A Federal policy which would insure that the changes in laboratory management and mission are slower than 5 years and more rapid than 20 might be considered desirable for maximum return on the investment made in creating experienced laboratory people. The present procedure of establishing new organizations as new needs arise is probably good if it can be coupled with a mechanism for transferring people and facilities from organizations whose effectiveness and missions are disappearing. The procedures for disestablishing laboratories should be improved. In the real world many organizational loyalties make the dissolution process extremely difficult.

In the process of selecting between laboratories, as in any growth process, competition is very important. Therefore, if the Government were to establish clearly defined, narrow, and exclusive missions for its laboratory organizations it would eliminate competition and would soon be faced with the complete coverage of all areas of technical endeavor by organizations convinced that nothing can be changed and all new projects are worthless.

Within the effective life cycle of a laboratory I believe the laboratory can develop its competence to the highest degree if it is exposed to a variety of problems. The legal limitations on accepting work from other agencies have presented no problems. The general belief that there is a definite relationship between manpower and performance does present problems. My own experience would indicate that people can perform at rates at least in order of magnitude (factor of 10) different depending on interest or lack of it in the work being undertaken. Interesting programs are easy to add to an already full workload.

As Parkinson states in one of his organizational laws, "Work expands to fill the time available for its accomplishment." I believe in the converse and that only by overloading development groups can we be sure of maximum return. We should by all means encourage **interagency use of laboratory facilities.**

The policies on interagency use are generally permissive rather than directive. The procedures for placing work in other laboratories or accepting work from other agencies are well established and can be utilized on a mutual agreement basis. There is much merit in doing work for multiple agencies. There is no substitute for being known by one's peers and outside effort accomplishes this objective. Interlaboratory contacts also provide data for the comparison of civil service standards.

There are limiting factors that control the amount of outside workload that can be accepted. These limiting factors are the physical plant, the mix of scientific talent available, existing program commitments, and restrictions on the use of resources (overtime limitations, for example).

Laboratories lack a fast reaction time when new facilities are required. As you know, to construct new facilities requires a minimum of 5 to 6 years from the time that the requirement is first known. There needs to be more flexibility in construction for research and development activities. Because of the complicated array of factors affecting laboratory workload, it is difficult to assess the the laboratory capability remotely. This assessment should be a prime function of the laboratory director assisted by his staff.