0 9 FEB 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Applications
Deputy Director for Processing
Chief, Management Staff

STAT

FROM : [   ]
Chief, Program and Budget Group

SUBJECT : ODP Terminal Allocations

STAT

1. On Friday, 2 February, I had a meeting with
[   ] DDA ADP Control Officer, to make sure
she had answers to all her questions about terminal
allocations. Her response to my request for DDA
FY 1981 terminal requirements was overdue. In this
meeting, which was originally scheduled by Helen for
Wednesday and then for Thursday, I explained to her that
ODP requirements would be handled separately and, there-
fore, she should not consider our terminal requirements
in FY 1979, 80 or 81 in determining the DDA FY 1981
requirements.

2. Background: In mid-November Helen had a meeting
of DDA ADP Control Officers to help coordinate responses
to OC's FY 1981 communication requirements and ODP's
processing requirements. I discussed the new terminal
requirement form and the reason for its use. In addition,
I passed out a draft copy of the form. On 30 November,
a memorandum, "FY 1981 Requirements for Computer Terminals"
was prepared for each Directorate and Office ADP Control
Officer. All the copies for each Directorate were sent
to the Directorate ADP Control Officer so whatever special
instructions that were necessary could be provided when
the office copies were received. The responses, which
were to include a final Directorate-wide ranking, were
due back to ODP by 20 December. The responses were
received from all Directorates except the DDA within one
week of the deadline. Two weeks after the deadline Helen
first asked for clarification on several well taken points.

This request for clarification led to a meeting on 3 January in which the D/ODP requested a memorandum be prepared addressing these points. When there was agreement on these points between Processing and myself, and the draft memorandum had been reviewed by D/ODP, I called Helen to let her know a memorandum would be distributed in the near future but I would like to meet with her ASAP to answer her questions so she could complete her FY 1981 requirements.

3. In our meeting I explained she was correct in the identification of terminals subject to limited allocation that were on the form she distributed to some ADP Control Officers in early January. In addition I told her:

a. The limitation on ODP terminals applies to all situations in which ODP could provide a terminal to access ODP central or dedicated services, ODP or user provided minicomputers, and external computer services.

b. Users can reprogram their funds to directly procure terminals. However, this is subject to the regular agency approval of reprogramming actions.

c. The request for an exchange of terminals (e.g., an advanced terminal to replace a Delta Data) would count against the allocation to a Directorate. However, the replaced terminal can be relocated within the Directorate and this will not count against the Directorate's allocation if the relocation action is initiated by the time the requested terminal is installed. The replacement of a terminal because it is inoperative or initiated by ODP (e.g., Design 100 for a IBM 2741) does not count against an allocation.

4. During our meeting Helen asked me if "ODP was part of the DDA." My response was that ODP was not part of the DDA as far as terminal allocations were concerned but this would not reduce the number of terminals allocated to the DDA in FY 1979 and 80. She accepted this response without any apparent or obvious concern. I reached the decision on treating ODP requirements separately in FY 1979, 80, and 81 after I reviewed ODP's requirements for these years and after a discussion with the ADD/A, DD/P, and AC/MS who were in unanimous agreement. I realize this is a change in our position but I

2

believe we made a mistake in the beginning when we included ODP's 1979 allocation as part of the DDA allocation. My reasons for my decision at this time are:

    a.   It would not be fair for the DDA allocation to have to support high priority ODP terminal requirements which in turn support the Agency in general or specific non-DDA offices or projects.

    b.   The unique requirement of using terminals to provide computer services to the Agency.

    c.   The difficulty in a clear distinction between which uses of ODP terminals are unique.

    d.   The question of allocating something back to ODP that is within the ODP budget and ODP gives final approval.

    e.   ODP has the only requirements that have been surfaced for the advanced terminal. No clear policy has been developed to what justification is necessary for these terminals. I believe this is an issue to be resolved within ODP. It is quite possible the DD/A could send a request for an advanced terminal to the Directorate ADP Control Officer who would approve it and the DD/P would not approve it when it is forwarded to him for final approval.

    f.   ODP has only a few hard requirements for terminals in FY 1979 and only one of the [ ] terminals allocated to the DDA in FY 1980 was for an ODP requirement.

    g.   In FY 1981 ODP is planning to begin the replacement of Delta Data terminals. These replacements, to replace inoperative terminals, will not be allocated in advance.

5.   A decision must be made within ODP as to who will approve and prioritize ODP terminal requirements since the DDA Directorate ADP Control Officer will no longer be requested to do this. It is assumed that whatever reports previously provided to the DDA Directorate ADP Control Officer containing ODP terminal inventories, requirements, and usage will continue to be provided.

STAT

Distribution:
    Original - Addressee, 1-C/P&BG, 1-ODP Registry, 2 - O/D/ODP
    MS/ODP [ ] caj/9 February 1979