

ACTION ITEM NO: 2-156

DATE SUBMITTED: 25 JAN 99

SUBMITTED BY: CG THIRD MAW

PROBLEM:

Inspection Criteria of the 990 Maintenance Mobile Facility (MF) Program

DISCUSSION:

COMMARFORPAC and COMNAVAIRPAC need to get together to decide, which is going to be responsible for inspecting the (MF) Program on a consistent basis. In addition, as to which checklist will be used. Disparities exist in the guidance and procedural management policies between the two agencies. In conjunction with this problem, an overall look at the (MF) Program needs to be addressed in establishment of procedures and policies throughout the Marine Corps.

The (MF) Program is currently inspected by Wing, COMMARFORPAC annually and COMNAVAIRPAC every two years. Both the Wing and COMMARFORPAC Inspectors use locally-generated checklist provided to each MAG/MALS coordinator. The majority of questions are straight out of the CSEC Program as they pertain to SE-PMS. The checklists often include additional questions pertaining to requirements that may have developed during the previous 18 months, that CNAP Inspectors may or may not be aware of. Additional requirements as directed by SYSCOM are implemented into the management and control of this program through the coordinators and at times are added as inspection items to their checklists. Both QAR's and CNAP Inspectors are SE-PMS Program Managers by assignment and are often out of the loop on undefined areas that affect the (MF) Program. This gap in the "pipeline" has created ambiguity between local QA, Wing, COMMARFORPAC, and COMNAVAIRPAC inspections' interpretations and checklists. Disparity comes in when, who to follow next and the changes made from one inspection to another. Interpretations from one inspection to another change and vary, which should draw a clear line on how procedures will be followed. Each 13670 order follows a basic format on the overview of the (MF) Program. However, inspections are not covered in basic format. There needs to be a decision on how the (MF) Program will be inspected, what will be the basic format and who will do that inspection. Resolve the multi-interpretations and have a refined inspection checklist Fleet-Wide.

RECOMMENDATION:

Implement a comprehensive (MF) Program Policy and assign a (MF) QAR Program Manager. Develop CSEC checklists that reflect the actual maintenance practices commensurate with the Fleet Activities and provide it up-line to Wing and COMMARFORPAC. Develop comprehensive procedures, policies and basic format for the (MF) Program to use Fleet-Wide, to include detailed Inspection Criteria. In overview, implement a procedure that will put everyone on the same page, with no misinterpretations by either agency evolved. Therefore, each Fleet Activity will know what to expect on their inspections and can maintain the program accordingly. Areas to include in the proper development of the (MF) Program are as such, a comprehensive Licensing Program with Phase I and Phase II certifications within the (MF) Program. The current SE Licensing Program in place will provide some but not all, i.e. Tactical Vehicles and Heavy Equipment, these licenses should be the standard procedures, not the rarity. The MOS and rank of the QAR should not be limited to the SE MOS's alone, but well-rounded background in not only maintenance, but also supply, 3M, Production Control and Logs and Records as well. A structured FASO-Type course pertaining to the (MF) Program covering these areas would be beneficial, with the idea in the future to develop and include a Training Syllabus for Fleet Activities. This would also aide in the implementation of a Primary/Secondary MOS for the (MF) Program, should that come into effect.

STATUS: 07 JUL 99

ACTION AGENCY:

CMC ASL-34

COMPLETION DATE:

TBD

STATUS: 15 JUL 99

Closed. Open forum discussion resolved to close issue during Logistics review Group (LRG) held at M.C.A.S. Miramar on 15 Jul 1999 and request re-submit Inspection-Criteria concerns to appropriate TYCOMS Chain-of-Command.