

H

1976 D. 16 12 54



THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ~~OFF~~ SECY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

16 DEC 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Defense Intelligence Board - ACTION MEMORANDUM

Don, 16 DEC 1976

The Defense Intelligence Board, and its three Panels, were established in July, 1976, for a six month trial period. They were created to achieve three major goals:

- to improve the interaction between intelligence users and producers;
- to improve the coordination between various elements of the Department of Defense, and to "educate" members in the operations and priorities of other intelligence users and producers; and
- to improve intelligence-related planning and decision making.

A. MEMBERSHIP

Chairman - Deputy Secretary of Defense

Principals or Representatives of:

- Secretary of the Army
- Secretary of the Navy
- Secretary of the Air Force
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Commandant of the Marine Corps
- Director of Defense Research and Engineering
- Under Secretary of the Air Force
- Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)
- Principal Deputy Director of Defense Intelligence
- Deputy Director of Defense Intelligence for Programs and Resources
- Director, Defense Intelligence Agency
- Director, National Security Agency
- Director, Planning and Evaluation
- Director, Net Assessment

SECRETARY'S COPY



msk
ETS

1
5/12/146

B. MEMBER VIEWS REGARDING THE SUCCESS OF THE DIB STRUCTURE

This trial period has now been completed, and all members of the Board have submitted their views regarding the new structure. The following points summarize most member views:

- members agreed that the Defense Intelligence Board was of significant value in improving the interaction between users and producers, and in educating members as to the needs and requirements of other intelligence users and producers;
- members felt that the Board was less successful in improving decision making. While the Board had been helpful in some instances, its work was not linked to major policy issues or to the major guidance documents in the defense intelligence planning cycle. Such a link would have to be established for the Board to be effective in improving decision making on intelligence matters;
- members felt that the Board had also been useful in bringing users and producers together to discuss substantive intelligence issues which impact on force planning, policy planning, and resource decisions. The Board had focused originally on organizational and procedural issues, but some members felt that its gradual shift towards discussion of substantive issues was of major value;
- members had more mixed reactions to the Panels. They felt that the Panels initially attempted to focus on too many actions or issues, and that members' staffs were unable to keep up with the work load involved. Members suggested that the Panels should probably not be continued in their present form, but constituted from time to time at the direction of the Chairman;
- members also indicated that it was difficult to set priorities or to determine at the Panel level what issues might be important to the DIB. Policy level guidance was required from the Board for the Panels regarding the issues the Panels should include in their work program. Only a limited number of DIB related actions could be initiated at the Panel level; and
- some differences of view emerged regarding whether three separate Panels should be maintained in the future. NSA, USMC, N.A., and DDR&E recommended that the three Panels should be combined into one support group for the DIB. OJCS, Army and DIA recommended that the Users Panel should continue as a separate body, but that the Producers and Resources Panel should be combined.



C. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The following major recommendations are submitted, based on these member comments:

- The Defense Intelligence Board should be continued with its present membership and should continue to meet as often as necessary under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary;

Approve DR Disapprove _____ DEC 20 1976

- The Defense Intelligence Board should focus on substantive intelligence issues, as well as organizational and resource matters;

Approve DR Disapprove _____ ~~SECRET~~

- The Defense Intelligence Board should have its role expanded to include review of major defense intelligence guidance and planning documents so that it can assist more fully in improving intelligence decision making;

Approve DR Disapprove _____

- The Defense Intelligence Board should be mainly responsive to user direction. The Board should initiate guidance to the intelligence components, and offer advice to the Deputy Secretary of Defense on intelligence matters, rather than serving as a review board for actions initiated at the staff level;

Approve DR Disapprove _____

- Staff support for the DIB should be provided by the ODDI. DIB actions should not be formally staffed and coordinated at the action officer level;

Approve DR Disapprove _____

- The operation of the DIB should continue to be reviewed on a six-month basis. The structure should not be institutionalized within the Department of Defense without regular examination of its value, and steps which could be taken to improve its work and effectiveness; and

Approve DR Disapprove _____

- The Defense Intelligence Board combines a wide range of intelligence, operations, and planning expertise. It has the potential to review or discuss operational and planning problems as well




as intelligence issues. The Secretary of Defense may wish to use it in this manner in the future.

Approve DR Disapprove _____

D. FUTURE ISSUES

The following point should be kept in mind:

- The Board has been set up during a period in which the CFI and NSC system for handling national intelligence planning has been in considerable flux, and in which no national intelligence planning cycle has been in operation. In the future, the DIB structure may have to be adapted to provide a forum for discussing the defense position regarding national intelligence guidance, planning, and resource issues.


 Robert Ellsworth

