Identification of Near-Term Savings Opportunities

Various savings opportunities were identified through the ABM effort. Those opportunities have been categorized into different areas according to the estimated time to implement and achieve the projected benefits. Accordingly, the GT ABM team chose the following categories for identified savings opportunities:

- **Near-term**- This type of opportunity can be defined as:
  - "Quick-hits", or those opportunities that are procedural in nature. This kind of opportunity generally requires only a decision to stop or modify certain activities within a process and is often non-regulatory in nature. In addition, this type of quick win is critical to success early in improvement initiatives.

    -OR-
  - "Short-term", or those opportunities that may require some minor software or hardware support, or a waiver to an existing regulation. The expected time frame for implementing a short-term opportunity is less than one year.
- **Long-term**- This category of opportunity is defined as requiring significant resources in terms of hardware or software or support; perhaps even a new set of applications. This type of opportunity will require significant investment of funds to attain the projected benefit in some cases. In other situations, it may require the rescission of an existing USMC regulation, or other action prior to making the recommended change.

The expected time frame for implementing a long-term opportunity would be longer than a year, and within a three-year period.

The ABMT concluded that the best implementation approach, given the level of change readiness we had assessed, was to get some wins on the board quickly. Discussion within the ABMT centered on a rapid proof of concept. Thus the "quick-hit" opportunities were targeted initially in order to provide momentum for the more complex and longer-term opportunities. The list of opportunities can be viewed in Appendices I-III, beginning from the initial brainstormed list of process improvements, through a weighted evaluation matrix, to a specific implementation action plan. Within this particular section, we will focus on nine initial pilot continuous process improvement efforts.

Identification Card Billet

This opportunity is one of those unique situations that happen when an organization is trying to do the right thing for its people. A WG-10 welder was occupying a billet for a GS-5 person due to a personnel redeployment effort. The individual was processing an average of three identification cards a day, costing $35K annually. Finding a way to reassign the individual to the area where he can contribute the most value to the organization freed up $31K of savings as the currently small workload was absorbed by other team members thus eliminating the need for one GS5 position. This opportunity required minimal analysis and was done immediately.

Secretarial Support

A PAT has been assigned to look into this opportunity. There appears to be potential savings via existing office personnel absorbing redundant activities, consolidating duties, or eliminating positions.

Recruit Uniform Fit

The image of a Marine in a perfectly tailored dress blue uniform with saber at present arms is a key component of the culture of the Marine Corps and has a tremendously positive impact on recruiting and morale. That standard is permanent and untouchable. Tradition and the regulation dictate a fitted uniform for Marines prior to their departure from MCRDPI. However, the regulation does not dictate how to accomplish the uniform fit.

What this opportunity is all about is the number of fittings that take place during the 13-week recruit boot camp period, now calculated at over three fittings per recruit. The first fitting currently takes place on days 20-21 of the training cycle. At this time, the physical transformation of the recruit is still undergoing significant change: some recruits are putting on weight due to consistent meals; many are dropping weight due to the exercise regimen. Approximately 70-80% of recruits return for a second fitting at POI training days 49 & 50, according to supply and services personnel. Third fittings and beyond (days 61 & 62) are required by about 10-15% of recruits after the Battalion Commander's inspection. A major factor driving the uniform fit process cost is the additional time needed to insure the female recruit uniforms are properly tailored. It should be noted that it takes approximately 33%

longer to fit the female recruit vs. the male recruit. MCRDPI is the only Recruiting Depot dealing with female recruit fittings.

The ABC model reflects the total cost for uniform fittings at $2.1M. Calculations provided by installation personnel performing this process indicate total fitting costs are $55 per male recruit and $198 per female recruit. Is this a reasonable cost? Perhaps, but what is necessary is to question the need for multiple fittings vs. doing it once (after the recruit physique is stabilized), and handling any minimal exceptions afterwards. A PAT is currently analyzing this opportunity and is working toward a single fit around the 8th week of the training schedule. Savings of $270K to $600K could be possible. The PAT should have an answer as to the projected savings in their final report to the CG on or about 18 August 2000.

Military Working Dogs

The use of war dogs and mascots in the Marine Corps is a time-honored tradition. The ABC model lists two activities relative to use of military working dogs within the Provost Marshal's Office (PMO):

- Patrol and Detection Dog Operations, defined as "building searches and perimeter patrols, scout searches, and detection of narcotics and explosives".
- Demonstrations of Military Working Dogs, defined as "military and community working dogs demonstrations".

The cost of these two activities totals $209K in the ABC Model. Since military pay and training represent 68% of this figure, only $66K may result in hard savings unless the Marines involved can be reassigned to more valuable duties. It appears that through coordination with the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), the entire function could be transferred there. The result could be a savings of $209K for MCRDPI, less the charge backs for utilizing the dogs on a loaned basis.

As stated above, most of the savings is in Military Personnel cost. However, some O&M monies can be realized. An activity identified in support of the dogs within MCCS, Provide Animal Treatment, consumes $170K of resources. Also, from discussions with I&L, we learned that planning for a new and improved kennel for the dogs on Parris Island would cost $ 225-240K. This new facility will require funding from O&M dollars assigned to MCRDPI.

This is a clear opportunity for regionalization of Military Working Dogs with MCAS combining activities. The result could be an improved process at a cost savings of $559K for MCRDPI. A PAT will be needed to assess the positive financial and intangible impacts of cost sharing the working dog function. It may make more sense to house the dogs on PI and charge back MCAS for loaned dogs.

Purchase Card

The Purchase Card system used by MCRDPI has been a move in the right direction. The use of the impact card has eliminated many small purchases, allowing the user to buy items up to $2500 without having to go through the formal procurement process. The impact card is used throughout the installation, and has generally been successful. However, as the process operates today, it has some extensive paperwork and budget control requirements.

The current system was established in 1998. The first step is to appoint an approving official, who cannot be a cardholder. This official is given the responsibility and a monthly money allotment to use in the functional area assigned. The cardholder is now appointed with a given spending authority, normally $2500 for a single purchase or within budgetary limitations. There is an exception: allowing purchases up to $50,000 per month from approved government sources, e.g., Industries for the Blind. Once these individuals are appointed, impact card purchasing can begin.

The procedural requirements for budget control are complicated. A requirement is identified using a Purchase Requirement Document (PRD) prepared by the requester. Once the Fund Administrator (FA) allocates the funds, a call is placed to a vendor for the order and the order is entered into a local database and is reserved in SABRS. When the item is received, it is accessed on the local database and receipt is acknowledged. Also, the FA expenses the document in SABRS.

Only recording actions are taken in various databases until vendor billing is received. Normally the billing comes monthly from the credit card bank. At this time the local database is accessed and reconciled with bank billing noting the items ordered for the period and date of billing. When liquidation is accomplished by DFAS, FA must track each document to ensure each order was reserved, obligated and expensed in the amount obligated. Once this process is completed, reports are furnished to the approving official for review and approval for all cardholders within his approving authority. At this time the Form 2035 (Summary of Accounting Data) is prepared using the various reconciled databases for the month and coordinated through Procurement.

The approving official must combine his (7 or less) cardholders' purchases and hand carry to Supply & Services, Procurement Division. The purchases are then distributed to the appropriate FA for SABRS input. Procurement provides a cursory review of the bills and consolidates up to 36 bills to a package and FedEx's to Kansas City, Mo., the Marine Corp paying office. It is interesting to note that Procurement enters all buy data into yet another database to track purchases by approving officials/cardholders.

The cost of Impact Card Purchases was not captured in the current ABC Model except for one organization. The activity in this organization, "Manage Credit Card Program", indicated that approximately $50,000 was expended purchasing approximately $32,000 in supplies, at a cost of approximately $1.50 for each dollar purchased. In future iterations of the ABC model, it is recommended that credit card purchases be captured as a stand-alone activity in the sustaining function of the model. Another organization estimated 90-95% of his/her time was spent working credit card purchases. This can be determined by employing an activity for cost associated with credit card management.

An excellent candidate for MCRDPI linking ABM and improving processes is the move to the new credit card program, now in development. It is called "Citi Bank" and will be implemented within this calendar year. This new credit card purchase process has been streamlined to eliminate some of the burdensome record keeping now required. The appointment of cardholders and approving officials remain the same except monthly spending limits will increase for larger and decrease for smaller organizations. When the system is completely installed, the PRD will no longer be required nor notification of the FA. The buy will be made by calling the vendor and placing the order. The vendor will bill the credit card and Citi Bank will assign a document number (Marine Corp Standard) automatically updating SABRS. The

FA can see the transaction on the Internet as the vendor charges against the card. The cardholder can also see all monthly purchases made via an electronic credit card statement available on the Internet.

When the monthly statement is available, the cardholder applies the line of accounting data (FIP) to purchases, certifies billing accuracy, and releases electronically to the approving official. Mismatched or unauthorized charges will be reviewed and corrected prior to payment. The approving official reviews and approves the billing online via Internet and releases the statement to the bank for payment. The bank then sends the billing electronically to Kansas City, MO, for payment and SABRS update.

It is estimated that the new system will return a minimum of 20% savings. A one-time startup cost of approximately $17,000 ($13,000 S&S + $4300 Comptroller) is necessary to get the program running. Analyzing the only area where we captured the activity cost in the model, it appears at least $10,000 will be saved, offsetting over half of the startup cost. Savings in other organizations will accrue as savings for MCRDPI. For example, Supply & Services estimates that 10-15% of their Manage Budgets cost ($193,237) is associated with credit card purchases resulting in an expenditure of $19,000 to $29,000 for managing credit cards. Applying the 20% estimated savings based on the new system could result in savings of $3,800 to $5,800. As indicated above, at least one organization can save at least 20% of the 90 to 95% of the time they expend on the Manage Budgets process; a significant savings opportunity. This new process needs to be continuously reviewed for improvements and additional cost savings.

Cell Phone & Long Distance Usage

Cell phone usage may be an area that can represent some savings for MCRDPI. Currently approximately 138 phones are in use around the Depot. The cost, according to I&L, CATSD, is roughly $14.00 per month for each phone. Records are maintained and up to date on the assignments of these phones. Perhaps assignments and need for a phone should be reviewed and an assessment made on authorization criteria. There may be opportunity for maintaining current service levels while reducing the cost of cell phone usage.

Long distance usage in FY 99 was $43, 000. A review of long distance usage could result in savings to the Depot. Most of the organizations may not need commercial long distance and the Defense Service Network (DSN) would suffice in the majority of the cases. A review of usage would determine who needs commercial long distance in their daily operations and those that could use DSN. Phones that do not need to access commercial long distance could be blocked, thus reducing overall cost via restricting usage to DoD use only. Another option may be that of assigning access codes, more effectively managing cost and tracking of long-distance charges by user.

Fire Department Telephone Watch

According to the ABC model, I&L, Fire Department, in now expending approximately $477K in labor, manning a telephone watch. The Provost Marshal is also manning a telephone watch and receives emergency '911' calls at an annual cost of $530K. These activities are redundant and total close to $1M with 29 personnel, as depicted in the model. Only one organization should be maintaining the 24-hour telephone watch. The consolidation of these activities into

one organization can result in significant process improvement. In discussions with the Fire Department, relieving this division of the activity will free up three to four people to man fire equipment and avoid new hires in order to comply with fire emergency regulations. While there are no immediate savings, there is a possible cost avoidance of two to three positions in the next FY.

Provide Short-term Storage of Personal Effects

Supply and Services is now charged with storing personal effects for recruits reporting to the Depot. This particular activity is costing $178K, with one FTE, to store items for recruits reporting for training. Of this total cost, $131K is consumed in a purchased service contract. The process basically requires the recruit to package his personal items while in training, turn them over to Supply and Services who stores and secures the items and returns these items to the recruit upon graduation. There are exceptions and issues that take place when a recruit fails to meet the rigid Marine requirements and must be eliminated from the training program. However, there are ways this could be accomplished in a more efficient manner. One method would be to give the recruit a box, have him address it to his home or guardian and mail it through the post office. This could save the Depot several thousands of dollars annually by eliminating the requirement for a storage and issue facility, manpower and a contract. The savings could be close to the costs indicated above less some pick-up and handling costs.

Weapons Field Training Battalion Boats

Success at transferring the skills of ABCM analysis is evident when personnel begin to bring forward opportunities for savings themselves. Just as we go to press with this report, one member of the ABC Team has questioned why the riverboat patrols that take place during range firing have to be so expensive. According to information submitted by this individual, six boats are on hand, with a total cost of $195K, plus $89K annually for maintenance. A PAT will be launched to evaluate this opportunity. Initial thoughts are to rent the boats MCCS has on hand for weekend recreation. This could be a win-win, as the boats tend to sit idle during the week when firing is occurring. Another thought could be to look for the root cause of having to patrol to begin with and evaluating alternative control methods during firing to prevent civilian boats from getting into areas where a stray round might find them.

Identification of Longer-Term Savings Opportunities

Longer-term savings are more difficult to quantify at Parris Island as a result of the current A-76 study and ongoing regionalization studies with MCAS Beaufort. Since changes are anticipated as a result of the A-76 study affecting FMEO and Motor T (70% of total depot costs), we have been asked to focus our cost savings efforts in other functional areas. Regionalization efforts from HQMC and on a local level have similarly reduced our scope of opportunity identification.

We have, however, selected a few areas to focus on for long-term savings opportunities as detailed below.

Manage Budgets

This is an extremely costly process as portrayed by the ABC model. The cost for MCRDPI is in excess of $1.6 million and uses 33 people (See Appendix VII-A for detail.) The activities are decentralized to the respective Installation Organizations. There are 144 people involved with this one process. The above numbers reflect specific activities within the Comptroller Budget office. (See Appendix VII-A for detail.) When one considers that approximately 88% of the budget is civilian, military, NAF personnel and contracts, it would appear an excessive amount of resources are expended to obtain and track discretionary resources. Thus, in the spirit of ABM, and using current model information, a cursory review was undertaken. Due to the complexities of this process, the multiple (and sometimes conflicting) procedures within it, and the time and resources that MCRDPI had to devote to this process, we have chosen to narrate the process as we understand it, rather than flow chart it. Either way, at the end of the day, one can see that it is a cumbersome process.

A visit to the Comptroller revealed the requirements for budget tracking by the FAs in the organizations. The Comptroller requires each organization to track their respective funds by the FA Technician assigned. Some organizations have more than one FA because of the high level of budget activities and the size of funding. As an example, I&L/FMEO, has at least four budget technicians (FAs) and one budget analyst. They also comprise approximately 60% of the budget. Other organizations, through the efforts of the Comptroller's office, have one budget analyst (FA) covering upwards of three organizations. There could be other areas where FAs can be consolidated to work two or three smaller accounts, thereby releasing currently assigned FAs for other mission essential duties. This option should be explored and implemented where feasible.

When the appropriations are determined, HQMC apportions the funds to each business enterprise. The Comptroller further assigns funds to respective organizations. The entity receiving the funds must submit a financial plan of their expected expenditures by month and object class to the Comptroller. After the monthly budget plan is approved, authority is given, via SABRS using the XR-2 report, to the FAs to execute expenditures based on the monthly budget plan on file. Changes to the plan and short falls by priority must be submitted as required. Organizations are expected to update SABRS with expenditures on a daily basis. A further requirement is to balance/reconcile SABRS cycle two times each week. If an unmatched report results, research and error correction is required. Each administrator is required to print and file the twice weekly reports. The requirements of the Comptroller appear fairly simple and straight forward, however, reconciliation, record maintenance and corrections require enormous amounts of time at the FA level. It is recommended that the cost of this routine record-keeping be documented in more detail as the ABC model matures. It should be a clear candidate for automation or elimination.

Supply and Services has to prepare and maintain a monthly budget plan for five work centers. They are using several systems to track daily expenditures. The first record, the purchase request document, is entered into a local system (ADAFATS) as buys are made pending entry into SABRS I. ADAFATS requires eight man-hours daily. This system is maintained through four stages of the procurement process: reservation, obligation, expense and liquidation. This information is reconciled, then entered into SABRS, updated, and balanced two times each week. One problem costing additional hours is the extra record keeping because SABRS cannot accommodate the detail necessary to meet organizational requirements. Spread sheets are also

maintained to show expenditures by day and month to validate monthly plan compliance, and are also used for monthly budgeting. Monthly purchases on credit cards are consolidated on the form 2035 (Summary of Accounting Data), invoices attached, coordinated through the Comptroller, and hand carried to Procurement. Also, some entries to SABRS can take up to 15 times to balance, which is clearly excessive.

Another problem surfaces in the liquidation process. This occurs when DFAS pays the bill, (updating SABRS) and there is a mismatch. Resolution research can take many hours. If the liquidation is posted after the FY ends and the discrepancy reflected an increase in SABRS, organizations have to write letters justifying the increase to get Comptroller approval before the error can be corrected.

Supply and Services is responsible for two other budgets: Working Capital Fund (Clothing) and Subsistence In Kind (SIK). These two budgets are not as labor intensive as the SABRS tracking, but both do require effort to maintain and manage.

The clothing budget ($22M) is basically a "push" system from DIPERS based on "sales". A three year plan is submitted each year in March and a monthly phase plan is submitted to HQMC and includes sales (issues) and obligations (replenishment). The information is entered into SABRS II by the receiving department. Unliquidated Obligation (ULO) reports are worked, but are fairly low volume. DIPERS produces an electronic daily report which is extracted to SABRS II—a fairly automated process.

The SIK budget ($12M) is similar to the clothing budget in that it is worked between Supply and HQMC. Food Service presents an expenditure plan to the SIK funds manager who reviews the plan for accuracy and submits it to HQMC. Quarterly allocations are set up by HQMC and submitted to Comptroller personnel who inputs the information into SABRS. Daily expenditures are reported to the FA via SABRS. Information is then keyed into a local spreadsheet to track against plan. If the organization exceeds plan, then they must ask HQ for more funds; however, if they are under plan, a letter explaining the difference is sent to HQMC. This process is much less intensive than the installation budget process.

Two other organizations were interviewed and the Manage Budgets process was similar to that of Supply and Services less the working capital and SIK budgets, with a few differences in record maintenance. FMEO uses Prime Vendor Contracts, and some additional record keeping is required to track these purchases via the Strategic Processing System. The ADAFATS is not used for tracking expenditures, but another database, Files Express, is employed. ADAFATS would not accommodate the size of the database generated by FMEO. RTR uses ADAFATS much the same as Supply and Services.

Another issue coming from the interviews indicates that the Comptroller requires extensive justification when an organization appears to be failing to meet their monthly plan. Most of the time organizations are meeting their plans, but because reservations are not clearly visible to the Comptroller, it appears the user is not spending at the correct level. Their funds, however, are committed (reserved) and plans are being executed properly. GT recommends that the Comptroller develop a method to gain visibility of reservations (commitments) to reduce many hours expended on unnecessary justifications.

Each organization is required to accomplish several reports and forward to the Comptroller, Fiscal Services and Liaison Office. FAMRS (Fund Administrator's Report), reconciled through two weekly cycles, is done internally and filed, but sent to the Comptroller quarterly, except in

the last fiscal quarter when they are required monthly. The ULO (Unliquidated Orders) is done quarterly and forwarded. The NULO (Negative Unliquidated Orders) is accomplished quarterly and sent to the Comptroller. Another report, DNR (Disbursements Not Received) is also furnished quarterly. All reports are balanced on a quarterly basis except for the fourth quarter when they are done each month.

It appears that an inordinate amount of time is used to balance reports "to the penny". The requirement is to track every document to ensure each is reserved, obligated, expensed and liquidated in the same amount. FAs are saying they "cannot be a penny off" and liquidations of a lower amount can be corrected through SABRS, but those having a higher amount and prior year liquidations require funding authority from the Comptroller. The level and amount of reporting appears to be excessive. GT recommends that consideration be given to allow more accountability at the FAs and approving official level to operate and execute their funds, thus relaxing some control at the Comptroller level.

One organization indicated problems with DFAS. This servicing organization is consistently late liquidating expenditures, resulting in penalties (late fees). This penalty appears more prevalent in paying of utility bills. The penalties are charged to the reporting organization, who really have no ability to control the process. FMEO has resorted to sending DFAS the bills/invoices via FEDEX one day after invoices are received in an effort to alleviate these penalties; so far, to no avail. The perception by the organizations is that 30 days is ample time for DFAS to process and pay the bills. The interest penalties and late fees total $13K for FY 99 according to records maintained in the Comptrollers office. The comment from the organization highlighting the problem was "here is one savings you can realize" (by getting DFAS to provide more timely service to their customers).

If you struggled through the above process paragraphs, just imagine what how people trying to execute the process must feel! It should be clear by this documentation that the Manage Budgets process needs to be studied to determine a more simple and effective process. The total dollars involved in the current process is large, and savings can be realized by reviewing and simplifying how work is done. We strongly recommend the ABMT target this opportunity for long-term savings as a project and launch a PAT in the near future. Please see Appendix VII for additional detail on costs and FTEs consumed by this process by organization.

Provide Ranges for Non-DoD Personnel

Weapons and Field Training Battalion is providing a service for the local community and other organizations by providing them the range and material for range operations. This cost of this activity as shown in the current ABC Model is $159K with four FTE's. This particular activity may be critical to maintaining good local community relations. However, it is believed that some savings could be realized by either charging for use of the range and materials or eliminating the activity and concentrating on the primary mission of training recruits. Acquiring funding from DoD for providing this benefit to civilian police departments as related to their counter-drug mission is another possibility. This is one activity that could have some risk involved and should be reviewed carefully by a PAT and presented to the ABMT and CG for a decision as to the best solution.

Consolidate Warehousing

Different organizations throughout the Depot are currently operating multiple warehouses. The process is the same for each warehouse resulting in redundant activities to receive, store and issue material. There appears to be significant savings by consolidating warehousing into a single site. According to Supply and Services, this has been a long-term goal for some time, and plans are in process to move forward on this improvement. We would encourage the evaluation of the current plans to consolidate warehousing by a PAT. Implementation, if justified, could initiate significant benefits from work reduction and elimination of redundant activities, and likely improve service response.

Time Reporting

The current time reporting system appears to be a manual system. Manual timesheets and other manual recording keeping systems should be kept to an absolute minimum if not eliminated. Technology available on the market today can provide a means for employees to enter their time on line and approvals provided electronically. There are DoD systems available that will eliminate the need to print a manual copy of a time record, manually keep track of time and have an approving official's signature before it is forwarded to the Comptroller. According to the Comptroller, Supply and Services is evaluating an electronic system to replace current manual time tracking. GT recommends this effort be accelerated by making contact with other Marine Corps Installations and DoD agencies to obtain available software for electronic time keeping.

TAD

Travel is another area that is in need of review. According to one organization, TAD is now prepared totally by the organizational FA (including travel plans and fund cites) and forwarded to the Comptroller for orders. If all work is completed and the organizational approving official has available travel funds, why not allow the organization to bypass the Comptroller and complete the process by requesting orders from DFAS? This modification alone will save several days and eliminate a step in the current process. Once completed, a copy can be sent to the Comptroller. Software is available that can make this process more efficient and effective. Our best practices research found that other military service organizations have software packages that may be available to MCRDPI for handling TAD electronically. We understand that DoD is working on a Defense Travel Service (DTS) program to be rolled out to all the services in the near future.

SABRS

Over the long term, SABRS needs to be examined and updated to meet the requirements of users. Presently many different "backup" records are being maintained to make sure questions from the Comptroller and HQMC can be answered when necessary. Each one brings with it a reconciliation process. It appears many reports are created without regard to whether the customer uses or needs them, but "just in case someone asks a question". Also, many organizations need information to track their expenditures in detail to support budget justifications and reporting costs. The organizations visited indicate SABRS I does a better job

than SABRS II. Training of organizational SABRS users would enhance the use of current SABRS I & II. It is reported that HQMC is in the process of fielding SABRS III. It remains to be seen if the system will track expenditures at the level of detail required by the organization. Provided the system offers the control and capture of detail needed by organizations and the Comptroller, many man hours can be realized by elimination of duplicate bookkeeping and excessive reporting.

MCCS Decentralized Retail Merchandising Information System

MCCS, Parris Island, has completed a pilot implementation of this system from WDC Systems, Inc. at the Recruit Sales Store. This is a Uniform Product Code (UPC) bar code based system. It has the potential allow redeployment of four to five non-appropriated fund positions through improved stock control process automation, while simultaneously improving customer service with reduced checkout time. In addition to better stock control and more accurate forecasting of demand, inventories can be reduced and inventory turns increased, resulting in higher profitability. This opportunity was already downstream when the ABMT was formed and past the stage of launching a PAT. Projected savings approximate $90-125K annually from a one-time investment of approximately $300K.

OTHER

Future updates to the model should identify areas of opportunities for study. As the model matures, it will gain creditability. Users who have made improvements in the process will be able to see the effect of the changes in the model. A-76 studies can be portrayed and modeled showing the effect of the MEO and the viability of competing in the A-76 PWS.

As models are completed across installations, benchmarking is a key tool to use in improving processes. Common processes across bases can be compared and opportunities for improvement can be identified. In addition, practices in other industries can also be used in benchmarking efforts. Look for companies known for being best in class even if they create a different product. They are likely to have some similar processes in which you can gain knowledge and insight to apply in your processes. A snapshot of the current model, costs, and activity data can easily be provided to regionalization project teams. Models can also be updated to determine the fiscal impacts of projects. The ABCM model can also help the USMC look for opportunities for further regionalization opportunities.