



HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

*Foray the =
Hold
W*

5 November 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy
Chief of Staff for Military Operations

1. In response to Chief of Staff memorandum, dated 27 September 1962, I am submitting as inclosures, the proposed organizational and functional arrangements for the creation of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations (ODCSP&O) and the Office Deputy Chief of Staff, Force Development (ODCSFOR).

2. The following points within this proposal are significant:

a. A proposed concept of Army planning is included. This concept recognizes that all staff agencies plan, but establishes two major planning efforts that would serve as the frame of reference for all other planning. These two major efforts would start from a single document encompassing the basic strategy, intelligence estimate and technological forecast and set forth the major force requirements (force structure) associated with two levels of resource. The first level (Army Force Development Plan) would be directed toward the capability level and the DOD Five Year Force Structure and Financial Program. This would be a "maximum acceptable risk" plan. The second level (Army Strategic Plan) would be directed toward determining "what the Army needs" to perform its missions within the established strategy, intelligence estimate and technological forecast. This plan would obviously incorporate a lesser risk. I consider it essential to sound planning to have the strategy, concepts, and major force requirements for both plans developed by one agency, Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Operations. The development of the Army Strategic Plan would be a DCSP&O responsibility. The development of the Army Force Development Plan, from the established parameters of strategy, major force requirements, etc., would be a responsibility of DCSFOR. The Army Force Development Plan would include an application of economic constraints and the hard realities of lead time, technological capability and limited manpower. Alternatives would be examined and findings would provide the basis for revision and modification. This plan would provide the program guidance and proposed program revision.

*File
Reference
File*

*in. Total No 420 5442
Copy #1*

30

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50920

SUBJECT: DCSOPS Reorganization

Both plans should extend over a similar period of 15-20 years and be relatable to each other and to the base program at any point in time. These two plans would then provide the planning basis for all other ancillary planning, programming and would consolidate the many unilateral plans (ARDP, MRE, ALRCP, ASOP, OFPP) we currently develop into two major planning efforts. The Army Force Development Plan would be designed to further meet the requirements of the "planning volume" for the over-all Army program.

b. This submission reflects the DCSFOR exercising General Staff supervision of Office, Chief Signal Officer. It is recognized that his role in strategic communications affords DCSP&O much interest; however, his role in the development of tactical communications and electronic capabilities within Army forces is equally important and is an integral part of force development. The role of strategic communications is performed primarily under the aegis of Defense Communications Agency (DCA). Further, if the recommendation to assign DCSFOR responsibility for the O&M,A appropriation is accepted, the relationship between DCSFOR and Chief Signal Officer would be drawn closer through their mutual interests in fiscal requirements. For these reasons, I support the recommendations of the Chief Signal Officer that he be under the General Staff supervision of DCSFOR.

c. This submission calls for an increase of 89 spaces above the total current space authorization for ODCSOPS. I have given the space requirements careful scrutiny and consideration, and in so doing, have denied the requests of the directors for additional spaces/where increased workload or self-generated functions were concerned. The spaces I request are as follows:

(1) Fifty-nine spaces are required to organize the present ODCSOPS into two General Staff agencies with separate administrative services.

(2) Confirmation of the 8 spaces previously approved for centralization of nuclear coordination responsibilities. This function is proposed for assignment within DCSFOR, and is currently being assumed by DCSOPS.

(3) Twenty-two spaces necessary to permit DCSFOR to discharge those responsibilities attendant to staff direction of the O&M,A appropriation, thus providing DCSFOR the responsibility for those resources most closely related to force development and maintenance. Since this proposal involves a transfer of function, transfer of associated spaces from COA is assumed.

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

d. Your memorandum of 11 October 1962 concerning revision of the Army programming system assigned DCSOPS the responsibility for the development and monitorship of Force Basis Annex and a separate study has been directed to determine the scope and nature of this responsibility. I would propose this function be assigned to DCSFOR and the spaces required be determined in that study.

e. In the matter of spaces it is significant to point out that the ultimate objective within any General Staff agency is to have the majority of its members conducting over-all serious evaluation and proposing broad action. In the atmosphere of today, I find large numbers of my people working with detailed data and reacting immediately to detailed questions from many sources. In view of this, I cannot identify any area where personnel may be saved.

f. The attached schedule of reorganization is based upon two assumptions. The first and more immediate one is that the world situation has returned to some degree of normalcy and, second, that the legal requirements of creating a new deputy will have been met. The critical aspect of timing is related primarily to the proposal that DCSFOR assume responsibility for the O&M,A appropriation. I view it as essential that that function be transferred concurrent with the start of a new fiscal year.

3. a. In accordance with the decision to divide the current DCSOPS, it is recommended that:

- (1) The planning concept be approved.
- (2) The organizational and functional arrangements proposed be approved.
- (3) The spaces requested be approved.
- (4) The schedule of reorganization be approved and action taken to satisfy the legal requirements necessary to create a new Deputy Chief of Staff.

b. In the event the implementation of the division of ODCSOPS is deferred, certain of these changes should be implemented now. In that event I recommend:

- (1) The planning concept be approved.
- (2) The functional rearrangements be approved.

SUBJECT: DCSOPS Reorganization

(3) The space requirements (8 spaces) associated with the nuclear coordination function be confirmed and the 22 spaces associated with the O&M, A appropriation responsibilities be transferred from COA to DCSOPS.

4. The proposals included herein have not been coordinated with other staff agencies.

5. At your convenience, I wish to discuss several aspects of this over-all plan and will amplify any aspect you may desire.

1 Incl
as



T. W. PARKER
Lieutenant General, GS
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Military Operations

DCSOPS EX

4 October 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy
Chief of Staff for Military Operations

1. References:

- a. CS 320, OCS Memo, subject: Reorganization to Improve Planning and Programming, 7 Sep 62
- b. CS 320, CS Memo, subject: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations

2. Study to date by the ODCSOPS working group of the detailed plan for reorganization of ODCSOPS has exposed some rather complex problems, the solution of which is not readily apparent. The resolution of these problems demands a considered judgment drawn from the knowledge of several experienced senior officers in the Department of the Army staff. Therefore, the time available for the completion of the detailed plan for reorganization becomes a prime factor controlling the quality of the plan. Reference a directs that a detailed plan, together with the recommended schedule for implementation be submitted to you for approval by 15 October 1962.

3. Accordingly, I request that the date of 31 October be established for submission of the detailed plan.

T. W. PARKER
Lieutenant General, GS
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Military Operations

APPROVED — OCS U. S. ARMY
5 OCT 1962



CS 320 (4 of 62)

30

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

CS 320 (7 Sept 62)

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations

1. Reference your memorandum of 20 September, subject as above.
2. I have considered your memorandum and its inclosures together with your comments in our conversation of 25 September on this subject. I believe that it is desirable to proceed with plans to effect a division of your agency into two separate elements in the manner outlined in my directive of 7 September.
3. In your continued planning, I feel that the broad outline plan you have submitted will require adjustment to bring it more into line with the concept Secretary Vance and I have approved. Specifically, it will be necessary to provide for separate strategic planning and force development planning. I do not believe that your division into quantitative and qualitative planning will accomplish the desired objective. Both planning functions must be concerned with quantitative as well as qualitative aspects. The strategic planning should result in the establishment of broad force requirements. Force development planning would translate these broad requirements into the specific forces which can and should be developed. A basic purpose in the division as originally outlined was to provide the closer organizational relationship between planning and programming which you stated was not accomplished in your solution.
4. I believe that you will also wish to make adjustments in your first look at relationships with other staff elements of the headquarters. As one example, I feel that the Chief Signal Officer's duties in operation of world-wide communications lead to the placement of his office under the general staff supervision of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations rather than under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Force Development.

(Sgd) G. H. DECKER

UNITED STATES ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF
G. H. DECKER
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

286 11 13 29 25
D 28410-EB

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DCS FILE COPY

Authority NND 50420
DECLASSIFIED



DCSOPS

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

20 September 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE CHIEF OF STAFF, U. S. ARMY

SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy Chief
of Staff for Military Operations

1. Reference: Memorandum Chief of Staff, Subject:
Reorganization to Improve Planning and Programming, file
CS 320, dated 7 September 1962.

2. An examination of the present organization and
functional responsibilities of the Deputy Chief of Staff for
Military Operations has been conducted for the purpose of
proposing in outline form a division of the present organiza-
tion into two major staff agencies. This examination center-
ed in three major areas. They were:

- a. To establish a logical functional rearrangement;
- b. To evaluate the planning and programming activi-
ties conducted by the Army and
- c. A cursory review of the effects upon other General
and Special Staff agencies under this proposed reorganization.

3. The general approach to the proposed division was
separately to identify the planning and force utilization func-
tions from those relating to force development. Another way of
stating this would be to identify and assign to one staff
agency the primary responsibility for providing staff support
to the Chief of Staff in his capacity as a member of the Joint
Chiefs of Staff, while the other staff agency would serve as
the primary support to the Chief of Staff in discharging his
responsibilities as Chief of Staff of the Army. Concurrently
the intent of the functional arrangement was to place the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DCSOPS

SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy Chief
of Staff for Military Operations

staff responsibility for the determination of Army requirements and the reasons therefor with one staff agency while the other was charged with the staff responsibility of translating approved requirements into operational forces. A third governing principle was to make one agency responsible for quantitative requirements while making the other staff agency responsible for qualitative developments. Insofar as possible, the proposed functional arrangements at inclosures 1 and 2 assign to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations general staff responsibilities relating to joint affairs, planning and policy determination, and the determination of quantitative requirements. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Forces would focus upon unilateral concerns, bearing staff responsibility for the development of qualitative requirements, and the development and maintenance of operational forces. Proposed organizational diagrams are attached as inclosures 3 and 4.

4. Focal points were retained to monitor information and serve as contact points for special warfare, army aviation, CBR operations and civil affairs/civil defense. The identification of functions was designed to assure however that the functional responsibilities were not splintered. In accord with your directive provision of a focal point for Army nuclear matters has been included within the functional responsibilities of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Forces.

5. No organizational solution was discovered for establishing the proper relationship between planning and programming, nor was it found feasible to develop a single long-range plan from which planning guidance would flow simultaneously to satisfy the planning input for joint plans and the planning guidance for programming. Proposed at inclosure 5 is a planning sequence establishing a base plan from which qualitative planning and programming can be guided. There is, however, a continuing need for the Army to state its requirements without political or economic constraints and this requirement can be met only through separate planning. The tab to inclosure 5 portrays graphically the relationships of the quantitative and qualitative plans to each other and to the base program at any selected point in time.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DCSOPS


SUBJECT: Reorganization of the Office of the Deputy Chief
of Staff for Military Operations

6. At inclosure 6 is a summary list of functional areas or arrangements representing an initial survey of the relationship of the proposed organization to other general and special staff agencies. The intent in providing this list is to identify those areas that merit further examination as detailed plans of implementation are developed.

7. The paramount purpose of DOD Project 39a to reduce over-all manpower requirements has been considered throughout the study. Until more detailed study and implementing plans have been completed, no evaluation can be made of accomplishment in this area.

8. In submitting these broad outlines of a plan of reorganization, in response to your memorandum of 7 September 1962, I do so with some reservations which I would like to expand upon orally with you before proceeding to the detailed plan and recommended schedule of implementation which I am directed to submit for approval by 15 October 1962.

6 Incls
as


T. W. PARKER
Lieutenant General, GS
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Military Operations

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Adjustment of Responsibilities Within Staff Elements

1. The division of functions of the present DCSOPS into two general staff agencies generates a requirement for reanalysis of total general and special staff responsibilities in light of the new agencies. It is apparent from the onset that close, constant coordination of effort between DCSP&O and DCSFOR is imperative. As concluded from Inclosure 5 the development of the quantitative and qualitative plans can only be effected through the combined efforts of the two agencies. Implementation of the plans, i.e., the development of resources and the utilization of ready forces demands equally associated effort.

2. Additionally, certain other existing general and special staff functions will be affected by the creation of DCSP&O and DCSFOR. A cursory review of the staff relationships of these two proposed staff agencies with other general and special staff agencies was made to determine the broad impacts and shifts of responsibilities of this proposed reorganization upon the collective Army staff. From this review the following functional re-adjustments and relationships merit further examination:

a. Office of the Director of Coordination and Analysis. Certain functions performed presently by the Director of Coordination and Analysis Group, Office Chief of Staff have been included within those recommended for these two new general staff agencies. This would not include those functions related to preparation of testimony and public statements. Those functions relating to the development, evaluation and coordination of long-range planning and policy and resultant statement force requirements are implied or identified within the major responsibilities of DCSP&O.

b. ODCSPER. No change in the functions of DCSPER is foreseen. However, a close working relationship between DCSPER, DCSP&O and DCSFOR must be established and maintained to assure the rapid flow of accurate information and requirements to effect the timely quantitative and qualitative personnel support of Army forces.

c. International Standardization. The assignment of responsibility for overall coordination of all International

Inclosure 6

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Standardization activities to DCSFOR would reduce such activities in CRD and DCSLOG, and would centralize and lend purpose to this effort.

d. ODCSLOG. Except as noted in c above, no change in the functions of DCSLOG is foreseen. However, a close working relationship between DCSLOG, DCSP&O and DCSFOR must be established and maintained to assure rapid flow of accurate information and requirements to effect the timely quantitative and qualitative logistical support of Army forces.

e. OCRD. In addition to transfer of International Standardization activities noted in c, those qualitative requirement functions of CRD relating to QMR should properly be the responsibility of DCSFOR.

f. OCOA. The creation of a major staff agency charged with developing operational forces appears to make it desirable to transfer general staff supervisory responsibility for the fund management related to this function. This would transfer staff budget responsibility for the O&M, Army appropriation from COA to DCSFOR. Such a shift would not propose to alter the budget program responsibility as now assigned.

g. OCSigO. As noted in Inclosure 2 the OCSigO is designated as a special staff agency under the general staff supervision of DCSFOR. This selection was made under the premise that the Chief Signal Officer has major army-wide staff interest with both DCSP&O and DCSFOR and the assignment of general staff supervision of the OCSigO to one would not affect his responsiveness to and support of the other and the other agencies of the DA staff. However, since the most critical aspects of the Chief Signal Officer's staff interest are directed towards assuring and maintaining the necessary communications and electronics in support of the ground combat capabilities for the army in the field, general staff supervision was accorded to DCSFOR. Additionally, review of the mission and functions of the Chief Signal Officer as prescribed under proposed AR 10-5 emphasizes the correlation, coordination and collation of communication and electronic matters associated with providing and improving combat signal capabilities.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

h. DCSOPS general staff supervision of the Chief Signal Officer has been of short duration and any evaluation of the functions of Chief Signal Officer have been limited.

i. OCMH. As noted in Inclosure 1 the OCMH is designated as a special staff agency under the general staff supervision of DCSP&O. In making this selection, it was considered that service history, as it is recorded, is made by the operational forces and their activities to a greater extent than by activities relating to the development of those forces. Additionally, review of available historical data should prove of value to the planning aspects of DCSP&O.

j. OCORC. Consideration was given to assumption by DCSP&O and DCSFOR of supervisory staff responsibilities on the activities of CAROTC and CNGB currently ascribed to CORC. Because of the overriding political aspects of this office and the maze of detail generated by other than pure military considerations it was considered that assumption of OCORC functions would serve to dilute the stature of the new agencies rather than enhance it. Close coordination by both DCSP&O and DCSFOR with CORC in matters pertaining to the Reserve Components to assure that the reserve structure responds to established requirements for organization, strength, equipment and training will be increasingly necessary.

3. Two possible solutions to permit a reduction in the Headquarters, Department of the Army strength through deletion of the Office of Foreign Military Training (FMT) from DCSOPS are under consideration for further study as follows:

a. All personnel performing the FMT function could continue to perform the function but be deleted from Headquarters Department of the Army accountable strength since the personnel are funded by or funds are reimbursed from the Military Assistance Program (MAP). This solution would reduce Hqs DA strength and retain the function and personnel.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

b. The functions and personnel of the FMT and the Mutual Security Division (DCSLOG) could be combined into a Class II MAP activity located in the Pentagon to enhance essential coordination and the accountable personnel strength of Headquarters, Department of the Army commensurately reduced. This solution would reduce Hqs DA strength and centralize the activity along mutually supporting functional areas.

4. The functions and implementing activities for the area South of the Sahara which are now assigned to the Africa Division, Operations Directorate, could be assigned to a Class II activity preferably located in the Pentagon, pending assumption of responsibilities for that area by a joint command. General staff supervision and policy guidance would be retained as a responsibility of DCSP&O.

5. The proposed reorganization envisions that DCSFOR would have general staff responsibility for qualitative requirements based on and mutually supporting the quantitative requirements prepared by DCSP&O. The DCSFOR would utilize these overall qualitative requirements in his planning for future forces. Therefore all qualitative requirements should be placed under the general staff responsibility of DCSFOR.

6. Study of the programming responsibilities under the current DoD programming system indicated that DCSFOR should be assigned program coordination responsibility for those programs relating to active forces (as currently portrayed in program II and III) and training as presently set forth in program VII. This coordinating responsibility should include review and analysis of resource requirements, evaluation in light of qualitative and quantitative plans and consistency with other force development policy. Consideration was given to the relationship of DCSFOR with Director, Army Programs, Office Chief of Staff. It was concluded that a requirement for overall program direction and coordination within the Office Chief of Staff is justified in light of the attention focused on this collective activity.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF

Washington 25, D. C. Colonel Moody/76262

CS 320 (7 Sep 62)

7 September 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR: DEPUTY CHIEFS OF STAFF
COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY
CHIEF OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR
INTELLIGENCE
CHIEF, OFFICE RESERVE COMPONENTS

SUBJECT: Reorganization to Improve Planning and Programing

1. Attached (Incl 1) is a study of planning-programing-budgeting relationships which was considered by the Secretary of the Army in connection with Defense Project 39a. After reviewing the alternatives presented, the Secretary has approved the following:

a. The concept of dividing ODCSOPS into two major staff elements, in the manner outlined in the study.

b. The retention of the Office of the Director of Army Programs in the Office of the Chief of Staff.

c. The definition of program coordination shown in Inclosure 2, as an aid in defining the responsibilities of the Director of Army Programs.

2. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, supported by other staff agencies as necessary, will develop a detailed plan for the reorganization of his office into two major staff agencies in consonance with the approved concept. The plan will be accompanied by an associated proposal for the necessary adjustments within other staff elements to avoid overlapping responsibilities and achieve maximum effectiveness and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

MANENT

personnel economy in strategic planning, force development planning, and related programing activities. The broad outlines of this plan will be submitted by 20 September 1962. The detailed plan, together with a recommended schedule for implementation, will be submitted to the Chief of Staff for approval by 15 October 1962.

BY DIRECTION OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF:

- 2 Incl
1. Study
2. Definition

*extract from what
will be Project 35A
report*

V. P. Mock
V. P. MOCK
Major General, GS
Secretary of the General Staff

Copy for:
DAP

2
DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420
USE ONLY

Programs Coordination

Program decisions involve a selection amongst various alternative courses of action so that the Army can come as close as possible to meeting genuine, over-all requirements with the most efficient possible use of resources. Program decisions must thus be supported by two different kinds of analysis. First, various proposed courses of action must be examined in order to determine what they will really contribute towards the meetings of valid requirements. Second, determinations must be made as to the amounts of resources various courses of action will actually require.

A primary function of all program proponents is to identify, analyze and evaluate all feasible alternative courses of action available to the Army and to recommend specific courses of action for meeting objectives. The bulk of program proposals, in the fields of forces and major weapons systems will be developed by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Force Development. Program proposals, including the feasible alternatives and recommended course of action, are staffed and submitted to the Chief of Staff, who sends them to the Programs Office for analysis. In making its analysis, the Programs Office assures that the impact on other programs has been properly evaluated. Further, the Programs Office identifies areas of possible duplication as between programs and areas in which assets available to one program may be applied to another. In the exercise of its function, the Programs Office may exercise the authority of the Chief of Staff to obtain information from any agency in the Army. The Programs Office does not make program decisions. Rather, its function is to insure that program issues presented to the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army are accompanied by adequate analysis and data to enable them to make fully supportable program decisions.

Secondary functions of the Programs Office are:

- (1) To record program decisions made by the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of the Army or higher authority in such form that they will be made available for budgetary purposes and for dissemination to those within the Army who will be responsible for execution.
- (2) To develop and coordinate instructions to the staff and to subordinate commands concerning the administrative and procedural aspects of the programing system.

Inclosure 2

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420

Office Memorandum • OFFICE CHIEF OF STAFF ARMY

320 (of Sept 62)

ODC&A/Col Moody/76262

DATE: 6 September 1962

TO : GENERAL DECKER
 GENERAL HAMLETT (Info) ✓
 (Copy for each)

FROM : SGS

M

320

SUBJECT: Implementation of Sec Army's Decision on Planning-
 Programing-Budgeting in Connection with Project 39a

1. As you will recall, Secretary Vance has had under consideration for some time a paper covering the planning, programing, and budgeting functions which was submitted to him in connection with Project 39a. He has discussed this paper with you previously and on Tuesday informed you of the general nature of his decisions. These were:

- ✓ a. To divide OPS into two major staff elements
- ✓ b. To retain the Director of Army Programs in OCS, and
- c. To approve a definition of program coordination prepared in his office.

2. These decisions were transmitted to General Oberbeck on 4 September by the memorandum at Tab A.

3. Attached at Tab B is a proposed memorandum for the staff calling on DCSOPS, with the support of other staff agencies, to develop and submit a detailed plan for the reorganization of his office and for necessary adjustments within other elements of the staff to implement these decisions on the part of the Secretary. In order to provide the necessary guidance for this action, the memorandum forwards:

- a. An abridged version of the paper submitted to Secretary Vance, with the original recommendations and other extraneous material removed (Inclosure 1).
- b. A copy of the Secretary's definition of program coordination (Inclosure 2).

4. General Oberbeck has discussed this memorandum with General Parker who considers that the earliest reasonable date for completion of the action is 15 October. While this is after the due date for Project 39a (1 October) it will be sufficient for the report on that project to refer to implementing action underway.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Authority NND 5042C
 DECLASSIFIED

5. Recommend you approve the proposed memorandum at Tab B.

APPROVED _____

SEE ME _____

NOTED JD 6 Sep 62

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 50420