command responsibility between them, each being responsible only to the Chief of Staff of the Army.

While geographic and tactical considerations may justify some variances in Army logistics concepts, we believe these should be relatively minor. Inventory management, stock control and other logistics concepts, however, should be standard and should be susceptible to standardized supply processing systems.

Each major command in the Army has had the responsibility for determining its own data processing requirements. Although the systems must, to a certain degree, be compatible with certain standards prescribed by the Department of Defense, each command designs its own system, devises data processing programs, develops management reports, and obtains data processing equipment. As a result, there has been dissimilarity in the systems, and data developed may not be readily interchangeable between supply activities. To illustrate, when a large-scale computer system was to be installed in Vietnam, the data processing equipment was moved from the Army Communications Zone, Europe, which was then being relocated from France to Germany. When the equipment reached the Long Binh complex near Saigon, a major programing effort was deemed necessary in order to utilize the equipment for inventory management and stock control in Vietnam. The same equipment had previously been utilized for similar functions in France.

Mr. ROBACK. What is the significance of that point? Do you mean they should have bought the equipment somewhere else?

Mr. FASICK. No, Mr. Roback; but it is a reflection of the command changing a program which had already been established in Europe. It reflects again the differences in the supply systems among and between the different commands within the Army.

Mr. DAHLIN. You mean the programs had to be squared with the system as it had been developed in Vietnam?

Mr. FASICK. It was tailored to meet what the Vietnam commanders determined would be their needs.

Mr. ROBACK. That would be inevitable, though, even if you had a standard system?

Mr. FASICK. No; not necessarily. I think the Air Force base supply system is a pretty good illustration, where they have a standard program that is applicable worldwide. No deviations are made to that program at a local level.

If changes are needed they have to be programed by higher levels. You could move an airman from a base in Europe and put him in a base in Thailand and he can operate the system. This isn't true in the case of the Army.

Mr. DAHLIN. You aren't challenging the point, though, that this particular machine was usable or should have been used in Vietnam?

Mr. FASICK. No; we compliment the Army for using equipment within the system as opposed to going out and buying new equipment.

Mr. LUMAN. You are saying if they had the standard system they are trying to move toward, they would have been able to move this piece of equipment without significant reprograming and the people could have gone in and operated it without the need to fly in technicians to cope with all these other problems?