148

15265

108706

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations

Released 3/5/79

REPORT BY THE

Comptroller General

OF THE UNITED STATES

Need For Consolidation Of Naval Oceanographic Activities

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

In response to a request from the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, GAO expanded an ongoing review of the assets and activities of the Naval Oceanographic Program and addressed certain questions regarding the Navy's efforts to consolidate these oceanographic activities. GAO found that although some action has been taken, the Department of the Navy has not met its previous commitment to consolidate all oceanographic functions and activities under one command and the program remains fragmented and uncoordinated.

CZIC COLLECTION

U.S. General Accounting Office

GC
58
.U553
1979

CED-79-27

JANUARY 25, 1979

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

15265

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-145099

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NOAA
COASTAL SERVICES CENTER
2234 SOUTH HOBSON AVENUE
CHARLESTON, SC 29405-2413

The Honorable John C. Stennis
Chairman, Senate Armed Services
Committee
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you requested on April 26, 1978, we are reporting on the efforts made by the Department of the Navy to consolidate its oceanographic activities.

At your request, we discussed the matters presented in this report with officials of the Departments of Defense and Navy. Copies of the draft were made available but no written comments were received.

This report contains recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement on actions taken on our recommendations to the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs not later than 60 days after the date of the report and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report. We will be in touch with your office in the near future to arrange for release of the report so that the requirement of section 236 can be set in motion.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General
of the United States

U.S. General Accounting Office
GC58.U553 1979
5015179
MAY 21 1987

CZIC COLLECTION

Property of CSC Library

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT
TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON ARMED SERVICES

NEED FOR CONSOLIDATION
OF NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC
ACTIVITIES

D I G E S T

At the request of the Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, GAO examined the Department of the Navy's efforts to consolidate its oceanographic function and activities. Although some action has been taken, the Navy has not met its previous commitment to consolidate under one program manager, and the Navy's oceanographic program remains fragmented and uncoordinated. Over 200 oceanographic activities or projects are being conducted and managed in separate Navy commands and many academic institutions without any overall coordination or single point of management within the Department of the Navy.

Beginning as early as 1966, the Navy recognized these problems and made several attempts to reorganize and consolidate management of all naval oceanographic activities. These attempts included several directives issued by the Secretary of the Navy unifying all previously scattered programs, projects, and efforts into one naval oceanographic program and a 1975 commitment to the Congress to consolidate all major Washington-based functions and activities at the National Space Technology Laboratory, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi.

The Navy informed the Congress and the Secretary of Defense that by relocating and consolidating Washington-based oceanographic functions and activities, it would establish and maintain one large, full spectrum Naval Oceanographic Center that would be controlled by one program manager--the Oceanographer of the Navy--and would include

--one naval oceanographic operational activity;

--one naval oceanographic research and development activity;

--one naval oceanographic headquarters center that would combine common administrative, logistics, and personnel functions; and

--a single technical manager for all oceanographic functions and activities at the Naval Oceanographic Center.

However, GAO found that while the Navy relocated several activities to the National Space Technology Laboratory, it never fully met its commitment to consolidate all major Washington-based oceanographic activities under one command. Even more important, recently high levels in the Navy have opposed the planned consolidation, and some actions have been taken that minimize benefits that might have resulted from moves already made.

Oceanography is an important element in national security, naval warfare, and the Nation's economic well-being. Although the Navy planned to achieve program coherence and efficiency by consolidating its major oceanographic functions, it has not done so, and the problems inherent in a fragmented and uncoordinated program continue to exist.

For example, the Naval Research Laboratory contains an ocean science division of over 200 personnel involved in more than 105 programs, projects, and activities directly related to oceanography while the Naval Oceanographic Research and Development Activity maintains a staff of over 200 personnel involved in the same types of activities.

GAO believes that the Navy should carry out its original commitment to consolidate and reorganize ocean programs, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and create effective coordinating processes

in oceanographic activities. Such action would result in

--better program formulation and review,

--more effective resource allocation,

--better utilization of research vessels and other expensive facilities,

--elimination of present and future duplication and overlap, and

--less management redundancy.

Accordingly, GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Secretary of the Navy to reorganize and consolidate management of all naval oceanographic activities under one program manager. Such action should include, as a minimum,

--completing the commitment made to the Congress to relocate and consolidate all Washington-based oceanographic programs to the Naval Oceanographic Center at the National Space Technology Laboratory or some other approved location,

--completing the establishment of the planned Naval Oceanographic Center with a single technical manager, thereby consolidating those naval oceanographic activities under one administrative and technical manager, and

--identifying and moving all other Navy oceanographic research and development functions and activities that should have been included as part of the Navy's long-range plan for consolidation.

Copies of this report were provided to and discussed with officials of the Department of Defense and the Navy. At the date of issuance of this report, no comments had been received.

BLANK

Contents

		Page
DIGEST		i
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Role of the naval oceanographic program	2
	Description of the naval oceanographic program	2
	Ocean science	3
	Ocean engineering and development	4
	Oceanographic operations	4
	Oceanographic operations assets	5
	Scope of review	5
2	ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN MANAGING THE NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM	6
	The Navy's previous commitments to consolidate oceanographic activities	6
	The naval oceanographic program remains fragmented and uncoordinated	8
	Conclusions	11
	Recommendations	12
APPENDIX		
I	Letter dated April 26, 1978, from the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee	14
II	Secretary of the Navy's Instruction dated May 23, 1975	15
III	Listing of all naval oceanographic program assets	17

ABBREVIATIONS

NORDA	National Oceanographic Research and Development
NRL	Naval Research Laboratory
NSTL	National Space Technology Laboratory
R&D	research and development

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, requested that we expand an ongoing review of the naval oceanographic program and address certain questions regarding the Navy's efforts to consolidate its oceanographic activities. (See app I.)

Because of concern over the use of the ocean and its possible contribution to improving world peace and the quality of life, on February 19, 1974, the Senate unanimously passed Senate Resolution 222 authorizing the Senate Committee on Commerce to undertake a national ocean policy study. On February 28, 1974, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce requested that we obtain information on Federal agencies administering programs related to marine science activities and oceanic affairs.

On February 25, 1975, we issued to the Congress our first report in a series on Federal oceanic affairs entitled "Federal Agencies Administering Programs Related to Marine Science Activities and Oceanic Affairs" (GGD-75-61). This report discussed and described Federal ocean programs and concluded that 22 activities in 6 departments and 5 agencies were conducting marine science activities at a cost of over $1.6 billion in 1975. The expenditures for Federal oceanic programs were projected to be nearly $2 billion in 1977.

On October 10, 1975, we issued a second report to the Congress entitled "Need for a National Ocean Program and Plan" (GGD-75-97). This report discussed problems that hindered effective Federal management of marine science activities and oceanic affairs and described attempts to achieve coordination in Federal oceanic programs. We pointed out that experts disagreed on the effectives of the Federal ocean programs and that it was doubtful that the resources of the departments and agencies were being applied in a manner to best serve national purposes.

On June 16, 1978, we issued a third report to the Congress entitled "Need for Improving Management of U.S. Oceanographic Assets" (CED-78-125). This report addressed the problems associated with operating federally owned and/or funded ocean research and survey vessels without a national ocean policy or program and recommended that single managers be designated for more coordinated and efficient civil agency and defense oceanographic operations.

On July 25, 1978, we issued a fourth report to the Congress entitled "Need for Improving Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy Support of the Strategic Ballistic Missile Submarine Forces" (CED-78-142). This report discussed some of the classified aspects of the Navy's oceanographic program and the importance of oceanographic support to strategic weapons systems.

In this fifth report on Federal oceanic affairs, we address the problems associated with a fragmented and uncoordinated naval oceanographic program and discuss the need for consolidating and improving its management.

ROLE OF THE NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

Naval seapower has been a cornerstone of the Nation's commerce and defense throughout the 200-year evolution of the United States and will continue to be a dominant influence affecting international relations. Today, however, the Nation is confronted with the possibility of new economic, political, and technical developments that may demand fundamental changes in the use of the oceans to maintain our national security, strategic deterrence, and the balance of world power.

The Navy has always been a primary factor in this Nation's diplomatic and military efforts to maintain the balance of world power. The Lebanon crisis, the Cuban blockade, and the Mayaquez incident are some of the prime examples of the Navy's role. As world energy and ocean resource issues mount and trade routes become even more critical, the Navy will be required to maintain and fulfill its traditional roles of sea control and strategic deterrence. Thus, it is essential that the Navy give high priority to acquiring a superior environmental knowledge and technology base for the future use of the oceans for economic exploitation, military applications, and political advantages. The naval oceanographic program was established for that purpose. (See app. II.)

DESCRIPTION OF THE NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

The naval oceanographic program, rather than being the title of a separately identifiable program, is the title given to a conglomeration of more than 200 individual tasks, projects, and support operations. Assets and funding for these tasks, projects, and support operations are spread throughout the full range of Navy appropriations and organizations. As a result, the Navy's efforts in

oceanography are essentially divided among three major functional areas: ocean science; ocean engineering and development, including underwater construction; and oceanographic operations, including the former naval weather service now referred to as environmental prediction services.

The following table depicts the total funding of the naval oceanographic program from fiscal year 1975 through 1977.

	Fiscal year (millions)		
	1975	1976	1977
Ocean science	$ [illegible]1.7	$ 70.1	$ 69.8
Ocean engineering	[illegible]2.3	34.9	38.4
Oceanographic operations	88.1	90.8	105.3
Total	$18[illegible].1	$195.8	$213.5

Ocean science

The primary objective of the ocean science program is to gain an understanding and collect information about the ocean in support of operations that are necessary for the Navy to fulfill its national security mission. The program is conducted to obtain knowledge about selected environmental parameters in underwater acoustics, physical oceanography, geology and geophysics, chemical oceanography, biological oceanography, and engineering research.

The following table depicts the appropriations given the Navy ocean science effort since 1975.

	Fiscal year (millions)		
	1975	1976	1977
Underwater acoustics	$25.5	$29.5	$29.0
Physical oceanography	19.3	21.7	21.8
Geology and geophysics	8.6	9.8	9.9
Chemical oceanography	2.0	2.2	2.2
Biological oceanography	3.4	3.7	3.7
Engineering research	2.9	3.2	3.2
Total	$61.7	$70.1	$69.8

Ocean engineering and development

The Navy ocean engineering and development program, consisting of research and development (R&D) programs in undersea search and rescue, salvage, diving, construction, medicine, and oceanographic instrumentation, is directed toward the goal of permitting the Navy to operate effectively at any depth, location, or period in the ocean.

The following table depicts the appropriations given the Navy ocean engineering and development effort since 1975.

	Fiscal year (millions)		
	1975	1976	1977
Rescue	$ 3.6	$ 3.0	$ 3.5
Salvage	1.7	2.0	2.2
Diving equipment	11.3	12.1	12.5
General applications	15.7	17.8	20.2
Total	$32.3	$34.9	$38.4

Oceanographic operations

The oceanographic operations program consists primarily of oceanographic and hydrographic surveys and related services and products for all ocean areas in support of the Department of Defense. Environmental prediction services are part of the operations program concerned with observing and collecting real-time oceanographic data and processing and disseminating this data to forecast sea, swell, surf, ice, sonar, and related environmental conditions.

The following table depicts the funding of the Navy oceanographic operations efforts since 1975.

	Fiscal year (millions)		
	1975	1976	1977
Deep ocean bathymetric surveys	$16.8	$19.9	$30.7
Coastal hydrographic surveys	7.2	9.9	14.5
Undersea surveillance surveys	15.0	13.3	14.6
Analysis and publication of survey results and other data	30.2	30.7	26.3
Environmental prediction services	10.0	8.0	10.0
Training and education	2.0	2.4	2.9
Other	6.9	6.6	6.3
Total	$88.1	$90.8	$105.3

Oceanographic operations assets

To accomplish the majority of its oceanographic operations, the Navy operates a fleet of 13 oceanographic vessels and 4 aircraft. These consist of nine coastal hydrographic and deep ocean survey vessels, four oceanographic research vessels, three RP-3A and one RP-3D aircraft. Further, the Navy owns and in some instances supports 26 oceanographic vessels leased to 1 Federal agency, 20 U.S. universities, and 6 foreign countries. (See app. III.)

Scope of review

We reviewed the functions and management of Navy oceanographic activities at the Department of the Navy, its fleet [illegible] field activities, and its laboratories. Information [illegible] tained in this report was obtained through interviews [illegible] Navy officials and by reviewing documents, records, and reports in Washington, D.C., and Bay St. Louis, Mississippi.

CHAPTER 2

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN MANAGING THE NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

It has long been known that the naval oceanographic program is fragmented and uncoordinated. Our review showed that the Navy has not met its 1975 commitment to consolidate oceanographic functions and activities under one program manager and problems continue to exist. Over 200 oceanographic activities or projects are being conducted in separate Navy commands and many academic institutions. As a result, these activities are independently funded, operated, and managed without any overall coordination or single point of management within the Department of the Navy. Further, we found that the Chief of Naval Operations does not directly control the application, funding, and management of oceanographic R&D efforts to support the Navy's fleet weapons systems.

THE NAVY'S PREVIOUS COMMITMENTS TO CONSOLIDATE OCEANOGRAPHIC ACTIVITIES

In 1966 the President's Science Advisory Committee met to review the national capability in oceanography. While the review complimented the quality of the Navy's efforts in oceanography, it pointed out that naval oceanographic activities were disarrayed and uncoordinated. As a result, the Secretary of the Navy established the Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy and called for unifying all the previously scattered programs, projects, and efforts into one naval oceanographic program under the direction and management of the Oceanographer of the Navy.

While this was taking place, other national priorities, such as the "space race" between the Soviet Union and the United States, began to draw attention and support away from developing a national or naval ocean program or plan. As a consequence, the Navy's participation in the Federal ocean program declined significantly. For example, in 1965 the Navy represented 50 percent of the Federal ocean program. In 1975, the Navy's share was only 11 percent and all of its oceanographic activities were still not consolidated.

In 1973 a Navy ocean science report prepared by an ad hoc committee from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution noted that:

"This review was difficult for several reasons, principle among which is a lack of rational organizations to the programs. Not only are there a great many participants--Chief of Naval Development, the Systems Commands, the Laboratories, Office of Naval Research and outside contractors--but as a consequence there is a lack of program structure, goals, and management mechanisms by which progress is measured."

Recognizing this problem, on May 23, 1975, the Secretary of the Navy issued a directive to consolidate the naval oceanographic program and its resources under a single program manager (the Oceanographer of the Navy) and to integrate it with other national oceanographic efforts. (See app. II.) In July 1975 the Secretary of Defense approved a Navy consolidation plan and directed that a full spectrum naval oceanographic center be developed by consolidating all Washington-based major R&D and operations elements of naval oceanographic activities at the National Space Technology Laboratory (NSTL), Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, under the program direction of the Oceanographer of the Navy.

The NSTL site was chosen because it was underutilized and had unique and valuable oceanographic-related functions, such as an underwater instrumentation test, calibration and maintenance, facility, and a computer system necessary for oceanographic program operations.

The Navy informed the Congress and the Secretary of Defense that by relocating and consolidating Washington-based oceanographic functions and activities, it would establish and maintain one large, full spectrum naval oceanographic center that would be controlled by one program manager (Oceanographer of the Navy) and would include

--one naval oceanographic operations activity;

--one naval oceanographic research and development activity;

--one naval oceanographic headquarters center that would combine common administrative, logistics, and personnel functions; and

--a single technical manager for all oceanographic functions and activities at the naval oceanographic center.

THE NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM REMAINS FRAGMENTED AND UNCOORDINATED

Our review showed that although the Navy moved several activities to NSTL, it has never fully met its commitment to (1) consolidate all oceanographic functions and activities under one command, and (2) establish a Naval Oceanographic Center under a single technical manager for all oceanographic functions and activities at the center. As a result, the program remains fragmented and uncoordinated, replete with unnecessary overlap, management redundancy and duplication. Even more important, recently high levels within the Navy have opposed the planned consolidation, and some actions have been taken that minimize the benefits that might have resulted from moves already made.

In July 1975 the Chief of Naval Operations directed the Oceanographer of the Navy to carry out the Department of Defense-approved relocation of the major elements of the Naval Oceanographic Program to NSTL. The initial relocation plan called for (1) consolidation of the Naval Oceanographic Office (NAVOCEANO) and the Naval Weather Service headquarters (DIRNAVOCEANMET) into one naval oceanographic operations activity, and (2) the creation of a Naval Oceanographic Research Development Activity (NORDA), which included the Navy contract research program, known as "Code 480," of the Office of Naval Research. The Navy's long-range plan called for eventually relocating and consolidating the majority of all Washington-based oceanographic R&D elements at NORDA while maintaining a small liaison staff in the Washington, D.C., area.

The consolidation process commenced in 1975 with the initial movement of a small group of NAVOCEANO personnel. However, the relocation was subsequently delayed because of a Federal court order to halt the consolidation because of the alleged inadequacy of the Navy's environmental impact statement. The case subsequently went before a Federal court in Washington, D.C., and after two supplements were added to the environmental impact statement and the Secretary of Defense reaffirmed the Navy's consolidation plan, the case was dismissed on March 31, 1976.

In addition to the Federal court problems, the Navy also underwent a series of congressional hearings and a congressionally requested GAO audit of the planned relocation. Our report entitled "The Announced Relocation of the Naval Oceanographic Office," dated November 1975 (LCD-76-315), concluded that if the Navy did consolidate its oceanographic activities, the relocation to NSTL should

produce annual recurring savings o bout $2.5 million and result in one-time costs of about .2 million.

By July 1978 the Navy had nearly completed the relocation of NAVOCEANO and DIRNAVOCEANMET into one naval oceanographic operations command at NSTL. In addition, a small oceanographic R&D command was established at NSTL. However, both of these units continue to report through separate chains of command--one to the Oceanographer of the Navy and the other to the Chief of Naval Research. As a result, these activities remain separated and uncoordinated.

Further, we found that the Navy has now downgraded the scope of the NORDA R&D mission to a mission level lower than was originally planned, thereby reducing the probabiliby of eventually consolidating the majority of all Washington-based Navy oceanographic R&D functions and activities into one oceanographic R&D command at NSTL. Consequently, almost $131 million in oceanographic-related R&D remains dispersed throughout various naval commands, activities, and laboratories. These include (1) the Navy's Material and System Command headquarters, which with their laboratories and activities report to the Chief of Naval Operations, and (2) the Office of Naval Research and its naval research laboratories and activities, which report to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Engineering and Systems. The problem of coordinating the R&D effort is further compounded by the fact that budgeting and funding is not provided by organization but by the following three major categories of ocean R&D programs.

--(6.1) Research

--(6.2) Exploratory development

--(6.3) Advanced development

The major weakness in this concept is the absence of centralized budgetary and technical control of the Navy's oceanographic program. Further, because of this budget and management structure, we were unable to match the exact amount of R&D funding with the individual commands, activities, and laboratories. However, we were able to determine that in addition to the lack of coordination inherent in this type of management structure, there is duplication of effort and overlap of R&D mission responsibility. The most severe example is the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) which contains an ocean science division of over 200 personnel involved in more than 105 programs, projects, and activities at the same time that NORDA maintains a staff of over 200 personnel involved in the same types of activities.

As noted in our June 16, 1978, report to the Congress, funding in some instances is provided to different naval activities and industrial firms for duplicate oceanographic projects.

We also noted that potential duplication and overlap exists in the ocean acoustics and environmental research areas. Research in this area is being carried out at NRL and NORDA under the Chief of Naval Research, while similar research is being conducted by the Naval Underwater Systems Center and the Naval Oceans Systems Center under the direction of the Chief of Navy Material.

In reviewing Navy internal documents, we further noted that the commanding officer of NORDA, in a letter to the Chief of Naval Research dated April 17, 1978, identified a number of other areas that were potential candidates for transfer to NORDA from the Navy Material Command laboratories including

--remote environmental sensing;

--environmental support to surveillance systems development; and

--ocean environmental effects on system or system design, development, and deployment.

The Deputy Chief of the Navy Material Command, however, opposed any further transfer of R&D functions or personnel to NORDA until "that lab has demonstrated a solid track record."

In addition, even though the Oceanographer of the Navy was designated as the central manager for all oceanographic vessels and resources, NRL continues to use basic R&D funds to operate an expensive ocean research vessel, the U.S.N.S. Hayes, while vessel resources and funding deficiencies remain for higher priority defense-related oceanographic operations.

A recent naval audit report dated July 28, 1978, confirmed our findings. This report pointed out that the Oceanographer of the Navy was provided only 8 percent, or $11 million, of the total $131 million in resources designated for Navy ocean-related R&D efforts in fiscal year 1978. As a result, the report pointed out that

"* * *the oceanographer was unable to fully exercise centralized authority, direction, and control including management of resources intended to achieve an integrated and effective naval oceanographic program."

Our assessment of why the Navy has not been more effective in consolidating the oceanographic R&D functions indicates that there has been some recent high level opposition to completing the Navy's commitment to consolidate the naval oceanographic program. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations in July 1977 directed that an evaluation be made of the entire naval oceanographic program. A resulting Navy study dated September 13, 1977, pointed out that oceanography within the Department of the Navy was uncoordinated and cited a 1977 naval audit report that described the program as fragmented. However, the study concluded that to consolidate all elements of the program would necessitate command reorganization and made recommendations that would continue to retain oceanographic functions dispersed within different naval commands.

We also found that the Chief of Naval Research has directed the separation of the Navy's contract research program functions (Code 480) from NORDA and has recently returned several Code 480 functions and personnel back to the Washington, D.C., area. These transfers of functions and personnel were accomplished even though official Navy correspondence dated May 15, 1978, stated that "there are no relocations or costs involved." By separating Code 480 contract research functions from NORDA and downgrading NORDA's scope and mission, the knowledge and overall Navy management of basic R&D is separated from the mainstream of oceanographic operations. We believe that by retaining Code 480 within the NORDA mission, the R&D contribution to the solution of fleet weapons systems problems would be enhanced, and consolidation of all oceanographic R&D functions would be greatly improved. Each of these actions created additional problems because the commanding officer, NRL subsequently opposed transfer of the majority of NRL's oceanographic R&D functions and personnel to NORDA because of the downgrading of the scope of the NORDA's R&D mission.

Conclusions

Shortly after World War II the discipline known as oceanography emerged as an important element in national security, naval warfare, and as an important element in the economic well-being of the Nation. Since that time naval oceanographic activities have evolved from a fairly

small number of scientists, engineers, and technicians into a widely fragmented and uncoordinated program.

Recognizing this problem, the Navy has attempted to bring about program coherence and efficiency by making a commitment to consolidate its activities and to relocate major oceanographic functions and personnel to NSTL. However, our review of the naval oceanographic program clearly shows that consolidation of Navy oceanographic activities has not been carried out and all of the problems associated with a fragmented and uncoordinated program continue to exist.

We believe that the Navy should carry out its original commitment to consolidate and reorganize ocean programs, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and create effective coordinating processes in oceanographic activities. We further believe that by taking these actions there would be

--better program formulation and review,

--more effective resource allocation,

--better utilization of research vessels and other expensive facilities.

--elimination of present and future duplication and overlap, and

--less management redundancy.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the Secretary of the Navy to reorganize and consolidate management of all naval oceanographic activities, under one program manager. Such action should include, as a minimum,

--completion of the commitment made to the Congress to relocate and consolidate all Washington-based oceanographic R&D programs to NORDA at NSTL or some other approved location;

--completion of the establishment of the planned Naval Oceanographic Center with a single technical manager thereby, consolidating the majority of all Washington-based naval oceanographic functions and activities under one administrative and technical manager; and

--identification and movement of all other Navy oceanographic R&D functions that should have been included as part of the Navy's long-range plan for consolidation.

Copies of this report were provided to and discussed with officials of the Department of Defense and the Navy. At the date of issuance of this report, no comments had been received.

JOHN C. STENNIS, MISS., CHAIRMAN
HENRY M. JACKSON, WASH.
HOWARD W. CANNON, NEV.
THOMAS J. MC INTYRE, N.H.
HARRY F. BYRD, JR., VA.
SAM NUNN, GA.
JOHN C. CULVER, IOWA
GARY HART, COLO.
ROBERT MORGAN, N.C.
WENDELL R. ANDERSON, MINN.
PAUL HATFIELD, MONT.
JOHN TOWER, TEX.
STROM THURMOND, S.C.
BARRY GOLDWATER, ARIZ.
WILLIAM L. SCOTT, VA
DEWEY F. BARTLETT, OKLA.
JESSE HELMS, N.C.
JAKE GARN, UTAH
FRANCIS J. SULLIVAN, STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

April 26, 1978

Honorable Elmer B. Staats
Comptroller General of the
United States
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. Staats:

I have been made aware of a study that you are conducting which, in part, looks at the consolidation of activities within the Navy related to oceanography. I am advised that the preliminary findings of the study are critical of the Navy's effort implementing previous commitments to consolidate oceanographic functions.

It would be most helpful to me if you would conduct a brief study concerning the Navy's oceanographic program that addresses the following questions:

1. What were the Navy's previous commitments with regard to consolidating oceanographic activities?

2. How many of these commitments have been carried out?

3. What other actions should be taken to achieve economies and improved management effectiveness within the Department of the Navy as it relates to oceanography?

This study need not involve extensive new research and investigations, but can simply bring together available information so that I can evaluate the Navy's performance in this area. Formal coordination with and comments by the Navy Department are not necessary.

Sincerely,

John C. Stennis

John C. Stennis

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
Office of the Secretary
Washington, D.C. 20350

SECNAVINST 5430.79A
OCEANAV:NOB
23 May 1975

SECNAV INSTRUCTION 5430.79A

From: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: Naval Oceanographic Program; policy, relationships, and responsibilities for

Ref: (a) United States Navy Regulations, 1973

1. Purpose. This instruction defines the Naval Oceanographic Program and Department of the Navy policy and objectives concerning it; establishes organizational relationships; and assigns responsibilities for the program.

2. Cancellation. This instruction cancels and supersedes SECNAV Instructions 5430.79 and 5430.84.

3. Introduction. Reference (a) defines the Department of the Navy organization and assigns responsibilities for the Naval Oceanographic Program to the Oceanographer of the Navy. The mission of the Oceanographer of the Navy is to act as the Naval Oceanographic Program director for the Chief of Naval Operations, under the policy direction of the Secretary of the Navy, through the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research and Development), and to exercise centralized authority, direction, and control, including control of resources, in order to insure an integrated and effective Naval Oceanographic Program.

4. Definition. The Naval Oceanographic Program encompasses that body of science, technology, engineering, operations, and the personnel and facilities associated with each, which is essential primarily to explore and to lay the basis for exploitation of the ocean and its boundaries for naval applications to enhance security and support other national objectives.

5. Statement of Policy. The basic oceanographic policy of the Department of the Navy is to provide that oceanographic information and related technological base necessary for the Department of Defense to fulfill its assigned missions.

6. Objectives

a. Primary (Military Application)

(1) To advance and best adapt the Navy's knowledge of ocean, coastal, and seabed areas for the purpose of increasing the effectiveness of naval and other service offensive and defensive operations and weapons systems.

(2) To support directly, military system development, and ship and other vehicle and equipment design, by the solution of specific, immediate, and long-range oceanographic problems.

b. Secondary (Ancillary Benefits to National Effort). To advance knowledge of all aspects of the ocean, coastal, and seabed areas, to permit and encourage successful exploitation of these areas for economic, scientific, social, political, and prestige gains. To cooperate in the preparation of plans for extending or developing international law concerning the ocean, coastal, and seabed areas, in furtherance and protection of U.S. interests.

7. Special Provisions. The following points, in consonance with the above policies and objectives, will be the basis for Department of the Navy actions related to oceanography:

a. National defense takes priority over other goals, and oceanographic efforts oriented toward national defense must be primarily, fully, and immediately responsive to military requirements.

b. As the nation's foremost sea-oriented instrumentality with the most expertise in oceanography, the Navy recognizes its de facto position of leadership in the field and its obligation to support the nonmilitary objectives of the national oceanographic program. The most economical approach to meeting many nondefense national needs is the limited expansion of Navy programs and facilities, where practicable.

c. To meet both military and nonmilitary requirements, the Navy must maintain an independent, comprehensive, and responsive program in oceanographic

APPENDIX II

...rveys, research, applications and dev-lopments, with adequate supporting ships, instrumentation, and facilities to carry out this program.

d. The largest portion of knowledge gained from oceanographic activities, and through the operations and facilities required to assure an appropriate level of oceanographic output for military use, is not classified and can be and is made available to national, international, and private organizations and programs. Consistent with its own established oceanographic effort, the Navy will cooperate with any national organization devoted to the study of the total environment, and/or any organization which attempts to provide a national focus to describe, understand, and predict environmental phenomena, and will also encourage the continued exchange of oceanographic data and knowledge with and between these organizations.

8. Responsibilities and Relationships

a. In carrying out his assigned responsibilities, the Oceanographer of the Navy is authorized to issue directives, management plans, requirements, and tasks, and to allocate resources for the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations.

b. The Chief of Naval Research is assigned additional responsibility as Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Ocean Science.

c. With the approval of the CNO, the Commander, Naval Weather Service Command, has been assigned additional responsibility as Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Environmental Prediction Services.

d. The Chief of Naval Material, with approval of the CNO, has assigned the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Development) additional responsibility as Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Ocean Engineering and Development.

e. With the approval of the CNO, the Oceanographer of the Navy will designate an Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Oceanographic Operations.

f. The Oceanographer of the Navy shall budget, justify, and administer all funds allocated to the Naval Oceanographic Program as required for implementation of the program; shall insure that adequate funds are budgeted by activities of the Navy Department for support of the program; and shall develop and maintain a comprehensive budget documented for presentation to higher executive authorities and congressional committees.

g. All national facilities, centers, and missions of the National Oceanographic Program assigned to the Department of the Navy will be managed and administered by the Oceanographer of the Navy.

9. Action

a. The Oceanographer of the Navy, under the Chief of Naval Operations, shall command the Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy.

b. The Chief of Naval Operations shall issue the necessary directives to implement the provisions of this instruction.

J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORF II
Secretary of the Navy

Distribution:
SNDL Parts 1 and 2
MARCORPS LS/L10 plus 7236061 (2)

Stocked:
CO, NAVPUBFORMCEN
5801 Tabor Ave.
Phila., PA 19120

APPENDIX III

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM ASSETS

Ships	User Activity
Bartlett	NAVOCEANO
Bowditch	NAVOCEANO
Chauvenet	NAVOCEANO
DE Steiguer	NAVOCEANO
Dutton	NAVOCEANO
Elisha Kane	NAVOCEANO
Harkness	NAVOCEANO
Lynch	NAVOCEANO
Canada Mail	Planned FY77
Silas Bent	NAVOCEANO
Wilkes	NAVOCEANO
Wyman	NAVOCEANO
Hayes	NRL, Wash., D
Mizar	Deactivated FY76
Acania	Naval Postgraduate School
Aconia	University of Alaska
Chain	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute
Conrad	Columbia University
Erline	Columbia University
Flip	Scripps Oceanographic Institute
Gilliss	University of Miami
Gyre	Texas A&M
Hoh	University of Washington
Knorr	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute
Kyma	New York University
Lulu/Alvin	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute
Melville	Scripps Oceanographic Institute
Moana Wave	University of Hawaii
Oconostota	Scripps Oceanographic Institute
Onar	University of Washington
Sir Horace Lamb	Columbia University
T-441	University of Conn.
Thompson	University of Washington
Tursiops	Florida State University

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM ASSETS

Ships	User Activity
Washington	Scripps Oceanographic Institute
S.P. Lee	U.S. Geological Survey
Eltanin (Islas Orcadas)	Argentina
Davis (HMNZS Tui)	New Zealand
Gibbs (H.S. Hephaistos)	Greece
Keathley (Chu Hwa)	Republic of China
Kellar 9N. R.P. (Almeida Carvalho)	Portugal
Sands	Brazil

Aircraft	
RP3-A (Seascan)	NAVOCEANO
RP3-D (Magnet)	NAVOCEANO
RP3-A	NRL
RP3-A (Birdseye)	NAVOCEANO

(08202)