

FILE *Training 3-1* 5 DEC 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Missions and Programs Staff,
DD/P

SUBJECT: Bureau of the Budget Reduction in the
COT Program

1. Thank you for your memo of 2 December on this subject. As you are aware, the Bureau of the Budget authorized an increase of 50 positions as against the 105 requested for expansion of the COT program, and provided funds for these positions in their original budget mark. The BOB cut \$487,500 of COT funds with the explanation that in a lean year language training should be scheduled within existing training priorities rather than stretching the COT training period at the salary costs requested. The Bureau also raised the question which the DCI himself raised when authorizing us to budget for the longer cycle, i. e. there must be alternatives for getting language training for DD/P COT groups without building up our in-house training costs beyond those now existing.

2. During the review of the budget, the Director asked Col. White to re-examine the need and the DD/S was advised that, while the Director approved the budgeting for salary costs for COT language study in FY 1968, he had not specifically approved the expansion of the COT program or the proposed language extension approach. In turn, the Executive Director, in his earlier approval of the language program for FY 68, had placed the caveat "subject to available funds." If the BOB mark stands, it may, unfortunately, be necessary for him to exercise that option.

3. As you are aware, these matters are integral to the entire issue of age hump, long range planning, etc., as well as the immediate appeal issues. Indeed, it may be more practical to use some of the funds provided for the 50 position expansion of the COT program in FY 68 to accommodate some part of the language requirement. This is particularly true if we are unable to recruit the COTs for these added positions, and I understand there may be difficulties in doing so. There will be options of this kind open to us, and DD/P along with OTR may wish to examine the practicality of this alternative.

4. In regard to paragraph 3 of your memo, unless the Bureau restores the funds, the language approach to which your memo addresses itself will have to be considered in a reprogramming context or dropped.

5. Let me assure you that Colonel White and I have marshaled all the arguments for appeal. Thank you for your help. How the BOB acts under the hard directions given by the President on the budget remains to be seen. I hope it is in our favor; we'll do our best.

(signed) John M. Clarke

John M. Clarke
Director of Planning,
Programming and Budgeting

cc: DD/S

STAT