

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenwald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are
responsible for the declassification of MILLIONS of pages
released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

27 NOV 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Follow-on Contract No. [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED]

1. This memorandum contains a recommendation for your approval which appears in paragraph 7. This is sent to you for approval because the work proposed was included only in the first quarter review.

2. The [REDACTED] Materials Analysis program is directed toward the development of a system capable of anticipating and identifying potential Bloc country developments of psychoactive, incapacitating, or behavior-control agents. The challenge will be to develop a structure-activity predictive capability such that the more dangerous analogs of parent molecules could be specified and where so indicated, fabricated and tested. To be able to anticipate, then duplicate and prepare countermeasures against the more dangerous developments and discoveries in this field could typify the best features of the intelligence process. This ambitious goal appears feasible if this selective screening program is used in conjunction with the special data base now in [REDACTED] being developed as a computer-managed and analyzable reference source.

3. The proposed work was approved in principle during the first quarter review. A preliminary 90-day contract was let, however, in order to allow time for appraisal of all potentially competitive firms in the greater Washington area while still maintaining screening activity. Four companies were contacted and invited to bid on this follow-on effort. Two proposals were received: one from [REDACTED] and the other from [REDACTED]. These proposals were compared according to: (a) total costs, (b) assigned personnel, (c) personnel experience, (d) average labor rate, (e) facilities, and (f) capability to respond to the special computer-compatible

reporting format of resulting data. [redacted] was significantly lower than [redacted] on total cost; however, their average labor rate was high [redacted]. In all other elements, [redacted] rated much higher. No significant savings (the lower bid cost was clearly an underestimate of the work load) or improvements could be identified in the [redacted] proposal. After hearing a full discussion of the evaluation process and its results, the Project Review Board agreed that the work should be continued with [redacted].

4. The proposed work will require a level of effort sufficient to conduct approximately 240 primary screens and 40 to 50 secondary screens over a period of nine months and will cost approximately [redacted]. No supporting action will be required from any other Agency component. [redacted] is aware of this work and endorses it.

5. Follow-on action is planned at approximately the same level of effort.

6. As in the past, this research will be classified [redacted] Association with the Agency will be classified CONFIDENTIAL. The work will be UNCLASSIFIED, i.e., the screening of the new compounds will be carried on in free access laboratories and the raw data will not require special handling. This classification is warranted because the work and data are not unique, especially within companies providing toxicological assessment of new compounds. Reports will be classified SECRET when they represent interpretative summaries revealing the purposes of the work. Dr. [redacted] extension [redacted] will be the project officer and will monitor the execution of this contract.

