

I would say over the past 5 years we are getting more visibility and giving AMC more control. I will give you an example.

The T-53 turbine engine, in which probably we have more money invested than any other secondary item in the Army, became critically short in supply 18 months ago. This is the engine that is installed in the Huey helicopter. The Huey buildup production rates were so high that we just could not get enough engines built at the same time.

One of the first things we did a year and a half ago in order to get visibility was to establish daily transaction reports on every T-53 engine by serial number worldwide exactly when it changes status. It is reported into AVCOM, the responsible NICP. It is put into their computers. They know exactly when it is serviceable, unserviceable, when it is put on, when it is withdrawn, and where it is.

Since that time we have extended this visibility to 20 high dollar value aviation items, which currently constitute 40 percent of the procurement dollar value of aviation repair parts.

Therefore, we have this daily visibility, as you might call it, and we have given control to AVCOM for the same thing. Between that level of intensive management and the quarterly, which constitutes as I said about 80 percent of the dollar value of items—we have some items reported on a monthly basis. So I would say the trend is toward more visibility and more control.

How far we go——

Mr. LUMAN. That is not my question.

In other words, assuming AMC gets this capability and they come in and say, "All right, our computers will handle it now. How about having the theater commanders report these assets to us?"

Then what happens? You have a study that says you ought to do even more than this.

General MILLER. This is right, and I believe that our overall information and management study, which is going on now, and should be finished in September, will permit us overall visibility as soon as we have these other automated systems meshed together and in effect. Depending on how far you want to go, and here you would have to study this from an efficiency and an economical point of view, there is no point in having reports on certain items where the expense of having the report is more costly than say throwing the item away.

Mr. ROBACK. I think the discussion with General Heiser went along the line at one point that if you had visibility, conceivably you would not necessarily have to have control. That is to say, if the information was readily available on what the assets were, you would not necessarily have to instruct, at least some authorities might believe you would not necessarily, as long as you knew about the information, that would be enough. You would not have to resolve the question of AMC control over the theater depots.

General MILLER. I think this is to a degree true. As I have said, the key to the placement of control is responsiveness to the man in the field.

The reason we have had theater stocks before is because the response time of the people involved in a theater of war was such that the commander there on the ground had to have those things under his control.

Again, it is the same thing down at the division level. The division carries a basic load, which is normally anywhere from 3 to 5 days of