

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

# Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Executive for Administration & Management

DATE: 4 November 1947

FROM : Assistant Director for Collection & Dissemination

SUBJECT: Comments on Management Branch Survey and Proposed Reorganization of OCD

1. In early October the Chief of the Management Branch delivered to this Office a survey study of OCD made by his Branch, including recommendations relative to changes in functions and procedures for the Office. The study and recommendations have been carefully studied. The considered conclusion of this Office is that the recommendations are not wholly practicable or desirable. A detailed discussion with recommendations are in the following paragraphs.

2. It is well understood that the first step in any survey should be a complete and objective determination of facts. In an effort to assure that the present survey would result in well established facts, OCD provided every possible access and facility for the survey team, even to the extent of interference with important work. This was felt justified by the hope that the survey might disclose opportunities to supplement the steps already initiated by OCD to increase over-all efficiency. In addition, the survey team was invited and urged to review with this Office all findings of presumed fact before undertaking to draw conclusions from them. It is regretted that the latter offer was not exploited, for it is now clear that the determination of facts has been neither complete nor fully accurate. OCD is prepared to demonstrate this; however, an exhaustive demonstration should not be necessary, as one or two illustrations will make clear. For example, the report states that no action has been taken by the Requirements Branch in the field of general requirements - whereas OCD can show that Requirements Branch has taken extensive action in this field. The report states that ORE prepares the first draft of Dissemination Orders - whereas these drafts are in fact prepared exclusively by the Dissemination Branch of OCD. The report states that the Requirements Branch has made a study "to determine collection potential" - whereas the true purpose of the study was not to determine collection potential, but rather to determine the amount and importance of information for which ORE can anticipate a need.

3. The nature of such statements in the report makes it difficult to place suitable reliance on the conclusions. Nevertheless, the ideas for improvement have been carefully considered by OCD, and certain of them have been accepted and applied, as will be illustrated in paragraphs 4 and 5, below.

4. a. The survey report lends weight to a belief which OCD had also arrived at: to-wit, that collection and dissemination action in the case of requests for documents might be speeded up. A Requirements Branch study of this problem disclosed three significant facts:

(1) There have been avoidable delays in the transmission of such requests to OCD.

NO CHANGE in Class. ☐

(2) There have been avoidable delays in OCD in acting on such of the requests as were not limited by deadlines.

DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: ☐

DDA Memo, 4 Apr 77

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

Date: 24 Feb 78 By: ORZ

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

(3) The delays have not been important, since requested documents have systematically been provided within the time limits set by the requesters themselves, and the latter have uniformly expressed satisfaction with the timeliness. Nevertheless, the delays were objectionable to this Office and offered an easy target for uninformed or hostile criticism.

b. OCD has accordingly revised its internal procedure so as to eliminate undesirable elements of delay in processing the "Transfer Type" requests, and to accomplish them by direct informal action when possible. ("Transfer Type" is the term used in OCD to denote a request whose solution consists of the picking up of a document in one part of Washington and delivering it in another.) The resulting short cuts apply to approximately 75% of those operating problems falling within the routine class. The results have greatly reduced the time to complete a request and have already drawn complimentary comments from researchers. There remain two external elements of this problem to be corrected:

(1) Delay within ORE. This will be the subject of direct discussion with ORE after the element in (2), below, has been adjusted.

(2) Relationship between ORE, the Reference Center and OCD. OCD has drafted a procedure, including the use of a form designed to insure rapid progress of each ORE Transfer Type request through the Reference Center to OCD. Only those requests which cannot be satisfied by the Reference Center from material already on file in CIA will be transmitted to OCD. This procedure, which is intended to apply also to requests from OO and OSO, has been forwarded to your office with Reference Center concurrence. If the requesters are satisfied with the loan of items, the procedure should eliminate many requests to OCD. When the work load is actually determined it will be possible to assign collection personnel accordingly.

5. Other examples of beneficial adjustments made are as follows:

a. Adequacy check procedure has been revised so that personal contacts by survey officers will ordinarily be made only when a recipient makes a positive report of dissatisfaction on the blank form provided him automatically at the time of dissemination. Heretofore, personal contact (generally by telephone) had also been made when the requester failed to return the blank form and thus left OCD without evidence as to his satisfaction. These contacts also provided a needed opportunity for working out details of procedure with a wide circle of requesters. Many misunderstandings were eliminated and steady improvement was brought about in the precision with which requesters stated their needs. In view of favorable progress to date, this feature of survey activity can now be reduced to contacts with the dissatisfied customers and to such new contacts as are needed to discuss requirements problems.

b. A few elements of Collection Branch procedure were found to duplicate unnecessarily certain functions which are responsibilities of the Requirements Branch and which it performs with high efficiency. These duplications were of

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

the trivial character which might logically be expected during the early period of trial and development in a new organization. They stemmed chiefly from minor misunderstandings and personal factors which have since disappeared, and they in no way justified the assertion in the survey report that the Collection Branch duplicates the receiving, coordinating, processing, or defining of requirements. This is discussed further in par. 6 b, below. All undesirable duplication has been eliminated. A former source of minor duplication, and a measure of OCD's success in eliminating it, are illustrated by two samplings conducted by OCD. The first, conducted in March before the Requirements Branch had completed the indoctrination of requesters described in a, above, showed that the Collection Branch performed major editing on 15% of the requests which had passed through Requirements Branch. The Requirements Branch promptly took remedial action; and a recently completed sampling, applying to all ORE document requests solved between 5 June and 28 July, shows that need for substantial editing by the Collection Branch has been eliminated.

6. a. The chief problem raised by the survey will now be discussed: i.e., the proposal for a major reorganization of OCD. Unfortunately, the survey report tends to regard the elementary routine transactions as the full and only business of OCD. The simplicity of the routine problems has long been recognized by OCD and - as pointed out in par. 4 b, above - such streamlining as is considered consistent with security and common sense has been effected. These routine problems appear statistically important, since they currently make up about 75% of the requirement requests received; however, in reality they account for much less than 50% of the important work load. For example, a routine requirement directive may be cleared by the Requirements Branch in a matter of minutes; whereas a single non-routine requirement directive recently issued by this Office necessitated weeks of preliminary coordination by that Branch. It resulted in 237 separate collection and dissemination obligations. It offered security hazards and policy complications for which no means of solution is apparent in the reorganization suggested in the survey report.

b. A major premise of the survey report is the idea that the Collection Branch's processing of a request duplicates operations already performed by the Requirements Branch, and therefore the operations by both Branches could best be centered in one collection desk. However, this premise is not consistent with the facts. A quick sampling of the log of actions taken by Requirements Branch in response to follow-up queries initiated by requesters has disclosed that Collection Branch became involved in only 36% of the cases, and more than half of these 36% involved the Dissemination Branch or other outside offices as well as Collection. Thus, a transfer of the requirement function to Collection Branch would immediately involve that Branch in tasks entirely outside its scope in 64% of all such cases, and at least partially outside its scope in 84% of all cases. Moreover, the sampling showed that in several of the instances where Collection Branch was involved with the requester, the collector's tendency was to discourage or oppose the requester's wishes whenever the problem offered complications or unusual collection difficulties. The Requirements Branch constitutes an impartial and invaluable buffer between the naturally opposing points of view of the man who wants a job done, and the man who has to do it.

c. The report of survey fails to distinguish clearly between the flow of work and the partially parallel flow of related papers; it fails to distinguish between the transmission of orders for action and the transmission of copies for

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

convenience; and it fails especially to show a grasp of the full magnitude and scope of the staff problems which constitute the bulk of the Requirements Branch work load. These problems are inescapable, no matter how CIA may be organized; and no other organization for handling them so far suggested offers a degree of efficiency equal to that with which they are now handled by the Requirements Branch. As OCD is now organized, the Assistant Director and Deputy are free from details, but they have the necessary controls to keep informed of the work load and special problems which confront the Branches. To make intelligent decisions it is fundamental that they know the workings of their Branches. They employ the aid of the three Branch Chiefs in determining policies, programs, and procedures. The administrative details are handled by the tiny administrative staff in the Assistant Director's Office, while the controlling operational details are concentrated in the Requirements Branch, where they fit because of their natural relationship to staff functions of the Requirements Branch. Thus, it is primarily the Requirements Branch which relieves the Assistant Director and his Deputy of details. There are additional operating details peculiar respectively to the functions of the Collection and Dissemination Branches, but these ordinarily do not occupy the attention of the Assistant Director and Deputy except when a Branch Chief voluntarily appeals for assistance or advice. This whole system has been thoroughly tried out by a group of professional intelligence officers who find it completely reliable in safeguarding the responsibilities and operations of CIA with a completeness not at all evident in the proposed reorganization.

7. a. A full discussion of the proposed reorganization and new procedure would lead to an undesirable debate on details. In substance, the proposal is to abolish the Requirements Branch and replace it by an administrative staff limited to five people, none of them professionals. The resulting inadequacy would be compensated for by abolishing, transferring, or ignoring, former Requirements Branch functions which do not conveniently fit the proposed reorganization. OCD regards the missing functions as essential ones which - despite their theoretical abolition or transfer - would still have to be performed by someone in OCD under the pressure of daily reality. The inevitable result would be to overwhelm the Assistant Director with details, and leave him confronted with responsibilities and urgent decisions far beyond the capabilities of his reduced organization to solve.

b. Once a sound statement of functions is agreed upon, it is not difficult to design an organization; and thereafter the organization itself can usually evolve sound procedures to carry out the assigned functions. In the present instance, the survey report offers what OCD regards as a defective statement of functions; and on the basis of this defective statement a new organization is proposed, with an entire new operating procedure worked out in such extreme detail, for example, as specifying that a certain paper shall be handed to a clerk at a certain point in its progress. It would hardly seem appropriate that professional effort of CIA should be required for prolonged consideration of a procedure in which the handing of a paper to a clerk is regarded as a noteworthy link in intelligence operations. In any event, details of this type should not be discussed before the major differences of opinion as to function have been eliminated.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

g. The proposed new statement of functions repeats many of the present OCD functions, but is noteworthy chiefly for those which have been omitted. The most significant omissions are cited below by underlined words in parentheses. In addition, certain of the functions which have been continued in effect are also cited below, but without underlining, for ease of comparison with the omitted (underlined) functions:

(1) (By continual surveys and contacts among the federal agencies concerned with national security, ascertains what intelligence information and intelligence they need but cannot supply from their respective sources.)

(2) (In accordance with the requirements determined as a result of the foregoing surveys and contacts) determines the collection and dissemination requirements for intelligence information and intelligence to meet needs not currently satisfied . . .

(3) (Determines whether collection and dissemination accomplished by CIA action has been adequate to satisfy requirements of authorized agencies).

(4) Insures prompt and adequate dissemination of intelligence material to all federal intelligence agencies; in such dissemination safeguards the security classification of CIA intelligence materials in accordance with prescribed security policies.

d. From the text of g, above, it is clear that while OCD would be responsible for assuring that intelligence requirements of authorized federal agencies are satisfied by adequate dissemination, it would at the same time be deprived of the authority either to ascertain what those requirements are or to check upon the adequacy of the disseminations made to satisfy them. Especially paradoxical is the situation revealed by g (2), above, which shows that while OCD would be expected to determine collection and dissemination requirements, it would not be permitted to ascertain the needs which are the indispensable basis for such determination. What seems to have been overlooked is that several ascertained requirements may lead to a determination of the necessity for only a single collection action, or possibly for none; and that a single collected item may subsequently become the subject of several disseminations made to satisfy needs which are systematically ascertained. The whole issue at this point is fundamental. It rests on a statement in par. I A 1 a of Exhibit IV in the report of survey, where the problem of ascertaining intelligence requirements is extenuated in the following words: "ORE is basically charged with developing intelligence requirements, while ICAPS has primary responsibility for coordinating CIA activity with federal intelligence agencies." ORE is, indeed, responsible for developing certain intelligence requirements. The Requirements Branch systematically ascertains from ORE its current requirements, its general requirements, and the NIR, as rapidly as they are developed. However, there are important distinctions between national intelligence requirements and departmental intelligence requirements: ORE is not charged with ascertaining the intelligence

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

FOIAb3b1

requirements which the departments and agencies may have but cannot satisfy from their own resources, but the Requirements Branch is so charged. This function is being accomplished regularly for the benefit of OSO, for the Contact Branch of OO, for establishment of [REDACTED] weekly and daily targets, and for coordination of agency requirements to fit into the CIA requirements produced by ORE. Furtherance of this function to include other than the IAC agencies has been restricted to date by work load and lack of personnel. Development of the Central Requirement File has been similarly hampered. However, these cannot be considered as functions of ORE. Ask ORE itself if it would accept them! The coordinated ascertainment of requirements of all types, and their screening at a central point, are indispensable functions which should not be divorced from the Office which is charged with collection and dissemination. ICAPS is responsible for coordinating policy and plans, but has no connection with operating matters.

2. As presented, the proposed new organization has a deficiency which could readily result in routine compliance with requests from insecure U. S. organizations or even from organizations secretly representing unfriendly foreign powers. This deficiency is not readily observed, since Exhibit IV states "The functions of the Collection Branch have been increased to include the initial processing of collection requests formerly accomplished by Requirements Branch." However, careful examination of the detailed procedures presented in Exhibits V and VI shows that the processing accomplished by the Requirements Branch has in fact not been included anywhere. Specifically, full responsibility for the varied analysis of a request is apparently placed in one person in step #18 in Exhibit V, yet no provision has been made for accomplishing the following tasks, which are the indispensable prerequisites in every determination of collection and dissemination requirements:

- (1) Determining whether fulfillment of the request is an acceptable CIA obligation under NSC policies.
- (2) Determining whether dissemination to the particular requester is permissible under applicable security policies.
- (3) Rejecting those requests which should not be approved.
- (4) Determining priorities of approved requests and resolving conflicts of priorities when necessary.
- (5) Determining the operating category of an approved request, and determining whether it is a problem for dissemination only, or for collection and dissemination jointly, or for collection, research and dissemination jointly.
- (6) Establishing and supervising any special controls which should be exercised during satisfaction of the requirement.
- (7) Reviewing the action, when complete, and reopening or taking other appropriate action in case the requester is not satisfied.

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

f. OCD feels that any effort of the proposed Collection Branch to handle the above seven functions could not be efficient. The suggested Central Control Section contains no professional personnel, and the amount of detail involved would be too great for the Chief, Collection Branch, to perform in person. The functions require specialized attention of personnel familiar with the applicable NSC policies, legal provisions, and security policies, and can ordinarily be performed quickly and in stride by people who are already expert in studies of this kind. To perform these functions efficiently, an entirely new type of personnel would have to be developed for the Collection Branch, and in the long run that Branch would have to be augmented in the same amount by which the Requirements Branch would be reduced. In addition, the functions are - by their very nature - not appropriate to the Collection Branch. If they are concentrated there the collection desk will naturally develop itself into two functions: i.e., one which does the present requirement functions, and the other which does the collection functions. At present there is a clear distinction of functions so that requests which arrive in the Collection Branch are clear, authenticated and ready for pure collection action. A close association of these functions will develop a tendency to disallow or reject requirements which impose especially awkward or difficult collection problems. Moreover, to authorize the Collection Branch to make final decisions which would have a conclusive effect upon the Dissemination Branch would inevitably lead to friction between those Branches.

g. Finally, the proposed new organization makes no provision for accomplishing the important staff functions which are not part of the work load stemming from requests received, but which stem from other causes and occupy more than 50% of the professional time of the Requirements Branch and the Assistant Director's office. This omission rests upon a sentence in par. I A 1 a of Exhibit IV of the survey, which states that the "OCD surveys within federal departments has (sic) to some extent duplicated ICAPS' efforts and has discouraged working level liaison between the ORE researcher and his departmental counterpart." This statement is not concurred in, and it may also be pointed out that prevention of duplication between ICAPS and OCD is an executive problem which should offer little difficulty. The OCD surveys and staff studies have been devoted primarily to matters falling exclusively within OCD's operating field: where they in any way affected interdepartmental coordination at the policy or broad planning level, ICAPS has been kept fully informed and coordination effected so as to avoid interference or duplication. Rather than constituting a function that can be eliminated, these Requirements Branch surveys and staff studies are performed principally at the direction of higher office, or at the request of other Assistant Directors. For example, out of 25 such surveys started by written directive of this Office, 7 were originated in OCD upon the decision of the Assistant Director. The remaining 18 were performed in compliance with orders or requests as follows: the Director - 1; Deputy Director - 1; Executive Director - 2; [REDACTED] - 1; Executive for 25X1A9a A & M - 1; ICAPS - 3; I & S - 2; OO - 5; ORE - 1; and JIOA - 1. Under the proposed reorganization the Assistant Director would have no facilities for executing these time-consuming and difficult staff problems. They continue to arise constantly, under the pressure of directive from higher office or daily operating necessity, and their volume is by no means fully represented by the 25 formally assigned problems listed above. The Requirements Branch, upon its own initiative,

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0

or in response to informal telephone requests, or in response to oral or written instructions from higher authority, is constantly occupied with pressing problems of this character in addition to its routine business of acting upon the daily flow of written requests for intelligence material.

8. OCD's consideration of this problem has been in much greater detail than summarized above, and the supporting analyses are available for discussion as appropriate. However, the above appears sufficient to substantiate fully the following conclusions:

a. The statements offered as fact in the survey are in many instances incomplete, misleading, or incorrect.

b. The recommendations offered in the survey are based on a false application of functions and a lack of appreciation of the full scope and complexity of many OCD problems.

c. The statement of OCD functions approved and issued by the Director on 15 October 1947, is sound and well confirmed by more than a year's operating experience.

d. Procedure and organization should be adjusted in accordance with mature judgment to meet changing conditions disclosed during operations. Systematic evolution would be frustrated by sudden, immature or revolutionary changes of functions.

e. The proposed reassignments of functions and reorganization are undesirable and impracticable, and would result in:

(1) The ignoring of essential operating functions and the failure to provide working machinery to exercise them, or the assigning of them to ORE, where they would be inappropriate and unwanted, or to ICAPS, where all operating functions are inappropriate.

(2) The combining of certain procedures which operating experience shows are best accomplished separately.

(3) The losing of professionals capable of making the statistical analysis of intelligence requirements and results required for use in corrective studies.

9. Nevertheless, the survey has been helpful in bringing to light a number of opportunities for improving the efficiency of operations. Some of the improvements have already been made and others are under study. Meanwhile, the following steps are recommended for progressive development of the organization to meet evolving operating needs:

a. On completion of the present review, the survey report to be filed for future reference as desirable.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Approved For Release 2000/08/22 : CIA-RDP61-00274A000200190015-0



**CONFIDENTIAL**

b. The functions assigned to OCD and its Branches by the Director on 15 October to be continued in effect.

c. Cognizance be taken of the expedited and simplified execution of the routine simple requests now termed "Transfer Type."

d. Executive Office approval be given to the procedure recommended by OCD, with Reference Branch concurrence, for processing "Transfer Type" requests through the Reference Branch, and thence to OCD when collection action remains to be accomplished. Also, approve the forms recommended to facilitate this procedure.


e. The Dissemination Order forms requested by OCD so as to eliminate present need for individual typing of these orders to be approved and printed.

f. OCD to observe any change in the proportion of "Transfer Type" requests, as compared with the other more complicated types, resultant from using the Reference Branch procedure; and to recommend any desirable reorganization or reallocation of personnel.

g. OCD to continue its over-all examination of procedure within the three Branches; to simplify where considered necessary and practicable; and whenever operating experience shows the necessity therefor, to recommend appropriate changes in Branch organization. In this work, OCD will be pleased to have the benefits of the experience of Management personnel to arrive at the simplest procedures commensurate with the practical execution of OCD's functions.

h. As reviews and recommendations occur, consider the changes of personnel requested on the basis of the work load to be carried in the foreseeable future.

25X1A9a

  
Assistant Director for  
Collection and Dissemination

25X1A9a

cc: 

**CONFIDENTIAL**