



New

Eval. function - function based

Gas tanks

Use - esteem

TV

\$ first

Search and quick rejection

Locate - deal with roadblocks

Emphasize

Creativity

Knowledge - Creativity

Not usually trade off

Better answers

Better quality, reliability cost

Lower weight

Why always under design

No matter how many engrs.

Create best environment

Cro/Bar

Decisions 3 shades gray

Sell market levels

Can't - sales - fix it

Perf. - eng. - fix it

Can - no profit cost - fix it

GM - lowest accountable

No one to delegate to

12 year gospel St. Smiddy

GM - gone & go

McCune - train engineers

\*(Boeing training 2000 engineers)

Use specialists

Questions:

Wouldn't I just assign another 100 engineers to it?

What is the difference between VE and good design engineering?

Isn't VE a crutch for poor training and a lack of experience?

Wouldn't varied work assignments under well-qualified people be the better long term solution?

Can you comment on need for modernized acctg. methods having greater definitions such as smaller and more specialized burden centers?

When "VE" an existing product, how do you overcome the "not invented here" complex?

How do you define "VE" and what makes it "new", bearing in mind that cost has always been a factor to be considered in design engineering.

\*(Mexico - 35%)

\*( ) not used - would have added.