

The committee has concluded that it is time for the Secretary of Defense to respond to the calls for reduced layering of the top Pentagon management headquarters. Consolidating the service secretariats and military headquarters staffs would reduce the existing nine major Pentagon headquarters staffs to six and eliminate one entire level of bureaucracy.

With regard to layering and duplication, the committee believes that military department consolidation should be viewed in light of the recommendations of the Final Report to the President by the President's Blue Ribbon Commission of Defense Management (the Packard Commission). The report, entitled *A Quest for Excellence*, recommends strengthening procurement through establishment of an acquisition executive in each military department who would supervise the performance of the departmental acquisition system. His immediate subordinates in the acquisition chain would be program executive officers (PEOs), each of whom would be responsible for several acquisition programs. Below the program executive officer would be much-strengthened program managers. "Program managers * * * would be responsible directly to their respective PEO and report *only* to him on program matters."

In order to accommodate the streamlined procurement chain, consolidation of the secretariats and military headquarters staffs may be required. To take the Air Force as an example, it is likely that the Assistant Secretary for Research, Development and Logistics will serve as the Acquisition Executive; next in the acquisition chain will probably be the Commander of the Air Force Systems Command; and next, the program managers. The Air Force military headquarters staff and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force would be completely cut out of the Packard acquisition chain. At present, however, almost all of the staff support to assist the Assistant Secretary for Research, Development and Logistics, should he become the acquisition executive, is in the Air Force military headquarters staff. As the Assistant Secretary, he has a very small staff. The expertise he needs is in the Air Force military headquarters staff where the research and development Deputy Chief of Staff has hundreds of people, including entire offices devoted to manufacturing, labor affairs, contract pricing, contract procurement, contract administration, industrial policy, development and acquisition management, test and evaluation, etc.

Consolidation of the secretariat and military headquarters staff would integrate the separate research and development staffs at each level. Duplication would be eliminated. The Assistant Secretary for Research and Development would gain the staff expertise necessary to perform his new role. The Air Force Chief of Staff, with his proper role as the ultimate authority on military requirements, would have a direct line to the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development through the Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development who would respond to the Chief of Staff as well as the assistant secretary.

The consolidation issue should also be viewed in terms of civilian control as broached in the Departmental Headquarters Study cited above. Secretary of the Navy John Lehman has indicated that when he assumed his position, the Navy staff spent approximately six months developing a Navy budget; he and his secretariat, on