

~~SECRET NOFORN~~

IACG

15 August 1980

SUBJECT: GRILL FLAME Program (U)

MG E. R. Thompson
Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence
HQDA
Washington, DC 20310

1. (U) References:

a. (U) DIA Ltr S-1922/DT-1, 7 Aug 80, subject as above. (SECRET)

b. (U) Report of the GRILL FLAME Scientific Evaluation Committee, Dec 79. (SECRET)

2. (U) Forwarded for your information at inclosure 1 are specific comments pertaining to a review of ref a proposal. Although the DIA initiative in this area is a well intentioned and long awaited one, there are several general areas of concern cited below to which your attention is invited.

3. (S/NOFORN) Whereas ref a justification for sole source procurement with SRI International may apply in the area of remote viewing technology, such justification is invalid in areas of "tracking" and physiological monitoring. So far as is known, SRI has no substantial data base regarding either "tracking" experiments or physiological monitoring. It would appear other possible contractors should be considered, some of whom may be more technically suited to accomplish these goals.

4. (S/NOFORN) The question of source of Army funding is one which must be resolved. The INSCOM GRILL FLAME Program (IGFP) operating budget for FY 81-83 stands at \$150K per year; however, the IGFP will be evaluated in July 1981 to determine program viability. It is premature under these circumstances for IGFP to be contractually committed to any three year program. It is not, however, premature for Army to so commit funds. Of FY 81 funds, approximately \$30K is to be dedicated

COFS CY

GRILL FLAME

~~SECRET NOFORN~~

CLASSIFIED BY DAMI-ESH M/S6, 0516302
DECLASSIFY ON Jul 80
REVIEW ON Aug 2000

SECRET NOFORN

IACG (15 Aug 80)
SUBJ: GRILL FLAME Program (U)

toward IGFP operations. Although the remaining funds are expected to be directed toward contractual training, by no means can IGFP allow those funds to be committed to SRI in their entirety. The IGFP must retain a high level of initiative in pursuing training/development required by remote viewing operations, and from whatever source these benefits might be derived. Under these circumstances, it is apparent that DA funding assistance for FY 81 and follow-on years will be required if ref a proposal is accepted.

5. (S/NOFORN) Ref a proposes training of two Army personnel in ORV techniques and one in "tracking" during FY 81. However, an associate of SRI having proprietary interest in development of the new ORV methods does not anticipate readiness for training for approximately one year. In view of lack of prior SRI involvement in formal "tracking" experiments, it is unlikely that a training procedure could be developed and training accomplished during FY 81. Under this proposed DIA concept, little substantive gain will be realized by Army during FY 81 with the single exception of the audio analysis portion.

6. (S/NOFORN) In view of ref b recommendations concerning cessation of contact with SRI, there appears to be a basic contradiction in the ref a proposal which may have already been considered by your office. Essentially, ref a proposes a long term period of association with SRI, and at an expanded level. Whereas INSCOM is of the position that continued contact with SRI is warranted, that contact should not be at the expense of pursuing other potential sources of training/information in the psychoenergetics field.

1 Incl
as

WILLIAM I. ROLYA
Major General, USA
Commanding

SECRET NOFORN

SECRET

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

14 August 1980

SUBJECT: INSCOM Comments to Proposed DIA Memorandum of Understanding re. GRILL FLAME Program.

1. (U) Reference: DIA Letter, S-1922/DT-1, 7 August 1980, subject: GRILL FLAME Program.

2. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. basic letter.

a. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2: It is INSCOM's understanding at this time there is little likelihood SRI will be prepared to administer "new" training technique during FY 81. SRI has done little formal experimentation in "tracking" and is ill equipped to examine physiological functioning. SRI, at the present time, cannot comply with "full year's effort" regarding some aspects of Statement of Work.

b. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2: INSCOM funds are limited and are directed toward sustaining an intelligence operational evaluation of psychoenergetics. INSCOM cannot MIPR funds to DIA without knowing individual costs of those elements of the program that are in support of INSCOM needs, and without knowing which elements SRI can realistically fulfill during FY 81.

c. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 3: Nonconcur that entire first year effort should be at SRI. In areas of tracking and physiological monitoring, SRI offers no meaningful advantage, particularly during critical first year. INSCOM funds are intended to be employed where they can best benefit INSCOM's evaluation effort, regardless of source of external support being sought.

d. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 5: A meeting of Action Officers was scheduled for 11 Aug 80. IGFP was never notified of such intent.

3. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. Mission and Objectives Statement.

a. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 1a: Functions related to development of a US ORV capability have been placed behind the overall objective of threat assessment. Elsewhere in proposal, threat is antecedent to development of a US capability. Recommend para 1a become para 1h, and objectives pertaining to development of a US capability be moved forward in priority.

b. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 1e: Recommendations re. GRILL FLAME Program should be last objective in series. Recommend para 1e become para 1i.

c. (S/NOFORN) Paragraphs 1h and 1j: Recommend combining these objectives in para 1g, as they are similar and must occur prior to final recommendation and threat assessment functions.

d. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2b: Milestones for year #2 mention establishment of a cadre of fully trained ORVs, but does not address prospect of other non-SRI sponsored training. Exploration of alternative possibilities must be a year #1 function, and a continuous process throughout follow on years. It is presumptuous to assume SRI has all there is to offer and that SRI training is the only prerequisite to achieving "full qualification." Such pursuit of qualification must be a continuous and dynamic process, not limited to sole source procurement of training and development services at SRI. INSCOM recommends

Msgr. DANIELS
 DTG: 051630
 JUL

SECRET

Aug 2000

~~SECRET~~

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

14 August 1980

SUBJECT: INSCOM Comments to Proposed DIA Memorandum of Understanding
re. GRILL FLAME (U)

term "fully trained" be deleted. The term "cadre" is vague. Recommend a minimum level of personnel be cited to lend substance to this milestone.

*HAVE
lightmares
about SRI
SRI involved
in operational
MAKES
idea*

e. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2c: Milestones for year #3 include "apply all ORV personnel to real intelligence programs". Who will provide these personnel? Who will coordinate collection priorities and tasking of ORV groups? Are such personnel to be trained only in new SRI methodologies or are they to include those previously trained? What is proposed saturation rate of tasking to be levied by DIA? Will Military Services lose control of their assets during this and the preceding year #2 data acquisition effort?

f. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2c: If Military Service ORV personnel are to participate in "real intelligence" collection activities from year #2 onward, it would appear the milestone "training programs for ORV monitors..." is more appropriately a year #1 or year #2 milestone. Otherwise, data acquired during year #2 and year #3 upon which final evaluations/judgements are based, will be data provided by "trained" ORV personnel functioning under the guidance of "untrained" monitor personnel.

g. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 3: All experimental/testing design, reports of progress and experiment results should be cleared by joint approval of Action Officers at the GRILL FLAME Committee level, not the COTR. COTR should monitor day to day activity of SRI, but not have the authority to unilaterally approve/disapprove basic initiatives or interpret results. This procedure would be in more direct compliance with responsibilities of the COTR outlined in the proposed MOU.

h. (S/NOFORN) Comment Overview: As far as INSCOM is concerned, the objectives and milestones as proposed by DIA represent a step backward. The IGFP has been training personnel for two years, has been working on real intelligence operational tasks for nearly one year, and has been examining "variables" impacting on ORV collection for nearly two years. IGFP has directed considerable effort toward determining guidelines for "best use" of ORV since its inception, and currently has a data base of over 500 ORV sessions of both training and operational categories. SRI was tasked during an earlier contractual agreement to develop a meaningful selection criterion (ORV profile) and essentially was capable of providing little which was not already known and already utilized by the IGFP in its early stages of development (refer report entitled "Special Orientation Techniques", SRI, June 1980)

4. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. Memorandum of Understanding.

a. (S/NOFORN) Unnumbered introductory paragraph 1: In this paragraph, determination of hostile ORV threat is placed antecedent to the goal of determining whether a useful ORV capability can be developed. This ordering of objectives supports rationale cited in paragraph 3a above.

b. (S/NOFORN) Unnumbered introductory paragraph 2: Recommend this paragraph be included in introductory paragraph 1, with wording as follows:

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

14 August 1980

SUBJECT: INSCOM Comments to Proposed DIA Memorandum of Understanding re. GRILL FLAME (U)

"...SRI International. The GRILL FLAME Committee will seek throughout the first year, and continually during follow-on years, to examine capabilities developed by potential contractors other than SRI. DIA and the Military Services will maintain "state of the art" continuity with psychoenergetics research within the US with a view toward diversification of external assistance support if, and when, required by operational needs of participating agencies/services."

AK380-13 conflict ?

c. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph b: Recommend addition of function:

"(4) Maintain continuity with state of the art developments in psychoenergetics research in the US and elsewhere to identify alternative training opportunities."

c7 does this neatly

d. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph b: Recommend addition of following function if comments of paragraph 3d, 3e, and 3f above apply:

"(5) Provide ORV (and/or) ORV monitor personnel support to SRI experiments as required during years #2 and #3."

e. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph c: If comments contained in para 3e above apply, recommend addition of the following task:

"(8) Establish intelligence collection priorities for application of ORV technique to real targets (commencing in year #2), insuring that the intelligence needs of each participating service are met."

f. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph d: If comments contained in para 3e above apply, recommend addition of following task:

"(9) Provides verbatim transcripts of all experimental ORV sessions directed against real intelligence targets to:

- (a) The GRILL FLAME Committee, and
- (b) the participating Military Service against whose EEI or intelligence "gap" the session was directed, and
- (c) the participating Military Service whose ORV personnel was employed."

g. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph d: Responsibilities of the COTR listed here do not agree with statements contained in Mission and Objectives Statement, para 3 (refer to INSCOM Comment, para 3g above). INSCOM concurs with duties outlined

SECRET

SECRET

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

14 August 1980

SUBJECT: INSCOM Comments to Proposed DIA Memorandum of Understanding
re. GRILL FLAME (U)

in MOU with single exception that the GRILL FLAME Committee should be responsive to inquiries from other services/agencies, vice the COTR as stated in para d(8), MOU.

5. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. Statement of Work.

a. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2.1: Army already has trained ORVs. Is proposed training to be in "new" SRI technique? If so, indications are the "new" technique will not be ready for another year. SRI therefore will probably be unable to achieve FY 81 training goal. Refer comments para 2a above. If training in "old" SRI technique is intended, it appears Army funding commitment should be reduced, since training of that type during FY 79 was significantly less manpower intensive for SRI than the "new" technique appears.

b. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2.2: A valid Army requirement for SRI to pursue. However, what is independent cost figure? If training of 2 ORVs in "old" technique and audio analysis are intended during year #1, Army funding contribution should be adjusted downward.

c. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2.3: Refer to comment para 2a above. Again, no formal training program exists. It is unlikely SRI could honor such a year #1 commitment with a quality program. Other contractor possibilities should be explored. Recommend Army contact USMC regarding Vietnam era employment of dowsers, a function apparently related to tracking. Recommend that FY 81 task be to develop a formal training program, and that training of Army personnel be moved to FY 82.

d. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2.4: SRI expertise does not appear to include physiological monitoring capability. Recommend consideration be given to diversifying contractor support by examining expertise of other organizations. The Maimonides Institute and the Meringer Foundation have made significant inroads into this area. The technical expertise of such organizations far outweigh that available at SRI, insofar as bio-physical evaluation is concerned.

e. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 2.8: Quick reaction tasks should be avoided whenever possible. Not only do they detract from the effort at hand and lead to numerous scheduling and production problems, but more importantly, there is a great security risk in involving uncleared personnel in sensitive intelligence situations.

f. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 6: Security Requirements. Sufficient SI/SAO billets should be identified to properly support the program. If and when SRI-I commences work on operational situations, then it would be wise if all personnel connected with operational matters possess the necessary clearances.

g. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 7: Monthly Status Report. Not needed. The COTR is there to insure that work is flowing smoothly and the quarterly technical reports should be sufficient to enable everyone to keep abreast of current developments.

*DA Unit
contract
to develop*

SECRET

SECRET

IAFM-OPS-HU-SA

14 August 1980

SUBJECT: INSCOM Comments to Proposed DIA Memorandum of Understanding
re. GRILL FLAME (U)

h. (S/NOFORN) Paragraph 8: Suggest more appropriate term than "interpret". The contract monitor should not try to "interpret" anyone's request but rather take requirements as stated to contractor and then serve as interface between contractor and primary customer if clarification is needed.

6. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. Miscellaneous Items.

a. INSCOM is not prepared to enter into 36 months effort with SRI-I. Is DA?

b. (S/NOFORN) Monthly Status Report: Again, this step is not needed. SRI-I staff personnel will be spending all their time and efforts in generating reports instead of concentrating on the job at hand.

7. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. Funding.

a. (S/NOFORN) Contract should be for 1 year - renewable if results so justify.

b. (S/NOFORN) It is not clear where the money is coming from to fund the levels indicated. Is DA going to provide \$150K for the Army portion of the \$450K? IGFP funds are directed toward INSCOM evaluation project.

8. (S/NOFORN) Comments re. MIPR Control Provisions and Guidance. Ref item 4: Changes in purpose scope or desired results, etc. must be approved by the GRILL FLAME Committee vice the Primary Contractor Monitor. Refer comment paras 3g and 4g above.

SECRET