

1. (U) The following is an assessment of how well the contractor filled the contract stipulations as provided for in Statement of Work ESU 83-134. Numbering corresponds directly to the format of the original statement of work. Page numbers in parentheses refer to pages in the draft final report.

#### Section 1.2, MAJOR GOALS

a. (S/CL-2/NOFORN) PHASE I: Met only partially. CENTER LANE personnel were not considered in determining the testings profiles finally concluded upon as identifying personnel with RV aptitude. Testing profiles arrived at are of debatable worth in screening for prospective RV personnel.

b. (S/CL-2/NOFORN) PHASE II: Met only partially. Only one "self-report" test was used (MBTI-J), which was contrasted against the "still-under-development" (p. 7) PAS personality profiling system. Results were inconclusive, but indicated little direct correlation. The second part, applying identified profiles against a general test population (Omni psi test respondents) appears not to have been done.

c. (U) PHASE III: Apparently not met. At the very least, INSCOM personnel were not tested against randomly selected targets. Only slight indications exist in the report (see paragraph 4.4b below) that any other personnel were ever tested in this manner; no indications exist that personnel showing "no talent" were tested against these same targets as control.

d. (U) Evaluation: Delivered in draft final report. Evaluation was equivalent in quality to first 2 phases. Recommendations were brief, and one--selecting all new psychoenergetic participants on the basis of the PAS guidelines--is questionable, based on the incompleteness of the research performed.

#### 2. (U) Specific Tasks

##### 2.1 (U) PHASE I

a., b., c., d., and e. (U) Accomplished. Personality profile was collected from identified personnel, and the extended Wechsler was administered as stated by individuals listed. Data was analyzed using the PAS concept, results were employed to designate certain "profiles of interest," and these were then used in extrapolation.

f. (U) A satisfactory interim report was not provided.

2.2 (U) PHASE II

a. (U) Accomplished. Self-report data was collected as stated.

b. (U) Partially accomplished. Only the MBTI form J was used in obtaining self-report information.

c. (U) Unknown. No detailed summary of analysis procedures or results was provided in report.

d. (U) Accomplished, but relevance was doubtful.

e. (U) Accomplished, but methodology, and the results and their implications, if any, were not clearly reported.

f. (U) No satisfactory interim report received.

2.3 PHASE III

a. (S/CL-3/NOFORN) Not satisfactorily accomplished. Possible profiles were suggested as indicating likely psi ability, but negative profiles were not specifically indicated. Rather, it was left to assumption that profiles not designated as positive indicators were by default indicators of negative ability. This despite the fact that 69 of the thus-far established 80 PAS reference groups were not represented, and therefore not tested for presence or absence of psi ability.

b. (U) At best only partially completed. INSCOM personnel were not so tested, and little data is presented in the final report indicating that anyone else was so tested, either (see paragraph 4.4b below).

c. (S/CL-3/NOFORN) Probably not accomplished. No indications exist in the final report that either a) criteria were developed to determine personnel lacking RV potential, or b) that such personnel were run against the set of targets as specified in 2.3, b., above.

d. (U) Not accomplished. No comparison of this nature is referenced in the final report, nor are results from such a comparison presented or discussed.

e. (U) Indications are that no reliable determination for personality testing-based selection of potential RV personnel was arrived at in Phases I and II. According to the stipulations outlined in this paragraph, the contract should have been terminated before Phase III.

3. (U) Security (N/A)

4. (U) Deliverables:

4.1 (S/CL-3/NOFORN) Delivered. What was presented in the draft final report probably does represent state of the art for RV personnel selection. However, it would have been reasonable to expect a much more thorough and professional package than was actually delivered.

4.2 (U) Not delivered. A letter dated 21 December 1983, and signed by Dr. Ed May, may have been intended as the Phase I progress report. If so, it was not only not labeled as such, but did not in any way meet the requirement as delineated in the statement of work.

4.3 (U) Not delivered.

4.4 (U) Not delivered. None of the specified three copies of the final report had been received as of 4 February 1985.

a. (U) Partially delivered. Test evaluations and comparisons were brief and inconclusive.

b. (S/CL-3/NOFORN) Not delivered. The only remote viewing results provided were listed in Table 3 (p. 21), for a total of seven trainee personnel. These "results" consisted of numerical factors representing "RV Learning" and "RV Figure of Merit" categories, but included little useable information as to how these figures were arrived at. No results whatsoever were provided for those "not identified as talented," who were to have been run against the selected random targets.

c. (U) Unsatisfactorily met. The summary and recommendations provided were sketchy and easily arrived at through common sense and an elementary knowledge of psychological screening vehicles. Some recommendations were questionable based on a thorough analysis of the research performed (See 1.2d, above), and some were actions that should have been accomplished in the course of the study in question. (See pp. 28-29)