

Mr. MORRIS. We do, sir.

Mr. ROBACK. You do? You said yes?

Mr. MORRIS. We do, sir, and that is the plan that I have outlined as we now contemplate implementing it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does that plan, as you have outlined it, coincide with the plan that the GAO had in mind or not?

Mr. MORRIS. Sir, I don't know that they recommended a specific plan. They recommended that we do achieve this greater coordination before the fact.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Have they made any comment upon this method of approach to achieving it?

Mr. MORRIS. They have not to me, sir.

Mr. ROBACK. What is the plan? Do you have a development plan published?

Mr. MORRIS. We do not.

Mr. ROBACK. Promulgated?

Mr. MORRIS. The first step agreed upon in late May, among the services and our office, is to establish what I have described as this joint staff of best talent from each service, DSA, under the supervision of my staff.

Its first assignment will be the development of a blueprint in concept. There are drafts of this kind of thinking already in being. We would hope that the materiel secretaries would be meeting very frequently to consider the products of this staff over the next year, coming up with approved objectives for the 5-year plan within which the service design organizations—which as you have heard are now quite substantial in each service—will do their own long-term design work.

Mr. ROBACK. What is this plan aimed toward, compatibility among the services, standardization?

Mr. MORRIS. As fully as this is a desirable thing to achieve, Mr. Roback, we are still far from certain how complete. I don't think we know enough individually or collectively as to the value of complete standardization among the services, due to their differences in mission, weapons systems, operating conditions and so forth.

The last thing that I personally feel we should allow to happen today is the stifling of the creative work that is going on and has been going on in the services. We need to simply pool our best talent, and agree upon those things that are wise to do in complete uniformity, and those things which must properly deviate based on service requirements. We are still very much in a creative and research phase.

Mr. ROBACK. What is the nature of compatibility? I mean, what values are you seeking? You don't know yet?

Mr. MORRIS. I would define it in simple terms as being that of simply applying the best experience, and knowledge and developments of each service across the board. Let me give you an illustration.

I think the Air Force has pioneered what all services now have agreed is the farthest step forward in terms of worldwide daily transaction reporting in the selected high value critical item category called recoverable items. They are proving the feasibility of doing this.