

C O N F I D E N T I A L

17 FEB 1984

OCE-M84-048

MEMORANDUM FOR: OC/OL Study Committee

ATTENTION:

[Redacted]

25X1

FROM:

Chief, Engineering Division, OC

SUBJECT:

OC/OL Support Survey

1. In general the logistics support to OC-ED is very good. The decentralized logistics components in FND and DND are an essential part of the ED effort to support OC. Without the day-to-day contact and able assistance from the often overworked logistics personnel, we could not function. [Redacted]

25X1

2. Attached are comments from two of our Branch Chiefs. We will forward additional comments later. We felt that providing the branch inputs would be useful even if there isn't a consistent view across all branches. [Redacted]

25X1

3. We would be happy to discuss these comments at any time [Redacted]

25X1

[Redacted]

25X1

Attachment
As stated

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

25X1
25X1

C O N F I D E N T I A L

C O N F I D E N T I A

ATTACHMENT

Question D. - An internal form called an "AR" is generated by the operating component of ED and is forwarded through the respective branch chief, the Program Management Staff, and through Chief, ED to FND/MSS. An 88 is generated from the AR and put into normal distribution. This is used for PRA procurement. Form 2420s are generated by the branches and follow the same route. For contract actions, memos are prepared for Chief, ED signature and sent directly to OL/PD.

Question J. - Centralizing the logs operations presently in FND and DND would not be advantageous in our perception. The operations are closely related to the technical personnel in the divisions and need to be for effective support.

Question K. - The question of the merits of establishing a Logistics team in OC is difficult. The teams in other components were presumably justified on the basis of geography, a problem not present for OC. However, a very significant advantage for those components which have contracting teams is the responsiveness of the team to the component's mission. We have observed that the detached teams are more responsive in aggressively working to solve procurement problems rather than simply saying that something can't be done. Our experience in dealing with OL/PD is mixed. In most cases the support is excellent and the contracting officers are responsive. Too often, however, it seems that the CO is more concerned with following very strict interpretations of the regulations than with resolving a problem by working with the COTR to find a better way. That is, the CO is more concerned with the rules than with the mission and its schedule, budgetary and programmatic requirements. The bottom line is that our preference would be to have a contracting team in OC.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

CONFIDENTIAL

SEB-M84-006
15 February 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Program Management Staff, OC-ED

FROM:

[Redacted]

Chief, Engineering Systems Branch, OC-ED

25X1

SUBJECT:

OC/OL Support Mechanism

[Redacted]

25X1

REFERENCE:

OL 14081-84, dated 2 February 1984

1. With the advent of the Logistics Resource Manager (LRM) in FEB, commencing with [Redacted] circa 1982, various shipping, procurement and stock movement issues were efficiently effected that would normally have taken months to resolve. OL RECAP support, however, came well after the fact, even after many briefings with OL to "get things going". One problem seemed to be OL's demand for specifics which could not be identified with OC at the time of request. Port of Call shipping delays, tardy establishment of service and other contracts, and slow responsiveness to procurement actions seem to be recurring issues. In recent months, discussions have been held between Messrs. [Redacted] and SEB to develop streamlined procurement techniques pertaining particularly to the values and merits of market survey-based procurements. A significant OC/OL cooperative relationship has been in effect since the OC/OL Liaison Officer [Redacted] position was established. The FEB/MSS OL contingent has been an effective support mechanism which has consistently provided good service particularly to the Foreign Network. DND's own Logs support likewise has been an effective operation and there would be little gain in merging DND and FND Log functions. The LRM should be overseer for all OC Logs functions and be closely aligned with the OL/OC Liaison Officer. [Redacted]

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

2. There has been much discussion regarding OL providing a three/four man staff in OC. This is a valid requirement which should be encouraged. SEB deals with OL via 2420, 88 (via MSS), and RFP documentation. We plan to initiate Project Portfolios for various requirements which are market survey-oriented. The purpose of this is to alert OL as soon as a requirement comes into SEB which may precipitate a market survey. The intention is to provide detailed descriptions of OC actions which could lead to off-the-shelf equipment multiprocurement based on market survey results without the need for RFP's. [Redacted]

25X1

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

25X1

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: OC/OL Support Mechanism

25X1

3. OC does not have a Utilities Engineering Staff; OL has a nucleus of such a group. Should OC develop its own Utilities Engineering Staff or should the OL contingent be increased in scope and manpower to support OC's needs? Today, OL cannot adequately support OC's Utilities Engineering requirements, neither can OC

25X1

4. There is no significant problem with the OL's Depot support. and Company have done a fine job supporting OC.

25X1

25X1

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

Memo for:

From: CSB

Subject: Input for OC/OL Survey

The responses are keyed to the memo:

A. By in large - yes. The weaknesses are in small parts ordering when we spend too much time going to parts suppliers ourselves. The strengths are in having knowledgeable people so accessible. ED uses FND's organization for the most part, and we have had some problems dealing with DND's organization because we are physically separate. We should be able to use one logistics organization for all purposes.

B. Material: FND/FEB/MSS Services Support: OL/PD

C. Include contacting officers to provide total service.

D. Leave that one to you, Jerry.

E. We don't got one.

F. We should be able to do multi-year procurements for big ticket items

G. No complaints.

H. Don't know.

I. We deal primarily with PD- ADP&EB. They are responsive to the limits of their resources, which are limited.

J. The material support that FND and DND have should stay the same, except that a single point should be established for ED actions regardless of the destination operating division. A contracting team should be established and be centrally placed to service the entire office. Organizationally, this could be ED or AMD.

K. Absolutely yes. The fact that we have almost always been located in the same building as the Procurement Division has always helped the situation. That should be enough. The reality is that so many other components have decentralized teams, the centralized team has always been decimated by having to staff the others. Therefore PD always seems to have a high percentage of new, relatively untrained and inexperienced negotiators and contracting officers. Once one is trained and has gained some experience, they leave. I suppose we just have to play the game, but that seems to be the only way we will get some dedicated help.

L. Thanks to some very good people, we have had good experience with communications with OL/PD. I wouldn't want to institutionalize it because it would only get worse.