

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE

April 28, 1967

→ Re: Information Retrieval

On April 27, 1967, a meeting of General Counsel with the Literature Committee was held at the American Tobacco Company to discuss the status and future of the computer project. Present were General Counsel Haas, Hetsko, Ramm, Smith and Yeaman; Literature Committee members Cooke, Decker, Holtzman and Jacob; Project Officer O'Shea; Senator Clements and Mr. DeHart from Tobacco Institute; Messrs. Austern and Denniston from Covington & Burling; and Mr. Krash from Arnold & Porter.

Mr. Austern opened the discussion of the computer project by outlining the historical background of the project and of the development of the contract between Covington & Burling and 3i. In summary, he stated that contract price for the developmental stage of the project to be completed by March 7, 1967, was estimated at \$167,000. In fact, by the end of February, Covington & Burling had paid 3i \$175,000. In March, Covington & Burling paid an additional \$18,000. 3i has billed Covington & Burling for the month of April on additional \$32,000, which sum apparently has been paid. It is expected that, by the middle of May, 1967, there will be 5800 documents in the system.

Under the original cost estimates, as stated in the contract, dated January 31, 1967, between Covington & Burling and 3i, the monthly charges by 3i would be \$15,200. By its letter of April 12, 1967, 3i informed Covington & Burling that the revised charges would be approximately \$34,500 per month.

The meeting discussed the purposes of the project. Mr. Ramm stated categorically that, if the project did not serve a litigation function, R. J. Reynolds would drop out. After some discussion about whether the project was meant to serve litigation or Congressional or public relations needs or all three needs, the General Counsel decided that it should serve all three needs.

Mr. Austern noted that the Congressional hearings had not been programmed into the system. He said that, in developing the information for the "Tar" and nicotine paper Covington & Burling wrote, it took 27 1/2 hours of lawyer's time to review the 1965 Congressional hearings. He estimated that it would take at least another \$50,000 of lawyer's time to index the Congressional hearings in preparation for including the hearings in the system.

Jacob made the following points with regard to the status of the computer project:

1. There are problems with the quality of 3i indexing. The Literature Committee has had problems with every document that 3i has submitted to it for critique. The quality has not been high but the

trend has been in the right direction.

2. The system is selective but not analytic. Lawyers will still have to analyse the documents after the documents have been selected from the system.

3. There are mechanical problems inasmuch as, when one presses a button, the answer in terms of accession numbers may arrive very quickly, but it still takes great time to phrase the question, to find the accession cards from the trays, to view all the cards, to get hard copies of the documents, etc. Lawyer's time is not infinite and the system does not seem to save the lawyer too much time.

After discussion, General Counsel directed Mr. Austern to do the following:

1. Continue with 3i at the rate of \$34,500 per month through June 30, 1967, or at least until Covington & Burling has obtained the computer discs and the computer program.

2. Continue to use the Scope of Coverage document that 3i is presently using; that is, the "Scope of Coverage" document developed in January and not the revised "Scope of Coverage" document distributed by Mr. O'Shea at the meeting (Exhibit A).

3. Review the status and progress of the system at the end of the trial period referred to in paragraph 1, above.

4. Not to enter into the system the Congressional hearing materials at this time.

The meeting then turned to the "Scope of Coverage" document and Mr. O'Shea pointed out to the General Counsel those areas which seemed to be causing the Literature Committee the most problems. These areas are circled on Exhibit A.

Mr. O'Shea raised the issue of whether "author comment" (not a word of art) should be included in the "Scope of Coverage." After discussion which indicated that it would cost between \$5.45 and \$5.15 per document (\$5,450 or \$5,150 per month), the General Counsel decided that "author comment" would not be included. When asked, General Counsel stated that this decision was not finally decided for all time and that the decision might be reviewed again in the future.

FKD