

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Office of Science and Technology
Series/Staff Member:
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 43311
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Committee for National Security Meeting, 10/27/98 [Folder 2]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	1	1	7	3

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)
001b. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)
001c. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Office of Science and Technology Policy

OA/Box Number: 43311

FOLDER TITLE:

Committee for National Security Meeting 10/27/98 [Folder 2]

2008-1524-F

kc1211

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or
financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President
and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of
an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial
information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement
purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of
financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information
concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed
of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C.
2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20502

NSTC COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Minutes of the October 27, 1998, Meeting

The Committee on National Security (CNS) held its eighteenth meeting on October 27, 1998. The principals who attended the meeting are listed below:

Dr. Jacques Gansler, Chair	Under Secretary of Defense Acquisition and Technology
Dr. Kerri-Ann Jones, Co-Chair	Associate Director, National Security and International Affairs, Office of Science & Technology Policy
Mr. William Reinsch	Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration
Ms. Rose Gottemoeller	Director, Office of Nonproliferation & National Security, Department of Energy
Mr. Jorge Perez-Lopez	Director, Office of International Affairs, Department of Labor
Ambassador Ralph Earle II	Deputy Director, Arms Control & Disarmament Agency
Mr. James Devine	Senior Advisor for Science Applications, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior

The primary purpose of the meeting was to receive status reports from the International Technology Transfer Issues and Policy Interagency Working Group, the Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D Interagency Working Group, and the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Technology Working Group. The meeting agenda is included at Attachment 1.

I. INTRODUCTION

Dr. Kerri-Ann Jones, co-chair of the CNS, opened the meeting and welcomed Dr. Jorge Perez-Lopez, Director, Office of International Affairs, Department of Labor.

3D1019 - 1000 LRS.

II. CURRENT EFFORTS

A. Update by the International Technology Transfer Issues and Policy Working Group

Dr. Jones introduced Dr. Gerald Hane, the OSTP chair of the International Technology Transfer Issues and Policy Interagency Working Group (ITTIP IWG). Dr. Hane first discussed the Federal Laboratory International Technology Transfer Policies case study. He reported that DOC offered to coordinate interagency input from technology transfer managers regarding the management of foreign participation in cooperative research and development agreements (CRADA), and that the IWG recently learned that DOD had commissioned Booz-Allen and Hamilton (BAH) to study the same issue. He noted that the IWG is holding final work on the federal laboratory technology transfer case study in abeyance pending the results of the two reports.

The goal of the BAH study is similar to that of the IWG -- to determine how technology transfer practices can be improved while taking into consideration economic and national security issues. The scope of the BAH study, however, is somewhat more limited given that it focuses specifically on CRADAs. Nevertheless, the preliminary findings are similar to those of the IWG: (1) improving internal controls could help the process, and (2) interagency consultations would be helpful in certain situations. Once BAH completes its study, the IWG will finalize its findings and brief the results of both efforts to the CNS.

Dr. Jacques Gansler noted that thousands of Chinese and Russian post-doctoral students are working in DOE national laboratories, frequently in areas adjacent to sensitive work. A quick check of DOD laboratories, USAMRIID in particular, similarly found foreign scientists in proximity to U.S. personnel working in sensitive areas. He noted that BAH was also undertaking a review of this personnel issue and studying the need for tighter controls in these areas.

Dr. Hane pointed out that currently the IWG was not focusing on foreign personnel issues. He suggested that the CNS principals provide specific guidance if they would like the IWG to include personnel issues. The CNS principals agreed that the IWG should consider this issue.

DOC has prepared two additional case studies: (1) International SEMATECH 300 Millimeter Wafer Initiative and (2) Rocket Casing Manufacturing. The IWG is circulating copies of both studies for internal review. Dr. Hane noted that the IWG members are not experts and will need to reach out to other parts of their agencies for advice. This is a key step, and the IWG asked the principals for assistance. Dr. Jones asked Dr. Hane to distribute the IWG membership list so that the principals would know who represents their agencies on the IWG (list at Attachment 2).

Mr. Reinsch noted that DOC is preparing the next three case studies: (1) coproduction of the M-109 Howitzer, (2) high performance computer export controls, and (3) third-party licensing. He expected these case study drafts to be available in the next few months.

B. Update on FY2000 Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D Agenda

Dr. Jones introduced Dr. Steve Rinaldi from the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) R&D IWG. Dr. Rinaldi distributed the IWG membership list (copy at Attachment 3). He stated that the group expected to complete its proposed CIP R&D agenda for FY2000 in the next day or two.

As background information, Dr. Rinaldi noted that the IWG was established in late March 1998 in response to efforts to develop Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 63, Critical Infrastructure Protection, which the President signed on May 22, 1998. PDD 63 established the Critical Infrastructure Coordinating Group (CICG), which has agreed to use the output of the CIP R&D IWG as its R&D analyses. The IWG is organized into eight subgroups: (1) banking and finance; (2) information and communication; (3) energy, which includes the electric power grid, oil, and natural gas production and storage; (4) transportation; (5) vital human services, which include emergency responders, continuity of government services and medical issues; (6) interdependencies; (7) outreach; and (8) budget.

The IWG initially established a baseline of on-going federal CIP R&D. OMB did a quick analysis in December 1997 and estimated that federal CIP R&D funding was \$710 million in FY98 and \$715 million in FY99. The read-ahead material provided a value of \$785 million, which included \$70 million in DARPA's budget that was subsequently zeroed by Congress. A second data call in June 1998 provided programmatic detail on ongoing and proposed CIP R&D. The IWG used the results of the two data calls as its baseline program. Currently, OMB has a detailed budget data review (BDR) underway, with results due in December 1998, that will provide a qualitative and quantitative picture of ongoing agency CIP R&D. The IWG did not perform any vulnerability studies; rather, it used studies that the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection (PCCIP) and others had previously funded.

The IWG used a two-step process to develop its FY2000 budget recommendations. First, it identified a comprehensive agenda that included all necessary and desirable CIP R&D without constraints of money or time. The IWG then compared the comprehensive agenda to the baseline, with the resultant differences representing R&D gaps and related needs.

Second, the IWG developed R&D priorities. Given that sufficient funding would not be available to undertake all of the R&D in the comprehensive agenda, each IWG subgroup identified its top five priorities among the programs they reviewed. Several common R&D needs were noted:

- Vulnerability studies need to be done in greater detail. Peggy Evans, OMB, noted that many vulnerability studies do not identify a clear threat. Dr. Gansler remarked that there are probably threat studies that the IWG did not review due to security restrictions. He agreed that the IWG needed access to those studies.
- There is a need for increased information assurance R&D.
- Intrusion detection and monitoring, including that for chemical and biological agents, is critical.
- Interdependencies among infrastructures are not well understood. Each IWG subgroup recommended increased study of interdependencies.

The IWG developed a menu of R&D options for FY2000 that includes new starts and extensions of ongoing programs. As a result of its analysis of the top subgroup priorities, the IWG recommended \$250 million in new CIP R&D funding for FY2000. Larger funding increases would likely be too big to be properly managed; smaller funding options would probably not allow PDD 63 guidance to be met. The recommended funding level of \$250 million best balances the need for fiscal restraint and meets the guidance of PDD 63. The roadmapping study that the Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office conducted earlier this year provided substantial input to the IWG analyses.

Mr. Reinsch asked how the IWG decided on specific values for the programs and if these values represented at least notional projects. Dr. Rinaldi answered that the values were based on notional programs and an assessment of needs and shortages in current efforts. Therefore, the \$250 million provides for incremental changes in existing programs and represents an increase over the baseline. Dr. Gansler recommended that the IWG complete its baseline evaluation so that the magnitude of the current programs could be better assessed in comparison with the incremental increases and total needs. Dr. Rinaldi noted that OMB's BDR would provide the necessary program baseline data, which will then be tabulated and provided to the CNS.

PDD 63 calls for a report to the President by November 19 with a plan to develop a comprehensive federal critical infrastructure protection plan that includes milestones for each CICG subgroup. The IWG accelerated its timetable and developed the proposed FY2000 agenda in order to provide inputs into the FY2000 budget process. The final version of the IWG's proposed FY2000 agenda should be completed within a day or two of the CNS meeting.

Dr. Gansler congratulated the IWG on its progress. He further asked if all the IWG participants were fully aware that the report has proceeded beyond the plan-for-a-plan mandate of the PDD for November delivery. Dr. Rinaldi noted that they were and that the IWG had been actively developing the R&D plan itself since March. It was noted that the IWG-recommended R&D program options had not been coordinated in detail with each department and agency. Rather, the IWG recommendations were part of an independent report based on the group's programmatic and technical analysis. Dr. Jones emphasized that the report would be distributed to the CNS for review and requested that this be considered as a streamlined agency review. She also noted that OSTP wished to review the IWG's proposed agenda with respect to other federal research priorities.

From October 1998 to February 1999, the IWG will concentrate on outreach to the private sector, academia, and international communities. From February to June, the group will monitor ongoing CIP R&D and develop FY2001 R&D proposals in close coordination with normal agency budget processes.

C. Overview of Nonproliferation and Arms Control Annual Report

Dr. Jones introduced Ms. Sarah Mullen of ACDA to present the annual report of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Technology Working Group (NPAC TWG). In terms of fulfilling the group's organizing principles, Ms. Mullen gave the group an "A" rating in promoting information sharing; a "B" in enhancing effectiveness, minimizing proliferation of working groups, and developing informal budget crosscuts; and a "C" in advising agencies on R&D priorities and framing issues and differences for adjudication. Concerning these last two principles, Ms. Mullen read from Under Secretary Holum's speech at last week's NPAC TWG symposium. Under Secretary Holum noted that although the NPAC TWG has been successful, its concept has inherent drawbacks that inhibit progress. TWG recommendations do not carry requisite weight within the acquisition structures of individual agencies. Technology shortfalls characterized as "national level needs" do not necessarily translate into high-priority R&D projects. R&D managers have little latitude to expend resources for the common good. Since the TWG has no discretionary funds, NPAC TWG-identified needs sometimes go unfulfilled. The TWG has only been partially successful in engaging policymakers at a level where priorities among competing national-level projects can be established and resources directed. (The CNS is one such policymaking body.) The NPAC TWG's role is not to prioritize agency R&D programs but rather to advise agencies on program priorities. New ways are needed to adjudicate conflicting R&D program issues if the NPAC TWG is to fulfill its mandate.

The NPAC TWG has 13 focus groups, two of which have experienced changes. First, the Fissile Material Monitoring focus group refocused its efforts last year. This group was originally intended to address the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT), but

given the slow progress in that area, the subgroup did not have much work to perform. More recently, it has examined policy needs in three areas: the FMCT itself, safeguards, and controlled information barriers. Second, the former START focus group has redirected its attention toward ballistic missile sensors and now includes missile technology control regimes as well as missile limitation treaties.

The NPAC TWG coordinates approximately \$770 million in 280 programs. Ms. Mullen noted that in 1996-1998, there was an increased emphasis in CW and BW detection but declining interest in active electro-optics, unattended sensors, and underground facilities. Dr. Gansler noted that the FY99 and FY00 budgets have substantial increases in the last two topics.

Ms. Mullen noted that several organizational issues have arisen in the past year. ACDA will be incorporated into the State Department, but Ms. Mullen will continue as a co-chair. Mr. Walter Busbee, the DOD co-chair, retired and -- as of this CNS meeting -- had not yet been replaced. Ms. Mullen urged that the DOD co-chair be proactive and support the mandate of the NPAC TWG. (Since this CNS meeting, the Office of the Secretary of Defense designated Colonel John Wade as the NPAC TWG co-chair.) In addition, the CIA has abolished its Office of Research and Development (ORD). Some NPAC TWG-related projects previously funded by ORD have been transferred to other parts of the agency while other projects have been terminated (which is of concern).

The NPAC TWG made five recommendations:

- Strengthen the role of the Technology Needs Subcommittee, expand its membership to include the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, and distribute the subcommittee results more widely.
- Expand communication among senior policymakers, developers, and users. Ask each focus group to conduct user-developer conferences. In addition, have a representative of each focus group attend appropriate policy backstopping meetings.
- Convince R&D principals to make their R&D enterprises more transparent and to help the NPAC TWG frame its issues for agency consideration and attention.
- Partner with other agencies that are developing technology not directly related to nonproliferation but that may have ancillary utility (e.g., R&D at NIH and EPA that may be useful in the BW area).
- Increase accountability for the work of the TWG and its focus groups.

Dr. Gansler provided an overview of the new Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), which stood up on October 1. DTRA is a consolidation of the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Chemical and Biological Matters, the Defense Special Weapons Agency (DSWA), the Onsite Inspection Agency (OSIA), and the

Defense Technology Security Administration (DTSA). This new organization is intended to provide increased focus in threat reduction and nonproliferation. DTRA includes full-time representatives from other agencies (e.g., FBI, DOE, CIA) on its director's staff. It has a senior advisory board that will conduct operations research analyses that include determining where new nonproliferation investments should be made and determining new policy initiatives to undertaken.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. FY2000 R&D Budget Priorities

Dr. Jones distributed an article from *Science* magazine that summarized the FY99 R&D budget as compiled by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). For the FY2000 budget, OSTP and OMB consider critical infrastructure to be a special emphasis area. The CNS may want to have it considered as a cross-cut issue next year. That would require a full programmatic review in conjunction with OMB. Another area of interest to the CNS is high-performance computing, which is currently a formal cross-cut technology area.

B. Weapons of Mass Destruction R&D Subgroup

At the last CNS meeting, the principals discussed the R&D subgroup established under the Weapons of Mass Destruction Preparedness Group, which itself had been established under PDD 62. The subgroup addresses R&D to counter or respond to chemical, biological, and nuclear terrorism, but it has concentrated on chemical and biological issues. The subgroup has three teams: a medical R&D team, a nonmedical R&D team, and a modeling and simulation team. The medical team produced a paper identifying gaps and research needs for the development of new therapeutics and vaccines, and the subgroup is studying this information and its implications for the FY2000 budget. The nonmedical team, drawing on the interagency Technical Support Working Group, prepared a report that identified some of the R&D needed to improve our ability to respond to chemical and biological terrorism. This report also presented some of the ongoing R&D activities in this area. However, the nonmedical R&D paper does not lay out a long-term research strategy to address needs. Finally, at its meeting last week, the subgroup reviewed a paper prepared by DOE on modeling and simulation. The efforts of these three teams will feed into the WMDP's consideration of proposed R&D expenditures in the FY2000 budget. This R&D process will likely become as active as the critical infrastructure protection R&D program. A key question is managing these large, interagency R&D programs. The CNS requested that the WMDP R&D subgroup provide an in-depth briefing on its plans and progress in the near future.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

- The ITTIP IWG will examine the issue of technology transfer via foreign personnel.
- The CIP IWG will provide its proposed FY2000 R&D agenda to the CNS for review.
- The CIP IWG will compare the results of OMB's BDR to its proposed FY2000 R&D agenda and provide the results of this analysis to the CNS for review and assessment.

Dr. Jacques Gansler, Chair (date)

Bruce W. MacDonald for 4/12/99
Dr. Kerri-Ann Jones, Co-Chair (date)

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Member list, Working Group in International Technology Transfer
3. Member list, Working Group in Critical Infrastructure Protection

Office

CSS Mtg - 27 Oct 98

- Gerald R. Kane

-- Gansler stated origin of BA 34 study

-- Revised - "deemed experts" licenses (for students, post docs, etc.)

--- There are criteria, but nature/pace of technology makes them obsolete. Will be revised.

-- KAS - deemed experts come across our desk in context of India Policy in evolving.

* - Have working group address personnel issue (R, KAS agreed)

-- Revised - INS lead? Probably right was to be here, developing system to track, but not done yet.

-- G4 - coordinating w/ I.T.T. group in DOC.

-- Update on the other case studies. Most difficult step - being able to draw on inputs of agency experts.

-- BR - will be finishing 3 more studies by

- Sally Mullens

-- Objectives of NPAC/TAG

-- Changes to Fissile material monitoring gp, Ballistic Missile Sensors

-- Funding Issue

-- Have tried to use Radars, but gave up on it. High confidence in their #'s (NPAC TAG)

-- State of play in R+D coordination

-- NPAC TUC recommendations

-- Will ad focus groups to have user/developer conferences,
Has worked well w/ intraagency coordination.

-- Suggested a brief to policy makers

KAT - why not use CVS w/ focus groups, CVS
can bring back to the agencies

Sally - need a message from CVS to their
members on NPAC TUC that it's okay to
come up w/ tech projects.

OMB - would support a process like C.P.R.D. Tech
to integrate their work into the agencies

-- Would like to increase their accountability

-- Example (on new DoD org): DTRA (reports directly to
Sauls)

-- Consolidates 4 agencies into 1

DSWA, OSIA, DTRA

-- 2000 people on these reduction

-- Have full-time reps on directors staff.

-- Hans Mark - links to services

-- Advisory board w/ agency reps

-- Have an "ops research" advisory body for new R&D
opportunities + policy.

-- Good up / Oct

-- Hans spent a lot of personal time w/ this

- KAT

-- Budget

-- Article from AAAS. In terms of 2000 -

Jack Lee / KAT memo on priorities. Process is
moving forward. C.P. -> special emphasis area

May want to talk about cross cut

--- High performance computing (is a formal course)

-- WMD

--- PDD-62

--- Did not have lead time of CIP; may be more complex

--- Set up R&D subgroup w/ 3 parts. Med team furthest along. Nonmedical team based on TS46. Need to create a nonmedical group w/ long term look

--- Hope to have digital analysis in 2 weeks

--- This group needs to get more intense. CIP

--- Big question - how do you manage these R&D groups?

--- Dander - good paper for subsequent mty.

Need overall \$ - ongoing + Δ

DoD IRK \$ $\rightarrow$ CIP use also! (Annular
bill).

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Office of Science and Technology Policy

OA/Box Number: 43311

FOLDER TITLE:

Committee for National Security Meeting 10/27/98 [Folder 2]

2008-1524-F
kc1211

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001b. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Office of Science and Technology Policy

OA/Box Number: 43311

FOLDER TITLE:

Committee for National Security Meeting 10/27/98 [Folder 2]

2008-1524-F
kc1211

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001c. list	Critical Infrastructure Protection Research and Development Interagency Working Group [National Security Act] (3 pages)	10/26/98	P3/b(3), b(7)(C), b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Office of Science and Technology Policy

OA/Box Number: 43311

FOLDER TITLE:

Committee for National Security Meeting 10/27/98 [Folder 2]

2008-1524-F
kc1211

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or
financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President
and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed
of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C.
2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of
an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial
information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement
purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of
financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information
concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]



CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION: TOWARD A FEDERAL R&D AGENDA

Dr. Steven M. Rinaldi
Office of Science and Technology Policy
October 27, 1998



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION R&D IWG - OFF AND RUNNING

- Under NSTC authority, IWG first met in late March; has met almost weekly with 19 agencies actively participating
- PDD-63 on May 22 established Critical Infrastructure Coordinating Group (CICG), which agreed to utilize output of this IWG
- IWG organized into eight subgroups:
 - Banking and Finance
 - Information and Communications
 - Energy
 - Transportation
 - Vital Human Services
 - Interdependencies
 - Outreach
 - Budget



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

CIP R&D IWG SUMMER ACTIVITIES

- **Establish the Baseline**
 - **OMB data call (December 1997): \$710 M in FY98, \$715 M in FY99**
 - **IWG data call (June): programmatic information and proposed new starts**
- **Review and Understand Vulnerabilities**
- **Determine Gaps and Shortfalls**
 - **What is the baseline?**
 - **What does a comprehensive, conceptual program look like?**
 - **The differences are the gaps and shortfalls**
- **Develop R&D priorities for each sector based on agency inputs**



IWG FY2000 R&D NEW START OPTIONS HAVE SEVERAL "COMMON THREADS"

- **Need for vulnerability studies**
- **Emphasis on information assurance in all infrastructure sectors**
- **Emphasis on intrusion detection and monitoring (whether monitoring of electronic intrusions or monitoring for chem and bio agents)**
- **Focus on interdependencies: each subgroup noted little ongoing work or understanding of this issue and its need to be addressed in R&D new starts**



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

FOLLOW-ON STEPS

- **Focus of IWG efforts from October - February**
 - Outreach to private sector, academia, international community
 - R&D conference next spring under consideration
- **Focus of IWG efforts from February - June**
 - FY2001 budget issues
 - Ongoing review of technology issues
- **PCAST has security panel, chaired by Norm Augustine, examining CIP R&D issues**
- **Coordinating R&D program of this magnitude, to include close partnership with the private sector, will require innovative management concepts and approaches**



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

THE NEXT MONTH

- **PDD-63 calls for a report to the President in November on plan for developing a CIP plan**
- **IWG R&D report for NSTC and CICG will have:**
 - **CIP R&D vision and objectives**
 - **Draft plan itself, in coordination with budget process**
 - **R&D options for FY2000**
 - **Interagency processes for budget, outreach, and technology monitoring**
 - **First draft completed by September 28, final by mid-late October**
- **But, rapid evolution of technology will require review of programs, threats, vulnerabilities, and agenda next year and beyond**



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

AGENCY WEDGE ALLOCATIONS FOR FY2000

WEDGE LEVEL:	<u>\$750M</u>	<u>\$500M</u>	<u>\$250M</u>	<u>\$125M</u>	<u>\$70M</u>
Defense	237.6	147.6	63.6	27.7	16.4
Commerce	117.1	94.1	49.1	25.7	16.1
Energy	134.5	76.3	41.8	22.0	13.4
Transportation	22.0	15.0	8.5	6.5	3.5
EPA	17.0	10.5	10.5	5.8	3.8
FEMA	28.1	16.1	3.1	2.1	0.8
DOJ	34.6	29.6	13.6	6.8	4.3
NSF	94.0	65.5	29.5	9.0	4.0
DOI	15.0	11.2	9.2	6.5	3.6
HHS	7.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
DOA	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NRC	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
NASA	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Treasury	37.0	28.0	16.0	10.8	3.0



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

IWG ANALYSIS: OPTIONS FOR FY2000

- IWG recommends \$250 million funding for FY2000
 - Draws from IWG “top five” priorities for each infrastructure sector
 - Balances fiscal restraint with responsiveness to Presidential direction
 - Is same level of new effort recommended by President’s Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection; 33% increase over existing baseline

<i>Funding Profile:</i>	<u>FY2000</u>	<u>FY2001</u>	<u>FY2002</u>	<u>FY2003</u>	<u>FY2004</u>	<u>FY2005</u>
Banking and Finance	19	22	22	16	15	15
Information and Comm	138	178	191	192	192	192
Energy	44	53.5	58.5	62	63	63
Transportation	16	26	41	56	60	60
Vital Human Services	20	21	21	26	29	29
Interdependencies	13	15	15	23	23	23
TOTAL:	250M	315.5M	348.5M	375M	382M	382M



*Critical Infrastructure Protection R&D
Interagency Working Group*

IWG ANALYSIS: OPTIONS FOR FY2000

- IWG developed options for FY2000 CIP R&D new starts
 - Closely coordinated with OMB and overall budget process
 - Identified 71 programs in six broad infrastructure categories
- IWG analyzed five funding options (wedges) for FY2000:

<i>Wedge Level:</i>	<u><i>\$750M</i></u>	<u><i>\$500M</i></u>	<u><i>\$250M</i></u>	<u><i>\$125M</i></u>	<u><i>\$70M</i></u>
Banking and Finance	58	42	19	11	3
Information and Comm	409	286	138	63	39
Energy	153	85	44	25	14
Transportation	33	23	16	9	5
Vital Human Services	66	40	20	11	6
Interdependencies	31	24	13	6	3

- Comments:
 - \$750M and \$500M wedges would be difficult to manage; no ramp-up period; may incur personnel shortages
 - \$125M option may not allow USG to meet Presidential guidance
 - \$70M option is effectively status quo; does not adequately address identified gaps