

The point has already been made that there is some difference of opinion regarding the handicaps that current regulations impose on the management of in-house personnel. In order to help resolve this and allied questions, it would be useful to initiate studies that include the examination of a number of case histories in which personnel difficulties have been encountered. While each case history can be reported under the cloak of anonymity, each should be a detailed study of an actual situation, with a careful analysis of the input at all management levels. Following such detailed studies, recommendations can be drawn up regarding the proper direction of future action.

It should be remarked that some studies of this kind have been conducted in the past, but they have usually been incidental to studies with a broader purpose and have not concentrated adequately on a detailed examination of personnel management procedures. Moreover, none have brought forth a specific and constructive plan of action to resolve the known problems.

9. RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

In addition to their mission orientation, the laboratories must have sufficient flexibility to react when there is an urgent national need. There have been too many times in the past (ballistic missiles, ASW system studies, etc.) when problems have arisen on which the immediate support of in-house laboratories could have been used. One of the main reasons given for not using the Government's technical specialists is the lack of flexibility in their response.

Virtually every study that has been made of the in-house laboratory system has been critical, in varying degrees, of the combined management of manpower, facilities, funding and personnel resources. At present, each of these is managed differently at practically all levels within the Military Departments. The Task Force believes that the management of resources and the responsibilities for policy, procedures and regulations pertaining to their use are fragmented among many staff agencies, whose concerns and interests are broader than merely RDT&E. In too many cases, RDT&E activities are bound by practices designed for logistical and operational activities—in contrast to the more generally recognized practices of industrial organizations, which are tailored specifically for the creative, laboratory-type organization. As a result, the operation and future planning of the laboratories depend upon a diffuse, high-level management structure with divided control and authority over resources and their use.

The Task Force concluded that the systems approach could well be applied to the administration of the DoD laboratories.