

We were advised that these calibration systems and their component laboratories had been established substantially without interservice coordination and without DOD guidance or direction.

The responsibility for providing calibration services is thus dispersed throughout the military department, and, with the exception of the Air Force, each major command activity separately determines the calibration capabilities needed to support its individual mission. Our study showed that, altogether, the three services were operating about 280 calibration laboratories in the United States, Far East, and Europe.

We also noted that 36 geographical areas within the United States, including the Puget Sound area, had three or more separate military calibration laboratories within 95 miles or less of one another. For example, military calibration laboratories were concentrated in the following areas:

Area	Number of laboratories	Maximum statute miles between laboratories
Norfolk.....	9	65
Los Angeles.....	9	95
San Francisco.....	9	75
Washington, D.C.....	6	20
Baltimore.....	5	50
Puget Sound.....	7	95

We were informed that the total investment in equipment associated with military calibration laboratories was about \$66,000,000 in 1963 and by December 1966 it had risen to about \$115,200,000.

The seven military calibration laboratories in the Puget Sound area, located within 6 to 95 miles of one another, were individually established and expanded during the period from 1956 to 1965 as parts of separate calibration systems developed to meet the needs and requirements of the individual services or major commands within a service. Our preliminary studies and discussions indicate that these laboratories, which have an investment of about \$1,300,000 in equipment alone, have significant duplication of facilities and that much of the equipment of each laboratory is in actual use for only a small percentage of its available time. Because of the technical nature and variety of the equipment, however, we were unable to determine the full extent of unneeded duplication, without performing a more detailed review.

The present proliferation of military calibration systems and laboratories appears to have been caused by a dispersal of authority among major commands within the Army and Navy and an absence of coordination from the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has a program designed to encourage voluntary interservice support initiated at the operating level and thus achieve greater utilization of facilities and eliminate and avoid unnecessary duplications. This Defense Retail Interservice Logistic Support Program appears to have been quite successful to date, having achieved, according to a recent DSA study, interservice support agreements with measurable benefits of \$26,000,000 at a reported cost of \$29,000. We believe, however, that even greater benefits may be realized through increased participation in the program by higher commands.

The current program seems to be most successful when dealing with functions that lie fully within the control of commanders at an operating level. We have noted, however, that functions, such as calibration, which are part of a service-wide system, do not respond to this program as readily as functions that lie fully within the control of local commanders. We believe that interservice calibration support on a significant scale can be more readily achieved by introducing, at the planning or major command level, a program similar to the Defense Retail Interservice Logistic Support Program.

We advised the Secretary of Defense of our survey findings and observations in a letter dated October 6, 1967. We have not as yet received his comments.

SERVICE-TYPE ACTIVITIES

Since at least 1960 the Department of Defense has had a policy that the military services should jointly utilize support facilities wherever possible. The Gen-