

LOGISTICS COMBAT
ELEMENT SYSTEMS (LCES)
DATA MIGRATION

**Project Sponsor:** Mr. Marc **Deployment Champion:** Mr. Jack

Master Black Belt: Maj Lucas Chesla

Black Belt Candidate: Maj Kyle
Black Belt Candidate: Maj Marcel
Black Belt Candidate: Capt Jarrod
Black Belt Candidate: Mr. Tim

# **Executive Summary**

### **Problem Statement**

For the past four months, LCES has managed personnel assigned to the command through numerous stand-alone excel files that are not integrated or shared within other staff offices within the Portfolio Manager (PfM). As such, maintaining a common operational picture for personnel status throughout the PfM is difficult and error prone. The current process takes 2-3 weeks per quarter to update personnel rosters and the data becomes outdated quickly because of the update time line. LCES needs a more integrated system that shares personnel status data across the PfM in real time and can be updated daily from any location.

## **Project Scope**

The scope of this project includes LCES personnel database management procedures, Program Manager (PM) database management procedures, shared drive and SharePoint procedures for personnel management. Marine Corps Systems Command (MCSC) personnel database management procedures is considered out of scope for this project.

### Major Project Phase (DMAIC) Milestones and Key Learning

In the Define phase the team proposed a charter to the project sponsor and Lean Six Sigma Master Black Belt. Developing the charter clarified and confirmed the need for a process improvement project for LCES. The team first constructed a Suppliers, Inputs, Process, Outputs, and Customers (SIPOC) map that helped identify their customers and the outputs associated to them. This helped the team highlight areas where more clarity was required in relation to customer requirements, outputs, and what in the process needed to be measured. The team also utilized the voice of the customer (VOC) tool to focus on the key customer issues in the current process, as well as requirements in the new process. It was determined that the customers not only wanted to improve the process of updating and managing the LCES database, but they also had very specific requirements they wanted to see in the new process and final product. This allowed the team to accurately create a database that would meet all desired requirements by the customer.

In the Measure phase, the team mapped the as-is process in which the PM and PfM updated their own internal databases and then the originator(s) sends them out to be reviewed and verified. The Measure phase helped identify "what" was happening in the process. Building off the SIPOC the team built a detailed picture of the current process and then identified steps within the process that were value added or non-value added. The team ensured that steps deemed value added met common criteria of changing the sequence and it's something the customer cares about while challenging non-value added steps.

The Analyze phase helped identify "why" things happened in the process and their root causes. The team evaluated the data collected in the measure phase and utilized the fishbone diagram tool to conduct a cause-effect analysis. By utilizing the data, the team continually asked "why" to ensure "vital causes" were validated based on fact and not by jumping to conclusions. The fishbone diagram produced results that confirmed the team's suspicions and reinforced process discrepancies at a larger staff level and

outside the scope of the project. The analysis results confirmed that independent databases and ineffective policies were the root cause of the inefficiencies. With acknowledgement from the process owner and minor refinement for what data should be collected, the team had new priority inputs and outputs for the customer.

After receiving all the new criteria desired by the customer, the team was able to take all the data points and create a system that reduced the 19 step process down to 7 and eliminated the two to three week cycle time.

In order to control the process, the team conducted multiple training evolutions for the end user and managers, and put safeguards on the data which restricts access to those who do not need it, to ensure security and reduce error of redundant or out dated information. This new process has significantly reduced time spent on updating databases and can now reallocate the \$32,300 in non-value added man hours to more critical tasks.

### **Conclusions**

The LCES database project utilized the DMAIC methodology to improve the personnel management process. The goal was to transfer ownership of database management from the PfM-level to the PM-level and create a way to gain access to accurate information immediately.

### **Benefits Realized**

The benefits realized by this project encompassed Type 2 (Cost Avoidance) and Type 3 (Quality of Life).

- Accurate database with photos of employees (filtered to Team Leader level for emergency situation preparedness).
- Unity of effort which reduces duplication of records.
- Common database for PfM LCES.
  - PfM input feeds PM records and vice-versa.
- Efficient record search capability.
- Version control through check-in, check-out process for database revisions.
- Summary reports for leaders which contributes to improved personnel management.

### Lessons Learned

- 1. Constant feedback from the customer was crucial because as we created the database, we learned more refined criteria desired so we were not starting again after completing the entire database.
- 2. Conducting meetings throughout the DMAIC phases keeps the customer and the LSS group abreast of all that occurred and helps ensure that everyone is on-track and satisfied with the team's progress.
- 3. Once the database was created, conducting training for the users and managers was crucial to everyone's understanding of the new personnel management system.