MEMORANDUM FOR BRIGADIER GENERAL STEWART

SUBJECT: Comments on Task Group Report

1. In accordance with your request, I have reviewed the Task Group Report dealing with alternative management arrangements for the New Photographic Search and Surveillance System. My comments are contained in the following paragraphs.

2. I believe that the report covers the spectrum of possible management arrangements for this system under the ground rules which were established. My comments will therefore be directed to points you may want to emphasize in your personal appraisal to Dr. Flax.

3. All of my experience points to the fact that a complex and important systems development task demands strong centralized management with clear assignment of responsibilities and recognized and enforceable authority if it is to succeed. Management arrangements must be as simple as possible in order to focus effort on the development task as opposed to management interfaces. In general to the extent that any arrangement does not adhere to this principle, there is a corresponding decrease in the probability of success of the project. Deficiencies can range all the way from increased dollar cost and slipped schedules to a complete debacle such as Advent. In a sense, the national importance of any system can be judged by the extent to which people and organizations are willing (or are directed) to submerge parochial interests, and establish and respond to strong centralized management. The ballistic missile programs, including Polaris, are obvious examples. Air Force participation in Mercury and Gemini are also pertinent. It would seem that if the new search system is indeed important and essential to national security, organizational prerogatives should be considered secondary to a strong centralized management arrangement.
4. In this light, if it is the intent of the agreement to maintain organizational identity and responsibility, the best arrangement one can hope for is a federation. Such arrangement is inherently limited to integrating or perhaps coordinating any common objectives and relevant capabilities of the participating organizations. However, organizational prerogatives remain paramount. I don't see how any arrangement based on such a principle can be successful in carrying forward a complex enterprise which depends on successful solution of intricate development and engineering problems.

5. In summary, I believe there are overriding considerations to support a fully integrated system project office.

DAVID L. CARTER
Colonel, USAF