

~~TOP SECRET~~HANDLE VIA  
**BYEMAN**  
CONTROL SYSTEM~~SECRET~~ NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.



THE NRO STAFF

December 2, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. McLUCAS

SUBJECT: The National Intelligence Resources Board (NIRB)

Mr. Helms organized the NIRB in May of 1968. It is chaired by the Deputy Director, CIA, and the original membership consisted of the Director, DIA and the Director of Intelligence and Research, Department of State. You will recall, however, that Mr. Froehlke was recently appointed as a member of the NIRB in lieu of the Director, DIA. We understand that Admiral Bowen will become the permanent member from Mr. Froehlke's office.

The purpose of the Board is to assist the DCI in developing judgments concerning the need for resources to support the foreign intelligence effort. In this role, the NIRB:

1. Evaluates the responsiveness of individual projects and activities to the intelligence objectives, requirements and priorities established by USIB;
2. Provides recommendations to the DCI concerning the level of funding generally appropriate for such projects and activities;
3. Advises the DCI in connection with questions which arise during the course of the review of the four major national intelligence programs (the CCP, NRP, CIP and CIAP) concerning needs for the procurement, development or utilization of resources;
4. Examines the interrelationship of intelligence programs and determines relative needs for coverage of particular intelligence objectives as between different sources or systems.

Attached are the minutes of the November 26 meeting of the Board.

FREDERICK L. HOFMANN  
Major, USAF

HANDLE VIA  
**BYEMAN**  
CONTROL SYSTEM~~TOP SECRET~~EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING  
DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DDES NOT APPLYCONTROL NO \_\_\_\_\_  
COPY \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ COPIES  
PAGE \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ PAGES

~~SECRET~~

26 November 1969

## NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE RESOURCES BOARD

Minutes of the Sixteenth Meeting, at 1200, 21 November 1969

DCI Conference Room

1. Lt. General Robert E. Cushman, Jr., Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, presiding, and Mr. Ray S. Cline, Director of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, and Mr. Robert F. Froehlke, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration and Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, were present. Others present included Vice Admiral Noel Gayler, Director, National Security Agency, Mr. John A. Bross, D/DCI/NIPE, Mr. Stephen A. Loftus of the Department of State, Maj. Gen. Jack E. Thomas, USAF, Ret., consultant to the NIRB, and  Special Assistant to the DDCI.

2. CIRIS-70: The primary matter before the NIRB at this meeting was the participation of NSA in CIRIS-70 and the nature of the data required from NSA. Mr. Froehlke observed that he needed to be able to place a dollar value on intelligence products and saw the dollar cost data as a useful common denominator for his task of resource management in the Department of Defense. The Chairman noted the DCI's need for the CIRIS as a tool for his coordinating role in resource allocation and saw further requirements and uses for the CIRIS in relation to Mr. Froehlke's responsibilities in Defense, the data required for the studies called for by NSSM's 51 (Thailand) and 77 (Certain Country Program Budgets), the needs of the Bureau of the Budget, and the necessity for the intelligence community to be able to define the worth of the intelligence product.

Mr. Nathan C. Fitts of the NIPE Staff opened a presentation on the CIRIS and its background and purposes, stressing that the purpose of the CIRIS was to show in a variety of ways the operating elements of the intelligence community, what they do and the main targets they work against.

~~SECRET~~

Admiral Gayler's position in the discussion that followed was that perhaps a CIRIS for 1970 covering FY 1971 and 1972 was not necessary, that FY 1971 figures were too near in time to be handled in an experimental way, that more time was needed to develop a dependable and meaningful machine system in NSA for developing data for the CIRIS, and that cost figures per position versus target could be meaningless or misleading because of the variety of targets covered by COMINT positions such as wideband or those on common-user circuits. He indicated his concern that data in the CIRIS could be misused to "manage" NSA and expressed his feeling that there was no real requirement for data on allocations of activity within stations since these could vary from time to time.

Members of the Board attempted to reassure Admiral Gayler that there was no intent to "manage" NSA but noted that the DCI, Mr. Froehlke and the Department of State needed data on resource allocation and the targets covered by those resources to carry out their responsibilities. Board members recalled that they had agreed at the preceding meeting to request data from NSA in CIRIS-70 on a station-by-station breakdown and to look into ways to report allocations of effort within stations as an alternative to a position-by-position basis. Board members pressed for data from NSA on broad task allocations within stations and within NSA and SCA Headquarters, noting that such data was essential for systematizing assessments of the scale of community efforts toward various objectives and for determining possibilities for resource trade-offs across program lines. In addition, the requirements on the Board to respond to certain NSSM's made such data even more needed.

After considerable discussion, Admiral Gayler accepted the charge from the Board to examine how NSA could respond to CIRIS needs on a station/HQ main element breakdown and how levels of effort on major intelligence objectives within stations and Headquarters could be identified. He requested the Board to define its needs in terms of the problems it was charged to deal with and to confine its requirements on NSA to elements of information really essential to the Board's purposes without trying to obtain too much detail. Admiral Gayler indicated he could have an answer for the Board in two or three weeks and that if the Board did not seek too fine a level of reporting, he might be able to provide data fairly promptly thereafter.

3. The Board adjourned at 1430 hours with its next meeting set for sometime in the week of 15 December.



Executive Secretary