

cerned about automatic data processing. Do you have terms of reference for this effort?

Mr. MORRIS. At this time we have a memorandum which forms the basis for this decision, Mr. Roback, which I would be pleased to furnish you if you would like.

Mr. ROBACK. Is there any reason why it can't be printed?

Mr. MORRIS. I think not, sir.

(The information referred to follows:)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1968.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (I. & L.); the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (I. & L.); the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (I. & L.); Director, Defense Supply Agency.

Subject: Review and approval of automated logistics systems.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has recently completed a study for the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee of several large automated systems projects in the Department of Defense. The study report was critical of the level of logistics systems integration and compatibility achieved thus far and the absence of effective Office of the Secretary of Defense review and coordination of proposed automated systems.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in March 1968, the OSD witnesses agreed with the basic GAO recommendation that greater OSD review and coordination of these programs was required and stated that a program for achieving this was being established. The committee was advised that this Office believes that major progress in achieving interservice system standardization has been accomplished through standard military policies and procedures contained in MILSTRIP, MILSTAMP, UMMIPS, MILSTEP, etc. These procedures were our first steps toward achieving standardization and compatibility between and within the automated supply systems of the military services and DSA. It was proper and prudent that we took these steps when we did.

As you know, my staff and I have been concerned for sometime that the recent acquisition of large-scale automated data processing equipments by each of the military departments and DSA may be getting us farther away from systems compatibility. Thus, we are making it more difficult for integrated supply managers to serve their customers and very difficult for one military service to support its sister services when multiuse equipments are required. The problems that have existed in connection with integrated support of the F-4 aircraft are a typical example of a case where incompatible systems precluded the Air Force and Navy from fully utilizing each other's common assets. This not only wastes money but degrades our support capabilities.

I believe it is in the mutual interest of the military services and the DSA to have compatible, automated systems. These systems do not have to be precisely standard, but they should be compatible to the extent that communications can be passed to, and logistics support assignments made to any military service or DSA without major disruptions or expensive reprogramming costs. I also believe that it is in our best interest to achieve DOD compatible logistics systems through the use of an integrated staff working for the military services, DSA and OSD.

I suggest that we form a joint planning team—to report to the materiel secretaries as a body, manned by a highly competent systems/ADP military person from each service, DSA and my office. This planning team could begin reviewing the features of our major automated systems now in operation or planned for the future and develop compatible procedural and system milestones for all of us to follow over the next 5 years.

I would like to have your reaction to this memorandum in the next several days so that we can plan to establish this joint planning effort.

(S) THOMAS D. MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

Mr. ROBACK. In the testimony by General Heiser, he referred to your office, referred to your calling upon the Assistant Secretaries for I. & L. to review their manning problems in this field. Now, is that a different effort?