NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM
Washington, D. C.
July 13, 1971

NRP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AGENDA*

Office of Deputy Secretary of Defense
Room 3E 928, The Pentagon
Thursday. July 15, 1971
2 - 5 p.m.

THE NRP FY 1972 Financial Program
and Related FY 1973 through 1977
Cost Estimates

Dr. McLucas

Reference A. Director's Report to the NRP Executive
Committee on Current Status and
FY 1972-1977 Financial Program
BYE-12954-71

Reference B. The NRP FY 1972 Financial Program,
FY 1973 Budget Estimate, and Related
FY 1974 through 1977 Cost Estimates
BYE-12936-71

In addition, the following briefings are available to
assist in the deliberations.

1. TAGBOARD Review
   Colonel Hartley

2. [Blank] Review
   Dr. Naka

3. SIGINT Multimission Study

F. Robert Naka
Secretary
NRP Executive Committee

Attachment - Issues

*Supersedes agenda dtd 8 Jul 71 (BYE-12956-71, p. 2)
ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION
at July 15, 1971 ExCom

1. Film Readout GAMBIT and Electro-Optical Imaging Systems

   Issue. Should both the Film Readout GAMBIT and EOI systems be developed.

   Background. At the April 23, 1971 ExCom meeting it was decided to proceed with both programs based on the President's desire to have a system of appreciable utility during his administration. Senator Ellender has expressed the view that we should proceed with only one of the systems.

2. Electro-Optical Imaging System

   Issue. Should the EOI system development be delayed for an additional year.

   Background. At the April 23, 1971 ExCom meeting, it was decided to delay the development of the EOI system for one year. In his letter of July 11, 1971, Dr. David suggests that the EOI system should be delayed for another year.

3. TAGBOARD Drone

   Issue. Should the TAGBOARD drone be improved in accordance with the review committee's recommendations.

   Background. The TAGBOARD drone has suffered from a number of malfunctions during several of the recent missions. The Committee appointed by the DNRO to recommend changes for improving the reliability of TAGBOARD has made some specific recommendations.

4. 

   Issue. Should the program be accelerated.

   Background. The USIB will consider at its July 15 meeting whether

   Depending upon the USIB requirement decision, the ExCom would be expected to select an appropriate budget option.
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MEMORANDUM FOR: Dr. Naka

Yesterday, when I was reviewing the cost numbers given to the principles before the last EXCOM for the various options they were to consider, I found a substantial error in the "Mix 4" EOI cost presentation which I would like to bring to your attention.

In the paper you distributed, the EOI cost numbers for Mix 1 and Mix 4 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY71</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>73</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Although the detail costs of the stretched out schedule have not been fully defined as yet, it is clear that the EOI costs for Mix 4 should have been given about as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY71</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>73</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The effect of this correction is to show that the cost of adding FROG and delaying EOI availability to 1976 is almost more than the principles were assuming when they made their decision.
As a separate matter, it would also seem appropriate to change the GAMBIT/HEXAGON launch projections in Mix 4 to comply with COMIREX's recent letter to you on this subject.

The cost projections distributed before the meeting assumed that FROG could replace five GAMBITs in FY 75, 76 and 77 and that HEXAGON launches could be reduced from 3 to 2 when FROG and EOI came along. I believe the COMIREX letter makes it clear that these assumptions cannot be made at this time. A correction to add 5 GAMBITs and 1 HEXAGON to Mix 4 would make Mix 4 another or so more costly than was assumed by the EXCOM at their last meeting.

Making all these corrections, the cost projections would show that the effect of adding FROG and delaying EOI to 1976 would be an increase in NRP cost by through FY 77 rather than the assumed by the EXCOM principles at the last meeting.

I believe it is important to make the EXCOM members aware of these changes before the next meeting.

Donald H. Steininger
Assistant Deputy Director for
Science and Technology