

effectiveness for each particular element one could expand varying amounts of dollars and hopefully achieve an optimum situation.

The reason that there was more than one contractor involved was simply because we felt we would like to have as many approaches to the solution as possible.

Mr. COURTNEY. Was the contractor evaluating his own product for combat effectiveness?

Mr. SEGAL. No, sir.

Secretary IMIRIE. You are referring to Martin, I presume?

Mr. COURTNEY. Martin, or United.

Mr. SEGAL. It turns out in the case of the Martin Co. that a piece of the system, the overall system, was a piece of hardware which they are themselves in production on, and a modification thereof. Thereby incurring a great cost savings, rather than developing a whole new item.

As a result of the study, the Air Force was provided with the necessary groundwork for launching a large-scale development program on a weapons system basis. One of the key outputs of the project was a set of recommendations along the line of research and development that would be required in specific gray areas, where feasibility might have been questionable, to achieve this capability for the time period.

Now, when the reports were received from contractors, the Air Force organized a team of experts in-house, chaired by the Rome Air Development Center since they were prime on the job, to review these final reports and prepare a comprehensive set of conclusions, recommendations, and findings on the Air Force part, and submit this document back through channels, through the Headquarters, Electronics Systems Division, thence to the Systems Command, and thence to Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HEBERT. Why couldn't this group to whom you refer which reviewed these reports—why could it not have originated and conducted the study?

Mr. SEGAL. The elements of the group were made up of people from all over the Research and Development Command, and it would have been very difficult to acquire the various disciplines that were required on a full-time basis, say for 9 months, which these contractors were able to do. But on a 3-week evaluation temporary basis we were able to obtain these various people and experts.

Mr. SANDWEG. Then this basically was a cost differential?

Mr. SEGAL. Cost effectiveness was a very interesting portion of the study, yes.

Mr. SANDWEG. It was not lack of capability within the Air Force?

Mr. SEGAL. I wouldn't necessarily say that, sir, no.

The capability does exist in-house, but maybe one can't obtain it altogether at the same time on the same day it is needed for a long continued period of 9 months.

Mr. SANDWEG. Is that considered at the time a contract like this is let out, when it is sent up for review?

Mr. SEGAL. I am not quite sure.

Maybe Mr. Meyer could possibly answer that question.

Mr. MEYER. Well, it is not generally considered during the contractual handling of the requirement.

But I am sure it was considered during the conceptual phase.