

~~TOP SECRET~~  
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
DIRECTORATE OF SPECIAL PROJECTS (OSAF)  
AF UNIT POST OFFICE, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90045

BYE-40315-65



12 November 1965

REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: SP-1

SUBJECT: Procedures for MOL Program Management

TO: Director, NRO (Dr. Flax)  
Director, MOL (General Schriever)

1. On being asked for my comments on a paper entitled "Procedural Considerations for MOL Program Management," (SAF-SL BYE-37596-65), and recalling that both the Director, MOL and the Director, NRO have invited my suggestions concerning Washington procedures for this program, I have prepared my recommendations and submit them in paragraph 3, below. I do not agree with SAF-SL BYE-37596-65, and have attached my specific comments on that proposal.

2. Since all of the principals have copies of the basic documents pertaining to this subject, the inclusion of background or explanation in a statement of management procedures is not necessary, and detracts from its clarity. Therefore, I recommend a simple statement of essential procedures, stated as briefly as possible, without explanation in the statement. However, I think that these procedures must be realistic and practical, and consistent with certain facts concerning the NRO responsibilities in the MOL Program, namely:

a. The Director, NRO, is responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the National Reconnaissance Program, which includes the reconnaissance aspects of the MOL.

b. The Secretary of the Air Force has delegated full authority to the Director, NRO, to act for him on all Air Force matters pertaining to the National Reconnaissance Program, including the MOL reconnaissance payloads.

c. The Director, NRO, holds the Director, SAFSP, fully responsible to him for the development, acquisition, and test of the MOL reconnaissance payloads in the same sense as for all other NRO payloads for which the Director, SAFSP, is responsible; the MOL program management is responsible for the overall system engineering, and integration necessary to integrate these payloads into the overall MOL system. The co-location

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC  
REGRADING DOD DIR 5200.10  
DOES NOT APPLY

~~TOP SECRET~~

Handle via BYEMAN  
Control System

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

of the SAFSP MOL payload office within the integrated SPO is for the purpose of assuring current and full information exchange to permit these separate responsibilities to be carried out in a well coordinated manner; it does not alter the complete responsibility of the Director, SAFSP, to the Director, NRO, for the development, acquisition and test of these payloads.

d. The Director, NRO, is involved on a daily basis in continuing discussions with higher levels concerning the entire range of NRO projects and responsibilities, in addition to his weekly meetings with the NRO Executive Committee, all of which may, and frequently will, result in some guidance and direction concerning the MOL responsibilities assigned to the Director, SAFSP.

e. The MOL responsibilities assigned to the Director, SAFSP, have a direct bearing on and are influenced by other NRO responsibilities assigned to the Director, SAFSP: in-house, within the Aerospace Corporation, and at certain contractors.

f. The Director, NRO, and the Director, SAFSP, are necessarily involved in frequent discussions and KY-9 telephone conversation concerning various aspects of the entire range of NRO responsibilities assigned to the Director, SAFSP.

g. Because of co-location, the inclusion of the SAFSP MOL payload office in the integrated SPO, and the frequent opportunities and occasions for discussions between the Director, SAFSP, and the Deputy Director, MOL, there is no problem whatever in keeping the Deputy Director, MOL, currently informed on all guidance received by the Director, SAFSP. However, it is extremely impractical for the Director, SAFSP, to keep anyone in the Washington management structure equally informed.

h. The only practical way to tie together the Washington ends of the two management channels involved is for the Director, MOL, and the Director, NRO, to use a single staff element for all reconnaissance aspects of the MOL, and for this element to be assigned to the NRO Staff to assure that its support of both Directors is carried out in full coordination and context with all related NRO considerations; assignment of this staff element to the staff of the Director, MOL, would undesirably isolate the staff support of the NRO responsibilities for MOL from the staff support of the rest of the NRO responsibilities, unnecessarily add extra coordination procedures which could not completely compensate

Handle via BYEMAN  
Control System

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

for this isolation, and unavoidably reduce the effectiveness of this support to both Directors in all areas where the reconnaissance aspects of the MOL bear upon, or are influenced by, other NRO matters with which the NRO staff deals continuously.

3. I recommend adoption of the following statement of procedures, which is consistent with the above comments, the present assignment of responsibilities, and the guidance I have previously received on this subject:

Procedures for Guidance and Direction  
of NRO Responsibilities for MOL

1. All guidance and direction concerning the MOL reconnaissance payloads and all other NRO responsibilities for the MOL Program will be issued by, or upon prior specific personal approval of, the Director, NRO.
2. All guidance and direction to the Director, SAFSP, and all BYEMAN communications to the Deputy Director, MOL, or other personnel at the SSD complex, will be transmitted through existing SAFSS-SAFSP communications channels and procedures, and SAFSP will provide all BYEMAN Control Officer services for document control and storage; to include provision for such service within the integrated MOL SPO.
3. Normally, guidance and direction which has, or is likely to have, a major impact on the overall MOL Program will be transmitted from the Director, NRO, to the Director, SAFSP, through, or with the prior coordination of, the Director, MOL.
4. In all instances where written guidance or direction is given to the Director, SAFSP, directly by the Director, NRO, an information copy will be given concurrently to the Director, MOL.
5. Other general guidance, direction and clarification will be given by the Director, NRO, to the Director, SAFSP, from time to time, in direct discussions and KY-9 telephone conversations.
6. The Director, SAFSP, will keep the Deputy Director, MOL, currently informed on all guidance and direction which he receives from the Director, NRO, by whatever means.
7. Response to all direction will be made in the manner prescribed in each individual directive.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

8. The Director, SAFSP, will furnish an information copy to the Director, MOL, of all wire messages and letters from the Director, SAFSP, to the Director, NRO, concerning NRO responsibilities for MOL.

9. Nothing in these procedures shall be construed to alter or constrain the direct access of the Director, SAFSP, to the Director, NRO, at any time for questions, discussion, or response concerning the MOL responsibilities assigned to the Director, SAFSP, and any direction received by him concerning these responsibilities.

10. The Director, MOL, and the Director, NRO, will use a single Washington staff element for all reconnaissance aspects of the MOL, as follows: All staff personnel supporting either director in the reconnaissance aspects of the MOL Program will be assigned to the NRO Staff (SAFSS) and, in addition to their support of the Director, NRO, will also provide all such staff support to the Director, MOL, including all files, information, charts, briefings, presentations and discussions.



JOHN L. MARTIN, JR  
Brigadier General, USAF  
Director

Atch  
Comments on "Procedural Con-  
siderations for MOL Prog Mgt,"  
(SAF-SL BYE-37596-65)

~~TOP SECRET~~

Handle via FUMM  
Control System

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

*paper* *copy* *attach*

Comments on the paper entitled "Procedural Considerations for MOL  
Program Management," (SAF-SL BYE-37596-65)

(The titles of the following paragraphs refer to corresponding paragraphs of the referenced paper)

1. "General"

a. Several specific points included in this part of the proposed paper reflect erroneous or incomplete understanding, which may be (and seem, in fact, to have been) repeated in other MOL documentation:

(1) The MOL Program does not depart from the condition "where the reconnaissance sensor itself has been the major element around which overall system integration is postured," as stated. Quite the contrary: the MOL reconnaissance sensor dominates the entire configuration of this project; its influence is far greater than the presence of man, even in the "manned-only" configuration. The requirement of manned/unmanned capability further extends the influence of the reconnaissance sensor on the configuration of the project.

(2) The MOL Program does not depart from the condition of the other satellite reconnaissance programs of the NRO due to "currently expressed national policy of overt and unclassified admission of the MOL," as stated. Neither does it depart in regard to covert aspects, as stated. There are no covert satellite reconnaissance projects in the NRO. All such projects have unclassified names (numbers, rather than words), but none of these projects has any public "cover" whatsoever; the mission is simply classified. The MOL has a name, in addition to a number, but it has no difference from the other reconnaissance projects in restraint concerning operation as a covert project. Reconnaissance cannot be acknowledged as the mission of any of them; there is no way that any of them can be operated covertly, nor their reconnaissance aspects "covered" by any plausible public explanation of their ostensible purpose. All conceivable cover for such unmanned activities has been used previously and thoroughly exhausted. The same applies to the manned aspect of the MOL: everything that can possibly be said in this regard has already been said by NASA, including the use of military astronauts, and the exploration of activities of possible future application to national defense.

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

(3) The draft ignores the Secretary of the Air Force delegation to the Director, NRO, of "the authority to act for me on all Air Force matters -- including personnel, materiel, and fiscal resources -- associated with the National Reconnaissance Office and/or within the purview of the National Reconnaissance Program, including the MOL reconnaissance payloads," (BYE-36998-65). In view of this delegation alone, it is not clear that the Director, MOL, has the full range of responsibilities outlined in the draft.

b. On balance, this part of the draft seems completely unnecessary, even if corrected to reflect the above comments, since the basic documents reflecting decisions by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense are available in original form to all who would have any reason to see the proposed document. I believe that this part could add to confusion on some aspects; it certainly does not clarify anything.

2. "Principles of the Management Structure." This section is in error in three respects:

a. Concerning the channels of program direction intended by the basic MOL documents in the original exchange between the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense, it is certainly not "clear that no other (than through the Director, MOL) is intended," in view of related documents and verbal discussion of this point.

b. The SAFSP sensor payload office co-located with the MOL Systems Office is not responsible for MOL sensor development. The Director, SAFSP, is responsible for this, and will use this sensor payload office as his principal support for this task.

c. I do not agree that the channel through which direction flows makes no difference, as is stated. I don't see how anyone can claim that there is no difference between getting direction from one source and accounting to another for carrying it out, or getting it from two sources and accounting to either or both for carrying it out, or getting it from one source and accounting to it exclusively.

3. "Procedures for Program Guidance and Direction." I do not see any purpose in including the five categories of guidance and direction, as listed, nor in any similar attempt to categorize guidance and direction. In actuality, governing procedures by this approach simply cannot work, as it is just not possible for the giver of guidance and direction to know, a priori, the full eventual impact it will, or may, have. This is a tedious, impractical way to define management channels; it is not realistic and will most certainly encumber, rather than streamline, the conduct of the program. I also do not agree that "all guidance and

~~TOP SECRET~~  
Handle via STEELMAN  
Control System

~~TOP SECRET~~

BYE-40315-65

direction will be issued . . . . to both the Deputy Director, MOL and the Director, SAFSP." While it may be appropriate to issue some guidance to both, most should be issued specifically to one with an information copy to the other (and all directives and guidance to SAFSP should be transmitted through the existing SAFSS-SAFSP communications channels and procedure). I do not agree with issuance of an action directive "to whom it may concern" or to "whom it would be appropriate for compliance, based upon his (otherwise) assigned responsibilities," as the present draft would have it.

4. "Procedural Principles"

a. My present MOL responsibilities are assigned to me by the Director, NRO, who has informed me that he holds me responsible to him for carrying them out. I, therefore, cannot agree with the "procedural principles" as written in the draft. I submit that it is axiomatic that my direction should come to me from the person to whom I am responsible for carrying it out, with no intervening modification or interpretation, and with no constraint on my direct access to such person for questions, clarification, response or discussion of such responsibilities and direction. I do not mean to imply that the sending of information copies to others is a constraint, nor the requirement to keep other appropriately informed, as long as this is realistically interpreted.

b. I cannot see any reason that the Washington organization for the MOL Program management should not follow the same pattern established by the West Coast in coping with the two separate managerial aspects which are involved in the program. The Deputy Director, MOL, does not have any personnel whatsoever in the area of MOL responsibilities which are assigned to the Director, SAFSP; he relies completely upon the latter's personnel for all information and support on this subject. By the same reasoning, I cannot see why the Washington office of the Director, MOL, should have any personnel whatever in the area of NRO responsibilities for the MOL Program; it seems to me that all such personnel should be assigned to the NRO Staff (SAFSS), and should, in addition to their work for the Director, NRO, provide all Washington area information and support to the Director, MOL, for all aspects of NRO responsibilities (all briefings, information, discussion).

~~TOP SECRET~~

Handle Via BYEMAN  
Control System