

reaching the point from which shipment can be initiated. For example, a priority requisition prepared by a unit in Korea must be processed by the following five organizations if no stock is on hand in Korea:

1. Requisitioning unit.
2. Direct support unit.
3. 8th Army Depot, Taegu, Korea.
4. National Inventory Control Point.
5. CONUS depot.

Mr. ROBACK. What does processing mean there? If you had rapid-fire communications and it was shot through the system at one time, what difference does it make?

Mr. FASICK. At each level they check to see if they have the stock on hand; if they don't, they pass it on.

Mr. ROBACK. Theoretically, they could do that by pressing a button if they had all the automatic equipment?

Mr. FASICK. I think so. In their long-range logistics plan, I suspect the Army has this kind of a system in mind to expedite and simplify these types of transactions.

A requisition for a unit in Europe may be processed through as many as six echelons of supply:

1. Requisitioning unit.
2. Direct support unit.
3. 7th Army Inventory Control Center.
4. Supply and Maintenance Agency.
5. National inventory control point.
6. CONUS depot.

The Air Force and Navy organizations and inventory placement practices facilitate the maintenance of only three basic echelons of supply—the requisitioning unit; the base or supply ship; and the air materiel area or tidewater depot.

I think the point we are making here, Mr. Chairman, is that for each additional level of supply or echelon of supply that you have, you increase the chance for error and for problems, and that the more simple the system is the better opportunity you have to have an effective supply system.

Mr. HORTON. It also means more personnel, too, doesn't it?

Mr. FASICK. It certainly does. On the other hand, as I pointed out before, the Army has somewhat of a different problem.

Mr. HORTON. Why?

Mr. FASICK. We are not suggesting that all of the echelons of supply could or should be eliminated.

Mr. HORTON. Why does it have a different problem?

Mr. FASICK. In the sense of the dispersal of units and the land masses over which they must transport materials, as opposed to a fixed base or a ship that goes out pretty well laden down when it goes out, so that its resupply problems are complex, but I think less so than the Army's. Within that framework, we are not suggesting that the Army completely reorganize, but I think hearings of this nature will result in some study and thought to ways we could do it better, to consider possibly where echelons of supply might be eliminated at savings in investment in inventory and in the interest of simplifying the supply systems.