entire inventory and costs. This integrated system will allow us to look across all the disciplines AMC is responsible for: procurement, logistics, industrial base operations, budget, and finance in one single system.”

When LMP is fully implemented across AMC, it will eliminate 2,200 unique bridges associated with legacy systems, and enable communications across the enterprise. With multiple instances of data, it made it difficult to accurately forecast requirements and identify available inventory across the enterprise. “It affects our bottom line,” Dickens said. “Full accountability of our inventory or documenting actual costs is very difficult because our systems are not fully integrated; so many times we are looking at different data. We expend a lot of resources to reconcile these differences because we are not in sync.” she said.

Dickens states that with LMP, AMC will reduce redundant and stovepipe IT investments and move Logistic support into the future.

“LMP is the Army’s solution for modernizing AMC’s 30-year-old legacy

See LMP on page 12
Challenges For The Future.

The “Logistics Engineer” – An Extended Vision With Some Additional Challenges For The Future.

Benjamin S. Blanchard is Professor of Engineering-Emeritus at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and a consultant in such fields as systems engineering, reliability and maintainability, maintenance and logistics support, and life-cycle costing. He has authored four textbooks (System Engineering Management, Logistics Engineering And Management, Engineering Organization And Management, and Design And Manage To Life-Cycle Cost), and has co-authored four additional texts (Systems Engineering And Analysis, Maintainability: A Key To Effective Serviceability And Maintenance, Life-Cycle Cost And Economic Analysis, and Maintainability Principles And Practices). Additionally, he has published numerous journal articles and has lectured extensively throughout North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia.

Professor Blanchard is a Charter Member and Past-President of the Society of Logistics Engineers. He is also a Fellow, Certified Professional Logistician, and has served as newsletter editor, and member of the Board of Advisors of SOLE. Ben is a member of the Council of Logistics Engineering Professionals and is currently serving as a member of our Advisory Committee where he has provided valuable leadership and guidance to CLEP and to the Board of Officers.

In recent issues of the CLEP Newsletter, there has been a very interesting dialogue on the subject of “Logistics Engineering” and, more specifically, the responsibilities and activities of a “Logistics Engineer.” Most of the emphasis has, of course, related to the design and development of a logistic support capability for a given system. In some instances, those elements of support have been subdivided into the (1) logistics associated primarily with defense systems (e.g., spares and repair parts, test and support equipment, transportation, maintenance facilities, and so on), and (2) the logistics associate with commercial supply chains and supply chain management (e.g., the business aspects of purchasing and procurement, transportation and distribution, warehousing, data and information, and the like). Further, these various facets of logistics have usually been viewed as independent entities, and not within the context of a higher-level “system,” or ultimately as part of a “system-of-systems (SOS)” network or configuration.

As we progress further in the development of our profession of logistics engineering, I would like to believe that we could enhance our overall “cause” considerably through a slight change in thinking and, hence, our on-the-job approach in the performance of our day-to-day activities and tasks. Perhaps, we might consider addressing the following steps as a start pertaining not only to our own day-to-day practices but in the promotion of same to others in related fields and in management:

1. **Breakdown the perceived barriers between what has been categorized as “defense logistics” and “commercial or business logistics.”** It is acknowledged that the two different spectrums of logistics activity have evolved from different sectors and with slightly different objectives in mind. On the “commercial” side, the functions of logistics have included the various aspects of physical supply, manufacturing and materials flow, and physical distribution. Recently, the emphasis has been on the supply chain (SC) and supply chain management (SCM) activities, to include all of the above along with more concentration on business processes, funds (money) flow, and information technology. Whereas on the “defense” side of the spectrum, the functions of logistics have dealt primarily with all of the “downstream” aspects of system maintenance and support; i.e., the development and acquisition of spares and repair parts, test and support equipment, maintenance software, maintenance personnel and training, maintenance facilities, data and technical documentation, and so on. While there are design, acquisition, and follow-on support-related functions required in this area, the emphasis has been pretty much relegated to the later and downstream segments of the system life cycle.

An objective for the future is to view these various facets of logistics as an “integrated package” and from a total systems “life-cycle” perspective. Regardless of the type of system, whether a military aircraft, a cargo-handling ship, or a community healthcare capability, there are logistics activities pertaining to SC and SCM functions, system maintenance and support requirements, materials recycling and disposal activities, and so on. Further, there are logistics requirements in each and every phase of the system life cycle, commencing from the initial definition of system requirements in conceptual design, through detailed design and development, manufacturing and production, transportation and distribution, system operation and support, and system retirement and material recycling and/or disposal. Thus, logistics (to include all of the defense and commercial aspects mentioned above) must be “integrated” and total “life-cycle” oriented.

2. **Logistics, as an integrated package, must be addressed as a major “subsystem” and as part of a higher-level “system.”** A “system” comprises a complex combination of resources (in the form of human beings, materials, equipment, software, facilities, data, information, consumables, services, etc.)

Continued on Page 5
MARK YOUR CALENDAR AND SAVE THE DATE

The Council of Logistics Engineering Professionals
In Cooperation With
US Army Materiel Command
Logistics Support Activity
Presents

The
2010 Life Cycle Logistics Tools Workshop and Users Group

March 8 - 11, 2010
Von Braun Center – North Hall
700 Monroe Street - Huntsville, Alabama

Get the latest information on life cycle logistics decision support tools, emerging logistics support concepts, policies and lessons learned.

Users Group Training and Workshop Sessions for:
- Systems Planning and Requirements System (SYSPARS)
- PowerLog-J Logistics Data Support System
- Post Fielding Support Analysis tools (PFSA)
- Computerized Optimization Model for Predicting and Analyzing Support Structures (COMPASS/COMPASS-Lite)
- Cost Analysis Strategy Assessment (CASA)
... and more

Visit WWW.LOGISTICSENGINEERS.ORG for Registration and More Symposium Details
The “Logistics Engineer” – continued from page 3

integrated in such a manner as to fulfill some designated need. It is mission-oriented, contained in some form of hierarchy, and may be broken down into “subsystems.” A system must have a purpose; it must be functional; able to respond to some identified need; and able to achieve its overall objective in a cost-effective manner. The integrated logistic support package, to which we have been referring, is not a system per se as it doesn’t stand alone as a single individual functional entity, but constitutes a major “subsystem” of some higher-level system. Additionally, this higher-level system may be a part of an even higher-level “system-of-systems (SOS)” configuration.

In the design and development of systems, decisions pertaining to the design of the prime mission-related elements of a system (e.g., operational equipment, operational software, operating facilities, etc.) obviously have a great impact on the design of the ultimate logistics support infrastructure. Conversely, the design of the logistics infrastructure can have a definite impact, either positively or negatively, on the design of the prime system elements. The interaction effects among the many different subsystems (of a given system) can be significant. Thus, the design of a system (to include all of its subsystems) must be accomplished on a concurrent basis and as a total integrated package.

From a logistics “engineering” perspective, the Logistics Engineer must be directly involved both -- (1) in the design of the prime mission-related elements of the system, in terms of “design for supportability”, and (2) in the design of the logistic support infrastructure to ensure that it effectively and efficiently supports the prime elements of the system. Further, the Logistics Engineer must participate in the design process from the beginning, and not wait until design of the prime system elements is already “frozen.”

3. The Logistics Engineer, to be effective, must be knowledgeable of the entire system design process and utilization of the appropriate design methods, models, and tools. The Logistics Engineer of the future, in order to be effective in influencing all aspects of total system design, must be an integral part of the system design team from the beginning. He/she must thoroughly understand the design process, be technically competent, respected and able to communicate with other members of the design community, be familiar with some of the more common design tools/methods/models being utilized in the design, and so on. For example, familiarity with the use and benefits of Computer-Aided Design (CAD) modeling and selected simulation methods may be beneficial in attempting to “sell” a supportability design concept in the early stages of system design.

In the past, the efforts and activities of the Logistics Engineer have been primarily limited only to the logistics support infrastructure as a “subsystem” for some major higher-level system, and such activities have been too late in the system life cycle in order to really have an impact on total system design from an overall supportability perspective. However, past experience has indicated that it is at the early stages of design (i.e., during the early conceptual design and preliminary system design phases) when one can have the greatest overall impact on the ultimate design configuration later on. While the Logistics Engineer of the past has been very effective in influencing the design of a given logistics support infrastructure, an objective for the future is for this same individual to become involved in the design process for the beginning. It is at these early stages of system design when the Logistics Engineer must first become involved.

In summary, my purpose herein is not intended to be discouraging, or negative, in any respect. The intent is to suggest several areas (and perhaps some challenges ahead) where we may wish to extend our thinking and span of activity, with the goal of improving our on-the-job effectiveness in practicing what we refer to as “Logistics Engineering.” A major objective ahead is to influence the overall design engineering community to accept logistics engineering (and the practicing “Logistics Engineer”) on an equal and concurrent part of the early system design process. If we are to further promote the “engineering” aspects of logistics, we need to step up to the challenges ahead. Good luck in this endeavor.

Ben S. Blanchard

Amateurs worry about strategy.
Dilettantes worry about tactics.
Professionals worry about logistics.

Unknown
The Importance of Mentors in the Military
By: Command Sergeant Major Jeffrey Mellinger, U.S. Army Materiel Command

Editor’s Comments –
Just a few years ago, several logisticians got together to discuss forming a new organization that would be focused on the science of Logistics Engineering. As we thrashed our way forward, a constant purpose for this new organization began to be repeated. From that, our mission statement for The Council of Logistics Engineering Professionals evolved. It was apparent to all present that our primary purpose, our mission, would be to mentor, educate, share knowledge and ideas and to advance the profession of logistics engineering with its members and throughout the logistics community and to disseminate the interdisciplinary principles of logistics supportability to industry and government.

Early in my career, I was fortunate to have a colleague who was willing to take me under his wing and “show me the ropes”, so to speak, regarding logistics engineering. He was my Mentor. I learned a lot from my old friend, and I try to pass along those things learned many years ago to young logisticians coming along today.

The need for mentorship is as important in our profession today as ever. Though a person can gain much knowledge from college and personal studies, there are just some things that must be learned from a great mentor.

The following article, written by the Command Sergeant Major at US Army Materiel Command, explains the need for mentorship today. Though he is speaking about the need for mentorship in the military, it is also relevant to our roles as logisticians in our community.

No matter how smart or accomplished we think we are, every one of us needs a mentor. None of us can make our way through this world without the advice, coaching or example of others. In Greek mythology, Mentor was Odysseus’ trusted counselor. Today, mentors are known as really wise counselors or advisors, and are sorely lacking in the Army today. The fact is that many leaders fail to knowingly, regularly and thoughtfully mentor others, and if they would only listen, they’d hear those needing it most asking for mentoring in so many ways.

Mentoring is not about hanging onto the coattails of a successful person, or trying to gain wisdom or status through osmosis, or dragging along promising subordinates. Neither is it hoping that by standing in someone else’s limelight you can get the light to shine on you. It is about taking and giving advice and wise counsel, about taking the time to share ideas and experiences with others. It is simply part of one of the basic military leadership responsibilities—taking care of soldiers.

There is no substitute for experience and time, or the knowledge, foresight and wisdom gained through trial and error or pain and mistakes. Mentoring provides beacons and checkpoints, provoking and stimulating thoughts and ideas, vision and goals, as well as azimuth adjustments, all in an effort to steer and guide. Each of us as citizens, soldiers and leaders has a responsibility to serve as a guidepost—directly or through example—for those around us. As soldiers, we carry cards and tags printed with the core principles necessary for us to provide our example—the Army Values. Army Values provide a basic guide for how we should conduct ourselves, but they do not charge us with passing anything to fellow soldiers or fellow man.

Mentoring is occasionally provided to general officers through Graybeards, or retired general officers. These wells of knowledge are brought in periodically and assigned to mentor and coach a specific officer performing a specific task. What a brilliant program. But what about the other 99 percent of the Army family? What about the colonels, captains, lieutenants, sergeants major, first sergeants, sergeants and privates? Who mentors them? What about our civilian work force? Don’t they need to learn and grow? What about our children? Yes, the children, but why? In a word—Columbine. We often say our soldiers are reflections of their society, so shouldn’t we have a hand in that society as well?

As we think back on our lives and careers, each of us can recall and share stories of those people who unwittingly left their mark on us. Every sergeant major can name and relate tales of their drill sergeants. Every general officer can tell you about their first platoon sergeant or company commander (CSA GEN Eric Shinseki surely remembered Ernie Kincaid). We can all remember a favorite caring, demanding teacher or coach. Many of us have a mentor whom we call on for advice, guidance or simply to sound out our latest brilliant idea. We all need a mentor or we are doomed to muddle and flounder our way through mistakes that others have made.

Serving as a mentor is one of the easiest things you can do as a leader. All it takes is that you demonstrate care and concern for the well-being and development of others. Getting involved with the future of those who will follow you is the surest way to know your own efforts will not be in vain, and that the legacy you’ve inherited will pass to succeeding generations. Tomorrow’s Chief of Staff of the Army is in an NCO education or commissioning program right now; a future command sergeant major is in AIT or struggling through a COIN lane; and the AIDS vaccine discoverer is in a recruiter’s office. We cannot afford to neglect the development and growth of a single soldier.

Where should you start? Start first with those immediately around you—your fellows and
Mentorship -- Continued from Page 6

subordinates. Make yourself available to them, and set an atmosphere conducive to frank discussions and open dialogue. Care enough to spend your most valuable resource—time. Our young leaders and soldiers are starved for your attention, guidance and counsel. And, quite frankly, they need to know that you care.

In a recent survey, young officers were asked what made them decide to make the Army a career, and the answer was often that they received frequent feedback and guidance from their senior NCOs and company and battalion commanders. So what difference could that possibly make? Well, these young officers (like all of us) need to know that what they are doing is important, that they matter to the Army (us) need to know that what they are doing is important, that they matter to the Army

What should you do to be an effective mentor? As I’ve stated, be there when your soldiers need you. Don’t be a leader who stands around watching things happen. Care more about your soldiers than yourself and your personal goals. Be the leader who injects guidance at the proper moment, who makes corrections before catastrophe or failure strikes. Be the leader who soldiers can come to for advice or simply to air concerns. Be the leader who leads, not pushes, but always prepared to take corrective action when standards aren’t being met or corners are being cut.

If we aren’t careful, we will create a generation of leaders who do not know how to lead, care and train. We must make a change, and that change can come through a strong, positive mentoring program. We have to show the future SMA and CSA, through our own example, how to truly care for soldiers and their training, growth and development.

COL Nick Rowe, a prisoner of war during the Vietnam War, often related a lesson from his first team sergeant who, with a piece of string, asked Rowe to push the string anywhere. Of course, the string didn’t go far or where Rowe wanted it to. He then told Rowe to grab the string and pull, and see if it didn’t go anywhere Rowe led it. This was a great lesson in leadership, but is also applicable to mentoring. You, too, can get your soldiers to go anywhere you coach, train, lead and mentor them.

So get out there, get your hands dirty, put your hat on the back of your head (figuratively), and talk to your soldiers and leaders. You can make a bigger difference. Teach your soldiers to think, not what to think. Teach them to act with foresight, purpose and vision, not react after the world has passed them by. Be a mentor.

New Riverine Boats Are Fast, Lethal, Flexible

By Andrew Scutro - Staff writer, Navy Times (www.navytimes.com)

If the Stryker armored combat vehicle were a boat, it might be the CB90, a Swedish-designed shallow-water vessel that’s fast, lethal and flexible enough to be an ambulance or a fast-attack craft.

The Navy has decided to buy two of the boats, now known in certain Navy circles as the Riverine Command Boat, for use by the newest incarnation of the brown-water navy, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command’s riverine group.

Already in use with navies around the world, the CB90 originally was a product of the Swedish boatmaker Dockstavarvet. SAFE Boats, based in Washington state, bought the licenses required to build the same boat for the Navy. There are more than 240 in use around the world, from Malaysia to Greece.

“The Mexican navy has about 60 of them. Brazil has a bunch, the Swedish navy, Norway,” company spokesman Bryan Wood said. “The [U.S.] Navy expressed an interest, but because it was built in Sweden, they couldn’t buy it.”

Now the Navy can.

Navy officials got a good look at the RCB in June during an annual conference on small combatant craft at Little Creek, Va. The Navy wants to buy the demonstrator on display at the show for about $2 million, Wood said. It also has contracted SAFE Boat to build a second boat to specific requirements for about $2.8 million.

The first boat is already in Norfolk, Va., Wood said, and the second should be delivered by June.

“We’ve got the contract and we’re ramping up production right now,” he said. “But the Navy might ask for an earlier delivery.”

Flexible force

Depending on the mission, the Riverine Command Boat can bristle with weapons from six different mounts. It has a remote-controlled weapon mount for a .50-caliber machine gun — or other weapon — on a mast behind the cockpit. It will also have a twin weapon mount on the bow that is controlled from the cockpit, as well as four mounts for crew-served weapons elsewhere on the boat. The mounts include electrical power supply to allow the use of mini-guns.

Continued on Page 8
Riverine Boats

The RCB is designed for maximum adaptability. It has an airy, aircraft-style cockpit with two operator seats and a middle jump seat that swings into and out of place. It has a head just below the cockpit divided by a passageway that leads to a bow ramp, so troops can be put ashore quickly.

The bow and hull are heavily reinforced so operators can run the boat up on a rocky stretch of beach to disembark riders without worry, Wood said.

“There are not many environments it can’t pull into and away from,” he said. “That’s one of the things the Navy found desirable, that it’s capable and proven.”

Although the vessel is built on metric measurements, it measures about 49 feet long and more than 12 feet wide. Powered by Swedish-built Scania engines, it has a Rolls-Royce jet-propulsion system that allows speeds of more than 43 knots. Meant to operate in rivers and other shallow waterways, it has a three-foot draft.

While the Navy declined to offer details on how or where the RCB will operate in the near future, a Navy official at the Pentagon said in a written statement that the boats are intended for use in the command role.

“The initial craft being procured will be used to develop RCB tactics, techniques and procedures before becoming a fully operational and deployable capability, and may, in the future, be used as a test platform for capability enhancements,” the official wrote.

Depending on the mission, it can bristle with weapons from six different mounts. Wood said the boat on order has a remote-controlled weapon mount for a .50-caliber machine gun — or other weapon — on a mast behind the cockpit. It will also have a twin weapon mount on the bow that is controlled from the cockpit, as well as four mounts for crew-served weapons elsewhere on the boat. The mounts include electrical power supply to allow the use of mini-guns.

The ship has cabin space that can be configured to carry more than 20 troops or serve as a floating command post with extra communication gear.

The space also allows rigging as a dive boat with portable hyperbaric chamber, or strictly as a gunboat with options to mount machine guns, grenade launchers, a mortar tube and Hellfire missiles.

It has been used in other navies as an ambulance. It can also be rigged for extended voyages with racks and a galley. The Swedish navy loads its boats in the well deck of amphibious warfare ships, although the RCB is not meant for long sea transits.

“It doesn’t have the range, but it can be an open-water boat,” Wood said.

Improved SURCs

Easily identifiable by the round flotation collars that wrap around the hulls of their boats, SAFE Boat products are already familiar to the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. SAFE Boats makes the Small Unit Riverine Craft that the Marine Corps used for years and has turned over to the Navy’s riverine units operating in Iraq. It also makes the Defender-class patrol boat in use by the Coast Guard.

Once the Navy took over the riverine mission, several upgrades were made to the SURCs — now called Riverine Patrol Boats — that had seen so much use from the Marines. The Navy replaced bolt-on Humvee armor with a lighter material, wired up electrical power supply at the gun mounts and improved the optics and communication equipment.

“They’re built more around night operations,” Wood said.

The Navy has about 24 of the improved SURCs and has orders with SAFE Boats to buy more RPBs.

“The Navy will eventually procure a total of 18 Riverine Patrol Boats that will initially complement and eventually replace most of the SURCs transferred to the Navy by the Marine Corps,” according to the Navy official.

The new RCB has stirred up a lot of interest in the Navy, Wood said — both from the new conventional riverine force, the naval special warfare community and surface warfare operators.

But some aspects of the new boat will be kept under wraps.

“We can’t say everything we want to say, because the Navy doesn’t want us to,” he said.
Achieving The Defense Logistics Enterprise

2009: Improving Performance; Extending The Enterprise; Retrograde and Refit; Supply Chain Synchronicity

- How can we better measure and improve every aspect of logistics performance?
- Capitalizing on the strength and expertise of our industrial base to extend the logistics enterprise even further
- Ensuring that equipment in Iraq is speedily and thoroughly redeployed in Afghanistan or other arenas that our troops need.
- What does the next level of inter service synchronicity look like. Find out how to do it, who is doing it, and what it takes!

In addition to the most senior cross-service logisticians, Defense Logistics is also your most cost-effective training option. We've created a specialized program to deliver you the most relevant content over 4 full days. This is your time to benchmark yourself against other services and commands, network with logistics leaders across the DoD and set your tactical priorities for the year to come:

**Synchronized Supply Chain Day:** Tuesday, December 1st
This day focuses on the end-to-end integration & synchronization of supply chain processes and systems to enable increased visibility and support to the Warfighter.

**PBL/SCOR® Model Workshop: Tuesday, December 1st (1-4pm)**
Brand new to the program, this three hour workshop examines the current opportunities associated with the development and implementation of PBLs.

**Two Day Main Conference Program:** Wednesday-Thursday, December 2nd-3rd
Featuring topics that are critical to achieving better support to the Warfighter.

**PBL, Maintenance & Sustainment Day:** Friday, December 4th
The new administration has renewed the impetus behind Performance Based Logistics. Find out how PBL’s are redefining and reshaping the way military-industry partnerships and defense contracts are structured.

A WBR Event
Mr. Martin discussed the presentation he had made on 22 October to the RAMS Board of Directors and that a decision to accept CLEP as a sponsor had been deferred until January 2010. The President thanked all who played an active role in preparing for the presentation especially Roy Beauchamp and Pat Dallosta.

In his absence the President spoke on behalf of Ben Blanchard and shared concerns regarding the questionnaires and progress made on the Organizational Capability Model: Logistics Engineering (OCM-LE).

- Immediate Past President and VP Programs, Bill Horne
  - In his absence the President spoke on behalf of Mr. Horne and reported that a check for a partial payment had been forwarded to the VonBraun Civic Center as a deposit for the upcoming LOGSA Conference scheduled for March 8th through the 11th in Huntsville, AL.

- The President also reported that CLEP had been incorporated in Virginia as a Non-Profit corporation. Filing with the IRS as a 501 (c)(3) Non-Profit Organization is in process.

- Following the LOGSA Conference in March 2010 the President has scheduled the Annual CLEP Meeting in Huntsville with dial-in capability for those unable to attend.
  - VP Admin, Vic Poillucci – No report
  - VP Operations, Lin Hallen – No report
  - VP Finance, BJ Silvey
    - In his absence, the President reported on behalf of Mr. Silvey who reported a balance of $15,969 in the CLEP account.
  - VP Membership, Mike Connor
    - Mr. Connor reported that letters had been mailed thanking members for their renewal and reminding those who hadn’t renewed that they needed to do so. Mr. Connor has completed his move to the Huntsville area and has requested that the membership materials be forwarded to him from Mr. Martin’s office.

- VP Communications, Dan DiDomenico
  - Mr. DiDominico reported that he continues to work on the Membership Data Base and is in the process of integrating various data elements.

- Interim VP Education, Pat Dallosta
  - As Mr. Osborne reported at the last meeting, he was resigning his position on the BoO due to personal reasons. The President nominated Mr. Pat Dallosta as an interim replacement. The motion was put forward to recommend that the Board appoint Mr. Dallosta to this position. The motion as seconded and voted upon with ayes carrying.
  - Mr. Dallosta discussed some ideas associated with the CLEP website.

- Webmaster, Stephen Rodock – No report

6. Status on Sections:
  - San Diego Section
  - Space Coast Section – Ms. Hall discussed a recent meeting held in Coco Beach.
  - National Capital Section
  - Phoenix Section - Mr. Martin reported that Mr. Jensen, Chair, will conduct his first formal meeting next month.
  - Huntsville Section – Planning is taking place for this section.

7. Other Business:
  - Mr. Martin provided some details regarding General Beauchamp’s trip to China and interest their in forming a CLEP Section. Training opportunities in China were also briefly discussed.
  - Dr. Stein discussed the interest of some colleagues in CLEP and their dissatisfaction with other organizations. He will be forwarding additional information on the them.

8. Actions:
  - As the President of CLEP, Mr. Martin took an action to send a letter to the RMS Partnership regarding the finalization of CLEP incorporation.
  - All officers were asked to review their areas for any updates needed based on the change in affiliation with the RMS Partnership. This includes the website, membership material, promotional materials, etc.

9. Adjournment:
  - The meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM EST.
Performance-Based Logistics
By A. Vic Poillucci, Vice President-Administration, CLEP

Background:
In September 2001 the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) mandated the implementation of Performance-Based Logistics (PBL) with the primary goals of increasing product availability and reliability at a reduced cost. In addition, several other benefits such as: defining and optimizing the sustainment infrastructure, influencing system design, optimizing system readiness, reducing the logistics footprint and reducing cycle times have been identified as by-products as a result of implementing PBL.

Discussion:
PBL has been accepted by most Program Managers involved in the Acquisition process as an innovative and effective way of acquiring product support for major weapons systems and subsystems. The techniques for implementing PBL, however, continue to evolve, particularly for the early stages of major acquisitions. In spite of those evolutionary delays, Services within the Department of Defense are experiencing tremendous success. Programs such as: the Navy’s F/A-18 aircraft, the ARC-210 radio the F-14 LANTIRN (aircraft has since been retired); the Army’s Abrams Tank System and the Improved Target Acquisition System are examples. Within acquisition agencies across all Services, the Program Manager is responsible for Total Life Cycle Management for systems and subsystems for which he has cognizance. To that end the PM must work with the war fighter, on the one hand - for whom he purchases systems, subsystems to fight and win wars – and on the other, his Product Support Integrator (PSI) who is charged with the responsibility for oversight and execution of those very same systems and subsystems.

Challenges:
The core challenges facing logisticians and directors of sustainment in both the DoD and Industry include (to name a few):

- A lack of policy guidance from the DoD and the Services reflecting a clear path to PBL implementation
- Difficulties in complying to Title 10 and the 50-50 rule while minimizing the repair times
- Getting senior leadership on the Industry side to engage in PBL despite the risks
- Engaging 3rd and 4th tier suppliers/vendors to become involved in the PBL process
- Bridging the communication gap between the logistics community and the acquisition community

Summary:
Performance Based Logistics has become one of the Defense Industry’s key strategies to extend the lifespan and improve the reliability of today’s defense systems. Increased deployments and shifting acquisition budgets are driving logisticians to minimize system downtimes and improve war-fighter support using innovative PBL approaches.

From the President - Continued from page 2

leadership and the activities of CLEP. An Advisory Committee Member may be asked, and designated, by the CLEP President to serve as the chair of a special committee or to assist the BoO in coordinating a CLEP symposia, activity or event.

4.2.3 Board Advisors could be made up of past office holders (or exceptionally qualified individuals with a simple majority approval of the board) and do so on a voluntary basis.

Note that the complete CLEP Operations Manual from which the above paragraphs were extracted is on our website at http://www.logisticsengineers.org under "About CLEP", select "Overview" and "Operations Manual".

Some of the specific ways Advisors assist the BoO include the following:

- Provide advice to the CLEP Board of Officers as indicated above. This advice is solicited anytime an advisor sees something that we as officers can do to improve the organization. The Advisors are asked to let the BoO know informally or formally anytime they see and area where we can improve. The BoO may also ask for guidance or advice as indicated above.
- The Advisors are also asked to support our monthly CLEP Officers Meetings when they are available. These meetings are normally held via teleconference although occasionally we try to meet face-to-face. Attendance at these meetings is optional for the Advisors however we find they provide insight and guidance that helps our organization. During these meetings the Advisors are invited to offer input and advice at any time or just listen.
- Our Advisors are also asked to occasionally volunteer to take on an action item.
- Our newsletter editor, Bill Horne, is always looking for good articles. Advisors are asked to provide articles to Mr. Horne that would be of interest to our members.
- As mentioned above, the Advisors are also encouraged to provide help related to technical programs for upcoming symposia and events and suggested speakers for these events.

I appreciate that I as the President of CLEP and as a member of the CLEP Board of Officers that I have the support and advice of the great individuals that make up our Advisory Committee. Those currently on the Committee in the following:

Prof. Ben Blanchard, CPL
Ms. Janlyn Hall
BG (Ret) Robert Stein, USAF
Mr. James V. Jones
LTG (Ret) Roy Beauchamp, USA
Mr. Lou Sciaroni, CPL
Dr. Ralph L Harper, Jr.

Next month I will tell you a little about each of the members of our Advisory Committee and the specific CLEP activities they are supporting.

James L. Martin, C.P.L.
President
LMP - Continued from Page 2

logistics systems (Command Commodity Standard System and the Standard Depot System). The solution is SAP, a commercial-based software system that provides uniformity and accuracy of data. It will enable AMC, its depots and industry partners to operate in the same system. It provides improved forecasting tools to support the warfighter and provides our depots a material and capacity requirements planning capability. It’s very exciting to know that we will have this additional power and capability that we never had before,” she said.

Dickens explains that instituting LMP will take a systematic approach and have long-range benefits.

“As SALE is realized, it will provide an enterprise view and make sure we have full accountability from a cost and inventory perspective,” Dickens said. Utilization of a commercial product like SAP will help the Army to leverage industry best business practices and continue to take advantage of both emerging technology and business practices,” she said.

AMC’s CECOM Life Cycle Management Command and Tobyhanna Army Depot and its industry partners are already users of LMP. “CECOM and Tobyhanna were first to deploy LMP in 2003. Now, it’s our turn and our transition is scheduled for deployment in May. The Defense Logistics Agency. Navy, NASA and prime contractors such as Raytheon and Northrop Grumman -- are utilizing SAP,” Dickens said. “They are already managing their supply chains with SAP. The future will allow AMC an ability to integrate with our partners, further improving the capabilities, visibility and processes that support the warfighter. The enterprise data will be available through a single warehouse, the Army Enterprise System Integration Program, or the data exchange piece.

“Through this tool, partners such as DLA will have improved visibility of Army depots and we will see their inventory, allowing immediate feedback on supporting the demand. The Soldier will know what AMCOM has by way of inventory, know whether their requisition is being released and on its way. It will all be instantaneous in one system,” she continued.

The transformation process to LMP from the old legacy systems appears to be a win-win systems for all involved.

“The change will have a major impact on the civilian staff,” Dickens said. “AMC employees will become well versed in enterprise resource planning that is widely used by industry. It will give them a very marketable skill. Standardizing our processes and providing an enterprise view means employees can quickly support any weapon system within the AMC supply chain at the different LCMCs. They will see all of AMC’s data and inventory and will be better able to forecast warfighters’ requirements to meet their needs,” she continued.

“When we initially deploy LMP, we will learn that the system is only the beginning of the journey and will actually discover the power of the system over the next three to five years,” Dickens said.

AMC’s TACOM Life Cycle Management Command and Joint Munitions Command are slated to complete the LMP transition in 2011.

USS Makin Island Sailors celebrate new Logistics Specialist Rating

By Mass Communication Specialist Seaman Christopher Fairbanks, USS Makin Island (LHD8) Public Affairs

ON BOARD USS MAKIN ISLAND (LHD 8) AT NAVAL AIR STATION NORTH ISLAND, Calif.

U.S. Navy Postal Clerks (PCs) and Storekeepers (SKs) onboard Makin Island had the unique opportunity to observe the Navy-wide merger of their rates into the new Logistics Specialist (LS) rating during a ceremony held onboard Makin Island on October 1st.

On hand for the historic event was Rear Adm. Michael J. Lyden, Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command.

“Today is a special day for more than 10,000 Sailors as we celebrate the history and heritage of the SKs and PCs, and usher in a new era in our Navy by establishing the LS rating,” said Cmdr. David Shealy, Makin Island’s Supply Officer. “We begin a new history of support to the fleet and our sister services.”

The merger was officially approved on Nov. 17, 2008 by Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Gary Roughead. Since then, a new rating manual, mobile training teams, and online training programs were developed to educate PCs and SKs in their new roles as LSs.

“We can see there’s excitement here today,” said Lyden. “I’m excited to recognize this significant milestone for our supply enlisted Sailors who today take a major step in shaping our future force so that the supply enlisted community can face the challenges of tomorrow’s Navy.”
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The transformation process to LMP from the old legacy systems appears to be a win-win situation for all involved.

“The change will have a major impact on the civilian staff,” Dickens said. “AMC employees will become well versed in enterprise resource planning that is widely used by industry. It will give them a very marketable skill. Standardizing our processes and providing an enterprise view means employees can quickly support any weapon system within the AMC supply chain at the different LCMCs. They will see all of AMC’s data and inventory and will be better able to forecast warfighters’ requirements to meet their needs,” she continued.

“When we initially deploy LMP, we will learn that the system is only the beginning of the journey and will actually discover the power of the system over the next three to five years,” Dickens said.

AMC’s TACOM Life Cycle Management Command and Joint Munitions Command are slated to complete the LMP transition in 2011.
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and accurate combat effects as a part of the joint fight. This is why weapons officers are so important to the Air Force."

Every six months, the school produces a new class of expert instructors on weapons, weapons systems and air and space integration. Upon completing the course, graduates return to their home stations, taking the latest tactics, techniques and procedures for air-to-air and air-to-ground combat to their respective units. "On average, our instructor aircrew members have nearly 200 combat hours each, and our space, command and control, and intelligence instructors have directed or supported combat operations in every contingency since the Cold War ended," said Col. Scott Kindsvater, Air Force Weapons School commandant.

The U.S. Air Force Weapons School graduated 96 officers, including members of the Air Force's first unmanned aircraft systems and F-22 Raptor validation courses, during a ceremony at the Flamingo Hotel June 13.

Comprised of 17 squadrons, the weapons school teaches graduate-level instructor courses that provide the world's most advanced training in weapons and tactics employment. "Our Air Force has been given responsibility for some of the world's most powerful weapons," said Gen. Robert Kehler, U.S. Air Force Space Command commander and keynote speaker. "It is our responsibility to employ these weapons to deliver precise combat effects as a part of the joint fight. This is why weapons officers are so important to the Air Force."

"True innovation comes not because of technological breakthroughs, but from people who execute, debrief and learn better ways to provide effects in flight," General Kehler said. "This requires critical thinkers with in-depth understanding to maximize weapon effectiveness. We provide real-time intelligence that allows warfighters to make quicker, more informed decisions."