

or twenty man unit a laboratory? This suggests that at least two parameters in any definition would be the questions of geographical concentration and of the number of professional personnel.

Once a laboratory is identified, I would say the following data would be helpful in making an initial screening of existing Federal facilities for possible new program assignments:

Name of Federal laboratory;

Location;

Number of professional staff, broken down by major disciplines, that is, engineers, physical scientists, biological scientists, behavioral scientists, and medical scientists;

A statement of the laboratory's major mission(s); and

A brief statement concerning each of the laboratory's major facilities or fields of competences.

I believe it would be *feasible* to establish a center clearinghouse for this type of information, probably in OST. However, in 1955 the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, the predecessor to the present Committee on Federal Laboratories, in response to Executive Order 10521, did prepare a Government-wide inventory of major Federal laboratories and equipment. A supplement was issued in 1957. Insofar as the Interdepartmental Committee was able to determine, little or no use was ever made of the information, which, incidentally, was given a security classification of "restricted" because of the amount of specific, detailed information in the total compilation.

Two types of clearinghouse might be considered. One type would be to establish an office which would promulgate certain guidelines as to the level and type of information to be sought and a standard format for its presentation. Then to periodically request, update and disseminate the information. This would be a formidable undertaking requiring a fulltime staff of several persons, use of automatic data processing and printing equipment, space, and significant funding. A second, less ambitious approach would be one of gathering existing equipment, facility and program inventories which are already being produced in varying degrees by many agencies and simply function as a central reference and information facility. Even this latter approach would require a minimum staff capable of establishing a useful integrative indexing system and of motivating agencies to fill in blank spaces where inventories do not now exist. This too would require space and a not insignificant amount of financing if it was to really fill a useful role.

This leads to the question of *desirability* of establishing a clearinghouse of such information. Its desirability would have to await the test of use. I think this would depend heavily on the extent to which agencies were brought to think in job shop terms by direction, policy, and urgings from Congress and top Executive Branch officials.

*Question 6. Several agencies have set up procedures to appraise the performance of contractors that do research and development for them, or that manage agency laboratories. To your knowledge, what consideration has been given to applying the standards and procedures of these appraisal processes to Government operated laboratories? To what extent would this be desirable?*

Answer: The Committee on Federal Laboratories has not studied this subject. The Department of Defense uses criteria to measure contract performance, but I am not familiar with the standards and procedures referred to. We plan to investigate these. In view of the foregoing, I am not prepared to say to what extent specific existing appraisal techniques should be used in any particular laboratory other than our own. From a management viewpoint, of course, some type of evaluation is a practical necessity.

*Question 7. What criteria do you use to rate the laboratories within the NBS?*

Answer: To answer this question meaningful for NBS I would like to paraphrase the question as follows: What means or criteria do you use to assess program capabilities within the NBS? The answer is that an annual or sometimes more frequent series of reviews of all of the significant programs of the Bureau are made by operating personnel to top NBS officials. Generally programs are closely related to one or several organizational units. The program of each division is also subject to review at least annually by Advisory Committees of the National Academy of Sciences. Finally, an outside evaluation of the Bureau as a whole is made by a Statutory Visiting Committee which reports annually to the Secretary of Commerce on the efficiency of NBS operations.

At the program reviews those responsible for the program discuss their past accomplishments, present work and future program plans. Information is given