Approved For Release 2000/40-2014-CIA-RDP61S00527A000200080002-6

23 December 1950

MERCHANUM FOR: Chief, Leonomic Research Area

THROUGH:

Chief, Plenning and Review Staff

THROUGH:

Chief, Services Division

THROUGH:

Chief, Transportation Branch

THROUGH:

Chief, Industrial Bivision

THROUGH:

Chief, thipbuilding breach

FROM:

25X1A9a

SUBJECT:

OFR Project 00.2430. Repolation of Difference in Values of Construction and Esports of Dry Cargo Vessels, 1950-57, RER, Found in CRR Reports RR 125 and RA 39.

- The subject project was initiated to investigate the discrepancies in the subject reports in the volume of dry cargo vessels built and imported by the USER.
 - the principal findings were as follows:
 - (a) HB 125 isoluded all merchant-type vessels built or imported by the USSR regardless of size or type and assumed that all such construction at the time of delivery was for the USSA maritims fleet. The term maritime fleet included all service of oceangoing, constal, Caspien Sea, and Denube fleats. Estelligence has shown that some vessels were assigned to service outside the maritime fleet as maval envillaries, research vessels, cable layers, and the like, immediately upon delivery from the shipbuilding yard or after a period of operation with the maritime fleet.
 - (b) Report BA 39 included only dry cargo vensels over 1,000 gross register toes built and imported by the USER and assigned to the presugating fleet only, excluding the Caspian Sea and Bumbe River fleets of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet. This report also

Approved For Release 2000/08/26 CIA-RDP61S00527A000200080002-6

SUBJECT: OHR Project 00.2490. Heschution of Difference in Volume of Construction and Reports of Dry Carso Vessels, 1990-97, USSE, Found in ORR Reports IR 125 and IA 39.

service immediately upon delivery from the shipbuilding yers, or trunshered from maritims to non-maritime service during the early years of the report. This report, however, does include some vessels which were uttherews from maritime service in the later years of the report.

- (c) The lack of firs intelligence precludes at exact listing of vessels allocated for service outside of the ocean-going fleet of the Soviet Ministry of the Maritime Fleet in either report.
- (d) In some cases differences were attributed to the credited year of delivery of a vessel. In one report a vessel would be listed as delivered in a designated year which the other report sould credit delivery to the previous or following year, as the case may be. This mitiation arose principally with vessels that were delivered close to the end of a year from a shipperd, therean, from an operational standpoint, the vessel became operational at the beginning of the following year. These differences affected current year totals only and balanced out over time so that my adjustment is believed messessing at this time.

i. Meccassendation

- (a) Despite the fact that the difference in approach can be explained there is still course for confusion in the wording of the tests. A more careful wording that clearly defined the limits of each paper say have availed confusion. Moreover, a clear coordination may have brought cut this factor also. These factors should be considered in future papers.
- (b) Should it be considered necessary to issue a corrigendum to either or both of these reports it in suggested that a single corrigendum be issued to holders of both reports and worded as follows:

Report PM 125 sham estimated volume end value of vessels of all classes and sizes built and imported by the RES ostensibly for service

Approved For Release 2000/08/26 CIA-RDP61S00527A000200080002-6

SUBJECT: ORN Project 00.2430. Reschution of Difference in Volume of Construction and Deports of Dry Cargo Vennels, 1950-57, USSE, Found in ORR Reports IR 125 and FA 39.

that some of these vessels were allocated for service outside of the maritime fleet as neval suriliaries, remearch vessels, cable layers, and the like, immediately upon delivery from the shipbuilding yard or after a period of service with the maritime fleat. This report, therefore, includes all of the maritime-type vessels constructed and imported by the UNER regardless of accignment.

Heport NA 39 shows the estimated number and volume (in gross register tons and in cargo carrying capacity in tons) of dry cargo vessels over 1,000 grt built and imported by the USSR and assigned to the decemping maritime fleet excluding Campion Set and Dambe River fleets. Therefore, all references in the report to vessels built or imported by the USSR for the maritime fleet exclude maritime-type vessels which were assigned to other services either immediately upon delivery from the silpbuilding yard or withdrawn in the early years of the report from maritime services, but include: some vessels which were withdrawn from maritime service in the later years of the report.

In both reports the lack of firm intelligence precludes an exact listing of vessels assigned outside of the ocean-going fleet of the Soviet Ministry of the Extiline Fleet.

<u>25X1A9a</u>

Distribution:

Original & 1 - Addressee

1 - St/PR

1 - D/3

1 - S/TR

1 - D/I

T.MILT