DCI/IC 72-0333

# ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
## WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

INTELLIGENCE

2 8 APR 1972

Mr. Bronson Tweedy
Central Intelligence Agency
Room 7E22
Washington, D. C. 20505

Dear Bronson:

As you requested, I have reviewed the draft terms of reference for the NSCIC Working Group and have also solicited comments from DIA and the Joint Staff.

I find the draft acceptable in all respects except that concerning membership. As proposed, the Group would have ten full members plus a chairman. The chairman and five of the members would come from the intelligence community. I do not believe that a group that large can be effective in arriving at consensus; more fundamentally, I do not believe that its composition is suitable to attack the problem with the necessary objectivity.

The stated purpose of the NSCIC is "to give direction and guidance on national substantive intelligence needs and provide for a continuing evaluation of intelligence products from the viewpoint of the intelligence consumer" (underscoring mine). In other words, the NSCIC is to be user-oriented, and this orientation is reflected in its membership. I believe that if the Working Group is to be effective in serving as the action arm of the NSCIC, it should likewise be user-oriented, and that its membership should mirror that of the parent body. Accordingly, I would propose membership as follows:

> Representative of the Assistant to the President, Chairman
> Representative of the DCI
> Representative of the Attorney General
> Representative of the Under Secretary of State
> Representative of the Deputy Secretary of Defense
> Representative of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

I think this would give us a group more appropriate to reflect the user viewpoint and act as a working level arm of the NSCIC. Further, it is small enough to be manageable as a decision/recommendation body.

This proposal purposefully excludes the intelligence producers from membership. This is not intended to exclude them from staff participation in Working Group activities. Their analyses and viewpoints - particularly regarding their measurement of customer needs - are essential as inputs to our examinations of the problems we will attack. Extended dialog between the Working Group and the producer community is thus a requisite to our success in solving or improving these problems. To assist this dialog, I would have no objection to having key producers present at Working Group sessions, when called for by the agenda. However, I feel that they should not sit as members of a group intended to guide and evaluate their efforts. That role should be reserved for the users and managers of intelligence.

Sincerely,

Albert C. Hall

2