29 May 1968 \$G-68/215

MEMORANDUM FOR: C/Information Processing Staff/OPPB

SUBJECT : Draft Five-Year ADP Plan

- 1. This is to refterate some of the comments made in our recent IPC meeting, and to mention some specifics which you might note and incorporate in a revised draft if feasible.
- 2. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS: While we all agreed that the tenor of the total presentation of the Agency Five-Year Plan is very well balanced, I feel that the order of presentation for the high level reader is bound to disturb him. The projected growth rates (which do not seem at all inordinate for CIA, which is assentially an information processing organization) will be read first, and most probably out of context. If you can work up a few pungent sentences to show that what follows in the way of projected trends should not be viewed with alarm you will be doing us all a very great service.
- 3. Page 3. Major ADP systems speaks to a partial list of major new and expanded ADP systems, which could imply that the figure cited in dollars and man years are devoted only to new developments, while in fact we know that your figures include all on-going operations as well as new applications.
- 4. On page 9 under "An Agency ADP Program", you state that only one-third of our ADP, the cost of the Office of Computer Services, is readily identifiable in the IPSE program category. This is certainly not true, or less true. In the context of the most recent Program Call. All of the CS ADP was covered under the IPSE program category.
- 5. Page 13. Major Agency ADP Projects by Priority. As noted in our meeting, we can not see the CRS document and information storage and retrieval systems being ranked as moderate instead of top priority, nor can we see the PBIS, TOD, or COINS being rated as moderate rather than marginal in priority. Nor can the CS accept the notion that the FI/D PARACEPT processing system should be ranked below the afore mentioned as marginal if promising sources develop. In my view, the probable success of the PARACEPT system, including the assumption that pertinent data will be acquired and used, certainly exceeds the expectations for COINS if not the other items mentioned. Re. FI/D PARACEPT,

the chart showing alternatives in terms of dollar reductions should show a difference between 4.0 million and 3.7 million from full system to optimum, since taking optimum down to 3.0 million will preclude the OCF and, in effect, leave us with what we have now. The same goes for the austerity figure.

- 6. As for the specific recommendations on Page 24, Paras. c, d, and e, I am sure you understood and sympathized with our point that management of Agency ADP has reached the level of management overkill already, and that more exacting reporting procedures and approval mechanisms will be counter-productive. On the other hand, If more explicit detail on Agency ADP programs must be developed, we certainly would prefer this to be done within the Agency Program Call and Budget structure, rather than as a separate exercise.
- 7. Page 27: RED. Please note that RID does not conduct ADP research.
- 8. Page 31: Figure 9. Your chart for FY 1969 shows 5.4 million, which includes 850K for new equipment, field microfilming (100K), and keypunch purchases of 110K. We have been moved for various reasons to strike those increases in that year, and if you plan to change the chart, it would bring that bar down to around the 4.3 figure.

25X1A

9. Page 37: Plans Directorate. If you want to change the figures, the last sentence of Paragraph 1. should read: this objective contemplates the data base of seven 1/2 million index records, over 1 million documents or 3.5 million pages, and performance of 1,000 document retrievals and 4,000 name searches daily, plus major additional processing. The third paragraph under "the RID Central Retrieval System" should be changed to read, in the second sentence, the first two subsystems are operational and the third will be operational in 1972. 25X1A

cc:	25X <u>1A</u>
1-C/FID/TPB .	
1-IPC/DDS&T	
1-IPC/DDS	

1-IPC/DDI