Approved for Release: 2020/02/07 C05111774





June 12, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Support of Value Engineering

After talking with	called		on
the attached memo and asked if he would	d have	anv objecti	ions to
calling him and explaining SAFSP's procedures			
with respect to the value engineering clauses in certain contracts.			
welcomed the idea and I o			again to
suggest that he talk with			
that had in fact called his engineering clause matter with him. He	m and o	ined that w	the va lue while Col
discussion provided him a better understanding of			
SAFSP/s procedures, had promised him several			
pieces of correspondence which would more specifically relate			
SAFSP's approach to satisfying this type of requirement in their			
contracts. said he also planned a visit soon to the			
West Coast and had promised	to	stop by a	nd discuss
the matter further.			
considers that we have	ve resp	onded to h	is memo.
		LIAM H. Yo	OST AF

Copy to General Berg

Approved for Release: 2020/02/07 C05111774

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

WASHINGTON 20330

JUN 1 0 1969



OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM FOR BRIGADIER GENERAL RUSSEL A. BERG, SAFSS

SUBJECT: Support of Value Engineering

Twice I have been asked to explain why the contracting officers for certain programs under cognizance of OSAF do not support the DOD Value Engineering program. following is one example.

Lockheed Missile and Space Company requested that a VE clause be included in contract AF 04(695)-896, but this requested clause was rejected with the statement, "... the cost penalty provision of the incentive plan will provide sufficient emphasis on cost control to assure sound financial program management." This reason for not incorporating a VE clause in the contract is contrary to ASPR Section I, Part 17.

Can you help me understand why these apparent conflicts with policy exist or provide me with information to satisfy the contractors who contact me?

> Assistant Deputy for Engineering

> > 906-10-004

SANOS PU.S.