

MEMORANDUM FOR:

S.

Notes from
Meeting for my Chrono,
J.

STAT

Date

- Vulnerable decisions

- IMAGER 5 MIV

[Redacted]

STAT

- DCI MGT./NFIP COMPOSITION
- congressional release criteria

[Redacted]

STAT

- HF (multi-year program).
- ICS - how did we do?
- anti language / OMB ineptitude

[Redacted]

STAT

Piece on lack
for T.

1. Guidance

a. How detailed should guidance be?

b. Currently calls for content of programs, studies, data

c. Want to give PM's good starts of directions, incentives,

(Quasi pressures may make this impossible)

d. What makes it easier to pursue DCI goals? Dollar range is one way.

e. How to make guidance a preview of program review. Announce issues.

f. Articulating what DCI really wants to do.

2. Program Review - what is role?
Three ways NFIP spends \$.
By intent -
a) investment
b) speculation
c) insurance

STAT

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

Nat/TAC - what are sensible ways to define criteria by which things can be categorized as NAT or TAC.

Personnel -

Three types of staff activities,

- time dominated \Rightarrow high structure

- non-time dominated \Rightarrow task structure

- non-recurring efforts

High level of official interaction.

Individual on staffs should expect high level of interaction with front office; bring in office leads when interaction involves commit of time/effort.

Staff Goals

Review Dyan:

a) expectations / what was possible

- run budget process as a timely, credible, rational process

- provide good foundations for decisions, provide good alternatives. (option broadening).

- pose answers to DCI "ultimate" questions

b) results

- really wound up with real alternatives, espec. major

- articulated "strategic" reasons for decisions (eg. imp. collection systems Soviets don't understand).

- mechanics went very well - on time, presentable drew praise. DCI perception

is that DCI felt budget has been

institutionalized.

JEK expectations,

- experience a bit of a bureaucratic nightmare
- problems intractable & tough but interesting.

Σ expectations were low.

Results

- satisfied but not content w mechanical process. (particularly follow-up, tracking & instt. memory)
- analytic - more deeply into systems than ultimate questions & strategies.
- staff has been a pleasure. Obvious professionalism. Non-selection of staff not a problem.
- Did do some hard things: some people left

who wanted to stay.
Changes made w/o disruption.

Overall satisfied that hard job was done and there is lots of promise for future.

Goals for coming year:

- Do as well on demonstrated competence - the budget.
- take advantage of start we have on better analytical support
- how much can we move anal. support for DCI closer to dealing to ultimate questions.
- deal with PM rankings in a more activist way. Combine them more meaningfully.
- followup established to insure DCI taken seriously.
- work should be done!!!

Role of DCI: Evolving since 1947; differs
over time & by DCI.

- prevent Pearl Harbor; insure info avail to military finds its way into policy hands.
- insure diverse viewpoints are heard
- serve as a "funding focal point" (includes but not limited to insuring efficient allocation).