LEVEL II

LOGISTIC SYSTEMS STUDIES

HANDBOOK

ADA084054

DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 8 1980
S
A

PREPARED BY

ANALYSIS DIVISION

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY, Alexandria, VA

February 1973

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DDC FILE COPY

(6)

LOGISTIC SYSTEMS STUDIES

HANDBOOK

PREPARED BY

ANALYSIS DIVISION

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

(12) 109

(11)

February 1973

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

406470

FOREWORD

The progressive refinement of Department of Defense logistic systems is dependent on a continuing program of management studies. One of the tasks of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and of the Logistics Systems Policy Committee (LSPC) is to initiate studies which will result in objective research and analysis leading to recommendations for improvements to the DoD logistics system.

This Handbook is published to provide guidance to the LSPC Secretariat, and to the Chairman and members of DoD Task Groups, on how to initiate, conduct, and report on logistic systems studies established under the direction of the LSPC. It also provides information and guidance to the DoD Components on their relationships with, and support of, DoD Task Groups. This Handbook is considered part of each LSPC Task Order assignment and will be followed by all LSPC Task Groups.

Although published for the LSPC, this Handbook has a more general application, and can be used by any activity involved in planning, organizing, or conducting a DoD study effort.

Appendix A of this Handbook contains a listing, in chronological order, of the actions which must be taken during the course of a study, with a reference to the portion of this Handbook in which that subject is discussed.

The LSPC Secretariat will review and update this Handbook periodically to insure that it reflects the most current experience of LSPC Task Groups. Users of the Handbook may submit recommendations for change to the LSPC Secretariat at any time.

L - Logistics
S - Systems
P - Policy
C - Committee

Accession For
NTIS GRA&I
DDC TAB
Unannounced
Justification
Per Form 50
By
Distribution/
Availability Codes
Dist | Avail and/or special
A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	FOREWORD	iii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
I	STUDY ASSIGNMENT	1
	A. Introduction	1
	B. Study Assignee	2
	C. Title of the Study	2
	D. Description of the Study	2
	E. Reporting Requirements	3
	F. References	4
	G. Contact Points	4
	H. Time Phasing	5
	I. Data Collection	5
	J. Task Group Composition	5
	K. Administrative Support	6
	L. Issuing Authority	6
II	STUDY PLANS	7
	A. Introduction	7
	B. Purpose/Tasks/Objectives	7
	C. Scope	8
	D. Study Approach	8
	E. Task Group Manning	9
	F. Study Schedule	13
	G. Data Requirements	14
	H. Itinerary	15
	I. Contact Points	15
III	SELECTING AND ORGANIZING A TASK GROUP	17
	A. Qualification of Task Group Members	17
	B. Task Group Leadership	18
	C. Task Group Chairman Responsibilities	19
	D. Task Group Member Responsibilities	20
	E. Task Group Decision Making	20
	F. Task Group Work Assignments	21
	G. Task Group/LSPC Secretariat Liaison and Relations	23

Chapter		Page
IV	HEADQUARTERS-LEVEL BRIEFINGS	25
	A. Introduction	25
	B. Briefing Sources	25
	C. Briefing Content	26
	D. Establishing and Scheduling Briefings	27
V	FIELD RESEARCH	29
	A. Introduction	29
	B. Selecting Field Research Activities	30
	C. The Field Research Questionnaire	35
	D. Arranging Field Research Visits	38
	E. Accomplishing Field Research	41
	F. Collecting Data During Field Research	44
	G. Individual Item Analysis	46
	H. Exit Interviews	48
	I. Documenting Field Research	50
VI	DATA CALL	53
	A. Introduction	53
	B. Identifying Data Requirements	54
	C. Selecting Data Submitters	56
	D. Quality of Data	56
	E. Establishing and Issuing Data Requirements	56
	F. Data Timing	57
	G. Data Publication	58
VII	FINAL REPORT — ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS	59
	A. Introduction	59
	B. Approach	59
	C. Classification	60
	D. Organization of the Managerial Analysis	60
	E. Organizing an Analysis Chapter	65
	F. Task Group Analysis	67
	G. Writing a Chapter	69
	H. Final Report Recommendations	70
VIII	POST STUDY ACTIONS	73
	A. Introduction	73
	B. Briefings	73
	C. Final Report Distribution	74
	D. Analysis of Component Comments	75

Appendix | Page

A. Check List of Study Actions 77
B. Task Order. 79
C. Task Group Reporting. 83
D. Study Plan. 89
E. Task Group Composition. 93
F. Preliminary Study Schedule. 95
G. Headquarters-Level Briefing Requirements. 97
H. Field Research Outline. 99
I. Guide to Preparing Final Reports. 103

CHAPTER I

STUDY ASSIGNMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

The study assignment, whether or not formally designated a Task Order and regardless of the issuing office, provides general direction on the study's nature and designates who will prepare the study.

Since a study assignment is issued by a relatively high level official and followed, shortly, by a considerably more detailed "Study Plan" (see Chapter II), emphasis in the development of the study assignment should be oriented primarily toward the reasons for its establishment and based on minimum research into the subject area involved.

This Chapter identifies and discusses the elements of information which should be included in any study assignment:

a. Identification of the study assignee;

b. Title of the study;

c. Description of the study;

d. Reporting requirements;

e. Other document or study references;

f. Contact points;

g. Timing of the study;

h. Data collection;

i. Composition of the study team;

j. Administrative support arrangements; and,

k. Authorization for the study.

The term "Task Order" is used throughout this Chapter to refer to the document which contains and establishes the study assignment. A sample formal Task Order is contained in Appendix B.

B. STUDY ASSIGNEE

This element of the Task Order designates the organization responsible for directing the study described in the Order.

Usually, this assignment will be made to one of the Department of Defense (DoD) Components in a Task Order addressed to the Assistant Secretary (Installations and Logistics) (I&L) of one of the Military Departments or to the Director of one of the Defense Agencies. However, when the specific organization which is to conduct the study has already been selected, this element of the Task Order should provide a precise identification of the assignee.

C. TITLE OF STUDY

The Task Order should identify the official title and a short title or acronym of the study.

D. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

1. General. The description of the study in the Task Order identifies the background and scope of the study, and delineates the specific tasks to be accomplished, products to be produced, or objectives to be met.

2. Background

This briefly discusses the events/factors which led to the establishment of the study, the nature of the problems which have been encountered in the study area, and/or the nature and scope of previous study efforts.

For Logistics Systems Policy Committee (LSPC) Task Orders, this discussion should identify the General and Specific Logistics Systems Plan (LOGPLAN) Objectives which the study is intended to further.

3. Study Scope

The scope of the study will be expressed in general terms in the Task Order since it will be discussed in greater detail in the Study Plan (see Chapter II). Care must be exercised in identifying limitations to the scope so that the Task Group is not barred from conducting research in logistics areas which are closely related to, or have a direct impact on, the area of the study effort.

The Study Scope establishes the parameters of the study, expressed in terms of inclusions, exclusions, or a combination of these:

(1) Commodity Range: Examples of the terms in which this can be stated are: specific Federal Supply Classes or Groups; secondary items only or principal items only; and, reparable items only or nonreparable items only.

(2) Geography: Generally, the alternatives are CONUS only, overseas only, or worldwide in scope.

(3) Functional: Studies can be limited to specific logistics functions (e.g., supply management, cataloging, depot-level maintenance, or procurement).

(4) Organizational: Studies can be limited to specific organizational levels (e.g., major command level in CONUS only, or unified command headquarters only).

4. Tasks/Products/Objectives

This portion of the Task Order defines the work to be accomplished by the Task Group in terms of any one or more of the following:

(1) Specific tasks to be accomplished: for example, "determine the relationship between ..."

(2) Specific products to be developed: for example, "develop a DoD directive which establishes policy for ..."

(3) Specific objectives to be met: for example, "develop a system which will provide the item manager with ..."

This element of the Task Order establishes minimum goals which must be met. The Task Group will be expected to go beyond these when justified by its research and findings, subject only to the restriction that its final recommendations not exceed the finally approved scope of the study.

Particular care should be taken in the development of this portion of the Task Order to minimize the likelihood of the Task Group not accomplishing its intended purpose. An effective technique is to consider the end result of the Task Group effort as a physical product and then to describe that product. The Task Group should be charged "to develop criteria for determining when ..." rather than being directed to "solve this problem." Such statements should always be positive; i.e., they should state what is expected, not what is not be be done.

E. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Periodic progress reports to the LSPC are required of all LSPC Task Groups. These reports are intended to advise the LSPC of:

a. Progress toward the achievement of major milestones, areas in which the Task Group is behind schedule, and the reason for slippage.

b. Problems which have arisen during the course of the study, Task Group actions taken to resolve those problems, and the specific action required of the LSPC to assist in the resolution of those problems.

Instructions for the submission of LSPC Progress Reports are contained in Appendix C.

F. REFERENCES

The Task Order should list material related to the subject of the study which has been identified as relevant.

This list of references should include such material as:

a. DoD and Military Service directives.

b. Management studies conducted by DoD, the Military Services or other DoD Components, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office, civilian Governmental agencies, or studies conducted by private management consultant organizations for these organizations.

c. Relevant theses or studies available from DoD or civilian educational institutions, such as the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, or individual Military Service schools.

These references should assist the Task Group in its initial orientation but should not be considered an exhaustive bibliography of references.

G. CONTACT POINTS

Task Groups work only for the LSPC during the course of their assignment and therefore the LSPC is the source for all instructions and guidance to the Task Group. Guidance is generally provided at LSPC meetings and received by the Task Group through the LSPC Secretariat.

A staff office within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (OASD)(I&L) may be designated as the point of contact for day-to-day guidance to the Task Group on matters not meriting the attention of the LSPC itself.

The Task Group should be authorized direct contact with DoD Components, other Government agencies, private industry, and educational and industrial associations to arrange field visits, briefings, and request data required for the study.

H. TIME PHASING

The Task Order establishes only two dates, the date a detailed plan for the accomplishment of the study is due (a minimum of 30 days should be allowed for the development of this plan) and the date the final report of the Task Group is due. (The completion date is expressed in terms of the monthly LSPC meetings; e.g., "Final report should be submitted to the October 1973 LSPC meeting.")

I. DATA COLLECTION

Every Task Group effort will involve a relatively large-scale, formal data collection effort. To facilitate the "data call," the Task Order should include the assigned Reports Control Symbol (RCS) to be used and the statement that each DoD Component will bear the costs of submission of its portion of this data.

J. TASK GROUP COMPOSITION

The Task Order will specify that Task Group manning will be on a full-time basis for the duration of the study effort. This is necessary to enable the Task Group to effectively plan and program its activities.

The number of Task Group members must be related to the Task Group workload, not to the number of DoD activities particularly interested in the subject to be studied. The required total manning of a Task Group must be the result of an analytical effort, involving consideration of such factors as the approach to the study, amount of research required, the number of different "areas" involved in the study, and the degree of specialization required of Task Group members. These factors are determined during the Study Plan development and hence, the Task Order should not specify Task Group manning. The Task Order should, however, identify the office(s)/organization(s) from which a Task Group nucleus will be drawn. The nucleus, consisting of the Task Group Chairman and one or two Task Group members, will be responsible for developing the Study Plan (see Chapter II), and one part of the Study Plan will be a statement of the full Task Group manning requirement.

K. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

1. Pay and Allowances. Pay and allowances will be provided by the parent organization (DoD Component or civilian agency) of each Task Group member.

2. Clerical and Office Support. Clerical and office support will be provided by the DoD Component designated in the Task Order. Ordinarily, this will be the DoD Component providing the Task Group Chairman. These services will be provided to the Task Group on a nonreimbursable basis and include, but not be limited to, the following: office space and office supplies; secretarial/typing assistance; printing and reproduction services for interim publications and Task Group forms, as well as for the final Task Group report; and, automatic data processing support, including programming and machine processing for Task Group data analyses.

3. Travel

The parent organization of each LSPC Task Group member including the Chairman will be responsible for funding its Task Group member's travel requirements. The Chairman will provide a copy of the proposed itinerary, as soon as available, to DoD Components to assist them in planning for the expenditures for Task Group travel.

The DoD Component responsible for providing administrative and logistical support will provide travel support, including:

(1) Making travel and hotel reservations and obtaining tickets;

(2) Issuing travel advances based on the member's orders; and,

(3) Processing travel vouchers and making payment, citing appropriate funds contained in the travel orders.

L. ISSUING AUTHORITY

The signature element appearing at the end of the Task Order is the authority to direct the accomplishment of the study.

Where the signer of the Task Order is acting in a capacity other than that represented by his official title, the signature element should express that alternate authority. For example, LSPC Task Orders are signed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L), acting in his capacity as Chairman of the LSPC, and the signature element of LSPC Task Orders should reflect this fact.

CHAPTER II

STUDY PLANS

A. INTRODUCTION

The Study Plan, containing the results of one or more months of extensive analysis into the nature of the assigned study, is a dissertation of what is to be accomplished and how. The Study Plan, when approved, supersedes the Task Order.

The Study Plan should be developed by a nucleus of the full Task Group (two or three members including the Task Group Chairman). The Study Plan will be submitted to the authority which issued the Task Order and should highlight any significant differences between the Study Plan and the original Task Order. The approved Study Plan should be disseminated by the approving authority to all DoD Components interested in the subject of the study.

This Chapter identifies and discusses the elements of information to be included in a Study Plan:

a. Study goals;

b. Study scope;

c. Study approach;

d. Task Group manning;

e. Study schedule;

f. Data requirements;

g. Itinerary; and,

h. Contact points.

A sample Study Plan is contained in Appendix D.

B. PURPOSE/TASKS/OBJECTIVES

This element of the Study Plan identifies the specific products which the Task Group plans to include in its final report.

This element may differ from that which was included in the original Task Order because of changes made during the Study Plan development by the Task Group nucleus as a result of analysis of the problem.

The approving authority should carefully review this portion of the Study Plan and note the nature of any changes between the original Task Order and the Study Plan.

C. SCOPE

The Scope is a more definitive identification of the study parameters included in the Task Order.

Consider the following in describing the study scope:

a. Make the study scope as broad as possible to prevent any improper restriction on Task Group research efforts. Affected activities will object to research into areas not firmly identified as being included within the scope of the study; therefore, develop the scope of the study plan accordingly.

b. Identify any exclusions from the study to avoid future misunderstandings.

c. There may be a need for the Task Group to research areas (e.g., commodities or logistics functions) which are not within the primary interest of the study, but which have a relationship with the areas of primary interest. Include these areas in the scope for study of the relationship.

There is an interrelationship between the scope of the study, the manpower authorized to the Task Group, and the amount of time allocated to the study. As each of these elements is tentatively established during the development of the Study Plan, the other two should be reviewed. Appropriate adjustments must be made in the trade off between study coverage, manning, and timing to insure that these are in balance when the Study Plan is submitted for approval. It may, for example, be necessary to limit the scope in order to insure completion of the study by a mandatory due date.

D. STUDY APPROACH

The Study Approach describes how the Task Group proposes to accomplish the study. It contains the sequential actions which the Task Group plans to take to complete the study.

The principal task in developing the study approach is to identify the full range of possible study conclusions and recommendations and then plan study actions to collect information and data to enable the evaluation of each of these. Do not start with a preconceived idea of what the conclusions should be and orient study research efforts toward proving them.

There are two basic approaches to accomplishing a study. In one approach the Task Group, through extensive field research, develops a high degree of expertise in the subject area of the study. The Task Group then analyzes the problem, develops conclusions and recommendations and prepares a final report. In the other approach, the Task Group performs limited research and then develops an interim set of findings, conclusions, and recommendations which are distributed to interested Components for comment. Based on these comments, the Task Group engages in additional highly specialized research, develops revised findings, conclusions, and recommendations and then prepares its final report. The choice of approach rests with the Task Group Chairman.

Consideration should also be given to the possible need for a service test or simulation. This must be identified in the study approach if it is considered a prerequisite to the development of final study recommendations.

The Study Approach should consider the following actions, as appropriate:

a. Review existing reports and analyses.

b. Obtain headquarters-level briefings from appropriate DoD Components.

c. Collect management data.

d. Conduct on-site field research at selected activities.

e. Analyze collected data and information.

f. Identify and analyze alternative courses of action.

g. Select optimum course of action from among these alternatives.

h. Establish a service test or simulation of Task Group proposals.

i. Develop a time-phased plan for the implementation of study recommendations.

E. TASK GROUP MANNING

1. Introduction

Task Group manning is determined by analyzing the amount of work which must be accomplished within the Study time frame established by the Task Order. The most significant factors in this

evaluation are the number of separate "research areas" included in the Study and the number of activities to be visited during field research.

This paragraph discusses these factors and how they combine to determine total Task Group manpower requirements, and the composition of the Task Group.

Task Group manning should be kept to a minimum. A shortage in Task Group manning, if not too severe, can be overcome by a greater effort or a slight extension of the deadline date. On the other hand, the problems of Task Group administration and supervision are increased as the number of Task Group members increases and are complicated by the presence of personnel for whom there is no real work assignment.

The planning effort invested in the determination of Task Group composition will also contribute toward planning the Task Group Schedule (see Paragraph F below), the itinerary (see Paragraph H below), and the field research (see Chapter V).

2. Research Areas

A research area is a logistics function involved in the subject matter of the assigned study. Stock control and procurement are examples of research areas within the scope of logistics studies. Most studies involve consideration of more than one logistics area. For example, a Task Group concerned with installation-level supply support cannot limit its research to requisitioning channels, but also should research the following functional areas: authorized stock levels, stock protection and reservation systems, war reserve identification and protection, asset reporting, local procurement, maintenance priority systems, maintenance-supply interface, and funding.

The number of different research areas included in the study prescribes, tentatively, the maximum limit to the number of Task Group members. One member can be assigned more than one research area but it is undesirable to split a single research area between two Task Group members.

Frequently, a large number of research areas are identified as being relevant to a study (perhaps as many as 15 or 20 individual areas). These should be aggregated into a manageable number of homogeneous groupings, in terms of such factors as the nature of the expertise involved or the organization/office at which the field research would have to be conducted. Examples include: supply management/stock control, technical/engineering, maintenance management, fiscal, and procurement. These homogeneous groups are a tentative

approach to the organization for field research (see Chapter V) and help to determine the number of people required to visit an activity to conduct on-site research.

3. Field Research Activities

From a manning standpoint, the basic question to be resolved is whether enough time is available to permit all Task Group members to visit all field research activities. While this is a most desirable objective, time constraints may require a larger Task Group to permit two or even three field activities to be visited simultaneously.

The way in which field research is conducted establishes a "multiplier factor" which determines total Task Group manning: the number of functional groupings into which field research must be aggregated times the number of activities which must be visited simultaneously in order to complete the study on time, equals the required size of the Task Group.

A decision to split a study team and visit more than one activity at the same time should be made reluctantly. It is desirable that all Task Group members visit all activities in the field research itinerary, because there is no substitute for actual on-site review in developing Task Group expertise.

4. Specialized Personnel. Consideration should be given to the need for highly specialized personnel to support the Task Group during all, or only a portion of, its operations. Examples of the types of additional personnel which might be required include data collection coordinator, ADP specialist and cost accountant.

5. Funding Constraints. The preceding paragraphs have identified the factors which determine the total Task Group manning. Fund availability must also be considered. Fund limitations (generally in the area of travel funds) may require a reduction in total Task Group manning.

6. Task Group Composition

a. Introduction. The Study Plan must specify the total number of people to be provided to the Task Group. In addition, it should specify the types of people desired, in terms of military-civilian mix, grade/rank, expertise, and/or DoD Component source.

b. Military-Civilian Mix. The relative number of military and civilian personnel on the Task Group may be a factor affecting the acceptability of study recommendations. For example, a study

involving supply relationships between combat units overseas may be identified as requiring a different military-civilian mix than one concerned with wholesale supply management in CONUS. Appropriate specifications should be included in the Study Plan when this factor is determined to be relevant.

c. Grade/Rank. The minimum grade/rank of personnel assigned to a Task Group is a function of the complexity of the task assigned and/or the organization levels which must be contacted to obtain information. Team members should have experience as management/systems analysts or experience in the tasks/functions included in the study. Generally, personnel of the 0-4/GS-13 level have sufficient experience for Task Group membership.

d. Existing Expertise. While the Task Group members are expected to become experts in the areas relevant to the subject of the study as a result of study research, some background in these areas is desirable to assist the Task Group in its planning efforts. Identification of desired background and experience should be expressed in terms of functional areas (for example, ICP stock control, depot transportation planning, or installation stock funding experience). Identification of the desired expertise should be made to provide the Task Group with a balance of all relevant experience insofar as this is possible within the constraints of the total desired Task Group size. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of using part-time consultants in highly specialized areas when such detailed knowledge would be required for a limited time only.

e. Personnel Source. Some DoD Components will have a greater interest in the study subject while other Components will have almost no interest. Some civilian agencies (for example, General Services Administration) may also have an interest. These factors should be considered in identifying the source of Task Group members. Within the limit of total desired Task Group size, an effort should be made to have personnel from each directly affected DoD Component on the Task Group.

7. Summary

The Study Plan should specify the total number of people to be assigned to the Task Group, the military-civilian mix when appropriate, and the minimum grade/rank required. In addition, the Plan should also specify the functional expertise and/or DoD Component source of personnel. (See Chapter III on criteria for selecting members for a Task Group).

An example of the identification of Task Group manpower requirements, showing functional and organizational needs, is contained in Appendix E.

F. STUDY SCHEDULE

The Task Order specifies when the final Study report is to be submitted. The Study Plan must contain other milestones. Following are several milestones which should be included in the Study Plan with suggestions on timing for a number of these. Actual time requirements must be tailored to the needs of each individual study effort:

a. Date on which full Task Group assembles.

b. Period during which Task Group establishes its approach to the Study, and develops requirements for Headquarters briefings. A minimum of two weeks leadtime must be provided for the briefings. The briefing schedule and general description of the briefing requirements should be provided to the involved DoD activities as soon as possible while a detailed briefing requirement should be provided at least one week in advance of the scheduled briefing.

c. Period during which the field research itinerary, field research questionnaire, and statistical data requirements are developed. Adequate time must be allowed for this planning effort. Inadequate planning can seriously handicap a study. Allow a minimum of three weeks for even the simplest of studies.

d. Date on which the field research itinerary is completed. This should be at least one week (and, preferably, two or more weeks) before the start of field research.

e. Date on which the field research questionnaire is distributed. The field research questionnaire should be in the hands of the field activities at least one week prior to Task Group arrival if the activities are expected to develop information in advance. This has an effect on the timing of the preceding element.

f. Date on which statistical data requirements will be released. Statistical data requirements should be issued before the Task Group departs on field research; however, it may be desirable or necessary to complete some field research before these data requirements can be identified.

g. Date on which statistical data is to be submitted. Allow a minimum of two months. This period will be extended by such factors as: the number of command echelons through which the reporting requirements must be processed; extent to which the requested data differs from that which is available at the data submitters; the amount of computer programming effort required; and, the need for planning plus data collection time, if the requirement is established for transaction data not already being collected by data submitters.

The collection of statistical data is the most difficult item to schedule and will be the factor most responsible for deterring the timely completion of a study.

h. Dates on which field research will begin and end. This is a function of the number of field activities to be visited, the amount of research to be accomplished at each, and the amount of writing time required between visits. These subjects are discussed in Chapter V.

i. Period during which final analysis will take place and the final report will be developed. Allow a minimum of three months. It is virtually impossible to allow too much time for this phase of the study.

j. Date for submission of the final report to LSPC.

In addition to the time allowances for study requirements identified above, allowance should be made for the following factors:

a. Military Leave. The military leave year ends with the end of the fiscal year and plans should provide for military Task Group members to take leave at that time to minimize forfeiture. Study schedules should be planned so that no group or joint actions (for example, field research visits, briefings, or joint planning sessions) are scheduled during the last two weeks in June.

b. Civilian Leave. The civilian leave year ends with the end of the calendar year, coinciding with the Christmas-New Year period. Only a limited amount of work should be scheduled during this period.

c. Local and National Holidays. Official (local, National, and foreign) holidays may have an impact on study scheduling. Do not schedule Task Group field research over holiday periods.

Appendix F contains an example of a study schedule. This schedule should identify specific dates, based on an assumed date of Study Plan approval. If this date "slips," a revised schedule should be submitted in the first Task Group progress report.

G. DATA REQUIREMENTS

Summary, program, individual activity, and/or individual item data may be required for Task Group review and analysis. (The development of data requirements is discussed in detail in Chapter IV.) This requirement will be met, to the extent feasible, through the use of existing reports and data. Special reports and data analyses may be needed to meet Task Group requirements. Generally, these data

requirements cannot be specified at the time the Study Plan is being prepared. The Study Plan should specify that data will be required, and that detailed data requirements will be forwarded later, directly from the Task Group to the headquarters of the DoD activities involved.

The Study Plan will cite the Reports Control Symbol provided in the Task Order.

H. ITINERARY

Field research at DoD activities will be required for the accomplishment of the assigned study. The identification of activities to be visited during field research is discussed in detail in Chapter V. The specific activities to be visited and the timing of the visits generally cannot be specified at the time the Study Plan is prepared. However, the type of activities which should be visited (for example, ICPs, depots, procurement offices, or operating installations) should be identifiable.

The Study Plan should specify that field visits will be required and are authorized, and that a detailed itinerary will be forwarded later, directly from the Task Group to the headquarters of the DoD activities involved.

I. CONTACT POINTS

It will be necessary for the Task Group to contact interested activities (for example, the Military Services, Defense Agencies, JCS, or civilian agencies) during the course of the Study in order to make travel arrangements, obtain clearances, identify sources of information, or obtain information and data.

Communication between the Task Group and these interested activities is more easily accomplished if the initial contact with each activity is made through an individual who is aware of the Study assignment and the Task Group mission. Therefore, the Study Plan should indicate that each activity involved with the Task Group will designate a single point of contact for matters pertaining to the Study.

The point of contact cannot be a member of the Task Group from the Component, but must be an individual within the Component who is at a sufficiently high organizational level (for example, at Departmental level) to expeditiously perform the duties and responsibilities of a contact point.

CHAPTER III

SELECTING AND ORGANIZING A TASK GROUP

A. QUALIFICATIONS OF TASK GROUP MEMBERS

The Task Order and the Study Plan will identify the total number of people required for a study, their grade/rank, the DoD Component providing the personnel, and the technical areas in which they should have specialized knowledge.

Neither the Task Order nor the Study Plan will identify the more subjective characteristics which are desirable for members and the Chairman of a Task Group. Involved components should consider the following important characteristics in selecting their personnel for duty with Task Groups:

a. Analytical Ability. The ability to perform analyses is the most important single capability required in Task Group members and overrides any other considerations. Analytical ability partially offsets a lack of writing ability and enables the individual to overcome deficiencies in technical knowledge. Analytical ability combined with a questioning attitude contributes to the effectiveness of a Task Group. Thus, what is sought is not only an individual who will ask "What is being done?", but who will also ask, "Why is it being done this way?" and, "How could it be done better?" An individual whose talents have been confined to interpreting existing directives — as opposed to developing new ones — does not represent great potential for contributing to Task Group deliberations. Similarly, the demonstration of outstanding competence in combat or supervisory duties alone, without some demonstration of management abilities in logistics, does not serve as an adequate recommendation for Task Group duty.

b. Writing Ability. The end result of Task Group actions is expressed through writing. The results of field research and final Task Group findings, conclusions, and recommendations must be written into a final study report. An ability to plan and organize written material and to express thoughts clearly and concisely in writing is an invaluable asset for a Task Group member. Individuals without at least a fair writing ability should not be designated for Task Group membership.

c. Technical Knowledge. Some familiarity with the subject area of the study is desirable and expertise in the area would be even more helpful. It should be noted, however, that the Task Group study

approach is designed to develop technical competence in the Group members during the study and prerequisite technical knowledge, while desirable, should be considered of secondary importance compared to the characteristics identified in the preceding paragraphs.

These characteristics are applicable both for members and for the Chairman of a Task Group. One additional major consideration in the selection of the Task Group Chairman is an ability to organize and manage a group effort. Preferably, this ability should have been demonstrated through the direction of a comprehensive study effort.

B. TASK GROUP LEADERSHIP

The Task Order will designate an organization responsible for conducting the study and this organization will be expected to provide the Chairman of the Task Group.

There may be instances in which the organizational assignment of responsibility for a study results in the designation of an individual as Task Group Chairman who is not in a position to devote full time to Task Group efforts. In this situation, the Task Group Chairman will identify a senior individual from his organization to serve as full-time supervisor of Task Group activities. The individual so identified will be designated as Task Group Director and will assume, on a day-to-day basis, the responsibilities of the Task Group Chairman as described in Paragraph C.

The relationship between a Task Group Chairman and a full-time Task Group Director will be as mutually agreed upon between the individuals involved and the Chairman is authorized to delegate full responsibility and authority for Task Group operations to the Director. The Chairman should make clear, both to the Director and to the Task Group members, the extent of this delegation and the nature of the authority and responsibility which he has retained for himself.

Throughout this Handbook, references will be made only to the Task Group Chairman and these should be understood to include the Task Group Director to the extent authorized by the Chairman. Generally, these references to the Task Group Chairman are intended to apply to the individual devoting full-time efforts to the study assignment.

A full-time member of the Task Group, not necessarily from the organization responsible for providing the Task Group Chairman, will be designated as deputy. This individual will be selected by the individual providing full-time leadership to the Task Group, and will be designated as "Deputy" to the individual exercising full-time Task Group leadership (i.e., Deputy Task Group Chairman or Deputy Task Group Director, as appropriate). Criteria which can be used for the selection of the

Deputy include: the most senior of the Task Group members; the Task Group member with the greatest amount of experience on a task group/study team; or, a member of the same office/organization as the Task Group Chairman and, therefore, someone of whom the Chairman has knowledge and in whom he has confidence.

C. TASK GROUP CHAIRMAN RESPONSIBILITIES

A Task Group is an ad hoc organization, established to perform a specific mission and then disbanded after the completion of that mission. While it is in existence the Task Group must be considered to be as substantial as any permanent organization, with the duties, rights, and responsibilities of permanent, standing organizations. Similarly, while the Task Group is in existence, the duties, rights and responsibilities of the Task Group Chairman must be considered to be comparable to those of the chief of any permanent staff organization.

Task Group members will be under the supervisory control of the Task Group Chairman. Their day-to-day working relationship will be as any employee-supervisor relationship. The employee's presence, absence, work assignments, and performance evaluation will be the responsibility of the Task Group Chairman. The Chairman has the responsibility for providing a Task Group product in accordance with the objectives contained in the Task Order and, therefore, it is his responsibility to use the resources provided (including personnel) toward the proficient attainment of those objectives.

The duties and responsibilities of the Task Group Chairman include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Establishing Task Group duty hours and work schedules: normal duty hours will be in accordance with the schedule of the organization providing logistical support; special duty hours (e.g., overtime) will be in accordance with applicable personnel regulations.

b. Making work assignments.

c. Establishing schedules for the accomplishment of Task Group work, such as dates by which drafts or final write-ups must be submitted.

d. Approving leave, although the final processing of leave requests and related documents must be through the parent organizations of the Task Group members.

e. Submitting performance/evaluation/fitness reports on Task Group members, in accordance with applicable directives.

f. Signing Task Group correspondence.

D. TASK GROUP MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Personnel are assigned to the Task Group on a full-time basis for the duration of the study subject to earlier release as mutually agreed upon by the Task Group Chairman and the providing DoD Component.

Individuals selected for duty with a Task Group (including the nucleus identified by the Task Order) will be placed on orders to the Task Group by their parent organization. These orders will be of an appropriate type to establish the relationships specified in this Chapter.

Task Group members are responsible for doing a conscientious, qualitative job, aimed at carrying out the mission of the Task Group. As a result, Task Group members cannot be considered "representatives" of the organizations from which they are sent and their allegiance and responsibility to those organizations must be severed for the duration of their assignment to the Task Group. Furthermore, Task Group members are not considered "contact points" for obtaining information from their respective organizations.

This does not preclude Task Group member contacts with his parent organization on personnel and administrative matters not connected with the subject of the study.

E. TASK GROUP DECISION MAKING

To be fully effective, the Task Group decision making process is dependent on extensive group discussion sessions and a free exchange of ideas among the Task Group members. During such sessions, Task Group members should not be inhibited by rank, grade, or organizational differences. The importance of full participation and free discussion should be continually emphasized by the Group Chairman.

As a study develops and progresses, decisions regarding procedural and substantive issues are required. Procedural issues are those related to the way the Task Group accomplishes its tasks. Substantive issues are those related to the potential effects of the Task Group's efforts; that is, the major findings, the analyses, the conclusions, and the recommendations of the Task Group. The following guidelines are provided for reaching decisions regarding each type of issue.

a. Procedural Issues. Decisions on procedural issues may be made by the Task Group as a whole, by the Chairman after consultation with Task Group members, or by the Chairman unilaterally. While Task Group input should be solicited on procedural matters, care must be taken to avoid wasting time in extensive discussions on these matters, and the Chairman should not be reluctant to make procedural decisions unilaterally or after minimum consultation with the Group members.

b. Substantive Issues. Decisions on substantive issues, because of their importance to the study, should be arrived at by the Task Group as a whole after a full discussion. The Group Chairman will perform the role of discussion leader and ensure that all Task Group members have had an opportunity to present facts and opinions. He must, however, be prepared to terminate discussion after the issues have been fully defined and presented and call for a vote on the substantive issue. While the Chairman has the prerogative of overriding the majority on substantive issues, this prerogative should be exercises with extreme reluctance. Substantive decisions should be supported by Task Group members for the duration of their assignment to the Group and minority positions will be not included in the final report. (Naturally, after returning to their parent organizations, Task Group members can participate in preparing their Component's comments on the Task Group Report, can comment freely on study conclusions, and can express their disagreement with portions or all of the report.)

F. TASK GROUP WORK ASSIGNMENTS

1. Research and Analysis Areas

The Chairman should identify as early as possible the areas into which Task Group research and analysis efforts will be divided (see the discussion on the identification and grouping of "research areas" in Chapter II). Specific assignment of responsibility for each of these areas should be made to individual Task Group members to permit them to concentrate their efforts during the course of the study. This assignment should cover: preparation of the field research questionnaire; identification of statistical data submission and data analysis requirements; conduct of field research; and, final report preparation.

There are two bases for making these assignments:

(1) Assign responsibility to a member who already has expertise in the research area: This has the advantage of producing quicker learning results, because the member is not starting from scratch in developing expertise. and is less likely to overlook less obvious areas of research. It has the following disadvantages: the knowledgeable individual runs the risk of assuming current knowledge in an area, when

it may in fact be obsolete; and, knowledge of an area is concentrated in the one assigned individual, with only limited ability by other Task Group personnel to engage in discussion or raise questions in the area.

(2) Assign responsibility to an individual who has no expertise in the research area: This has the disadvantage of delaying the time in which Task Group expertise is developed and runs the risk that the novice in an area will overlook important information. An advantage results if there is another individual on the Task Group who already has some expertise in the area; Task Group total competence in the area is increased, and the two individuals are able to engage in cross-fertilizing discussions.

The Chairman should emphasize to the Task Group that this individual assignment of responsibilities does not permit Task Group members to completely ignore areas other than their own. Each member of the Task Group is expected to contribute to the development of all areas involved in the study effort, by assisting during study planning and identifying information applicable to other research areas during the course of field research.

The Task Group Chairman should devote his efforts to the primary responsibilities of the position: planning and supervision of Task Group activities and emergency support for individual Task Group members. If the Chairman accepts some continuing research responsibilities, these should involve areas with a minimum workload.

2. Contact Points

As discussed in Chapter II, each activity with an interest in the study area will identify an individual to serve as a single point of contact with the Task Group.

Generally, contacts with the DoD Components will be made by the member of the Task Group concerned with the subject involved. However, a member of the Task Group should be identified as the individual to make general contacts with the DoD Components not involving any specific Task Group research area. There is no particular guidance for the designation of these individuals other than that a Task Group member should not be designated as the point of contact for his own Component. Designating a Task Group member as the point of contact for his own Component establishes a relationship which can be misinterpreted to identify the Task Group member as the "representative" of his Component. It also makes him vulnerable to receiving direction and policy guidance about the position he should take on matters under study by the Task Group, as well as to receiving requests for information about Task Group deliberations.

G. TASK GROUP/LSPC SECRETARIAT LIAISON AND RELATIONS

The LSPC Secretariat is established as the "working arm" of the LSPC. As such, its responsibilities with respect to a Task Group are as follows:

a. Providing assistance and advice to the Task Group Chairman, when requested; and,

b. Serving as liaison between the Task Group Chairman and the Logistics Systems Policy Committee itself.

To facilitate these contacts, the LSPC Secretariat should designate a Project Officer for each Task Group.

Basically, Task Group contacts with the LSPC (for example, for submission of the periodic progress reports discussed in Chapter I) will be accomplished through the LSPC Secretariat. The Task Group Chairman, however, is authorized direct access to the LSPC when deemed necessary. Ordinarily, the subject requiring direct access will first have been discussed with the LSPC Secretariat and appropriate action taken at that level in order to obviate the need for the direct contact with the LSPC.

The Task Group final report is submitted to the LSPC through the LSPC Secretariat.

CHAPTER IV

HEADQUARTERS-LEVEL BRIEFINGS

A. INTRODUCTION

The first action which must be taken by a Task Group is "office research," the identification and review of written material pertaining to the subject of the study. This material includes, but is not limited to, the following:

a. DoD and Component directives;

b. Earlier OSD or DoD Component management studies on the same, or related, subject;

c. DoD or DoD Component audit or inspection reports;

d. General Accounting Office reports; and

e. Studies by contractor research organizations, such as the RAND Corporation.

Office research effort provides basic knowledge for Task Group members of the study area and furnishes a basis for the joint development of a detailed approach to the study. There is also a need for an early briefing from affected agencies (e.g., the Military Services, the Defense Agencies, or civilian agencies, such as the General Services Administration or the Federal Aviation Agency) to provide the Task Group with an overview of the organizations, policies, and systems involved with the subject of the study.

B. BRIEFING SOURCES

Headquarters-level activities include: Departmental headquarters of the Military Services; the headquarters of Defense Agencies, such as the Defense Supply Agency; and the headquarters of the major logistical commands of the DoD, such as Headquarters Army Materiel Command, or Headquarters Air Force Logistics Command.

Briefings should be required of all DoD Components with an interest in the subject of the study. Whether a briefing is provided by Departmental headquarters, or by the logistics command headquarters, or by both, should generally be at the option of the briefing DoD Component, although it is appropriate for the Task Group to specifically identify a headquarters from which a briefing is desired.

Following is a partial list of the organizations which can be requested to provide initial headquarters-level briefings:

Office of the Secretary of Defense
Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Headquarters, Department of the Army
Headquarters, Army Materiel Command
Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
Naval Material Command Headquarters
Headquarters of Specific Naval Hardware Systems Commands (e.g., Naval Ship Systems Command Headquarters)
Naval Supply Systems Command
Headquarters, U.S. Air Force
Headquarters, Air Force Logistics Command
Headquarters, Air Force Systems Command
Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps
Headquarters, Defense Supply Agency
Headquarters, Defense Communications Agency
General Services Administration, Federal Supply Service

C. BRIEFING CONTENT

The desired contents of headquarters-level briefings should be stated to the briefing activities in general terms, to avoid placing any limitations on the scope of the briefing which would result in the omission of significant material. Complete coverage is particularly important at this early stage in the study when the knowledge of the Task Group members is limited.

Following are the types of subjects which should be included in these briefings:

a. The DoD Component policies which govern the subject under study, including the logic/rationale for those policies.

b. General description of the process, system, or procedure involved in the study, identifying the organizations involved.

c. Data portraying the magnitude of the operation; for example, number of items, number and dollar value of transactions, inventory value, or annual issue value.

d. Existing problems and a description of the actions which have been, or are being, taken to solve them.

Each briefing Component should also be requested to recommend specific locations for Task Group field research. The rationale for these recommendations should also be furnished.

Briefers should furnish copies of any charts or statistics used in the briefing at the start of the briefing. One copy should be furnished for each member of the Task Group.

In addition, two or three copies of each relevant directive (DoD or Component) should be furnished to the Task Group at the time of the briefing.

D. ESTABLISHING AND SCHEDULING BRIEFINGS

The headquarters-level briefings should be presented shortly after convening the full Task Group. Generally, only two actions should be planned for accomplishment prior to these briefings: "desk research," with the Task Group members reviewing basic literature (for example, studies and reports) pertaining to the subject of the study; and, Task Group development of a basic approach to the Study and of a common understanding of the goals and objectives of the Study.

These briefing requirements should be established in writing to the Assistant Secretary (I&L) of the Military Departments and to the Directors of Defense Agencies involved in the study. While this formal copy is being processed through channels, a copy of the request should be sent (or, preferably, delivered) directly to the designated contact point. An example of a written request for a headquarters-level briefing is shown in Appendix G.

Allow one full day for the briefing from each separate DoD Component with the briefing scheduled to start relatively early (for example, 0830 or 0900 hours).

The requirements established for these briefings should be expressed in general terms. Prior to the briefings, the Task Group should develop a "check list" identifying minimum subjects which the briefer should cover. The Task Group member assigned each functional area should insure that all items on his check list have been covered.

A member of the Task Group should prepare a writeup of each briefing session for future reference. Assignment of this responsibility to a Task Group member not from the Component presenting the briefing is an effective educational technique.

CHAPTER V

FIELD RESEARCH

A. INTRODUCTION

The Headquarters-level briefings discussed in the preceding Chapter will provide the Task Group with general knowledge of the organizations involved in the study and an understanding of how the several Headquarters have directed operations be accomplished, or how these Headquarters think operations are being accomplished.

The goal of on-site field research is to permit Task Group members to observe how operations are actually being accomplished.

There are a number of purposes which must be served by field research, and all of these must be kept in mind when developing field research requirements. This research is intended to develop information and knowledge which will enable the Task Group to determine:

a. Is there a problem? If so, what is it? Is it as stated in the Task Order/Study Plan, or is it actually something else? Field research must be directed toward the identification and solution of the real problem, regardless of the problem stated in the Task Order/Study Plan.

b. How big is the problem? This determination will enable the problem to be placed in proper perspective, since the acceptable cost of a solution must be related to the cost/magnitude/effect of the problem.

c. What are the potential acceptable solutions to the problem(s), and what are the advantages, disadvantages, and net effects of each?

d. Which of the potential solutions is optimum for resolution of the identified problems, and what are the cost-benefit implications of this solution?

This Chapter discusses how to plan for, and conduct, field research, including:

a. Identifying and selecting activities to be visited;

b. Developing a field research questionnaire/writing outline;

c. Arranging for the visit;

d. Performing field research;

e. Collecting data during field research;

f. Individual item analysis ("item chase");

g. Exit interviews at the conclusion of a field research visit; and,

h. Recording the results of field research.

Recognizing that the Chairman may not be present during field research at all activities, references throughout this Chapter to actions of the Task Group Chairman at a field research activity should be understood to refer to the senior member of the Task Group in the absence of the Chairman.

B. SELECTING FIELD RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

1. Type Activities to be Visited

The first consideration, determining the type of activities which must be visited, is established by the nature/subject of the study. Several types of activities to be considered when developing a field research itinerary include the following:

(1) Inventory control points (ICPs).

(2) Storage activities/stock points.

(3) Maintenance activities.

(4) Purchasing activities.

(5) Engineering/development activities.

(6) Cataloging activities.

(7) Disposal activities.

The preceding list is not all-inclusive. There are a number of alternatives to be considered in determining the type of activities which must be visited in order to obtain the information required.

Field research need not be limited to one type of activity; the nature of the study may require visits to two or more types. For example, a study involving commodity management may require field research visits to inventory control points, maintenance activities, engineering/development activities, and user/consumer activities.

2. Information Sources

Having established the type(s) of activities to be visited, certain information sources can be used to identify the specific activities which should be considered for inclusion in the field research itinerary.

These information sources include:

(1) DoD Component "Directories": Various "directories" which aggregate activities by function are published by the DoD Components. There are, for example, Military Service "directories" which identify inventory control points and storage depots; there is a DoD directory which identifies all Property Disposal Offices; there is a wall map of the Continental United States (CONUS) which identifies the geographical locale of all major DoD installations.

(2) DoD Component Recommendations: As indicated in the preceding Chapter, the DoD Component headquarters can be requested to recommend activities to be visited during field research, with a rationale for the recommendation.

(3) DLSC Reports: The Defense Logistics Services Center (DLSC) publishes a number of reports identifying activities which have various types of management responsibility (e.g., wholesale, retail, and cataloging) for the DoD item range. These reports contain item counts, indicating the relative significance of the listed activities.

(4) Specialized Available Data: Other specialized data is also available to assist in the identification of potential field research activities. For example, in a study concerned with installation-level supply support, Military Service manpower program documents can be used to identify geographical areas in which large numbers of DoD personnel are currently assigned and scheduled to remain. Requisition workload, purchase, and storage data reports are examples of logistics-function, management reports which provide meaningful indicators of relative size or volume in terms of such factors as numbers of transactions, dollar value, tons, issues, square footage, or numbers of documents. The emphasis on available data is deliberate; because a specialized data collection for determining program magnitude is generally not justifiable and should be undertaken only under extraordinary circumstances.

3. Selecting Specific Activities

The preceding action should have identified a relatively large number of activities from which the specific activities to be visited can be selected. Following are some of the factors to consider in making the selection, recognizing that the actual selection will probably involve an attempt to optimize a combination of several factors:

(1) Size: Size must be considered in relation to the area under study. For example, in a study involving wholesale management of a particular commodity area, an inventory control point which has management responsibility for 90% of the items used by one Military Service should be selected for visit, even if it is one of the smallest ICPs in that Service.

(2) Breadth of "Sample": It is generally important to have a sample of activities from across the DoD and, occasionally, from non-DoD agencies in the field research itinerary. For example, a study of the processing of high priority requisitions should include activities from all four Military Services and the Defense Supply Agency, and possibly the General Services Administration (GSA); on the other hand, a study of aircraft engine management should probably include activities from three Military Services only. To avoid having study results biased by the individual idiosyncracies of the activities visited, if time permits, the field research itinerary should include at least two activities from each of the DoD components having a major interest in the subject of the study.

(3) Geography: In certain studies geography is a substantive consideration; for example, in a study involving world-wide support it may be necessary to visit overseas activities as well as those in CONUS. In other cases, geographical location is important only because judicious selection of activities facilitates field research. A few factors to consider are:

(a) Many Activities on one Place: Activities can be selected because one trip (and, therefore, one travel period and one transportation expenditure) places the Task Group in an area having eligible activities, which can provide either geographical or functional coverage. For example, a visit to San Francisco provides immediate access to a continental Army headquarters, a Naval supply center, air stations, and shipyards, a major subdivision of Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service (MTMTS), a Defense Contract Administration Services Regional Office, and a GSA Regional Office; in addition, it places a Task Group within easy access of an Army depot, a Defense depot, a GSA depot, and a major aerial port of embarkation. In

functional terms, for example, a visit to an Air Force, Air Materiel Area places a Task Group at a facility which includes an inventory control point, a storage depot, and a maintenance depot.

(b) Travel Flow: Activities can be selected because of the ease of transportation scheduling. For example, inclusion of two Defense Supply Centers on an itinerary can be accomplished easily by selecting the Defense Construction and Defense Electronics Supply Centers.

(c) Convenience: Several areas are particularly convenient for visit from Washington, and activities in these areas can be selected for that reason. These include: Richmond and Norfolk, Virginia, and the Harrisburg area and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Activities in these areas can be selected for initial field research visits, because they are easy to re-visit if oversights in field research are discovered later in the study. In addition, these areas can be reached by car, a factor to be considered if field research encompasses holiday periods when public transportation reservations are difficult to obtain.

4. Sequence and Timing of Visits

There is no rigid rule for determining the sequence in which activities should be visited. However, the following general guidance is offered:

(1) A nearby activity which is easy to reach should be considered as the first place to visit, because the first visit includes a "shakedown" for the field research questionnaire, and a revisit would be relatively easy, if significant changes to the questionnaire make it necessary.

(2) For the same reason, CONUS activities should be visited before those overseas, in a study which involves world-wide field research.

(3) There may be one "key" activity on the itinerary (for example, the largest item manager, or the activity having coordinated procurement responsibility, or the standardization assignee). A definitive statement cannot be made that this activity should be visited first, or last; this determination must be made separately for each study and careful consideration should be given to that decision.

(4) On a procedural study, it may be desirable to sequence activities based on document or materiel flow (for example, requisitioning activity to ICP, or depot to transshipment point to ultimate consumer).

(5) Generally place the "less significant" activities toward the end of the itinerary, so that if slippages require the omission of some activities, these are the ones affected.

The length of the field research questionnaire will determine how much time is required at each activity. The following general rules are suggested as guidance in determining travel schedules:

(1) If possible, travel should be scheduled to alternate one week of field research with one week of write-up time. However, this may be impossible due to the time and fund constraints under which the Task Group is required to operate.

(2) Except in the most unusual circumstances (for example, when overseas travel is involved), uninterrupted field research should be no longer than two consecutive weeks.

(3) As a general rule, one day of field research write-up time is required for each day of actual field research time. This requirement is tempered by the extent to which later activities are repeats of activities visited earlier, thus simplifying the preparation of field research write-ups.

(4) Travel should begin as early in the week as possible, so that additional work days are available if more time is required for field research than was originally anticipated. For example, a visit expected to require two work days should begin not later than Wednesday.

5. Visit Information

An information sheet should be published prior to the start of each field research trip and distributed to each traveler (a second copy for each traveler's family is desirable) and to each clerical employee. This information sheet should contain the following information:

(1) Departure flight number, date, airport, and time of departure; and time of arrival at each destination city.

(2) Name, office name, and telephone number of field research activity contact point (discussed in Paragraph D.3.).

(3) Name and telephone number of hotel/motel.

(4) Time and place of initial meeting.

(5) Any special arrangements for local transportation (e.g., airport pick-up by visited activity, or commercial rental car).

(6) Flight number, date, time of departure, and time of arrival for intermediate field research stops.

(7) Return flight number; date and time of departure; and time and airport of arrival at home city.

C. THE FIELD RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Introduction

The purposes of the field research questionnaire, or outline, are to guide the conduct of field research, insure that all required subjects are covered, and serve as a writing outline for recording field research findings.

Responsibility for the development of the field research questionnaire should be divided among Task Group members in accordance with the research area assignments discussed in Chapter III.

In developing the field research questionnaire, identify the range of possible conclusions and recommendations which might develop from the study. Then construct the questionnaire to collect information which will enable an evaluation of each potential conclusion and recommendation. Do not start with a preconceived idea of what the conclusions should be and orient study research efforts toward proving them.

The field research questionnaire cannot be expected to identify every question which should be asked during the field research, or every piece of data which should be collected, although it should identify most of these. The Task Group members using this guide are expected to be flexible and identify instances in which the answers to previously developed questions point out a line of research which had not been previously visualized, and to pursue that line.

2. Developing the Questionnaire

The first action in the development of the field research questionnaire is to identify the major topics and sub-topics about which information must be developed. These are the major headings in

the field research guide and the major paragraph titles in the write-up of that field research. If these topics are properly selected, and the remaining field research questionnaire properly organized around them, this document can be used as a guide for field research and as a writing outline. The detailed questions developed under each identified major topic and sub-topic provide the basis for research and writing.

The general approach in field research is to obtain a description of the operations in the area under study. Following are a number of suggested statements/questions for obtaining such information:

(1) Describe the process by which "X" is accomplished.

(2) Identify the criteria under which each type of action takes place.

(3) Identify the directives/ authority for these actions.

(4) Identify the different categories into which actions fall for purposes of review, the criteria for each category, and the final reviewing/approving authority for each category.

(5) Furnish time-related statistics (e.g., average per week or month, or total for the preceding fiscal year) of workload/ volume/frequency with which each type of action takes place.

The preceding is a generalized description for the development of a questionnaire; however, each questionnaire must be specifically tailored to meet the requirements of individual research areas. A major pitfall in field research is excessive detail, both identified in the field research outline and developed during the field research itself; this excessive detail requires an unplanned expenditure of time. The actual degree of detail must be tailored to the nature and purpose of the study. For example, a study oriented toward developing an organizational change requires only minimum procedural detail, and should be primarily oriented toward what is done, rather than how it is done. On the other hand, a study with the objective of developing a standard DoD procedure must be based on a detailed understanding of what current procedures are and why they are that way.

Appendix H contains an extract from an extensive field research outline for a study on the feasibility and desirability of integrated management for a specific commodity area. The objective of the outline was to insure that the Task Group had a detailed knowledge of actions being taken by each Military Service in managing the commodity. The extract in Appendix H was useful as a guide for conducting field research and recording the field research findings.

The following additional comments apply to the development of a field research questionnaire:

(1) The questionnaire must be tailored to each type of activity included on the itinerary, but the same questionnaire should be used for a given type of activity in all DoD Components. That is, one questionnaire should be used for ICPs and a different one for storage sites, but the same questionnaire should be used for ICPs of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and DSA.

(2) The questions should be designed to elicit free responses. That is, questions with "Yes/No" answers should be avoided, unless they are immediately followed by an appropriate follow-on question — "If yes, why?", or "If yes, how?", or "If no, why not?" Generally, questions should be in the form of "describe how....", or "explain why....", or "identify the criteria or rationale for...."

(3) Answers should be quantified to the maximum extent possible with precise numbers, dollar values, or percentages, and the questionnaire should contain a reminder to this effect. The questionnaire should also identify specific statistical data which should be collected during the course of field research.

(4) Questions designed to elicit information on which the Task Group could make analyses or form conclusions should be asked first. Opinion questions should be held to the end of each major topic in the field research questionnaire. Soliciting an opinion may provide the respondent with a sense of the Study tenor or ultimate conclusions and cause the respondent to shape his answers. When an opinion is obtained, obtain an evaluation of the opinion, or identify some factor(s) which will enable a later evaluation of the opinion. Identify, for example, the position held by the individual, his grade and status in the organization, how long he has been on the job, and the degree to which his job or organization may be affected by the study results.

(5) After the field research questionnaire has been developed, review it against the Study purposes/tasks/objectives established in the Task Order or Study Plan, to insure that research is covering every aspect of the Task Group assignment.

3. Advance Distribution. Advance distribution of the field research guide to activities on the itinerary, while optional, is generally desirable. The overall desirability of such action should be evaluated before a decision is made. The advantage of advance distribution is that it will permit the field activities to develop required information prior

to the arrival of the Task Group, thus expediting the Task Group research efforts and minimizing the length of the visit. On the other hand, advance information which enables the field activity to prepare for the visit may also enable it to divert the Task Group effort. Where the nature of the study or of the field research effort is such that the latter is a possibility, the field research questionnaire should not be distributed in advance.

4. Revisions. The field research questionnaire, as initially developed, is the best estimate of the Task Group as to what questions will develop the information required for the study. Actual field experience with this questionnaire may identify the need for revision; this is not unusual. However, changes should be kept to a minimum once the questionnaire has been used in field research; an important requirement for analysis is consistency of information among activities.

D. ARRANGING FIELD RESEARCH VISITS

1. Check List — Pre-Field Visits

Following is a listing of the actions which must be taken prior to making field research visits, recognizing that not all actions will be required for all activities:

(1) Obtain approval of the itinerary from the Departmental Headquarters of the activities proposed for visit.

(2) Obtain a contact point at each activity and an authorization for direct communication.

(3) Advise all activities involved of the timing of the proposed visit.

(4) Establish field research initial briefing requirements with the activity contact point.

(5) Confirm the content of the field research initial briefing requirement in writing.

(6) Make administrative arrangements for housing, local transportation, and the time and place of the initial meeting.

(7) Distribute the field research questionnaire and the individual item analysis requirements and guide (see Paragraph G. of this Chapter).

2. Length of Field Research Visits

The Task Group Chairman must determine the time required for a field research visit based on the magnitude of the questionnaire and the capabilities of the Task Group members. The only firm timing guidance provided is that associated with the activity entry process. Entry interviews and the initial briefing will use the first half-day. Thus, if the Task Group arrives the night before the start of the visit, individual research will probably not begin until after lunch the first day; if the Task Group arrives by mid-day of the first day of the visit, individual research will probably not begin until the morning of the second day. No special time segment needs to be allocated for the exit interview which may be accomplished by the Chairman, while the remaining members of the Task Group are completing their individual field research.

3. Itinerary Approval

Arrangements for field research visits must be made through the headquarters of the activities being visited, generally through the designated contact points. The final field research itinerary should be furnished to these contact points as soon as it is developed. Except in the most unusual circumstances, there should be at least a one-week notice to each activity to be visited.

The notification to the DoD Components should identify the activities proposed for visit, a general description of the purpose of the visit, and the precise dates involved. This notification should request the name, office identification, and telephone number of a contact point at the activity to be visited, and authorization for direct contact with that individual. (After the field research contact points have been identified, a list of these should be published and distributed to all Task Group members for future reference.)

Communications with field activities should be accomplished through the designated contact points, and correspondence should be addressed to the Commanding Officer, with a copy marked for the attention of the contact point. This will improve the handling of study communications at the field activity.

4. Initial Briefing Requirements

An initial briefing is generally required from each activity visited and should be discussed with the field activity contact point as early as possible.

The bulk of the Task Group effort during the visit should be devoted to research with the individuals actually engaged in performing the functions involved in the study. Therefore, the initial briefing session should be limited to material associated with the study scope. The time consumed by the briefings should be limited; one hour may suffice for certain studies; briefings exceeding four hours should be rare.

The initial briefing by the activity should include the following:

(1) A description of the overall organization and functions of the activity with emphasis on those organizations involved with the functions in which the Task Group is interested; and,

(2) A brief overview description of the process(es) involved in the subject of the study which will enable each Task Group member to relate his assigned research area to the total process/system.

Any telephone discussion of the initial briefing requirements with the field activity contact point should be confirmed with a written description of the desired materiel.

The activity should be requested to have copies of charts and statistics used in the briefing available prior to the start of the briefing. One copy should be provided to each member of the visiting group, as these expedite the taking of notes. Providing a copy of the briefing "sound track" is optional.

Representatives of the major organizational units which will be visited during field research should be present at this initial briefing. This will simplify and expedite the start of individual research after the initial briefing session has been completed.

5. Observers

The Component Headquarters of an activity to be visited may wish to send "observers" to the activity at the time of the Task Group visit. The presence of observers from Headquarters may have an inhibiting effect on the freedom and frankness with which answers and information are provided. The Task Group Chairman should, therefore, take every reasonable action to discourage the presence of observers.

The Task Group may also receive requests for permission to send observers to field research activities other than those of the organization making the request (for example, from members of the LSPC Secretariat or from the headquarters of one of the other Components

interested in the subject matter of the study). Again, the presence of outside observers may have an inhibiting effect, and every effort should be made to discourage this practice. In any event, the Task Group has no authority in this area, and an organization desiring to send an observer must obtain permission from the Component Headquarters of the field activity involved.

E. ACCOMPLISHING FIELD RESEARCH

1. Entry Interview

There will be an "entry interview" when the Task Group arrives at the field research activity and when a member of the Task Group enters each different organizational element of the activity. The "top management" of the activity (for example, the commanding officer, his deputy, or his chief of staff) as well as someone from the management level of each different organizational element visited (each directorate, division, and branch) will want an explanation of the nature and purpose of the Task Group visit.

In addition to identifying the subject and authority for the Task Group study, the following points should be stressed during this entry interview at each organizational level, as well as when starting field research with an individual worker:

(1) The purpose of the visit is to educate the Task Group members in how a particular process/action is being accomplished;

(2) The Task Group is not from the Component Inspector General or Auditor, nor is it from the General Accounting Office;

(3) The Task Group concern is to identify systemic problems and deficiencies — that is, things wrong with the system which permit undesirable things to take place within the logistics function(s) being studied — not to identify things wrong at the activity being visited;

(4) Individual activities will remain anonymous insofar as the identification of deficiencies is concerned — if it becomes necessary in the final Report to establish the existence of a systemic deficiency by showing the effect at field level, this will be done in the form: "At Activity X it was observed that....," with the actual identity of Activity X known only to members of the Task Group.

2. Research Methodology

After completion of entry interviews and the initial briefing, the Task Group should divide, with each member researching individually assigned area(s). When the Task Group divides, each member may be required to go through an "entry interview" in each different organization and at each different organizational level through which he passes. For this reason, each Task Group member should be familiar with the preceding guidance on entry interviews.

There are two basic approaches for conducting individual research at field activities:

(1) Research sessions can be conducted in a conference room, with the appropriate personnel brought to that room. This has the advantage of providing optimum physical conditions for the question and answer session; however, it has the disadvantage of requiring the respondent to interrupt the session and return to his work area to get copies or examples to support the session. In addition, this does not represent the most "comfortable" environment for many lower-level field personnel, particularly since management personnel may elect to observe.

(2) As an alternative, research sessions can be conducted at the desk of the respondent. The advantages are the opposite of the disadvantages described above — the respondent usually feels more at ease and has ready access to documents, references, or examples. However, conditions may be less than optimum, because space may be tight, the noise level may be relatively high, and the respondent may be interrupted by on-going business.

On balance, the latter approach is more likely to produce complete answers and provide a more realistic observation of the task as it is performed on a day-to-day basis.

The interview with the respondent should start with a repeat of the points discussed under the subject of "entry interviews." It is important to stress the educational purpose of the visit and the fact that nothing derogatory will be reported, thus allaying the individual respondent's concern for his job security.

The field research will be conducted based on the previously developed field research questionnaire; however, the questionnaire is intended as a guide, not a straitjacket. Task Group members are expected to deviate from that questionnaire and follow through on relevant subjects which are identified during the course of field research. This is particularly important during the first few field research visits.

3. Research Guidance. The following considerations apply to the conduct of field research:

a. Before separating for individual field research, arrangements should be made for a central meeting place/work area for use by the Task Group during its visit to the activity. This need not be an elaborate conference room facility, but should be a location at which the entire Group can convene to discuss the status of their research and make plans for further research.

b. The activity visited may wish to have a member of their management staff accompany some or all of the Task Group members during the individual field research interviews. The Task Group has no control over this, but the Chairman should attempt to discourage this practice, because of the negative effect it may have on the completeness and honesty of the information received.

c. Obtain the name, organizational location, and telephone number of each respondent interviewed, for possible later contact to clarify notes or obtain overlooked information.

d. Task Group working hours with activity personnel are generally established as beginning one-half hour after the start of normal working hours of the activity being visited and ending one-half hour before the end of the normal work day. This timing permits the local personnel to accomplish some of their most important work despite the presence of the Task Group.

e. The Task Group should have a daily meeting to discuss findings and exchange information having impact across research areas. This meeting may be held at the field research activity before departing for the day or at the Task Group quarters immediately after the return from the activity. These should be informal sessions at which each member describes the highlights of his findings for the day, with emphasis on those findings which may: (1) be of significance to the study conclusions; (2) have significance in another Task Group member's research area; or, (3) require corroboration by another Task Group member.

f. Derogatory remarks or comments should not be made about the operations being observed. When individual analysts observe operations/situations/conditions which appear to merit change, these should be discussed with the individual immediately in charge of that operation. He should be advised that the discussion is personal, the situation will not be discussed with either higher level personnel in the field activity nor included in the study report, and action on the situation is strictly at his option.

g. As a general rule, get copies of everything; if in doubt, ask for a copy. Get copies of such items as: local directives; samples (filled and blank) of forms and formats used; management reports and statistical data; and, correspondence establishing policy, furnishing criteria, or providing examples of actions taken.

h. When requested information is not provided immediately make a note of the "due-in," and make certain that the respondent understands what is expected and by when. Although it is desirable that all required information be taken with the Task Group when it departs, some information may have to be mailed later. At a meeting held shortly before the end of the visit, the activity contract point should be advised of the "due-in" material, the respondent responsible for providing it, and the expected arrival time.

i. Answers should be quantified to the maximum extent possible with precise numbers or percentages. Words like "few," "occasionally," "often," or "many" mean different things to different people. When these kinds of words are used, find out how many, or how often, or how much. If a precise figure is not available, accept the respondent's estimate, but identify it as such, and get the respondent to evaluate how good he thinks the estimate is.

j. On occasion Task Group members will have difficulty conducting field research due to lack of cooperation. Such situations must be handled with delicacy and tact. The Task Group has no inherent authority, even though its assignment comes from the highest logistics level within the DoD. Initial efforts to resolve the situation should be between the Task Group member concerned and the respondent's immediate supervisory level. If the Task Group member fails in his efforts, the Task Group Chairman should enter the picture at that same level. Further action will involve discussion of the problem, by the Task Group Chairman, through successive supervisory levels until top management at the field research activity is reached. Discussion beyond the activity level is at the Chairman's option and should be to the contact point in the activity's departmental headquarters. Finally the problem can be forwarded to the Chairman of the LSPC Secretariat, who can obtain assistance from the office of the LSPC Chairman.

F. COLLECTING DATA DURING FIELD RESEARCH

The Task Group may establish a requirement for masses of statistical data requiring extensive preparation prior to submission. (See Chapter VI.) However, the Task Group will also collect certain statistical data during the course of field research. This statistical data will fall into two categories: (1) data identified in the questionnaire as an

element of information to be collected during the course of field research, and (2) data identified during field research and determined to be relevant to the study. Since the latter type of data is available, collect it. Also obtain copies of existing published reports containing management or statistical data. This information may prove to be useful during the analysis phase of the study and the cost of collection is virtually nil.

A more difficult question may arise regarding data identified in the field research questionnaire. If it is readily available, there is no problem; collect it. However, at least some of the data identified may prove to be unavailable without the expenditure of effort on the part of the field activity. For example, obtaining desired data may require research through files to collect scattered documents, the manipulation of data in existing reports, or the development of a computer program to extract the data from mechanized files.

In this situation, the Task Group must evaluate the following:

a. How important is the requested data to the final study analysis? For example, some data requirements will be established in the field research questionnaire for the sole purpose of giving the analyst (and final report reader) an idea of the magnitude of the area under discussion. Such requirements can be dismissed if required data is not readily available.

b. How much will it cost to develop the requested data? How many man-hours and/or how many computer hours would be used to develop the information? A data requirement which can be met with the investment of one clerical man-hour should probably be levied with no additional thought. On the other hand, serious thought must be given to the collection of data which would require, for example, 40 man-hours of programming effort or eight hours of computer time to produce.

c. What data is available as an alternative to the requested information? Frequently, the precise information desired is not available, but some approximation is readily available; for example, data requested by Federal Supply Class may be available summarized by Federal Supply Group, or data requested by individual Issue Priority Designator may be available by Issue Priority Group.

When requested data is not readily available, the Task Group must evaluate the probable need for, and usefulness of, that data against the estimated cost to collect it. Where approximately comparable data is available, the Task Group must engage in a form of marginal analysis to determine whether the additional precision of the data which could be developed is worth the cost.

These are difficult evaluations to make during the initial field research phase of a study. This evaluation must be made on a case-by-case basis. Because of the differences in management systems between DoD Components, some incompatible data will be collected. Learn to live with it.

G. INDIVIDUAL ITEM ANALYSIS

1. Introduction

A useful technique for determining how actions are taken by field activities (for example, how items are managed or how materiel requests are processed) is to examine specific, individual items or transactions, and collect selected elements of information associated with each item or transaction. This technique, called "item chase," is intended to supplement system descriptions; it provides statistics about the size or frequency of selected factors or events and amplifies portions of the system description. Since item chase involves a review of items or of transactions, the technique is used only when research can be conducted in terms of either or these two factors. For example, a commodity management study can include an examination of how management processes are accomplished for a selected range of items; a study involving the procurement program can include an examination of a number of buy transactions; a study involving the standardization program can include an examination of a number of standardization projects; and, a study involving the maintenance program can include an examination of the scheduled and actual maintenance actions for a selected range of items.

This paragraph discusses means for selecting items to be "chased," determining the data to be collected during the chase, and conducting the chase. References, in the paragraph, made to "items" should be considered to also mean "transactions."

2. Selecting Items

The item chase can, of necessity, involve only a sample of the total items encompassed by the study. If item chase findings are to be extrapolated to the universe, the sample must consist of a number of items considered to be representative of the universe of items. It is essential that approved statistical sampling techniques be used for determining the size of the item chase and selecting the items to be included.

A sample size may range widely, depending on the acceptable sampling error and the degree of confidence desired in the validity of the answer. An additional factor to be considered is cost, considered in terms of how much time is available for item chase at each activity, how many Task Group members are available for the chase, and how much time will be required to complete the chase.

Approved statistical sampling techniques must also be used in selecting the specific items to be reviewed during the item chase. Pure random and stratified random samples may be used for item selection. The Defense Logistics Services Center item files present a source of information for the identification of items of supply with selected characteristics for inclusion in a stratified random sample. Other possible techniques include randomly selecting the ending digits of the Federal Item Identification Number of the items to be included in the chase, or directing each field research activity to select every "nth" item in their files for inclusion in the sample.

Field research activities should not be permitted to freely select the items to be reviewed, because the randomness of such a selection may be suspect, raising questions about the validity of the sample.

Finally identify more items for chase than are actually required for the desired statistical confidence/sampling error. A portion of the identified items can be expected to be unsatisfactory for item chase, because the item is no longer managed/used at the activity being visited, there are no transactions of the type germane to the study on the item, or the respondent (for example, item manager, buyer, or technician) who can answer questions about the items is on leave and will not return until after the visit has ended. An extra 10 to 15 percent should be sufficient.

3. Data Elements

Item chase is best accomplished using an individual form for each item. This form should have certain basic heading elements of data, such as:

(1) Activity: To enable the sorting and re-sorting of the forms.

(2) Task Group Member: To identify the individual who can interpret the handwriting and abbreviations on the form.

(3) Respondent Name and Telephone Number: To identify the individual (e.g., item manager, buyer, or technician) who provided the answers shown on the form, for later reference.

(4) Item Number: To identify the item; for example, Federal Stock Number, Manufacturers Reference Number, or Contract Number.

(5) Item Name: To give the Task Group member an idea of the size/complexity/importance of the item.

(6) Unit of Issue and Unit Price: To permit quantity and dollar value summations.

Beyond these suggested standard elements, no guidance is furnished, since each item chase format will have to be tailored to the requirements of the individual study.

4. Conducting the Item Chase

The item chase should be organized in terms of the individual organizations which will furnish the required data, to minimize the extent of back-tracking by the Task Group members. Early in the field visit, a listing of the specific items to be examined should be furnished to the contract point, so that the specific respondent (e.g., item manager, buyer, or technician) for each item can be identified. With this identification, item chase responsibilities should be assigned based on the individual or organization from which answers will be obtained.

The Task Group Chairman should maintain a running count of complete items and be aware of the composition of the item chase sample for the activity. As items "fall-out" of the sample, additional items should be assigned to insure that the total on which data is collected coincide as closely as possible to the desired composition of the sample.

H. EXIT INTERVIEWS

Since the Task Group has nothing substantive to contribute at an exit interview, such interviews are conducted only at the request of the activity visited. Generally, activity officials desire an exit interview to discuss Task Group findings, especially any derogatory information that may have been identified. What is generally expected by local officials is an exit critique similar to those experienced with Inspector General (IG) Teams. This feeling exists in spite of

the Task Group Chairman's comments, during the entrance interview, about the nature and purpose of the Group's visit.

When an exit interview is required, it may be conducted by the Task Group Chairman, while the other Task Group members complete their field research. At the interview, the following points should be made:

(1) The nature and authority of the Task Group study assignment should be repeated.

(2) The educational nature and purpose of the visit should be repeated.

(3) The fact that the Group is not an IG, auditor, or GAO should be repeated and emphasized.

(4) In response to a direct or implied question (and only under those circumstances), it should be emphasized that the members of the Task Group have drawn no conclusions about the quality of the activity, since this was not the purpose of the visit and the Task Group members' approach was not oriented toward developing such conclusions.

(5) It should be conceded that the Task Group members may, nevertheless, have noted some apparent deficiencies, but that these would immediately have been discussed informally with the immediate supervisory personnel involved, and would not be discussed in this exit interview nor in the Task Group final report.

(6) Appreciation should be expressed for the assistance and cooperation of the activity. Specific mention should be made of the contact point or other individuals whose assistance has been particularly helpful.

(7) When appropriate, the point should be made that some of the data requested by the Task Group could not be provided immediately, and that personnel of the activity are in the process of developing such data for forwarding to the Group. Unless a problem has arisen with the collection of such data, this comment should be made in a very low-key manner. The purpose of the statement is to get the situation "on the record" without getting management unduly excited.

(8) The point should be made that the Task Group has collected the telephone numbers of the individuals with whom field research was conducted and, with the approval of the activity management,

the Task Group would recontact these people directly to clarify points previously discussed or to raise questions which were inadvertantly overlooked during the visit.

A request may be made for a copy of the write up of that specific activity, or of the total final report; this request may be in terms of pre-publication copy for review and correction or a post-publication copy for comment. If such a request is made, it should be explained that the report is submitted directly from the Task Group to the LSPC without screening, review, or coordination by any of the DoD Components; that generally the report is then sent to the headquarters of the interested/affected DoD Components for review and comment; and that official distribution of the final report for the purpose of collecting comments is the responsibility of the Component headquarters. However, the activity should be advised that an unofficial copy could be sent personally by the Task Group after the LSPC has authorized distribution of the report for review, and appropriate information should be taken for this purpose.

I. DOCUMENTING FIELD RESEARCH

The results of field research must be recorded for Task Group use and reference during the analysis phase of the study and possible publication in the final Task Group report.

As discussed earlier, the field research questionnaire should be developed to serve as a guide for field research and an outline for recording findings. If this has not been done, a separate writing outline will have to be developed. This outline should be similar to the one used for field research and be developed in terms of the major topics and sub-topics reviewed during field research.

The following is guidance for the preparation of written descriptions of field research findings:

a. Ordinarily, the field research findings on each activity will be recorded in separate documents. (See Chapter VII regarding the organization of a final study report.)

b. Completeness, understandability, and accuracy are basic goals in the preparation of write ups. At the time the write ups are being prepared, a decision may not have been made regarding their publication. If in doubt, writing should be done as if for publication; the field research description should be written in a flowing, narrative style, rather than in the stilted style of DoD directives or formal correspondence. Under these circumstances, readability is a desirable goal.

c. Activity write ups intended for publication should contain only an exposition of what was found during field research, including relevant statistics. They should contain no analyses or comparisons with other activities.

d. Individual Task Group members may wish to record conclusions or impressions from the visit. This should be done separately from the activity write up when writing for possible publication.

e. Write ups should be prepared as soon as possible after the completion of field research to avoid the possibility of failing to record significant findings.

As soon as field research write ups are completed, they should be distributed to each Task Group member for review. Distribution of this material, however, should be closely controlled and limited to the Task Group.

CHAPTER VI

DATA CALL

A. INTRODUCTION

This Chapter discusses Task Group statistical data which:

a. Require a significant leadtime for preparation because of the volume of the data, or its complexity, or both;

b. Require the use of data processing equipment; or,

c. Involve the submission of data from activities not included in field research.

The data are required to enable the study to be quantified for such purposes as:

a. Providing measures of the size or significance of selected aspects of the study;

b. Assisting in the identification of the problem;

c. Determining the actual size/frequency/significance of the problem;

d. Identifying potential solutions to the problem;

e. Measuring the impact or effect of these potential solutions; and,

f. Developing cost/benefit analyses of Task Group recommendations.

As soon as it is determined that a "data call" is required, a member of the Task Group should be assigned responsibility for the area; this should be considered when the assignment of functional area responsibilities are made. While one Task Group member is assigned the role of data coordinator for the Task Group, this does not relieve other members of the Task Group of their responsibilities for the data call. Their continuing responsibilities include identifying the elements of data which should be collected, determining the activities from which data should be submitted, and establishing data analysis requirements.

This Chapter discusses the Task Group data call, including:

a. Types of data which can be collected;

b. Identification of data requirements;

c. Selecting activities from which to collect data;

d. Establishing and issuing data submission requirements;

e. Data timing; and

f. Data publication.

B. IDENTIFYING DATA REQUIREMENTS

1. Basic Approach. The basic approach in developing data call requirements should be to identify the full range of possible conclusions and recommendations which might develop from the study and construct the data call so as to enable an evaluation of each of these.

2. Types of Data. The initial task to be undertaken in developing data call requirements is a determination of the type(s) of data needed to meet the purposes of the study. In this process, the following types of data should be considered:

a. Does the study require only logistics data (for example, inventory, procurement, or maintenance statistics), or does it need cost information, or operating program (for example, troop strength, or equipment density) information?

b. Is only summary data (for example, totals for each activity) needed, or will data have to be analyzed on a more detailed basis (for example, separately for each Federal Supply Class involved)?

c. Is only static data (for example, inventory levels or number of buys) required, or must transaction data be submitted on requisitions or purchases)?

3. Data Elements

A limited number of standard data elements can be identified as required in any data call. Such elements include: project code for the data call, identification of the reporting activity, identification of the type of record when more than one type of information is being collected, and trailer record identification.

Generally, a data call involves a significant cost. Therefore, a Task Group should be authorized only one data call, which should be carefully developed. In developing the data requirements, the need for each data element should be evaluated and there should be one or more analyses anticipated for each data element requested. The only

exception to this general rule is a case where intuition indicates a need for a data element and its addition will not significantly increase the cost of the data call.

After preliminary discussions by the Task Group have identified the types of data which will be required, early liaison should be established with the DoD Logistics Data Element Standardization and Management Office (LOGDESMO), in Headquarters, Defense Supply Agency. LOGDESMO is establishing an inventory of data elements (existing or in the process of development) in DoD logistics reporting and management systems. LOGDESMO is available to support the Task Group effort by providing information on existing standard data elements and codes, and by providing assistance in developing an effective configuration of data elements and codes to satisfy Task Group requirements.

4. Data Processing Assistance

Early liaison should also be established with the data processing organization which will be responsible for processing the data input. Every effort should be made to have the data processing organization designate a systems analyst to be responsible for all Task Group work and to authorize direct contact between the Task Group and that analyst.

The data processing organization should be requested to assist the Task Group in the development of formats and requirements for the submission of data, based on the technical requirements of the equipment on which it is to be processed. In addition, early liaison with the data processing organization may result in unanticipated benefits; their background and experience may permit the data processing organization to make substantive contributions to the Task Group data call requirements.

5. Data Submission Controls

The following controls are generally applicable to data calls, regardless of the subject matter of the study:

(1) When specific codes are established for entry in a data field, emphasize that no other codes are acceptable.

(2) Identify two codes to be applicable to all fields: one to identify data which is "Not Available," and the other for data which is "Not Applicable."

(3) Generally, do not specify blank spaces in the data record, but require fields to be filled with leading/trailing zeroes, and the "Not Available"/"Not Applicable" codes, as appropriate. When

blank spaces are essential (for example, as in part numbers which do not fill an assigned field and would be distorted beyond use by the addition of zeroes), they should be specifically allowed.

(4) When specific codes have been established for all possible entries in a field, provide one additional code for "None of the above" or "Other". Require these to be explained in the letter forwarding the data submission.

(5) Require that all tapes be labeled to identify: BPI (Bits Per Inch), density, number of records, and UIC (Unit Identification Code), and name and address of the submitting activity.

After the data call requirements have been developed, identify the edit routines which will be applied to the data input when it is received. Include a description of these in the data call and establish a mandatory requirement that this edit routine be used before data is released to the Task Group.

C. SELECTING DATA SUBMITTERS

Generally, the activities to submit data are selected from among those identified for field research, since the same logic and criteria apply to both selection processes. However, study requirements may arise for which this is not the valid basis for identifying data submitting activities. It may be desirable to collect all of the data applicable to a specific area from all DoD activities involved— for example, all of the IPG I requisitions processed by all DoD inventory control points for a specific 90-day period.

D. QUALITY OF DATA

One-time data submissions required for logistics management studies are basically subject to a high error rate. Three factors have an effect on the volume of errors and the time required for their correction. These factors are: the number of data elements collected, the types of data (i.e., static vs. transaction) collected, and the number of activities from which the data is collected.

These factors should be kept to a minimum consistent with study data needs and the requirement to have a valid data sample to permit extrapolation of findings to the universe.

E. ESTABLISHING AND ISSUING DATA REQUIREMENTS

Data submission requirements must be established and supported by detailed description of the desired data input— every element of information must be described and identified in detail.

In this regard, there is sometimes a significant difference in language among the DoD Components. In some cases the same "thing" (e.g., type of item, or control process, or management technique) is identified by different names in different components, while in other cases the same name identifies different things in different components. After data requirements have been drafted, they should be reviewed by an individual from each DoD Component which will be involved in data submission to insure that the language of the requirement will be properly interpreted in each activity.

Data requirements should be issued over the signature of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L) and addressed to the Assistant Secretary (I&L) of the Military Departments and the Directors of Defense Agencies. However, while this copy is processing through official channels, a copy of the data call requirement should be furnished directly to the designated contact point in each involved DoD Component.

When a voluminous or complicated data call requirement is involved, consideration should be given to a "data swing"— one or two Task Group members particularly knowledgeable on the data call should visit each of the data submitting activities after sufficient time has elapsed for them to have had an opportunity to analyze the data call requirement. This visit would give the data submitting activities an opportunity to clarify their understanding of the Task Group requirement, and should serve to both ease the effort at the submitting activities and improve the quality of the data which is received.

F. DATA TIMING

In planning data requirements, the following approximate time factors should be considered:

a. Allow at least three weeks for the data requirement to process through the headquarters levels involved and reach the submitting activity if the data call involves the wholesale logistics system; e.g., the inventory control point level. If the data call involves activities at the user/consumer level, consider that about 45 days will be required before the data requirement reaches the submitting activities.

b. If any extensive computer programming effort is involved for the extraction of required data, at least 90 additional days should be allowed.

c. If transaction data is required, and this data is not already being collected, the data scheduling must not only allow for planning time, but must also allow time for the collection of on-going transaction data.

Action should be initiated to develop the data processing requirements (i.e., how the data input is to be massaged) as soon as the data submission requirements have been tentatively identified. Many of the data processing requirements can be established at this point in time, and these should be transmitted to the data processing organization so that computer programming can begin while the data input is being developed. It is likely that final data processing requirements will not be identified until at least some portion of the analysis phase of the study has been completed, because field research and analysis can be expected to reveal additional data processing requirements.

With luck, proper planning will result in most of the data processing requirements being identified early in the study, permitting the bulk of the programming effort to take place while the field activities are developing and submitting data. Generally, Task Group data analysis requirements do not require extensive amounts of machine running time. However, significant time must be allowed for the input edit, rejection, and correction of submitted data. One-time data submissions are subject to a high error rate, and time must be allowed for the analysis of these errors, contact with the submitting activities, and action (local Task Group correction, or activity resubmission) to correct erroneous data. As a planning guide, a minimum of 60 days should be allowed for this, and analyses should not be expected to be available for Task Group use until about two months after data is received from the field activities.

G. DATA PUBLICATION

The data call is generally described in brief in the introductory chapter of the final report. Publication of the data call requirement is optional and is done to let the reader know the basis for the data portion of the report. When published, the data call requirement generally appears as an appendix.

Frequently the results of computer processing of the data submissions are published in the final report so that the reader has this basic information available to assist in evaluating the report. The publication of computer processing outputs is a function of the data which is collected and the way in which it is arrayed. As generalized guidance, however, computer processing outputs derived from the data call should be published in a manner which is meaningful to management personnel, rather than only to specialized operations research personnel.

The decision as to what statistical data will be published is based on an estimate of the validity of the data and of the usefulness of the computer outputs to potential readers of the report.

CHAPTER VII

FINAL REPORT — ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS

A. INTRODUCTION

Chapter V discusses field research, including the preparation of field research write-ups. Chapter VI discusses statistical data collection, including the development of computer products. The field research findings and statistical data provide input to the final report.

Each final report has a "managerial analysis" segment containing the basic findings, analyses, conclusions, and recommendations of the Task Group. On occasion, one or more additional segments containing the field research write-ups and/or the statistical computer products are also published. Publication of these additional segments is at the option of the Task Group, but should be done only when the information portrayed adds to the value of the managerial analyses or provides additional insight to the readers of the report.

The total size of a final report (that is, the total number of pages produced) determines whether the report is published in a single volume or multiple volumes.

The remainder of this Chapter discusses the actions involved in determining what should be included in the "managerial analysis" segment of a final Task Group report, as well as how the report can be formatted.

B. APPROACH

The basic principle governing the development of the final Task Group analysis is that of collective decision making; substantive Task Group decisions on the subjects in the final Report, the points about each subject, the conclusions from these points and, finally, the recommendations should be jointly developed by the members of the Task Group.

The sequence of actions which must be taken in the development of the final study analysis are these:

a. Identifying the major topics which must be discussed in the study report, and establishing a tentative organization for the report — a group task;

b. Performing an initial analysis of each topic, as the basis for the preparation of a "first draft" of the final report — a group task;

c. Preparing the first draft — individual tasks;

d. Reviewing the first draft, establishing a firm organization for the report, and developing tentative study recommendations — a group task;

e. Rewriting, as required — individual tasks;

f. Developing the final report recommendations — a group task; and,

g. Editing the complete report — an individual task.

This Chapter is limited to the substantive aspects of each of these subjects. The procedural aspect, that is, the mechanics of report writing and report publishing, is discussed in Appendix I.

C. CLASSIFICATION

Every effort should be made to avoid the inclusion of classified material in a final study report. Proper evaluation and understanding of final report recommendations requires a broad staffing base, and report distribution is restricted by the assignment of a security classification. If classified material must be included, efforts should be made to have that material confined to only a portion of the report, which can then be classified and published separately.

Classification of final reports will be based on their content, and will be assigned in consonance with DoD directives and with the directives of the activity providing administrative and logistical support to the Task Group.

When classified material is not included, reports generally will be identified as "For Official Use Only" (FOUO) to limit distribution to Federal Government personnel during the staffing phase. After staffing has been completed and a final decision had been made on study recommendations, the FOUO designation can be removed. A statement to this effect should be included in the report.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE MANAGERIAL ANALYSIS

1. Introduction

The way in which the report is organized should be discussed

by the Task Group. However, report organization is essentially a procedural matter and the Task Group Chairman should be prepared to curtail discussion and make decisions in this area without resorting to Task Group voting.

The managerial analysis segment of a Task Group normally consists of a foreword, an introduction, a series of analysis chapters, and one or more concluding chapters. This paragraph discusses the organization and content of each of these.

2. Foreword

The foreword provides a brief (generally less than one page) transmittal for the report and should contain the following elements:

(1) Reference to the Task Order which established the study;

(2) Identification of the study tasks/purposes/objectives; and,

(3) A statement that the report contains the final (or interim, when appropriate) findings, analyses, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

The Foreword is signed by the Task Group Chairman.

3. Introductory Chapter

The purpose of the initial chapter in the Task Group report is to establish a frame of reference for the balance of the report. It should explain the background of the study, how the study was accomplished, and how the report is organized. The following subjects should be considered for inclusion in the Chapter:

(1) Background: A summary of the events which led to the identification of the problem and a description of earlier studies and analyses relating to the subject/situation/problem.

(2) Study Objectives: A listing of objectives taken directly from the Task Order/Study Plan. Any modifications to these which were adopted by the Task Group during the course of the study should be clearly identified and their rationale/basis provided.

(3) Scope of the Study: A reiteration of the Scope prescribed by the Task Order/Study Plan. Any Task Group-developed

modifications should be highlighted. (NOTE: At some point in this introductory chapter, probably in one of the preceding three paragraphs, reference will be made to the Task Order and the Study Plan, and these documents can then be included as appendices to the final report.)

(4) Task Group Composition: An identification of the organizations which provided personnel to the Task Group. Ordinarily, the names of Task Group members are not published.

(5) Study Approach: An identification of the study approach, including reference to the types of activities visited. A list of the activities visited during the course of the study should be published in an appendix.

(6) Assumptions: A clear identification of any assumptions which governed the Task Group effort, with the rationale for their use.

(7) "Nature of the Beast": A brief, general, overall description of the logistics system(s) involved in the study, as background for the more detailed descriptions of individual portions of these systems which will be included in the later analyses chapters. In a study involving a commodity area, this description might include such information as: the total size of the commodity area in terms of items, inventory value and issues; the relative interest of the DoD Components in this commodity area, expressed in terms of these same measures; and, the nature of the major management processes which affect these items. In a study involving a functional area, this description might include such information as: the total size of the area, expressed in such terms as the annual number of transactions, number of personnel involved, or annual expenditures; the relative interest of the DoD Components in the functional area, expressed in terms of these same measures; a description of the several subelements of the functional area, including some indication of their interrelationship with one another; and, an indication of the relative size of these subelements, expressed in terms of the same measures.

(8) Report Organization: A description of how the report is organized, so that the reader will know what to expect in each chapter, and the interrelationship between the chapters.

4. Analysis Chapters

a. Introduction

The chapters of the final report which contain the analyses of findings, leading to study conclusions and recommendations, are the

most significant portions of the final study report, and there are a number of approaches which can be followed in organizing the analyses, conclusions, and recommendations. Three approaches are: the functional approach; the program approach; and the tasks/objectives approach. Within each one of these, there is also the possibility of having a separate categorization in terms of geography, for example, CONUS vs. overseas, or East Coast vs. West Coast activities.

b. Functional Approach. In the functional approach, the Task Group must identify those "functions" which affect the problem under review, or would have an impact on the final decision. After an introduction which describes how and why these functions were identified and selected, each function must be discussed and analyzed in terms of its impact on the problem or on the final decision. For example, a study of the potential for integrated management of selected commodity areas requires an analysis of how the various materiel management functions (e.g., requirements computation, stock control, procurement, cataloging, engineering management, and maintenance management) are accomplished in order to determine the susceptibility of the commodities for integrated management. Accordingly, the final report of such a study will include an analysis of each of these functions.

c. Program Approach. The program approach is appropriate for use when the Task Group has determined that the assigned subject of the study actually consists of a number of relatively independent efforts, each of which requires a different analysis, which might result in different conclusions or recommendations. In this approach, the Task Group must identify the separate "programs" included in the study assignment, and orient the analysis effort around each of these. For example, a study of the organization of the Defense Disposal Program observed a basic program as well as subprograms involving excess contractor inventory and excess Corps of Engineers property. It was also observed that the basic program was divided geographically. Therefore, the final report could be organized in precisely that way: a separate chapter on the basic CONUS program, another on the basic overseas program, a chapter each on the contractor and Corps of Engineers programs, and a final chapter on "special management areas."

d. Tasks/Objectives Approach. When a study is oriented directly to the Task Order/Study Plan objectives, each analysis chapter may address one of the tasks or objectives assigned to the Task Group. For example, a study on overseas supply support required the Task Group to identify: how an interservice support system should operate; criteria for selecting items to be included in such a system; and, criteria for selecting the activity to provide the supply support. Therefore, the final study report can be organized in those terms.

4. Concluding Chapter(s)

After the analysis chapters, one or more "concluding" chapters are required. These can include some or all of the following:

(1) Summary Analysis: Each of the analysis chapters are developed and written individually, with individual conclusions. When there is a significant interrelationship between the findings and conclusions of several of these chapters, it is necessary to develop a "summary analysis" chapter which integrated these separate findings and synthesizes them into a unified product to permit the development of a coordinated, internally consistent series of recommendations. This "summary analysis" chapter should contain an analysis portion synthesizing the findings to a coordinated set of recommendations for the entire study. Frequently, this summary analysis chapter can serve as an "executive brief" for the report, and when appropriate, a statement to this effect should be included in the report Foreword.

(2) Summary of Recommendations: Where the individual analysis chapters can stand independently, individual recommendations can, and should, be developed in each. It may also be desirable to develop a chapter which briefly summarizes the findings of the individual analysis chapters, and restates the conclusions and recommendations developed in each of those chapters. The purpose(s) of such a summary chapter are: (a) to permit a realignment of the recommendations in terms of the action agencies involved; and/or (b) to simplify the preparation of implementing instructions; and/or (c) to permit an evaluation of the workload impact of the recommendations; and/or (d) merely, to serve as a ready reference to the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report.

(3) Implementation Planning: The study Task Order/Study Plan may require the development of a plan for the implementation of study recommendations. As a minimum this implementation plan should contain a chart which identifies the major implementing actions, the relationship between these actions, and the amount of time each action is expected to require for completion. Since it is difficult to forecast how much time will be required for review and approval of a report, the schedule for implementing actions should be based on an "Approval Day."

(4) Future Actions/Plans/Blueprint: Frequently study efforts identify the need for additional actions beyond the scope of the study recommendations, such as follow-on studies to determine the

desirability of extending the current study recommendations to closely related areas; or, studies of related areas to eliminate systematic problems which are adversely affecting the area covered by the current study. These follow-on actions should be identified by the Task Group for consideration by appropriate authority, even though the areas involved are outside the scope of the actual Task Group assignment.

E. ORGANIZING AN ANALYSIS CHAPTER

There are five elements to each of the analysis chapters:

a. Introduction: The purpose of the Introduction is to explain why the chapter is being written and to tell the reader what is going to be discussed in the chapter and how it is organized.

b. Facts/Description/Current System. This portion of the analysis chapter describes, compares, and contrasts the same "thing" (management area, logistics function, system, or procedure) in each of the Components, activities, or areas involved. For example, in a chapter devoted to a discussion of requirements computation methodology this portion of the chapter would describe, compare, and contrast how each of the involved DoD Components categorizes its items, the extent to which each uses operating program information, and how each computes gross requirements and collects and applies asset information.

c. Analysis

This portion of the analysis chapter evaluates the significance of the described "thing" including the contrasts and differences between the DoD Components in terms of the study purposes/objectives. For example, if the subject of the study is to determine the feasibility of placing a commodity area under the "one item-one manager" concept, the analysis would consider the implications of the different management systems and methodologies in use.

If the reaction after completing an analysis section is "So what?", either the subject has no relevance to, or impact on, the final decision, or the analysis has been unable to establish any such relationship. Depending on the nature of the subject and the amount of interest previously expressed in it, one of two actions can be taken: (1) the subject can be ignored in the final report; or (2) it can be identified in the chapter introduction as having been considered but rejected, with a brief statement on the reason for rejection. The latter course of action is preferable, because it assures the reader that the subject has been considered.

d. Conclusions. These are a series of relatively brief statements which synthesize and summarize the results of the analysis. Each conclusion, either alone or in conjunction with others, must lead to a specifically stated recommendation, or to an implied recommendation that no change should be made.

e. Recommendations. Every recommendation must derive from one or more conclusions. The initial draft of each analysis chapter should contain draft recommendations, whether or not these will be published in the individual chapters. This should be done even when it is strongly suspected that recommendations will have to be developed from the interaction of several chapters. (See Paragraph H below for a discussion on the development of recommendations.)

The preceding discussion has described the standard elements of an analysis chapter, and has identified one way in which these can be presented — that is, in the sequence Introduction, Facts/Description, Analysis, Conclusions, and Recommendations. An alternate way in which this same information could be presented is to organize the chapter in terms of the major subtopics, and present the description and analysis under each of the subtopic headings. This organization of an analysis chapter would be presented as follows:

A. INTRODUCTION

B. SUBTOPIC "A"

1. Facts/Description

2. Analysis

C. SUBTOPIC "B"

1. Facts/Description

2. Analysis

D. SUBTOPIC "C", "D", etc...

E. SUMMARY ANALYSIS

F. CONCLUSIONS

G. RECOMMENDATIONS

Under this concept, the example used above of the chapter on requirements computation methodology in the study of a commodity area would

be organized with major paragraphs on "Item Categorization," "Operating Program Information," "Computation of Gross Requirements," and "Asset Information," with "facts/description" and "analysis" paragraphs under each heading.

Which of these two approaches is preferable will depend on the nature of the subjects to be analyzed. There is no requirement that the same approach be adopted for all analysis chapters (that is, both approaches can be adopted for use within a single report). However, internal consistency is desirable within a report whenever practical.

F. TASK GROUP ANALYSIS

1. Introduction

This Paragraph discusses group actions involved in the development of individual final report chapters. Paragraph G below discusses the responsibilities and actions of individual Task Group members, as authors, in the development of their assigned chapter(s).

The preparation of each chapter involves a three-step review process (an initial review, follow-on review(s), and a final review), with slightly different goals and emphasis associated with each step. For convenience these will be discussed as if they were all sessions involving the entire Task Group because the exchange of ideas which generates from group review sessions is desirable.

However, group review sessions are very time-consuming, and the larger the group, the more this is true. The Task Group Chairman may limit participation in review sessions in order to save time, even going so far as to restrict participation to himself and the individual author of each chapter. Restricting participation should be done reluctantly and is considered particularly undesirable for the Initial Review.

Continual reference should be made to the study purposes/tasks/objectives throughout the review processes described below to insure that the final study report will meet the requirements established in the Task Order/Study Plan.

2. Initial Review

This review occurs after field research has been completed and, hopefully, statistical data analyses are available for review. The purposes of this review are:

(1) To identify the topics and the points which must be made on each topic; and,

(2) To establish tentative conclusions and recommendations for the chapter, and identify additional areas for which conclusions and recommendations will have to be developed by the author.

There are two approaches to determining what topics should be included in a chapter and what points should be made on each topic. One approach is to include in the report almost everything that the Task Group has learned about the subject. An alternative and preferred approach is to identify the form of the possible conclusions which might be developed regarding a topic (for example, "X is/is not the optimum way of accomplishing this function."), and determine what information is required to reach a valid conclusion. This latter approach confines the discussion to only those topics which are determined to be relevant to potential conclusions.

The author of the chapter may be required to present additional material, conclusions, and/or recommendations for decision by the Task Group at the second review.

3. Follow-on Review(s)

This is a review of a chapter draft and may in fact involve more than one review. For each such review, the chapter draft should have been distributed in advance of the review session, and all personnel participating in the review should bring their "marked up" copy of the draft to the review session.

The primary goal of this review is to answer the following:

Have all topics essential to this chapter been included, and have all essential points on each topic been included?

Are all topics, and points under each topic, essential to the chapter? Do all lead to a meaningful conclusion?

Have all essential conclusions been identified? Are all the conclusions meaningful, valid, and relevant to the study purpose and objectives?

Do all recommendations flow logically from the stated conclusions? Are there any unsupported recommendations?

In addition, each Follow-on Review should consider such factors as the clarity and adequacy of the language, and the correctness of punctuation. The Follow-On Review must be oriented toward producing a draft chapter acceptable for publication.

4. Final Review. This review should follow a writing effort devoted to making only procedural changes, improving clarity, and correcting punctuation and grammar. After completing the final review, the chapter should be ready for publication. The final review is the one which is most susceptible to having limited participation.

G. WRITING A CHAPTER

This Paragraph discusses the responsibilities and actions of individual Task Group members as authors.

The first action by the author should be to develop a detailed outline sequencing the several topics to be included in the chapter and identifying the progression of the points to be made under each topic. Developing these outlines serves the essential purpose of forcing the writer to organize his thinking and to consider the most logical sequence of material.

The primary aim of the outline is to develop a "flow" or continuity for the chapter, so as to establish a smooth, clear transition from one thought to the next. Organization, a logical sequencing of the thoughts and points in a paper, is a critical factor in determining the readability and persuasiveness of written material. The outline must also establish the setting or context of the discussion and show the relevance of each fact or description to the basic subject of the study.

A specific time period should be allowed for the development of these outlines and they should be reviewed and approved by the Task Group Chairman. As the actual writing progresses, a need to change the outline may be recognized. Minor changes should be made by the author as the need arises. Major changes should be reviewed by the Task Group Chairman and made only with his approval.

Having developed an outline which has been approved by the Task Group Chairman, it is the responsibility of the chapter author to cover the topics and points previously agreed upon during the Initial Review. However, the author of a chapter is not a robot, doing only what he has been told to do in the Initial Review. Instead, he is expected to be a thinking member of the Task Group, with the responsibility to make changes which appear to be justified by the detailed examination which the topic receives during the course of writing. The author is expected to:

a. Include additional points which are identified as relevant;

b. Omit material which proves to be irrelevant;

c. Revise or eliminate conclusions developed during the Initial Review when found irrelevant or invalid; and,

d. Develop new or different recommendations when the detailed examination justifies such action.

Data processing products should be available for review and inclusion in the analysis. However, the writer also has the responsibility of identifying additional data processing products which may be required in his assigned areas.

The following are offered as general guidance in writing analyses:

a. Write based on the premise that the reader has no prior knowledge of the subject nor of any of the considerations evaluated during the course of the study.

b. Write to be understood and to avoid misunderstanding.

c. Be objective and factual. Emotional statements and unsupported opinions have no value in a study report.

d. Write to persuade those who may oppose study recommendations, by answering in advance any questions they may have concerning the subject under study. Forestalling a nonconcurrence through a thorough analysis is far more effective than rebutting a nonconcurrence.

e. Do not abridge the writeup solely for the purpose of not exceeding some arbitrary maximum size goal. Treat the subject in as much length as is necessary to insure comprehensive coverage.

f. Redundancy generally has a reinforcing effect. As a general rule, for subjects deserving a total chapter or a major portion of a chapter, tell the reader what you're going to tell him, then tell him, then tell him what you've told him.

H. FINAL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

The final recommendations can make or break a study report and considerable effort should be devoted to their development.

Recommendations must be specific and firm, identifying clearly who is to take what specific action. A recommendation which, either directly or in effect, tells everyone to "Do Better!" is worthless.

The standard form for recommendations is as follows:

a. OSD Direction. "It is recommended that...."

DoD-wide studies will involve direction from the OSD level, and it is appropriate at this point in the recommendation to identify the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, or one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense. The Task Group should specify the lowest level within OSD which has the authority to direct the action.

b. Action Agency. "It is recommended that 'X' direct...."

Here the Task Group must identify the specific office which must take the action. This will generally be at the DoD Component level. At this point in the recommendation it is appropriate to identify the Secretary, or Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics, of the Military Departments, or the Director of one of the Defense Agencies.

c. Recommended Action. "It is recommended that 'X' direct 'Y' to ...."

Here the Task Group must identify the action which must be taken. Since Task Group reports result in headquarters-level action, this will generally involve either a change to an existing directive or issuance of a new directive. Where an existing directive is involved, the Task Group must identify it, as well as the precise change which is to be made — for example, "change paragraph 5e, of Air Force Regulation 999-999 to read as follows:...." Where a new directive is proposed, a draft should be provided as an appendix to the final report, and the recommendation should refer to that.

Some examples of final report recommendations are as follows:

"It is recommended that DoD Directive 4140.12 and DSAM 4140.1 be amended to require the mandatory reporting and release of stocks above the procurement objective...on a reimbursable basis to meet funded...requirements of other ICPs within the DoD."

"It is recommended that ASD(I&L) direct the Military Services to request Federal Stock Numbers for all commercial vehicle components and repair parts...."

"It is recommended that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) in coordination with the Assistant

Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) assure that the Military Services and the Defense Supply Agency include the following sums for 'Superfiche' (48X) equipment procurement in their budget submission:

Army	- $1.27 million
Navy	- $0.31 million
Air Force	- $0.57 million
Marine Corps	- $0.28 million
Defense Supply Agency	- $0.05 million"

"It is recommended that the Secretary of Defense direct:

The Secretaries of the Military Departments to transfer all resources involved in the staff supervision and operation of the...program to the Director, Defense Supply Agency.

The Director, DSA, to assume command and control over all Department of Defense disposal activities worldwide...."

CHAPTER VIII

POST-STUDY ACTIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

The Task Group may be disbanded as soon as the final report has been completed and copies submitted. However, there are certain actions, discussed in this Chapter, which must be taken after the report has been submitted. These actions are:

a. Briefing the issuing authority and other interested organizations on the study report;

b. Distributing the final report to interested activities; and,

c. Analyzing the comments received on the final report.

Generally, these actions can be accomplished by the Task Group Chairman alone; on occasion, however, assistance from one or two Task Group members may be useful.

B. BRIEFINGS

The first briefing of the Task Group's study report should be to the authority which established the study. Briefings to other groups before distribution of the final report can only be made with the prior approval of this authority; however, such briefings can be made after the study final report has been distributed.

There are two ways in which the final Task Group briefing to the LSPC can be presented:

a. A brief providing the background of the study (its purpose, scope, objectives, and approach) can be developed and provided, through the LSPC Secretariat, to the LSPC members for their information prior to the briefing. The briefing to be presented to the LSPC for their information would then contain the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

b. The full text of the final briefing — i.e., copies of charts and "sound track" giving the report findings, conclusions, and recommendations — can be developed and provided, through the LSPC

Secretariat, to the LSPC members for their information prior to the actual LSPC meeting. If this is done, no briefing should be presented at the LSPC meeting, since this would be redundant and wasteful. Instead, the Task Group Chairman should indicate the availability of the Task Group to answer any questions raised by the LSPC members.

All members of the Task Group should be present at the final Task Group presentation. Their presence at additional Task Group briefings should be at the discretion of the Chairman.

Additional briefings are not generally established at the initiative of the Task Group but are presented in response to specific requests. The DoD Component contact points should be advised that the Task Group is prepared to brief on the study.

C. FINAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION

The final Task Group report is the property of the issuing authority, and is not available for distribution until such distribution has been approved by that authority. (It is conceivable that the issuing agent may determine that a Task Group report should not receive detailed consideration within the DoD; under these circumstances, copies of the report should not be in circulation.)

Normally, the Task Group report is circulated to DoD Components for comment. The number of copies of the final report required by each DoD Component can be obtained from the Component contact points. The total Component requirement adjusted upward to provide for unanticipated requirements, will be the number of copies of the final report printed. Four hundred copies are generally adequate, providing an economic production quantity as well as enough copies for DoD-wide staffing.

When the report is based on an LSPC assignment, the LSPC Secretariat prepares a formal memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L), as Chairman of the LSPC, to each DoD Component concerned with the subject of the study. This memorandum is addressed to the Assistant Secretary (I&L) of the Military Departments and to the Directors of the Defense Agencies, as appropriate, and:

a. Forwards a limited number of copies of the final report (generally two or three);

b. Requests formal written comments on the report from each addressee (about 60 days should be allowed for the development of these comments); and

c. Indicates that additional copies of the report are available from the Secretariat.

Signature and release of this memorandum authorizes the Secretariat to make bulk distribution of copies of the final report to the DoD Component contact points, and individual distribution of copies of the report which may have been requested of the Task Group during the course of field research. A record should be maintained of the distribution of copies of the final study report.

D. ANALYSIS OF COMPONENT COMMENTS

Comments from the DoD Components are used in the final review of Task Group recommendations. There is a need to analyze these comments and determine the effect they should have on the recommendations.

Responsibility for this analysis can be assigned to the LSPC Analysis Staff, to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (OASD)(I&L), or to the Task Group. The Task Group, while best qualified to analyze the comments by virtue of their recent study experience, may have developed certain biases during the Study. Therefore, the preferred arrangement is to have the LSPC Analysis Staff or a Component of the OASD(I&L) staff analyze the Component comments — with the Task Group chairman, plus one or more team members, available to provide comments. Task Group input is important because in many cases the Group would already have considered the factors cited in the comments.

A practical analysis technique is the development of a "spread sheet," identifying the content of each recommendation and relating the comments of each Component to each recommendation, thus providing a ready reference to the overall reaction to the recommendation. It identifies those recommendations which received universal concurrence — where these are severable from other recommendations, they could be implemented without any further delay.

Regarding the more controversial recommendations, DoD Component comments must be carefully analyzed on their merits. For example, Component comments which simply do not concur without giving a reason are of no value. Component comments which nonconcur only because the recommendation would require them to change their procedure, without describing the negative impact of such a change, are also useless. When such comments have been provided, the Components should be requested to provide some substantive support for their comment; if they fail to do this, the nonconcurrence should be ignored.

When requested, the organization assigned the analysis responsibility can also provide a critique of the Component comments and a recommendation of the final action which should be taken on each recommendation.

APPENDIX A

CHECK LIST OF STUDY ACTIONS

Item	Description	Reference
1	Preparing Task Order	Chapter I
2	Preparing Study Plan	Chapter II
3	Determining Task Group Manning	Chap II, Para E
4	Developing Study Schedule	Chap II, Para F
5	Submitting Periodic Progress Reports	Chap I, Para E & Appendix C
6	Office/Desk Research	Chap IV, Para A
7	Establishing Headquarters-Level Briefings	Chapter IV
8	Developing Field Research Itinerary	Chap V, Para B
9	Developing Field Research Questionnaire	Chap V, Para C
10	Arranging Field Research Visits	Chap V, Para D
11	Establishing Field Research Activity Initial Briefing Requirements	Chap V, Para D
12	Developing Data Call Requirements	Chapter VI
13	Conducting Field Research	Chap V, Para E
14	Exit Interviews — Field Research	Chap V, Para H
15	Documenting Field Research	Chap V, Para I
16	Developing Outline of Final Report	Chap VII, Para A
17	Organizing Analysis Portion of Final Report	Chap VII, Para D
18	Task Group Final Analysis	Chap VII, Para E and F

Item	Description	Reference
19	Developing Final Recommendation(s)	Chap VII, Para H
20	Preparation of Final Report	Appendix I
21	Presenting Final Report Briefing(s)	Chap VIII, Para B
22	Distributing Final Report	Chap VIII, Para C
23	Staffing Final Report	Chap VIII, Para D

APPENDIX B

TASK ORDER
(Sample)

1 January 1971

Logistics Systems Policy Committee

LSPC Task Order Number 2-71

A. STUDY ASSIGNEE

The Analysis Staff of the Defense Supply Agency is requested to undertake chairmanship of a Task Group formed to accomplish the task described herein.

B. TITLE

Study of the Department of Defense Personal Property Disposal Organization.

C. DESCRIPTION

1. General. Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) memorandum of 30 November 1970 (subject: Expediting the Personal Property Disposal Process) advised that a full scale study would be conducted to determine whether it is feasible and appropriate to centralize or consolidate the total utilization and disposal function within the Department of Defense. This LSPC Task Order is promulgated for the development of recommendations incident thereto.

2. Scope. The Study provided for by this Task Order will:

a. Encompass the organizational and functional responsibilities and policies (and directly-associated procedures) concerned with the utilization and disposal of DoD Personal Property subsequent to transfer of accountability to a Property Disposal Officer. It will include:

(1) Consideration of those DoD utilization screening actions accomplished prior to transfer to the PDO, as necessary to understand their interface with the disposal function.

(2) Consideration of utilization and disposal actions performed by GSA, as necessary to understand their interface with the DoD disposal function and process.

(3) Review of all functions (e.g., demilitarization and reclamation) associated with the disposal program.

(4) Review of DoD disposal functions within both CONUS and Overseas.

b. Consider such organizational, functional, and responsibility changes that would lead to the optimum operation of the personal property disposal function of the DoD worldwide.

3. Specific Tasks. This Task Order requires Task Group 2-71 to:

a. Determine in detail through on-site research, and document, the various interface of the Military Services, DSA, and GSA with respect to the disposal of DoD property.

b. Analyze various organizational alternatives, including but not limited to: (a) accomplishing all Federal Government utilization screening prior to the transfer of excess materiel to Property Disposal Officers; and, (b) establishing single agency operation and/or management for the DoD Personel Property Disposal Program.

c. Recommend with full justification, the optimum management organization, to include the assignment of functional responsibilities for property disposal (including utilization) in CONUS and overseas areas.

d. Develop a plan for the implementation of recommended organizational changes.

D. REPORTS

The LSPC will be apprised of Task Group progress through monthly reports provided to the LSPC Secretariat, and through personal liaison between the Task Group and Secretariat. Narrative summaries of progress will relate to the time-phased plans for task accomplishment. Preparation of summaries will be keyed to scheduled LSPC meetings to insure currency. Major changes to the plans will be reported by submission of a revised plan together with supporting justification. Milestone slippage of one month or more must indicate the problem source, impact on the project, actions taken to overcome the problem and the get well date.

E. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The Task Group will utilize but not be limited to the following reference material:

1. DoD Directive 5126.43, "DoD Logistics Systems Planning."

2. DoD Directive 4160.21, "DoD Personal Property Disposal Program."

3. DoD 4160.21-M, "Defense Disposal Manual."

F. CONTACT POINTS

The Task Group is authorized direct contact with DoD Components and with the General Services Administration to arrange visits and request data, information, briefings, and documents required for this study.

The LSPC Secretariat will designate an individual to serve as Project Officer for this study, and Task Group contacts with the LSPC and/or the Secretariat should be made through this individual.

G. STUDY TIMING

A plan for the conduct of this study should be submitted to the LSPC within 45 days of the receipt of this Task Order.

The final report of this study should be submitted to the September 1971 meeting of the LSPC.

H. DATA COLLECTION

The Task Group is authorized to collect data as required for the accomplishment of this study. Each DoD Component will pay the costs involved in the collection and submission of required data. Reports Control Symbol (RCS) DD-I&L(OT)99999 is assigned to any data submission requirements established for this study.

I. TASK GROUP COMPOSITION

The Task Group will be composed of highly qualified personnel (minimum grade 0-4/GS-13) on a full-time basis. Task Group members will function under the chairmanship of the Chief, Analysis Division, DSA.

Initial Task Group manning, for the purpose of developing a plan for the accomplishment of this study, will be as follows:

Analysis Division, DSA	- 1
Air Force	- 1
DSA	- 1

Final Task Group manning requirements will be identified in the Study Plan.

J. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Administrative support for this Task Group will be provided by the Director, Defense Supply Agency.

JOHN JONES
Chairman
Logistics Systems Policy Committee

APPENDIX C

TASK GROUP REPORTING

Monthly progress reports are required to be submitted to the LSPC. These reports are submitted through the LSPC Secretariat, and are due at the Secretariat by not later than ten working days prior to the scheduled LSPC meeting. These progress reports will contain three kinds of information:

a. Fixed Information: This is information describing the study itself, the composition of the Task Group, and the major tasks assigned to the Group. This information will be submitted as part of the first progress report of the Task Group and will be resubmitted only when an element of information changes.

b. Status. This describes actions which have been taken since the previous monthly report, and updates the status of the Task Group in relation to its identified milestones.

c. Requests for Assistance: This identifies problem areas requiring assistance from the LSPC.

The format for the submission of these reports is shown on pages 4-5 of this Appendix. The desired conteat of each element in the report is described below:

Item 1. Task Group Number: From the Task Order.

Item 2. Title: As established by the Task Order.

Item 3. Chairman: Name, rank if military, organization, and telephone number of designated Chairman. If a Task Group Director has also been identified (see Paragraph A, Chapter III, for circumstances under which this would be required), also provide comparable information for this individual.

Item 4. Components Serving on Task Group: Insert the number of people from each Component assigned to the Task Group on a full-time basis.

Item 5. Date Study Started: Generally, this is the date on which the entire Task Group was first convened on a full-time basis.

Item 6. Planned Completion Date: Insert a specific date or identify the LSPC meeting (e.g., "July 1972 LSPC Meeting") by which the final report is scheduled for submission.

Item 7. Principal Tasks: These should be taken from the Task Order or approved Study Plan, whichever has the more detailed, definitive listing of tasks/objectives/purposes established for the study.

NOTE: The above elements, all on the first page of the Progress Report, are considered "fixed information," and are intended to be submitted only with the submission of the first progress report. A revised page will be submitted only when one of the elements changes (e.g., a component withdraws its augmentee without replacement). When that occurs, the monthly Progress Report will highlight and explain the change.

Item 8. Milestone Report: This is also an element of fixed information, and the data identified in Items A and C below are to be submitted with the submission of the first progress report. Updating of the "Milestone Report" to record the starting of action on a critical milestone event, the re-scheduling of a planned completion date for an event, or the actual completion of an event, is to be accomplished manually by those responsible for maintaining these reports for the LSPC principals. A statement updating the "Milestone Report" will be included in the monthly Progress Report.

A. Critical Milestones/Phases: These generally will be as identified under the heading "Study Schedule" in the Study Plan.

B. Date Started: Record the actual date for each event.

C. Completion Dates

(1) Planned Completion Date: This information will also generally be derived from the "Study Schedule."

(2) Actual Completion Date: Record the actual date for each event.

The monthly Progress Report will be submitted in the form of a memorandum containing the following elements of information:

a. Subject: This will always be: "Monthly Progress Report, LSPC Task Group (identify), as of (insert date)."

b. To: The addressee will be the LSPC.

c. Changes: Report any changes to the fixed information items of the progress report (Items 1 through 7 of the format) in a separate paragraph for each item having a change. When appropriate, include an explanation for the change.

d. Milestone Report: Report any entries to be made in any of the columns of the Milestone Report (Item 8 of the format). Any discussion or explanation of these entries should be included in the "Actions Taken" paragraph.

e. Actions Taken: Report on actions taken by the Task Group since the previous submission of a Monthly Progress Report. Include any required discussion or explanation of entries in the "Milestone" portion of the reporting format.

f. Required Assistance: Identify any factors which could have an impact on achieving Task Group purposes/tasks/objectives (e.g., insufficient Task Group manning, lack of qualifications of Task Group personnel, lack of cooperation from DoD Components, or inadequate time authorized). Identify the actions which the Task Group collectively, or the Chairman individually, has taken to overcome this problem (including, for example, efforts through the DoD Component contact points or through component representatives on the LSPC Secretariat), and identify specifically action(s) the LSPC should take on the matter.

g. Signature: This report will be signed by the Task Group Chairman or Director.

TASK GROUP REPORT FOR LSPC

1. TASK GROUP NUMBER:

2. TITLE:

3. CHAIRMAN:

4. COMPONENTS SERVING ON TASK GROUP: OSD_____ ARMY_____

NAVY_____ AF_____ MARINE_____ JCS_____ DSA_____ OTHER_____

5. DATE STUDY STARTED:

6. PLANNED COMPLETION DATE:

7. PRINCIPAL TASKS ASSIGNED TO TASK GROUP:

CONTINUATION SHEET

TASK GROUP REPORT FOR LSPC

8. MILESTONE REPORT

A. CRITICAL MILESTONES/PHASES	B. DATE STARTED	C. COMPLETION DATE	
		1. PLANNED	2. ACTUAL

APPENDIX D

STUDY PLAN
(Sample)

PLAN FOR THE STUDY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL ORGANIZATION (LSPC TASK GROUP 4-71)

A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

To determine the optimum management organization for the Department of Defense (DoD) personal property disposal function worldwide.

B. OBJECTIVES

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the current organization for the disposal of personal property within the DoD.

2. Identify areas in which restructuring of organizations and/or organizational relationships would result in quantifiable and other advantages to the DoD.

3. Recommend:

a. The optimum organizational structure for the DoD personal property disposal program; and,

b. A plan for the implementation of any recommended organizational changes.

C. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this Study encompasses functions and organizations involved in the disposition of all types of DoD personal property.

The Task Group will study existing and potential organizations for the disposition of all categories of DoD personal property, worldwide. This will include:

a. Functions relating to the utilization, donation, sale, or other disposition of excess and surplus personal property.

b. All organizational levels within the DoD, including DoD Component headquarters, sales offices, holding activities, and satellites, in both the United States and overseas.

c. Both ICP and installation-controlled property.

d. All categories of materiel, including contractor inventory, Corps of Engineers Civil Works property, nuclear and cryptological materiel, and redistributable MAP property.

e. Programs related to the disposition of DoD personal property, such as demilitarization, reclamation, and precious metals recovery.

The scope of this Study does not include disposal policy or procedures except those which are directly associated with, or are directly affected by, the organizational structure of the disposal process.

D. STUDY APPROACH

1. Collect and analyze basic management data, to be obtained from the DoD Components.

2. Obtain briefings from the Military Services and Defense Supply Agency regarding the operation of the disposal program.

3. Review existing GAO and DoD Component reports and studies relating to the organization of the DoD Disposal Program.

4. Examine, through on-site field research at selected DoD activities in both the United States and overseas, existing relationships between various organizations involved in personal property disposal, in such areas as:

a. Policy and procedural guidance.

b. Budgeting and funding.

c. Reporting excess and surplus materiel for disposition.

d. Utilization, donation, and sale of personal property.

e. Management (workload and accomplishment) reporting.

5. Analyze the data and information obtained and determine areas in which there appears to be a potential for program improvement through organizational change.

6. Evaluate various organizational alternatives, including but not limited to:

a. Accomplishing all, or some portion of, utilization and donation screening prior to the transfer of materiel to Property Disposal Officers (PDOs).

b. Accomplishing demilitarization and/or reclamation prior to the transfer of accountability to PDOs.

c. Establishing single agency operation and/or management for the DoD personal property disposal program.

6. Develop courses of action for resolving problems, if any, associated with the current Disposal Program organization, including:

a. Recommending the optimum management organzation for the accomplishment of DoD personal property disposal functions; and,

b. Developing a plan for the implementation of any recommended organizational changes.

E. TASK GROUP MANNING

The Task Group will serve under the overall Chairmanship of the Chief, Analysis Division, and under the immediate administration of the Task Group Director who will also be from the Analysis Division.

Personnel for this Task Group will be assigned on a full-time basis for the duration of this study, and will be placed on appropriate orders by their parent organization. The types of personnel required are shown in Enclosure 1 to this Plan. 1/

F. SCHEDULE

The Task Group is expected to convene on 22 February and has been directed to submit its final report by the September 1971 LSPC meeting.

A preliminary study schedule allocating this 31-week period is shown in Enclosure 2 to this Plan. 1/

G. DATA REQUIREMENTS

Summary, individual program, and/or individual activity data will be required from DoD Components for Task Group review and analysis. These requirements will be met through the use of existing reports and available data to the extent possible. However, special reports may be necessary to meet Task Group requirements.

1/ Ordinarily the Task Group Composition and Study Schedule will be shown as indicated. However, for presentation in this Handbook, these are actually contained in Appendices E and F, respectively.

Specific data requirements will be made the subject of separate correspondence directly from the Task Group to the DoD Components concerned.

H. FIELD RESEARCH ITINERARY

A representative number of DoD activities engaged in various aspects of the total DoD personal property disposal function will be visited in both the United States and overseas.

A detailed itinerary will be developed by the Task Group, and the specific activities to be visited will be selected after initial briefings have been received. These selections will be coordinated with the DoD Component headquarters through the respective contact points designated in accordance with Paragraph I below. Notice of activities to be visited and timing of the visits will be furnished to the contact points as soon as available, but not less than one week prior to the desired date of visit.

I. CONTACT POINTS

In addition to the full-time team member(s) provided to the Task Group, each Military Service, DSA, and GSA will designate an individual to serve as a point of contact with the Task Group. This individual will be responsible for providing, or arranging for, required data and briefings and for furnishing assistance in arranging visits, as necessary.

APPENDIX E

TASK GROUP COMPOSITION
(Sample)

1/ Chairman-- Analysis Division, DSA

1/ Inventory Accounting Specialist-- Air Force

1/ Disposal Specialist-- DSA

Disposal Specialist-- Navy

Disposal Specialist-- GSA

2/ Data Coordinator-- Analysis Division, DSA

1/ Identifies personnel already designated by the Task Order as Task Group nucleus.

2/ Identifies personnel already assigned/designated by the Task Group Chairman from resources under his control.

APPENDIX F

PRELIMINARY STUDY SCHEDULE
(Sample)

Work Week(s)	Dates	Study Action
1 - 2	22 Feb - 5 Mar	Task Group convenes. Accomplish desk research. Develop Headquarters briefing requirements.
3	8 - 12 Mar	Receive Service and DSA headquarters briefings.
3 - 7	8 Mar - 9 Apr	Develop Itinerary and Field Research Outline. Develop and distribute data requirements.
8 - 19	12 Apr - 2 Jul	Conduct field research in CONUS and overseas.
20 - 30	6 Jul - 17 Sep	Analyze information and data and prepare final Report.
31	24 Sep	Submit Report to LSPC.

APPENDIX G

HEADQUARTERS-LEVEL BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS
(Sample-Extract)

Individual briefings are desired from each Military Service describing how supply support is furnished overseas. These briefings should cover all levels of supply support, ranging from that which is furnished to customers/end users to that which is furnished to overseas installations from CONUS sources of supply. The briefings should encompass all commodity areas (including, for example, medical and dental supplies and ammunition) except bulk petroleum and subsistence; further, it should consider all types of items (e.g., both end items and repair parts, both investment and expense items, and both integrated- and Service-managed items). The briefing should include, but not necessarily limit itself to, the following:

a. Identification of the different types of stock levels which exist at installation (base, post, camp, station) level.

b. The method(s) of computing and replenishing each of these levels.

c. Funding arrangements applicable to overseas stocks, including method of financing installation-level stocks, and the point/level at which customer/end user funds are controlled.

d. System for the control, allocation, and issue of investment/end items.

e. The relationship between overseas supply activities and maintenance activities (in overseas theaters and in CONUS) insofar as the repair of unserviceables for return to stock is concerned.

f. Local purchase of supplies by overseas activities.

g. Service/Departmental systems for identifying workload elements and for authorizing resources (e.g., funds, personnel, and equipment) in relation to workload.

h. A description of major existing Common Supply Support arrangements in overseas areas, identifying for each the geographical area, commodity(ies) included, and DoD activities involved.

In development of these briefings, consideration should be given to the fact that the Task Group is composed of personnel from all Military Services, and an effort should be made to insure that the presentation will be meaningful to personnel unfamiliar with individual Service language/nomenclature.

The individual Military Service briefings requested above have been planned as follows (all are scheduled for 0900):

a. Army: 25 January

b. Navy: 26 January

c. Air Force: 27 January

d. Marine Corps: 28 January

The following comments apply to all four sessions discussed in this memorandum:

a. Space is available at the Task Group location.

b. Attendance will be limited to Task Group members only, and there will be no discussion or dissemination of the contents of any briefing, or its related discussion period, outside the confines of the Task Group.

c. Eight copies of all charts and statistics used during the briefing should be available for distribution to Task Group members at the start of the briefing.

d. Questions should be directed to Lt Col John Jones, USMC, at 274-6311, and support requirements should be arranged through Lt Col Jones.

/s/
WILLIAM SMITH
Chairman
LSPC Task Group 9-99

APPENDIX H

FIELD RESEARCH OUTLINE
(Sample-Extract)

* *

SECTION IV

MATERIEL MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS

A. REQUIREMENTS

1. Basic Guidance

a. Organization
b. Directives - policy/procedural
   (1) Higher Headquarters
   (2) Local
c. Program Guidance
   (1) Title, contents
   (2) Source
   (3) Local adjustments
   (4) Use in requirements process - program/usage/attrition factors

2. Computation Methodologies

a. Item Categorization (cost/usage/expendable vs. recoverable/etc. as used in requirements computation process); definition.
b., c., etc. Description of each process used:
   (1) Criteria
   (2) Timing/frequency
   (3) Mechanized/manual
   (4) Program elements used/program factors developed, used - how? adjustments prior to use?
   (5) Source of past history - usage/issue/demand/wearout?
   (6) Asset data included - range, depth, timeliness?
   (7) Unserviceable reparables - considered? source?
   (8) Maintenance cycle - depot/installation
   (9) Levels - what? how devised?
   (10) Pipelines - what? how devised?
   (11) Special requirements input: (a) Mobilization Reserve Stocks; (b) Special Projects - maintenance support/one-time/initial issue; (c) GFE.

NOTES: (1) Manual review of mechanized process?
(2) Item Manager use of SSM developed requirements?
(3) Process for budget defense vs. buy computation vs. apportionments?

c. Review Process: (1) timing; (2) by whom; (3) how; (4) relation to operating program during review.

3. Stratification (Inventory and Requirements):

a. Timing/frequency
b. Strata used - including definition
c. Action on Long Supply - excess vs. Contingency Retention vs. Economic Retention

4. Maintenance Scheduling/Programming (Workloading)

a. Data flow between requirements and maintenance re: (1) unserviceable available/projected/generated, (2) maintenance capability.
b. Who establishes maintenance schedule? Review/approval point? Approved schedule information to Requirements?
c. Historical reliability or maintenance schedule as source of serviceable items?
d. Flow of up-date data re: (1) actual unserviceable generation, (2) actual serviceable production.
e. Requirements revision based on maintenance production slippages: (1) information flow, (2) frequency info flow, (3) frequency recomputation, (4) system flexibility without recomputation.

5. Asset and Consumption/Issue/Usage Reporting:

a. Timing/frequency
b. Source
c. Elements included: serviceables/reparables/management categories
d. Demand/issue/usage/sales/etc. as basis?
e. Adjustments prior to input to computation process?

6. Program Changes - operating (flying hours/landing/equipment conversion/etc.) and financial (budget/funding):

a. How received?
b. Historical frequency?
c. How reflected in gross/net/buy computations/recomputations?
d. How are budget cuts apportioned?

7. Financial Relationships (e.g., budget/funding/ceilings):

a. When/how received?
b. Effect on gross computations
c. Effect on buy computation - what? how reflected?

8. Procurement Initiation:

a. Procedure, including forms, routing.
b. Fund availability/citation procedure.
c. Effect of fund shortages-budget reduction/end year.
d. Technical data transmission to procurement agency; part numbered MIL/FED specs, drawings, etc.
e. Differences for intra-service PR vs. inter-service MIPR.
f. Decision on procurement method.
(1) CP vs LP
(2) Sole source vs advertised

9. ICP/User Relationship:

a. Review/modification/approval of factors used in computation.
b. Review/modification/approval of final computation.

10. Statistics by FSC:

a. Requirements Computation Process - Number of items, by type process.
b. Procurement History - Annual value of past buys (up to 10 years, if available) by:
(1) Type requirements methodology.
(2) Expendable vs Reparables - including initial provisioning.
c. Workload (manpower or manhours) Distribution by:
(1) Type of Requirements methodology.
(2) Expendable vs Recoverable.

B. DISTRIBUTION

1. Concept

a. Organization structure
b. Directives (obtain copies)
c. Distribution policy including resupply concept

etc.

* * * *

APPENDIX I

GUIDE TO PREPARING FINAL REPORTS

The purpose of this Appendix is to establish standard guidance for the mechanical aspects (for example, paragraphing, use of appendices, and identification of sources) of producing a final study report. For guidance in additional areas not covered by this Appendix, refer to the U.S. Government Printing Office "Style Manual" or, secondarily, one of the several guides used at graduate schools for the preparation of theses (for example, Turabian's "A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations").

A. OVERALL ORGANIZATION

When the total final report is divided into "Volumes," each of which is a physically separate document, Volumes are identified by roman numerals. The Volume number and title is shown on the title page, which is the first page of the volume, immediately beneath the title of the total report. This same information is also shown on the cover (and spine, when the cover is edge-printed) of each volume in the same relative location.

When necessary, a Volume may be divided into "Parts," which are identified by capital letters. If one Volume of a multiple-Volume final report is divided into Parts, it is not necessary that all Volumes be divided in this manner. When each Volume of a multiple-Volume final report is divided into Parts, the Parts are sequenced separately within each Volume (that is, each would have a Part A). Identification of each Part appears at the top of a right-hand page. The word "Part" and the Part letter are centered in the middle of the page; the Part title, all in capital letters is centered immediately beneath the Part letter. The Chapter identification starts three lines below the Part identification.

Volumes, and parts when they are used, are divided into "Chapters," which are identified by roman numerals. Chapters are numbered consecutively within a Volume, even when that Volume has been further divided into Parts. For example, if Part A of Volume I of a final report contained three Chapters, Part B of Volume I would start with Chapter IV. Chapters start on a new, right-hand page. The word "Chapter" and the Chapter number are centered one inch from the top of the first page of the Chapter; the Chapter title, all in capital letters, is centered two lines beneath the Chapter number.

B. PARAGRAPHING AND SUBPARAGRAPHING

Chapters are divided into paragraphs and subparagraphs, identified as follows:

The first level of paragraphing is placed flush left and identified with a capital letter; the title of the paragraph appears in all capital letters.

The second level of paragraphing is indented four spaces from the left margin and identified with an arabic numeral.

The third level of paragraphing is indented four additional spaces (a total of eight from the left margin) and identified with a lower case letter of the alphabet.

The fourth level of paragraphing is indented a total of 12 spaces from the left margin and identified with an arabic numeral in parenthesis.

The fifth level of paragraphing is indented a total of 17 spaces from the left margin and identified with a lower case letter of the alphabet in parenthesis.

For example:

A. STORAGE DEPOTS

1. Introduction

a. Background

(1) Overseas

(a) Europe

No portion of a letter/number series will be used unless there are at least two paragraphs at that level. That is, a paragraph cannot be identified as "1" unless there is at least a paragraph number "2" or "(a)" unless there is at least a paragraph "(b)."

Numbers and letters are not assigned to paragraphs unless a title is also used, as shown in the preceding example. These titles are underlined. The only exception to this is when the subparagraphs are part of a series which has been identified in the text, for example: "... through the use of three techniques:

(1) Actual on-site evaluation;

(2) Review of audit and inspection reports; or,

(3) Correspondence with the commanders involved."

When there is only one paragraph at a given level which has a title and has been assigned a number/letter, the text of that paragraph will begin on the same line as the paragraph title. For example:

"a. Introduction. This subparagraph represents the only..."

When there is more than one paragraph under the title, each paragraph will be indented four spaces from the indentation of the line with the paragraph title, and the first of these will start on the next line after the paragraph title. For example:

"a. Introduction

"The discussion in this area...

"As a result, this portion is developed..."

When letters/numbers are not assigned to a level of paragraphing because titles were not used, lower levels of paragraphing will use the appropriate identification as if the higher level number/letter had been used. That is, for example, this paragraph itself is at a level which would use arabic numbers for identification, but this paragraph was not numbered since it was not assigned a title; however, subparagraphs of this paragraph which qualify for numbers/letters, because they contain a series, would be identified by lower case letters, just as if an arabic number had been assigned to this paragraph.

C. NUMBERS

Readability, flow, and comprehension are the objectives of writing. A long string of digits will lose the reader. The need is to express numbers in a form which will maximize reader recognition of the thought you are trying to convey. Another aspect of this "numbers" area is the question of the degree of precision required, and this will vary from subject to subject within the final report. The more precisely a number is expressed, the more complex it becomes, and the need is to express numbers only to that degree of precision required for each specific situation. This portion contains guidance on how numbers should be presented in final reports.

Spell out the numbers "one" through "ten"; use the actual arabic figures for numbers "11" and larger, except when used at the beginning of a sentence. Never use both the figure and the spelling; that is, never use "...issued ten (10) times in the past...."

Numbers up to and including the hundred thousand range should be shown as all digits; e.g., 17,500 or $950,000. Numbers starting at

one million and up should be shown as a combination of numbers for the amount and words for the magnitude; e.g., "22 million," or "$13 billion."

Ordinarily, numbers through the hundred thousand range can be rounded off to the nearest hundred, or even the nearest thousand; for example, round off "226,347" to "226,300," or even "226,000." For somewhat more accuracy without losing the reader in a string of digits, state this as "just over 226,000."

Similarly, numbers starting with one million should be rounded off to the nearest million or, if greater precision is required, to the nearest hundred thousand but expressed as a decimal portion of the nearest million; for example, round off "4,372,156" to "4 million" or to "4.4 million."

Where decimals are used in the text and the figure shown is less than a whole number, use a zero in front of the decimal; for example, "0.9 million," or "0.3%."

Analysis chapters make wide use of percentages, and a few special comments apply to them:

a. Percentages in the text of a chapter are always presented as numbers— that is, use "45%," not "forty-five percent."

b. Also, consider the use of terms such as "about half" or "approximately two-thirds" rather than the precise percentage figures, except when the precise figure is significant. The feeling for the order of magnitude of the figure is more easily expressed through use of these words than through the use of the actual numbers.

c. When precise data is available and that degree of precision is an element of the thought which is to be conveyed, express percentages to the nearest tenth of a percent. Note that tenths of a percent are thousandths when expressed in decimal terms; that is, "22.3%" is the same as "0.223."

d. Percentage figures can be no more precise than the figures on which they are based. Thus, it becomes misleading to present a precise percentage figure which was developed from rounded-off numeric data. If the base from which percentages are derived was rounded off before the percentages were developed, the percentages should be expressed to the nearest whole number and not to the tenth of a percent; that is, express as "36%," not as "35.8%."

e. Frequently, it is meaningful to present both an absolute value (a number) and the percentage which it represents of some total. This should be expressed as in the following example: "Of the total requisitions processed during FY 1972, 42,000 (39.5%) were in IPG I."

D. TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables present arrangements of statistical data. Figures contain pictures of such things as forms, or organizational charts. Tables and figures are numbered separately, and individually within each chapter. That is, the first table in Chapter II will be identified as "Table II-1," while the first figure in that chapter will be identified as "Figure II-1."

Both Tables and Figures will have separate lists identifying the pages on which they can be found, in addition to the normal Table of Contents identifying chapter locations.

Each Table and Figure will be given an identifying descriptive title, which will appear both at the top of the Table/Figure and in the list at the front of the report.

Because of physical composition problems and to avoid interrupting the reader flow, only the briefest data presentations should be inserted in the text. Generally, data should be designed to be presented as a table. Ordinarily, present data as "Table II-3 shows...", rather than "The following table shows..." Tables and Figures must be explained, described, or discussed in the text of the chapter; they cannot merely be "thrown in." Extensive discussion is not essential, but there must be some language in the text explaining what is shown in the Table/Figure and/or indicating why it is included in the text. Therefore, when using Tables/Figures say, for example, "Table II-5 contains requisition data showing trends for FY 1972," not "Table II-5 contains statistics applicable to this subject."

Identify the source from which the data used in Tables was derived. Insert the word "Source:" below the lower left corner of the Table, above any footnotes which may be required, followed by the identification of the source. Where the data was derived from a standard report, use the title or Reports Control Symbol of the report as the source. Data derived from the statistical data submission should use that term to identify the source. Data which was collected during field research from something other than a standard report should be identified as "Source: Field Research."

Explanatory notes are frequently required in support of Tables, to explain the peculiarities of certain of the data contained in the table. Use numbers (for example, "2/") to identify these footnotes rather than using the special symbols on the typewriter keyboard. Several footnotes are used frequently in analyses:

a. When original quantities are added, then all figures are rounded, the total may not agree with the sum of the individual entries. For example:

Original Quantities	Rounded-off Quantities as they would appear in a report
1.24	1.2
3.64	3.6
4.88	4.9 1/

The following footnote should be used: "1/ Total does not agree due to rounding."

b. When percentages are calculated and rounded off, some entries may not represent a high enough percentage of the total to qualify for entry. For example, if percentages are being recorded to the nearest whole percentage, any value which calculates to less than ½% would round off to zero; however, a zero percentage for an entry with some absolute value is clearly inaccurate. Under these circumstances, use the following footnote: "Less than (insert the minimum percentage value which would result in an entry— for the example given above, use "0.5%")." When this occurs, a column of percentages need not add to 100%.

c. Large numbers (e.g., hundreds of thousands, or millions) generally cannot be shown in their entirety in a table because of space limitations and/or readability. Under these circumstances, place a notation identifying the extent of rounding-off in parenthesis just below the title of the table (e.g., "in millions of dollars").

E. QUOTES

Extensive and extended quotations are rarely justified within the text of a chapter. Quotes should be limited to that precise portion of the material whose exact language would be significant to the reader. A summary of the original reference material will generally be more satisfactory than an actual quote of the full text. When quotes are considered justified and are used, make extensive use of ellipses— three periods (...)— to indicate that the actual quote has been carefully limited to only the most essential information.

When a full presentation of some source document (e.g., a directive) is considered essential, include this as an Appendix to the report. However, a summary of the significant portions of this document (i.e., those points which make it important to include the document, in toto, in the report) must be included in the text. Do not say "Appendix C contains DoD Directive 4140.26" without summarizing those portions of the directive which are considered significant to the chapter being written.

The first reference to a source document should be complete. That is, identify the author and title if the source is a book; identify the author, title, and publication (including date) if the source is a magazine article; and, identify the full number, title, and date if the source is a directive.

F. APPENDICES

The text of a chapter must "flow" in order to retain the attention and interest of the reader. Including extensive quotations from other documents runs the risk of breaking that flow. The solution to this problem is to summarize the significant portions of the document in the text of the report, then reproduce the document in its entirety as an Appendix to the report.

Some typical material which should be published in an Appendix rather than in the text, with the understanding that the text contains a summary of the significant portions of the material, include:

a. The Task Order;

b. The Study Plan;

c. A list of activities visited during field research;

d. The full text of those very few documents (e.g., directives or correspondence) which are considered so significant to the report analysis as to justify their reproduction in full in the report;

e. A draft of proposed directive(s) developed as part of the study recommendations; and,

f. Appropriate chart(s) covering actions involved in the implementation plan for study recommendations.

Appendices are:

a. Published at the back of the volume in whose text they first appear;

b. Identified by capital letters;

c. Assigned letters consecutively throughout the volume, regardless of the chapter in which they appear;

d. Page numbered consecutively with all other pages of the volume; and,

e. Identified in the lower right hand corner of each page to identify the Appendix letter, and the page of the appendix; for example, "Appendix I, page 7."

G. CONTENTS LISTINGS

There is a possible total of four different listings of the contents of a study report that can be required:

a. Table of Contents;

b. List of Tables;

c. List of Figures; and,

d. List of Appendices.

The Table of Contents identifies the text which has been included in the report. As a minimum, it identifies chapter numbers and titles, and the page on which the chapter starts. Generally, the Table of Contents will also list the identifying letter, title, and beginning page for each major (first level) paragraph within the Chapter.

The List of Tables and the List of Figures will contain similar information: the Table/Figure Number, its title, and the page on which it appears.

The List of Appendices will contain the Appendix letter, its title, and the page on which it starts.

The total contents listing (including the Table of Contents and the Lists of Tables, Figures, and Appendices) for the report will be published in all volumes of a multi-volume report, with an identification of which portion of the contents appears in each of the volumes.