

It is requested that four copies of the "Amended Project Charter, 2.75-Inch Rocket System," to be issued by your office, be furnished within 30 days after date of this memorandum. It is also requested that a revised "milestone" schedule of actions be furnished showing target dates for effecting transfer of all Navy rocket motor contracts to your department.

PAUL R. IGNATUS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 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.).

Subject: Procurement responsibility for 2.75-inch rocket launchers.

By memorandum of June 4, 1968, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) recommended that a single manager for tri-service procurement be established within the Department of the Army for 2.75-inch aircraft rocket launchers.

Based upon our discussions of the merit of the recommendation, I conclude that there are benefits in terms of standardization, cost and procurement flexibility to be achieved in placing the responsibility for procurement of all service needs under a single manager. I therefore approve the establishment within the Department of the Army of a single manager for tri-service procurement of the 2.75-inch rocket launcher, to be effective with the fiscal year 1970 procurement program and to parallel the scope of the 2.75-inch rocket system responsibility as currently assigned to the Department of the Army.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) is requested to coordinate the development of necessary details for achieving this transfer of responsibility with the Departments of the Navy and Air Force. Such details, including time schedule, proposed project charter, and if necessary, proposed personnel adjustments, should be provided to this office by August 31, 1968.

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

COMPETITION FOR M-158

Mr. ROBACK. What was your experience with competitive producers on the 158 that went out in a limited quantity for competitive—you had several people?

General ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBACK. What has been the actual production experience to date? Have there been, for example, any problems?

General ANDERSON. No, sir. There have been no problems.

In the first competitive procurement, as I mentioned, that was won by Chromcraft competitively over some 13 bidders, and they produced essentially on schedule. We have had no production problems.

Mr. ROBACK. Chromcraft was the bidder on quantity; but was not the 158 bid awarded with several others?

General ANDERSON. Yes. It was subsequently awarded to Brown Engineering. I think that was for 330 launchers.

And then finally in a small business set-aside, 420-odd to A.C. Electronics.

Mr. ROBACK. What I am trying to find out is whether there is a competitive source availability to some extent?

General ANDERSON. Yes.