



### **BENEFITS**

- 4 Partnerships, Sikorsky, Boeing, GE, Honeywell Performance Based comprised of Materials and Services (Technical Engineering & Logistics Support Services (TELSS)
- ■Technical Engineering & Logistics Support Services (TELSS)
  - Contract vehicle to purchase needed parts from OEM directly
  - CDRL provides written input / suggestions on process improvements and changes
  - On the ground OEM engineers actively supporting work in process and planning
  - Receives/stores and Issues OEM parts on hand at the depot
  - Generates basis for efficiencies/cost savings as described below
- Efficiencies achieved
  - Repair Turn Around Time (RTAT) Reductions FY 2003 2008
    - Sikorsky 34%
    - Boeing 45%
    - Honeywell 45%
    - GE 70%
  - Component Output
    - Sikorsky Increased by 70% (03 08)
    - Boeing Increased by 25% increase (03-08)
  - Cost Savings





### **BENEFITS** (continued)

- Boeing
  - » CCAD Manhours \$17M since Nov 2005
  - » Parts \$59.3M since Nov 2006
  - » Storage, Analysis Failure Evaluation & Reclamation (SAFR) -\$24.9M in parts
  - » Cost Savings \$56M
- Sikorsky
  - » A to L Recap RTAT reduction from 426 to 299 days
  - » A to A airframe RTAT reduction 34.1%
  - » Cost Savings \$56M
- Honeywell Unit Funded Cost reduced by 50% in FY 08
- Reliability Improvements
  - GE increased time on wing between overhaul from avg 300 to 1,450 hours
  - Review of 23 parts indicates that a minimum of 15 reflect increase in reliability –projecting an approximately 50% improvement for all NSNs.
    Projects to ~\$53M cost avoidance over 10 year period





### **OPPORTUNITIES**

- Cost Reduction Initiatives
  - Boeing
    - Follow-On Contract plan to reduce parts costs by an estimated \$95M over 5 year contract
    - Follow-On Contract plan to reduce Engineering/Logistics costs by 37%
  - Sikorsky
    - Current contract has goal to reduced RTAT by 27% and decrease material costs by a minimum of 10% over life of contract





### **CHALLENGES**

- AMC/DA G-8 notes from Ms Gerton's visit to CCAD
  - Not convinced we're as fiscally responsible as we can be
  - Perception is Partnerships very expensive
  - Where is the tradeoff between readiness and cost
  - What are we (LCMC) doing to drive down costs
  - Should be financial input into contracts current contracts drive high ULO / inventory accountability challenges, don't interface with standard financial systems
  - Very concerned about LMP transition of Partnerships

AMCOM is working on all of these

