

~~SECRET~~

JAN 18 1950

Assistant Director, OGD

Assistant Director, ORE

Incorporation of Evaluations of CIA Information Reports Into CIA Library Reference File

References: Assistant Director, OGD memorandum of 28 December 1949, Subject as Above.

1. The procedure proposed by reference (a) is not concurred in.

2. The following comments are offered:

a. The subject evaluations are already available for future reference in two places--the office originating the report and the evaluating office.

b. The evaluations have been and still are used primarily as messages to the originating office. Therefore the comment is slanted to provide assistance to the collector of information, rather than information to the user of the report. Only occasionally do evaluation sheets bear information as to why the report is rated 2 or 3, and even 1 and 4 ratings are not always explained. The evaluation sheets also carry questions to the field, based on the report, that would be of little interest to the later user of the report.

c. To meet the library's need of two copies of each document evaluation would require that management furnish for the evaluators, in place of the current non-filmy forms, new forms in filmy in five or six copies per set, carton stacked. This would be necessary to permit a one-typing job, which is not feasible in five and six copies with the present forms. Further, even one typing would impose an additional work load in those instances when the evaluations are now simply penciled in triplicate. Finally, stapling and handling of more papers, while minute, when undertaken in volume will detract measurably from the time available for substantive work in analysis and evaluation.

d. The work load of the library would be heavily increased along these lines:

(1) Check all intelligence documents returned to insure evaluation attached; if missing, follow up and obtain.

(2) Remove one of the two stapled copies and set up a file or tickler system to insure that this duplicate evaluation is carried to the second library copy of the document when the latter is returned to the library.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

(3) Physically attach these duplicate evaluations to the second library copy of the document.

e. The imposition of the increased work load on both library and evaluators appears hardly justifiable on the basis of merely providing a third reference source where two already exist.

3. The alternative has been considered of having the evaluator simply stamp on the document under the "Return to Library" stamp a capsule evaluation such as "Content Evaluation --- ; --- (blank spaces to be filled in with appropriate letter and number, possibly using an endless type stamp permitting selection of letter and number desired.) However, this would impose upon the Library the task of stamping the second library copy upon its return, with all the concomitants of a tickler system and follow-up on documents not stamped. Further, it would require a plethora of new stamps throughout the O&S offices. Like the proposed procedure, this alternate possibility seems not justifiable in view of the existence of two reference sources of the evaluation.

25X1A9a

Assistant Director
Reports and Estimates

S/PP-PL.Br/VA/jw

Distribution:

Adm. Q&I

AD/ORS -2

S/PP -2

Mg. Br -1 ✓

SECRET