

~~SECRET~~  
16 March 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Special Assistant to the DDI  
for Special Projects

SUBJECT: Comments on Your Review of the  
IG Requirements Report

1. In general, I think you have done a fine job of refocusing, rewording, and making more meaningful the original recommendations of the IG. OCR, being an information processor and not essentially a producer, is not directly concerned with the majority of the recommendations. Therefore, in the case of those recommendations where I could see no way to make a meaningful change in, or addition to, your efforts, I will not offer any comment. These include Recommendation Nos. 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, and 27.

2. On the balance of the recommendations, I have the following comments:

Nos. 1 and 2 - I think your approach to this haunting priorities problem is sound, and I am particularly interested in the exclusion or negative list as yet another means of getting at this problem of reducing requirements. Let me suggest that a further way to enforce an exclusion list is to cease dissemination to analysts of incoming intelligence responsive to requirements which have been designated superfluous and unnecessary. Since OCR handles the major portion of the dissemination and distribution of nontechnical intelligence within the Agency, we can play a role in this matter. Even if USIB were found unwilling to go along with some of our exclusions, we could at least stop the flow of the resulting material into the CIA production complex.

Nos. 8 and 26 - Let me start by saying that I cannot wholly agree that the organizational location of CGS is largely irrelevant to the problem of its effectiveness. The fact that CGS is located in the DDI, as opposed to a level above both the DDI and DDS&T, does probably affect its acceptability as a mechanism to be utilized by S&T offices. By the same token, I do not

SECRET

-2-

suggest that the problem is insurmountable nor that a working relationship between DDI and DDS&T can not be achieved. I think the most important aspect of the matter here is to insure that CGS plays a meaningful role as a broker between the collection and production functions, encouraging contact, assisting in the proper channeling of requirements, pointing up duplication, sampling and monitoring responsiveness, and in general, assisting the line authorities in helping to control and validate their requirements. A staff which attempts to do more, namely to insert itself into the decision-making chain, will succeed, I fear, only in confusing the effort and forcing both collector and producer into a pattern of circumvention.

I am in favor of your proposal for an advisory group, and indeed suggest that you consider expanding it to include OCR. We are striving currently to retaylor our operations to make them more responsive to the priority needs of the production offices, and, as a major processor, we form a vital link between collector and producer. I think we can play a useful and necessary role in the deliberations of such a group, possibly furnishing information on patterns of incoming flow and dissemination of materials available from no other source. Further, I feel for our operations to be most responsive to production needs, it is important that we be aware of the production office requirements problem. I urge the DDI's earnest consideration of this proposal.

No. 9 - I have no quarrel with your modification of this proposal. An equally, if not more important problem, it seems to me, is to insure the rotation of personnel of CGS with those of the production offices on a routine basis to fight against the problem of creating a permanent cadre of staff officers who, as time goes by, become more and more separated from the line production problems. I submit that a two-year hitch on this staff should be the maximum and that the staffing of it be handled as a matter of course by the DDI Career Service Board.

No. 13 - So long as initiation of meaningful collection guides does not rest solely with CGS, I agree. I think all three parties, that is, collector, CGS, and producer, have a stake in these guides and any party should have the option of initiating action.

SECRET

SECRET

-3-

Nos. 24 and 25 - Your rewording is obviously less specific and more practical. Here again, as in the case of Nos. 8 and 26, I think that this office could assist the production offices in validating requirements by helping to insure that responsive information is not available and in sampling the responsiveness of the nontechnical sources which we process. These four recommendations, 8, 24, 25, and 26, are all part of the same problem, and I think we can participate in attempting to solve them.

25X1A9a

[Redacted Signature]

Deputy Director of Central Reference

SECRET