## SLNATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

May 23. 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. FLAX

SUBJECT: Unmanned DORIAN System Studies

- 1. You will recall that Dr. Foster requested that the results of the NOL/DORIAN vs an unmanned DORIAN-type system be available for DDR&E review by June 6 (Tab A).
- 2. You and Gen Schriever now are scheduled to review the results of the contractor studies, SAFSP in-house studies, MOL SPO inputs, etc, in Los Angeles on June 7. At the same time; I expect to present at least the preliminary results of the NRO Staff's analysis of the predicted target coverage results of the manned vs unmanned MOL/DORIAN against a 30 day period of actual recorded weather.
- 3. The MOL Policy Council review of the same subject tentatively is scheduled for June 9. Gen Evans and I were concerned that this was too soon after the West Coast review. However, Gen Schriever apparently would have personal scheduleproblems with an MOL Policy Council review the following week and requests that the Policy Council meet as scheduled, even if the material presented is not yet in polished form. I recommend the Policy Council meeting scheduled for June 9 be adhered to if possible.
- 4. However, the material presented to DDR&E must be polished and complete and I recommend at least a week be allocated for that purpose. Accordingly, attached is a memo for your signature to Dr. Foster, indicating that the effort is taking a little longer than anticipated, and estimating submittal of the results to DDR&E by June 17 (Tab B).

Atchs 🖖 . Tabs A & B

James T. Stewart Brigadier General, US

Director, NRO Staff

(f)





## DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

6 APR 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (R&D)

SUBJECT: MOL versus an Equivalent Wholly Unmanned System Development and Mission Comparison Study

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, in his letter to the Secretary of Defense of March 21, 1966, requested that the Air Force study the comparative development and operational costs and differences in operational effectiveness of performing the MOL reconnaissance-intelligence mission unmanned versus manned.

The Secretary's response of March 25, 1966, to this request stated that we had a study under way which would provide the estimates of manned versus unmanned development costs as well as the comparative operational effectiveness of each approach.

It is important that such a study be responsive to our needs for information to assess the worth of developing a system and performing the mission wholly unmanned as opposed to our current MOL concept. I am convinced that such a comparative study is meaningful only if the development cost and the mature system operating costs of the two approaches are viewed as separate entities and not as an outgrowth of one from the other.

I desire that as a minimum, the study cover the following comparative points:

- 1. Configure the wholly unmanned system and its method of operation to provide the same quality and quantity of reconnaissance-intelligence information as the MOL.
- 2. Assess the difficulties and risks of obtaining equal intelligence content with the wholly unmanned system and determine the development and operating costs to achieve it.
- 3. Compare the wholly unmanned system performance with the expected performance of the unmanned version of the MOL as evolved from the manned development flights.

BYE-5188-66

GROUP T

Excluded from automatic

downgrading and declassification

Fage 1 of 2 pages Copy 1 of 4 copies

HANDLE VIA BYEMAN CONTROL SYSTEM



6 APR 1966

2

4. A comparison should be drawn between the operational effectiveness of the two approaches with regard to the number of missions required to insure equal target coverage (objectives seen per day, per week, per month) and the ability to select and/or discriminate between target systems. This should also include an assessment of the manned and unmanned system ability to circumvent weather phenomena in locating and identifying targets of interest.

It is therefore requested that the Air Force introduce into its study effort the points I have outlined. The results of the study should be made available for DDR&E review no later than 6 June 1966.

John S. Foster, Jr.

HARDLE VIA DYEMAN CONTROL SYSTEM

c. 2 1 2 pages.

BYE-5188-66

## +SI NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

2 3 MAY 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR Director of Defense Research & Engineering

SUBJECT: MOL vs an Equivalent Wholly Unmanned System Development and Mission Comparison Study

Reference is made to your memorandum of April 6 on the above subject which requested that the results of the study should be made available for DDRAM review no leter than June 6, 1966.

The studies and analyses are taking a little more time than anticipated. I now estimate the results will be available for DDR&E review by June 17, 1966.

Alexander H. Flax

PORTAN HANDLE VIA VEMAN

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING

CONTROL NO BYE 52335-66
COPY 2 OF COPIES
PAGE OF PAGE