

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

27 April 1950

25X1A9a

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Comments on D/FE Monthly Report for March 1950

1. Explanatory Notes.

- a. We are in general ^{25X1A} agreement with D/FE's comments and had, in fact, discussed them with [REDACTED] at the time they were prepared. WJM saw a copy at that time.
- b. D/Pub was aware of the fact that, in both of the cases cited, there were some details that were out of date. The estimates reportedly remained valid.
- c. In the case of 7-50 an "uncoordinated" copy was sent to the requester as IM-273. This was done in the midst of the coordination process. The paper was then delayed on orders of AD/R&E but subsequently released for final coordination and publication. The paper was revised, however, and up-dated to 16 February 1950 - Published 20 March.
- d. 19-50 was a case where uncoordinated copies were required by the requester on short notice - with coordinated edition to follow. Because of the nature of the subject-matter ("Reports of Soviet Military Activity...") obsolescence was very rapid. Reports received subsequent to the cut-off date of 20 March tended, however, to confirm the estimate and a note to this effect appears in the final publication.
- e. The reference to "as little as two or three working days" for drafting is misleading if applied to the cases cited. Two full weeks were allowed the division in the case of 19-50. D/Pub edited, typed and reproduced in two days and delivered to requester. Copies went out to agencies for coordination on following day. 7-50 was initiated 21 December 1949 and draft was received in D/Pub 3 January 1950. It was sent to the agencies on the fourth working day after receipt (9 January). In addition, D/FE had five days for revising paper when it was decided to issue as ORE./
- f. The problems cited are most frequently encountered in papers on the Far East where the situation has been fluid for some time.
- g. In both of the cases cited, uncoordinated drafts were delivered on short notice. Urgent procedures were applied in delivering these copies on time. No similar urgency was required for the delivery of the coordinated edition. It is possible that in such cases the requirement has been satisfied when the uncoordinated draft has been delivered. The IM would then appear to be the appropriate medium. This was considered in the case of ORE 19-50 but not until the coordination process was already well along.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

It should be pointed out in this connection that DCI 3/1 par. 3 g (3) requires subsequent coordination of estimates that have been prepared under "exceptional circumstances" and delivered in uncoordinated form to the requester.

2. Summary of Comment.

a. Selection of medium. Where uncoordinated copies are requested, should the IM be used instead of the ORE? If a coordinated estimate (in IM form) is to follow, only two or three days would be saved by this procedure, unless urgent procedures were authorized for coordination of the project. The IM is the solution only if, upon investigation, it is found that the requester does not actually require subsequent coordination or if the subject matter does not justify ORE treatment.

b. Selection of material. Emphasis should be placed on the point that details which may quickly become outdated should not be included in ORE's unless they are absolutely necessary in support of the estimate. This should be checked by the editors. It is obvious that under our present procedures the average estimate would be out of date before publication if casual current references were included which are not essential to the general conclusions of the paper.

c. Authorization of urgent procedures. Does the inclusion of incidental detail subject to rapid obsolescence of itself justify the exceptional procedures in DCI 3/1 if there is not also present either (1) an urgent need for the estimate because of the critical and/or current situation to which it relates or (2) a fixed deadline prescribed by the requester? I would hesitate to recommend that we subject the agencies to excessive demands in cases where only some of the supporting detail might become outdated but where the estimate itself may be neither urgent nor subject to rapid change. The solution to this problem is largely editorial. Where details must be included, they can be revised either in the text or in footnotes in the final stages of coordination. It should be noted that this is, at best, cumbersome under present directives. (Updating did not seem feasible to D/TE in the case of 19-50.)

3. Recommendations.

a. Pending a more detailed study of the coordination process as outlined in DCI 3/1:

(1) D/Pub should consider with care the selection of media for estimates, especially where delivery of uncoordinated copies is requested. This should include a review of the original request to ascertain whether coordination is, in fact, desired.

(2) The Divisions, especially in areas as fluid as the Far East, should exercise care in the inclusion of details that may quickly become outdated and are not essential to the basic conclusions of the paper.

CONFIDENTIAL

(3) D/Pub editors should be alert to the problem noted in the above paragraph.

(4) Whenever justified by the subject matter or the deadline fixed by the requester, D/Pub should take steps to have urgent procedures authorized.

(5) Care should be exercised in the coordination process to make sure that the time lag is kept to an absolute minimum.

b. A careful study of experience with the coordination procedures prescribed in DCI 3/1 should be made with a view to recommending changes either in the procedures or their implementation or both.

CONFIDENTIAL