

*for [unclear] [unclear]*  
396

FINER MEETING OF NIS AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GUIDED MISSILES

"to make recommendations to the NIS Committee on procedures for OMAIC review of guided missiles content in various topical components of the NIS."

Sections  
16, 60, 64


21 March 1960

L  
CIA

1. The following were present:

- Mr. J. A. Minogue Army
- Mr. A. E. Gerard Army
- Mr. E. P. Roland Navy
- Mr. C. P. Berney Air Force
- Mr. R. S. Kain State

8 7 12 SS  
7-116  
(b) (3)



2. The Chairman outlined the history of OMAIC/NIS relations, supplemented by reports of experience with OMAIC from various members of the ad hoc committee. Some of the more pertinent points follow:

NW 26640/3

a. Difference of opinion was expressed as to the appropriateness of submitting NIS drafts to OMAIC before they are processed in OBI. One member suggested that because such drafts have not been "reconciled" with other NIS Sections they are departmental intelligence and therefore of little interest to OMAIC. It was pointed out, however, that the cover page of each NIS draft bears the producing agency statement of approval for use in the NIS, and for purposes of OMAIC review the drafts can be considered national intelligence.

b. The significant differences between NIS and NIE processing and allocations of production responsibility were discussed. This matter was thought to be pertinent to Committee actions inasmuch as OMAIC's review to date has shown some inclination to identify the NIS with the agreed-type intelligence found in the NIE.

c. The practicability of excerpting OI material from NIS drafts for purposes of the review was questioned. Some members were of the opinion that with OMAIC's need for assurance that all matters relating to guided missiles - even oblique references - are submitted to them for review, entire manuscripts in most cases would have to be reproduced. Section 6<sup>d</sup> might be an exception.

d. In response to the request of one of the members, the Chairman agreed to look into SIC's handling of the OMAIC review on Section 72 and make such information available to the Committee at the next meeting.

*document [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]*

APPROVED FOR RELEASE  
DATE: SEP 2006  
MAR 29 1960

(9)

e. The following basic problems with GMAIC's proposal of 3 January 1960 were highlighted during the discussion.

(1) The GMAIC review might involve serious delays in NIS processing. The time required to resolve GMAIC comments -- some of which might concern one or more subcontributors -- would be added to that required for the GMAIC review.

(2) Differences in producing-agency processing for sections involved in GM make a common approach to the review of all NIS elements unrealistic. With Sections 81, 82, and 83 processing might be handled with minimal difficulty by section coordinators. On the other hand, Section 84, which involves subcontributors and requires coordination with other agencies, and Chapter I, which involves NIS Committee approval, present a more complex problem.

(3) GMAIC's requirement for 25 copies of NIS drafts places an unacceptable reproduction burden on NIS-producing agencies.

(4) The nature of the GMAIC review holds the danger of needless emasculation of the NIS. Using NIS 26 (84) as an example, it was pointed out that GMAIC actions have tended more toward deletion than ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> toward ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> recording of NIS GM coverage.

*Loward*

f. In the interest of establishing a basis for Committee action, the members were asked to examine expeditiously the following preliminary proposals with their respective agencies before the next meeting.

(1) That the subject of guided missiles be considered temporarily unsuitable for coverage as basic intelligence. In the opinion of one member, the state of the art, the fluidity of most aspects of production and employment, and the high security classification make NIS guided missile coverage infeasible. This view was not shared by most of the members. The opposing view was based on two factors: 1.) that neither military operations and capability nor the scientific effort of a number of countries could be given adequate treatment without discussing GM; and 2.) difficulties such as nonfirm information and high classification applied mainly to NIS 26; any decision on GM coverage should not be geared to one unusual situation.

*see appendix  
copy  
with K  
approval*

*No*

(2) That the GMAIC review take place at page proof stage. Although such procedure would provide for review close to the end of processing -- a feature considered desirable by the Committee -- it might require the expensive and time-consuming remake for a second proof.

*OBI +  
CAF  
W.D.  
Account title  
Nov 23  
1960*

*Yes*

(3) That GM coverage be isolated in a separate NIS Section, whereby problems of security classification and interservice coordination would be alleviated. However, the separate section approach might create intelligence voids in certain NIS elements. Since GM is essentially a weapons system, and no system per se is covered in any other unit of NIS, it runs through several parts of the already established outline for NIS: production in 64, research in 72, employment in Ch. VIII. ho

(4) That departmental coordinators, rather than Chapter coordinators, assume responsibility for obtaining the review. This modification of the GMAIC proposal would insure consistency in the review procedures of the individual producing agencies but would not reduce the complexity of interagency coordination. Dait care

3. The next meeting of the NIS ad hoc committee will be held at 1000 hours on Monday, 4 April 1960.



Distribution:

- 2 - State
- 10 - Army
- 2 - Navy
- 2 - Air Force
- 5 - OBI

NW 26640/3