

NPIC/P&DS/D/6-1313  
20 April 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Support Systems Section, Development Branch  
Plans and Development Staff

SUBJECT: Review of Project Orientation Procedure

REFERENCE: Draft of Project Orientation Procedure dated 11 March  
1966

1. Basically, the idea of a formalized procedure is excellent and is almost mandatory if available, money and manpower is to be allocated intelligently. However, the proposed procedure, although workable, seems to contain a number of superfluous steps.

2. A diagram of the proposed procedure is shown in Attachment I. The following criticisms are offered:

(a) While it is feasible for internal NPIC sources to fill out the Project Suggestion Form (PSF), it seems unrealistic to expect a contractor or potential contractor, offering an "unsolicited proposal," to complete an internal NPIC form. It would undoubtedly become the task of a P&DS employee to extract the necessary "meat" from an outside proposal and generate the PSF.

(b) The procedure recommends that each time a step is completed, a copy of the Project Suggestion Routing Sheet (PSRS) be sent to the Administration Assistant for control purposes. This could result in 7 or 8 copies of the PSRS being duplicated, if the project got the total treatment. If such a control system is needed a simple tear-off ticket type of form could be utilized whereby a segment of the form is returned after each step in the procedure is completed.

(c) There is serious doubt concerning the necessity of a project passing through the evaluation committee and the Assistant for P&DS, twice. Also, there seems to be no valid reason for a P&DS Branch investigation step. Before the Evaluation Committee can make a preliminary recommendation, it will be necessary for each member to ascertain for himself the desirability and feasibility of the suggested project. This work will undoubtedly be carried out by members of each branch

ILLEGIB

ILLEGIB

at the request of his respective branch chief. In many cases the branch chief will be able to pass judgment based on his knowledge of center operations. In either case an additional investigative step would seem to add very little. It would also seem that sufficient information could be assembled at this point to enable the Assistant for P&DS to make his "stop or go" decision. If these changes to the procedure are made, the process could be diagramed as shown in Attachment II.

3. The reference procedure in either of the above forms, would seem to negate the present requirement for the inter-branch review of all projects. In as much as the branch chiefs, as members of the Evaluation Committee, would become conversant with each project as it was evaluated, an additional review should be unnecessary.

4. It is suggested that the Administrative Assistant could act as the secretary for the Evaluation Committee. In this capacity he could issue the agenda for each meeting in time to permit investigation before the meeting, establish the time and place of each meeting through liaison with each member, write the minutes and recommendations from each meeting and circulate the desired copies to all interested parties. The Administrative Assistant could also maintain all the files pertaining to the project evaluation process.

25X1

Attachments: 2 (As Stated)

Distribution:

Original - Addressee  
1 - Chrono/DB

clc