

[home>library >fydp base year>meeting notes](#) • [previous](#) | [folder](#) | [next](#)

## DoN FYDP Improvement Project

New...

New Revision

Go

[Go Back]

**Meeting Notes**

Reports/White Papers

Progress Reports

Presentations

Instructions

Room Index

Room Security

Tools



news: daily | weekly  
advanced search

chat | notify | print |  
tutorial | help

### Meeting Notes 9-6-00 (init mtg w Masciarelli)

Elaine Kujawa (Elaine Kujawa), 09/14/2000 - 05:42 PM

#### Meeting Notes

**Date:** 9-06-00**Subject:** Meeting with Mr. Joseph Masciarelli (USMC RP – Programs Division)**Client Attendance:** Mr. Masciarelli,  
Col Pat Garrett (RPD)  
Mr. Steve Costa (RPAB)  
Capt. Jon Reistroffer**KPMG Consulting Attendance:** Vince Pontani, Elaine Kujawa

**Summary:** Mr. Masciarelli is the Deputy for the Programs Division; his office collates and prepares all of the POM submission documents for the Marine Corps. Mr. Masciarelli's immediate superior is Brigadier General Thomas, Director of the Programs Division. Mr. Masciarelli is very interested in this engagement since he feels he is one of the innovators who have been instrumental in trying to get money to do this type of improvement for the Navy and Marine Corps. He is very interested in the outcome and wants to be involved in the process and his people will also be involved in the process.

#### Key RP Division personnel identified by Mr. Masciarelli:

Col. Pat Garrett (Program Development Branch Head)  
 LtCol. Stephen Bucher (Assessment and Acquisition Branch Head)  
 LtCol. Don Burlingham (DON-PIC – integration with Navy Programs)  
 LtCol. Don House (JROC Branch Head – brings the JCS/Cinc viewpoint)  
 Mr. Steve Costa (Assessment and Acquisition Branch – process and system improvement focus)  
 Maj. Ed. Pratt (Program Development Branch – developed USMC program codes in use today)  
 Maj. David Newman (Program Development Branch – director of program code/PE development)

#### Mr. Masciarelli's comments:

##### *Measures of Success:*

- Agreement between all parties – "meeting of the minds" on the "process" for PPBS and the recommended "To-Be."
- The process should be "Top-Down" and a more "macro" viewpoint vice a "bottom up" approach and then refined within the regulatory or fiscal constraints from higher authority.
- Look more from a "To-Be" standpoint – determine what is the optimal "ideal" PPBS POM process that meets not only all of the

OSD requirements but supports Service decision makers and then compare this ideal model with the way it is done today. (PR has done some of this already – when we are ready – Mr. Masciarelli will make the models available for our use.)

- Make the "As-Is" and "To-Be" processes less personality driven – unscramble the process from people.
- Do not re-invent the wheel – the Marine Corps needs to make this process easier and more productive from the automation standpoint – they do not have the depth of manpower as the other Services to keep it the way they do and they need state of the art IT to be able to keep up.
- Use or re-use existing IT tools – there are many available systems and software that will work
- The PPBS process IT needs embedded Decision Support Tools – to enable what-if drills and other types of modeling
- Close the gap between "Programming" and "Budgeting" – reduce the differences to the "least common denominator" – this should involve common data and accurate data (data warehousing and data bases).

***Other:***

- The Air Force and Army modernized their PPBS/POM process 3-4 years ago. The Navy and Marine Corps are behind and need to catch up.
- The Program and Budgeting integration at the Service level in the Marine Corps is only about 3-4 years old – before that, each was a separate department.
- The Marine Corps has undertaken this type of initiative several previous times with varying levels of success – mainly dependent on the personality of the initiative sponsor and whether the results met his pre-determined expectations. When Gen Krulak was CG MCCDC, SRA Corporation conducted a functional review of the USMC POM process as part of the Marine Corps Process Improvement Program (MCPIP). These MCPIP/SRA models may still be resident at MCCDC, Quantico.
- The USMC has developed Marine Corps Program Codes that are used internal to the USMC. These make it much easier for the program sponsors and the field agencies to provide the proper and timely data for development of the USMC POM. These program codes do not correspond to the OSD Program Elements but they have mapped the data elements across to the PE structure.
- OSD is driving toward a standardized PE structure that can be used for program comparisons that cross all service boundaries.

**Col Garrett's Comments:**

- Too much of the expertise and capability within the USMC is a result of "super-star-it is." Very few personnel know the PPBS process and build intricate data systems and/or personal databases and programs that are not standardized. When these key people transfer or leave, the expertise and corresponding systems are not institutionalized within the Service and therefore disappear.
- As a result of the DoD downsizing for the last decade, many of the

program sponsors do not take a pro-active or positive approach to building future programs but instead have a defensive orientation on programs. The sponsors build program rationales to defend the program against cuts and therefore the outlook on information, program and POM timelines, as well as the program lessons learned are all built around this defensive posture.

- Col Garrett is interested to see if this defensive orientation by the program sponsors has promulgated a systemic flaw in the way that the Marine Corps manages the POM data.

---

[go to top](#)

[previous](#) | [folder](#) | [next](#)

[new...](#) | [new revision](#)